TENNESSEE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION LEADER PERFORMANCE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ROLE EXPECTATIONS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Gene Warren Turner

August 1974

E

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer gratefully acknowledges the support of the doctoral committee--Dr. Robert S. Dotson, Dr. Peter M. Husen, Dr. Earl M. Ramer, Dr. Dewey H. Stollar, and particularly the chairman, Dr. John T. Lovell. Without the suggestions, assistance and encouragement of this committee the study would not have been completed.

Special thanks is expressed to Dr. Cecil E. Carter, Jr. for valuable help in processing the data for analysis.

Sincere appreciation goes to Dr. Vernon W. Darter and Dr. William D. Bishop, past and present dean, respectively, Agricultural Extension Service. Their many considerations related to study leave, use of extension documents and permission to administer the survey to county extension personnel made possible the study in its present form.

Many thanks are due Mr. H. T. Short, District Supervisor; Miss Estelle Vines, Associate District Supervisor; and all extension personnel in extension District One. Without their willingness to carry on the work while the author was on leave the study could not have been completed.

Thanks are expressed to county extension personnel across Tennessee for completing an additional survey in an honest manner.

Finally, to my wife, Charlotte, and sons, Wesley and Glenn, thanks for the encouragement, kind words and smiles when these were most needed.

ABSTRACT

The problem explored was how the ideal role relates to the actual role of the extension leader as perceived by his staff and further how does performance of the extension leader relate to high congruity of ideal and actual role? The following questions were explored and analyzed: (1) is there a significant relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role (as perceived by staff members) and high performance rating of an extension leader; (2) is there agreement among staff members as to role items and segments that should constitute the job responsibilities of an extension leader; (3) is there agreement among staff members as to the manner in which role items and segments are actually being carried out; and (4) is there a relationship between congruity of ideal and actual role and perceived leader behavior (as measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire) of the extension leader?

Job descriptions of the 95 Tennessee county extension leaders were analyzed and categorized into 39 role item statements. These items were further classified under five role segments. A Likert-type questionnaire was developed using these 39 role items which was used to collect data to determine ideal and actual role of the extension leader as

perceived by his professional staff. The LBDQ was used as a second measure of perception of actual role.

A summary of findings included the following. Congruity of ideal and actual role as perceived by an extension leader's staff was significantly correlated with his performance. Total score related to actual role, however, proved to be more highly related to performance than congruity scores.

The staff of extension leaders considered that 31 of the 39 role items should ideally be a part of the job responsibility of the extension leader. Two of the remaining eight were related to coordinating training and use of volunteer leaders; three to specialist use in planning, implementing and evaluating the county program; two to training personnel; and one to coordinating securing of sponsorship for all program areas.

The staff of extension leaders considered that 29 of the 39 role items were actually being performed in a satisfactory manner. Eight of the remaining ten were classified low consensus in the ideal dimension and presumably were being performed at about the level staff members felt these should be. Two role items, assist staff in implementing their assigned area of work and counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities, moved from high consensus in the

ideal dimension to low consensus in the actual dimension. Thus these two items were perceived by staff of the extension leader as not being performed at a satisfactory level.

Extension leaders ranking above the mean on both initiating structure and consideration scored significantly higher on 38 of the 39 role items than did leaders ranking below the mean in both these dimensions. Congruity measures used in the study were highly correlated with initiating structure and consideration scores.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Problem	4
	Purpose of the Study	5
	Significance of the Study	7
	Limitations of the Study	7
	Definitions	8
	Organization of the Study	12
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
	Introduction	14
	Role and Organizational Effectiveness	14
	Role and Performance	18
	Educational Research and Role	25
	Summary	36
III	METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	40
	Introduction	40
	Population	40
	The Development of the Role Study Instrument	41
	Role Congruity Measure	44
	Performance Ratings Used	
	Administration of the Instruments	46
	Treatment of the Data	47
IV	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	48
	Introduction	48
	Question One	49
	Question Two	59
	Question Three	69
	Question Four	79
	Summary of Performance Indicators	85
V	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	88
	Introduction	88
	Study Summary	89

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Findings	93
	Question 1	93
	Question 2	96
	Question 3	99
	Question 4	102
	Performance Rating and Its Relationship to Several Predictors	103
	Conclusions	104
	Recommendations	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY		111
APPENDICES		116
A.	Questionnaires	117
B.	Tables	135
VITA		167

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Relationship of Difference Scores (D_1 and D_2) and Leader's Performance Rating - 1973	50
II.	Relationship of Ideal and Actual Scores and Leader's Performance Rating - 1973	53
III.	Relationship of Performance of Extension Leader, Educational Level (BS and MS) and Length of Service - 1973	57
IV.	Consensus Levels by Role Item for the Ideal Role of an Extension Leader - 1973	60
V.	Consensus Levels by Role Item for the Actual Role of an Extension Leader - 1973	70
VI.	Comparison of Actual Role by Segments of Extension Leaders Ranking Above the Mean (Group I) in Both Initiating Structure and Consideration with Extension Leaders Ranking Below the Mean (Group II) in Both Dimensions (t-test) - 1973	81
VII.	Relationship of Initiating Structure and Consideration to Total Difference Scores and Difference Segment Scores (Kendall's Tau) - 1973	82

TABLE		PAGE
VIII.	Relationship of Initiating Structure and Consideration to Total Actual Score and Performance Rating (Kendall's Tau) - 1973	84
IX.	Relationship of Performance Rating to Several Predictors of Performance (Kendall's Tau) - 1973	86
X.	Comparison of Leaders' Rating 3 (Group I) and 5 (Group II) by Actual Role Item - 1973	135
XI.	Relationship of Each Actual Role Item with Performance (Kendall's Tau) - 1973	142
XII.	Frequencies, Mean, Variance, Mean Rank, and Consensus Level of Each Ideal Role Item - 1973	145
XIII.	Frequencies, Mean, Variance, Mean Rank, and Consensus Level by Each Actual Role Item - 1973	151
XIV.	Relationship Between Ideal and Actual Perceptions by Role Items - 1973	157
XV.	Comparison of Actual Role by Items of Extension Leaders Ranking Above the Mean (Group I) in Both Initiating Structure and Consideration With Extension Leaders Ranking Below the Mean (Group II) in Both Dimensions (t-test) - 1973	161

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Agricultural Extension Service began because of a need for leadership to solve problems facing rural America. In the late 1880's the Department of Agriculture employed field agents in New Jersey, Wisconsin and Virginia to demonstrate methods of disease control on potatoes. Seaman A. Knapp, employed as special agent for the promotion of agriculture in the South in 1902, was the best known early Extension Agent.[1] Through Knapp's efforts by 1904 over twenty agents were employed in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas. These early agents worked directly with farmers in six or eight counties who agreed to follow recommended agricultural practices. Based on their success and Dr. Knapp's leadership, the first county agent was appointed in Smith County, Texas in 1906. The role of these early agents was to exhibit leadership to solve a particular problem.

---

[1]H. C. Sanders (ed.), "A Brief History," The Cooperative Extension Work (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), pp. 13-22.

Extension type youth (4-H) work and home demonstration work began in the early 1900's. Passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 resulted in extension work as presently known.[2]

Extension work spread to all areas of the United States and to each county in Tennessee. Staff size increased and the county agent came to be recognized as coordinator or leader of the local extension staff. Throughout the United States and in Tennessee, the county became the basic programming unit. Number and complexities of programs multiplied as the recognized needs of rural people grew. Extension work developed and proved its ability to contribute to solution of problems in rural society. Presently, there are extension staffs in each of Tennessee's 95 counties. Staff size ranges from one professional in Lake to 14 in Shelby County.[3]

In December, 1970 changes were made in job responsibilities and authority of the county agent in Tennessee. He was assigned the title, extension leader, and given line authority over other members of the county staff. This change was in accord with a significant and recent

---

[2]L. D. Kelsey and C. C. Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Company, 1955), pp. 12-27.

[3]Directory, The University of Tennessee, Institute of Agriculture, Knoxville, 1974, pp. 23-42.

development in extension work in the United States, namely the designation of one member of the county staff to assume administrative responsibilities with the title of chairman, director, coordinator or some similar term.[4]

Extension leaders in Tennessee developed their job descriptions in early 1971. These descriptions were discussed with the extension leader's immediate superior, the district supervisor, and approved as official guidelines for the extension leader position. Even though each extension leader developed his own job description, a common thread of administrative and program responsibility was evident in each description. These job descriptions were on file and written in a manner that permitted item analysis.

Role expectations that others possess for the extension leader play an important part in achieving effective job performance by the extension leader and his staff. Charters in discussing role agreement and goal attainment stated that:

> A person cannot be indifferent to how others perceive him when he must interact with them in order to attain his goals. It is only in the reasonably predictable environment, interpersonal or otherwise, that the individual can effectively pursue his goals. To maximize the predictability of the environment, not only must he strive for accuracy in discerning how others view him and the situation, but

---

[4]Robert C. Clark, "Principles of County Administration," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Fall, 1969, p. 153.

he must be willing to conform to some degree to the expectations that others have of him.[5]

Gross stated:

> People do not behave in a random manner; their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and those of others in the group or society in which they are participants. Three basic ideas which appear in most of the conceptualizations considered are that individuals in social locations behave with reference to expectations.[6]

Slocum stated:

> Many of the activities of Extension, as we have known them, may be compared to the activities of a ball team in the sense that people who occupy various specialized positions have to cooperate with people in other positions in order to attain desired goals.[7]

I. PROBLEM

Clarification of understanding relative to role perception and role expectation is an integral part of effective and satisfying performance. The extent of the gap that existed between the perceived ideal and perceived actual role of the extension leader position was unknown.

---

[5]W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Social Background of Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 798.

[6]Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 17.

[7]Walter L. Slocum, "Specialization and Change in Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Fall, 1969, p. 165.

Specifically, data were not available for the perceived ideal role and perceived actual role of the extension leader by those counter positions that most closely interacted with the focal extension leader position; namely, the professional staff of the extension leader. Role expectations for the extension leader as perceived by representatives of these counter positions may be defined as the ideal role. Perception of the manner in which the extension leader actually performs his role by these counter positions may be defined as the actual role.

Thus, the problem may be explicitly stated: how does the ideal role relate to the actual role of the extension leader as perceived by his staff and further how does performance of the extension leader relate to high congruity of ideal and actual role.

II. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The basic purpose was to assess and analyze the relationships that existed between the ideal and actual role of the extension leader as perceived by staff of the extension leader and to determine the relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role and performance rating of the extension leader. Specifically, the purposes of the study may be expressed as follows: (1) to determine actual and ideal role of the extension leader as perceived by his staff; (2) to assess and analyze

the incongruities that exist between actual and ideal role of the extension leader as perceived by staff members under the supervision of the extension leader; and (3) to determine the relationship that exists between the job performance rating of an extension leader and high congruity of ideal and actual role.

The following questions were explored and analyzed:

1. Is there a significant relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role (as perceived by staff members) and high performance rating of an extension leader?

2. Is there agreement among staff members as to role items and role segments that should constitute the job responsibilities of an extension leader?

3. Is there agreement among staff members as to the manner in which role items and segments are actually being carried out?

4. Is there a relationship between congruity of ideal and actual role and perceived leader behavior (as measured by the LBDQ)[8] of the extension leader?

---

[8]Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (eds.), "Editor's Preface," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1957), p. vii.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

An examination of results of this study by extension leaders can result in greater understanding of "role perceptions" by the extension leader which in turn will enable him to perform more effectively as leader of the county staff.

Supervisory personnel can use the study findings in counseling with extension leaders and county staff to bring about a higher level of understanding related to job responsibilities of the extension leader and use of techniques to effectively carry out these responsibilities. Administrative personnel can use the study results as one factor to analyze and evaluate the basis for determining performance ratings.

In summary, findings of the study can enable county, supervisory and administrative personnel to more fully understand expectations related to the extension leader position.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study will not determine an ideal role for an extension leader nor will it determine role items or role segments that should be used in rating an extension leader. Results are applicable only to the extension leader position as characterized in the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service.

V. DEFINITIONS

Actual role. Behavior that is actually being carried out as perceived by the respondent or the manner in which the incumbent actually performs related to a role item or segment.

Associate district supervisor. Person responsible to the district supervisor for certain assigned district administrative and program responsibilities.[9]

Consideration. "Referring to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff."[10]

Counter position. Position(s) that interact with the focal positions.[11] Counter positions in this study are extension agent, associate extension agent and assistant extension agent.

---

[9]The University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service Handbook, Knoxville.

[10]Clarence J. Cunningham, "Measures of Leader Behavior and Their Relation to Performance Levels of County Extension Agents" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1964), p. 20.

[11]Gross and Others, op. cit., pp. 48-58.

Difference score$_1$ (D_1). Total numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role also measured on a 1-5 scale. For example, a role item scored 4 on ideal and 5 on actual would have a D_1 score of 1. Likewise, a role item scored 4 on ideal and 3 on actual would have a D_1 score of 1.

Difference score$_2$ (D_2). Numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role also measured on a 1-5 scale only if actual is less than ideal. For example, a role item scored 4 on ideal and 5 on actual would have a D_2 score of 0 (because actual is more than ideal). However, a role item scored 4 on ideal and 3 on actual would have a D_2 score of 1.

District supervisor. Person designated as possessing administrative authority for the three person district supervisory staff in the Tennessee Extension Service.[12]

---

[12]Agricultural Extension Service Handbook, op. cit.

Extension leader. Person designated as possessing administrative responsibility for the county staff in the Tennessee Extension Service.[13]

Focal position. Position central to the study or position under study.[14] Focal position in this study is the extension leader position.

Ideal role. Behavior that is perceived by the respondent to be ideal for the role under study. This behavior is related to a role item or segment.

Initiating structure. "The leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure."[15]

Performance rating. Relative rating of extension leader's performance on a scale of one to five. Extension leaders were rated as three (below average), four (average) or five (above average).

---

[13] Ibid.

[14] Gross and Others, op. cit., pp. 48-58.

[15] Cunningham, op. cit., p. 20.

Position. Location of an actor in a social system.[16] Positions of relevance in this study include extension leader, extension agent, associate extension agent, assistant extension agent, district supervisor, and associate district supervisor.

Role. Set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position.[17]

Role expectation. "Expectation that one person has of the role behavior of another."[18] Each staff member has certain expectations of the extension leader.

Role item. A single expectation.[19] Evaluate performance of all county staff members is an example of an expectation or role item.

Role perception. "Perception that one has of the role expectation that another person holds for him."[20] The extension leader knows

---

[16]Gross and Others, op. cit., p. 48.

[17]Ibid., p. 60.

[18]Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 72.

[19]Gross and Others, op. cit., p. 61.

[20]Owens, op. cit., p. 72.

that each staff member has certain role expectations of him; his estimate of that expectation is role perception.

Role segment. A set of expectations or group of expectations that may be classified together.[21] For example, eleven role items constitute the personnel management role segment in this study.

Staff members. Professional staff who are responsible to the extension leader. These may possess any of the following titles: extension agent, associate extension agent, or assistant extension agent.[22]

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study included five chapters, the selected bibliography and appendices.

Chapter I included an introduction, problem statement, purpose, importance of the study, limitations of the study, definitions and organization of the study.

Chapter II presented a review of selected literature.

---

[21] Gross and Others, op. cit., p. 61.

[22] Agricultural Extension Service Handbook, op. cit.

Chapter III discussed methodology and procedure.

Chapter IV presented and analyzed the data.

Chapter V included a summary of the study, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The appendices included the data gathering instruments and raw data tables.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

The basic purpose of this study was to assess and analyze the incongruities that existed between the ideal and actual role of the extension leader as perceived by staff of the extension leader and to determine the relationships between high congruity of ideal and actual role and performance rating of the extension leader.

This chapter will first deal with literature concerning role theory as it relates to the study of organizational effectiveness. Second, literature specifically related to various role concepts and their relationship to performance will be reviewed. Third, specific educational studies utilizing the concept of role will be summarized. Finally, a brief summary of literature as it serves as a background for this study will be developed.

II. ROLE AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Role is the concept that makes society possible. It mediates between the individual and society or the individual and organization. Relationships between the person and society or a person and an

organization can be studied or measured by utilization of the concept of role.[1]

A theory or study of organizational behavior as it relates to the individual will find it necessary to develop concepts that "chop up" behavior into chunks that are manageable and can be studied. The concept of role allows such study.[2]

Roles develop in an organization in response to the group's task requirements and to individuals that compose the group. Specific content of any role will vary depending on the group's task and characteristics of members.[3]

Foskett makes the point that social scientists have tended to take role consensus as a "given" and have assumed that the "distinguishing feature of culture is a high degree of agreement as to the roles of behavior." This statement may be appropriate when discussing a conceptual model, but is incorrect when talking about the actual situation. The most casual study reveals the range of consensus from one population

---

[1]J. A. Jackson (ed.), "Editor's Preface," Role (London: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

[2]Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957), p. 242.

[3]A. Paul Hare, Handbook of Small Group Research (New York: The Free Press, 1962), p. 116.

to another. "Consensus is not a given but rather a variable to be determined by empirical inquiry."[4] Roles become more specialized and specific in content as society or organizations increase in complexity.[5]

Kaylor, in his study of an emerging organizational position (program developer in the Chattanooga, Tennessee public schools), summarized:

> Complex organizations are interlocking networks of positions and roles. Associated with every organizational position is a structurally defined role which establish the parameters for the acceptable behavior of the persons who fill the respective positions. These parameters for role behavior are defined by the mutual sets of role expectations held by the individual and other persons in the organization.[6]

Sarbin and Allen note that role is a term directly from the theater. It is a "metaphor intended to denote that conduct adhers to certain 'parts' (or positions) rather than to the players who read or recite them." They emphasize the utility of the concept of role to the many disciplines (including education) engaged in human relations research. Role expectations

---

[4]John M. Foskett, Role Consensus: The Case of the Elementary School Teacher, a Publication of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1969), p. 6.

[5]Michael Banton, Roles (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), p. 66.

[6]James E. Kaylor, "Examination of an Emerging Organizational Position with Selected Techniques of Role Analysis," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1972), pp. 130-131.

are defined by Sarbin and Allen as the rights and privileges, duties, and obligations of a person occupying a position in relation to other persons (occupying other positions) in the social system. Content of role expectation can and does vary depending on the occupant of the position and the particular point in time under consideration.

The interacting nature of role cannot be overlooked. The occupant of one position interacts with many other persons; his behavior varies depending on the role occupant with which he interacts. Complex social interaction is accomplished through sharing of role expectations. Clearly delineated role expectations are a key factor in producing behavior which will be predictable resulting in effective and satisfying interaction. The individual will recognize role enactments that are appropriate and can predict complementary enactments by others.

Three types of lack of clarity in role expectations can exist according to Sarbin and Allen. One is "uncertainty and vagueness of expectations." This type results in a great deal of time and effort expended in attempting to predict expectations of other interacters. A second type results from "lack of agreement among occupants of complementary roles." Many studies have found that consensus among workers occupying complementary roles concerning role expectations for a particular position is less than commonly believed. A third type results from "incongruity between the

role performer's expectations for his role and the role expectations held by those comprising the audience. Role behavior by the position incumbent in this case may be viewed by the audience as ineffective or improper.[7]

III. ROLE AND PERFORMANCE

Stogdill stated that performance is determined to a great degree by our expectations and our perception of expectations others have for us. Parameters of role performance are established by these two sets of expectations. He drew on documented research that suggests performance is likely to be more effective and satisfying if a role is clearly defined, but not structured to the degree that it restricts one's freedom in carrying out his work.[8]

Argyris stated that a source of energy available to an organization is the psychological energy of individual members. If a person experiences psychological success, this energy is hypothesized to increase.

---

[7]Theodore R. Sarbin and Vernon L. Allen, "Role Theory," The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol I, 2nd Edition, eds. Gardner Lindzey and Elliott Aronson (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 488-506.

[8]Ralph M. Stogdill, "Role Perception and Fulfillment in Research," Educational Research: New Perspectives, eds. Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1963), pp. 93-99.

Conversely, it decreases with experiences of failure. Three requirements are necessary for an organizational member to experience success. First, an individual must aspire to achieve an increased sense of competence. Second, an organization must exist that permits opportunity for the individual to define his goals, determine his way of attaining these goals and relate these to the organization's goals. Third, the society and culture of which the individual and organization are a part influence both the person and the organization. These influences can be in the direction of success or failure.[9]

Hodgson, Levinson, and Zaleznik, in an analysis of executives at work, stated: "A distinguishing characteristic of executives is their involvement in the processes of generating and using power in organizational settings." This power constitutes the basis of whatever capacity is possessed to influence others and to move the organization towards its objectives. If one is to generate and use power he must be involved in a network of interpersonal relationships and transactions. As power is generated and used one develops or adopts a role performance or set of performances. Organizational demands must be delineated and action implemented that will meet these objectives. To meet these goals the

---

[9]Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), pp. 33-34.

structure of forces that exist at the personal, interpersonal, and organizational levels must be evaluated and brought into some meaningful relationships with each other. If success is attained in bringing together these relationships, the result is presumably satisfying for one's self and productive for the organization.[10]

Charters, in discussing the consequences of role expectations for teachers, stated that the line of reasoning common in educational literature majors on the congruity or disparity among perception of behavior, expectation of behavior, personality needs, and similar concepts. Congruity is perceived to lead to tension-free harmony and satisfaction while disparity creates tension and dissatisfaction. The degree of congruity or agreement present is presumed to determine the effectiveness with which a person or organization pursues its objectives.

As to role agreement and goal attainment, Charters summarized that a person cannot be indifferent to how others perceive him when he must interact with them in order to attain his goals. It is only in the reasonably predictable environment, interpersonal or otherwise, that the individual can effectively pursue his goals. To maximize the predictability of the environment, not only must he strive for accuracy in

---

[10]Richard C. Hodgson, Daniel J. Levinson, and Abraham Zaleznik, The Executive Role Constellation (Boston: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1965) pp. 62-78.

discerning how others view him and the situation but he must be willing to conform to some degree to the expectations that others have of him. If he enters the situation as an unpredictable participant, under normal circumstances, he, in turn, will be unable to predict the responses of the other participants to him. Other reasons a person may have for being concerned about expectations of others are ego rewards furnished by group members for compliance with their expectations. Also, such concern allows the individual to avoid sanctions which may accompany noncompliance. Social system and organizational effectiveness in goal attainment is likewise dependent on congruency between need-dispositions and role demands.

Charters summarized several studies that explored the relationship between role agreement and teacher satisfaction. The central prediction of such studies was that if perceptions of the expectations of participants in an administrative interaction overlap, the participants feel satisfied with the work accomplished no matter what the behavior or accomplishment; when the perception of the expectations does not overlap, the participants feel dissatisfied.

Empirical investigations of role conflict have, according to Charters, been in the main descriptive or have dismissed the strategies of resolving conflict. Research studies commonly assume that role conflict disrupts, produces tension, and over-time produces anxiety. Some studies,

however, indicate that role conflict does not always increase the problems of role incumbents. An example is when the incompatible demands of competing groups or individuals for the role incumbent cause a stand-off. Such a situation allows the role incumbent to chart his own course while conflicting members of the role set engage in a power struggle or seek to agree on role expectations.

Charters offered his comments on the assumption that whatever has a positive effect on teacher satisfaction also positively affects the teaching-learning process. This issue has seldom been conceptualized beyond the general statement that happy teachers are better teachers. He thinks that educators regard the statement as obvious and thus have not dealt with the issue. The issue is in need of conceptual definition, including recognition of the multidimensional concepts involved. Consistently positive research is not available, proving that a positive relationship exists between teacher satisfaction and performance. Many morale studies have been conducted in industry. These do not indicate that morale is necessarily related to job productivity. Charters summarized his thinking regarding the relationship between the teacher's level of satisfaction and teaching performance by stating that if there is a connection, it is more complex than generally assumed.[11]

---

[11]W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Social Background of Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), pp. 797-801.

The concept of role and idea of role set[12] offer a practical ray of hope toward conceptual fusion of personality and organization. Bennis credits Kahn with taking role as the unifying concept and Merton's notion of role set (cluster of significant others who transmit expectations to the role incumbent) and measuring several organizational dimensions that help to bridge the conceptual gulf between the individual and the organization. Included are role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload.[13] Kahn found that role ambiguity like role conflict is prevalent in today's organization. It exists when information available to a person is less than required for adequate role performance. Two types are identified. The first results from lack of information concerning definition of the job, its goals and ways of achieving job objectives. In type two, the role incumbent is concerned with his standing in the eyes of others and about consequences of his actions for attainment of personal goals. Both types are associated with increased tension and reduced trust in associates. Task ambiguity creates job dissatisfaction but also seems to undermine the person's relations with others as well as the individual's self-confidence.

---

[12]Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), pp. 71-81.

[13]Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 193.

Effects of role ambiguity resemble those of role conflict but occur independently of it.[14] Contradictory expectations in role conflict create opposing role pressures (role conflicts) on the role incumbent which in general cause intensified internal conflicts, reduced job satisfaction and decreased confidence in superiors and the organization.[15]

In discussing training related to extension program development and its relationship to the Extension Management Information System (EMIS), the point was made that training is necessary to "ensure training, supervision, and evaluation being done from a common philosophic base and with common role expectations and role performance, common standards and criteria, common goals, etc."[16]

Corwin, in discussing staff conflicts in the public schools, stated that:

> Two features of the modern work setting prevent close surveillance. One is the sheer complexity of modern organizations, which is responsible for alternatives that demand employees to use their judgment

---

[14]Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, and J. Diedrick Snock, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), pp. 94-95.

[15]Ibid., pp. 70-71.

[16]Extension Program Development and its Relationship to Extension Management Information Systems (Ames: Iowa State University, 1974), pp. 12-13.

> and initiative. The other is the professionalization of employees and their concurrent demands for more opportunity to use independent judgment. The fundamental problem, then, is not the conflict between individuals and organizations, but the inconsistencies among organizational principles, and especially the conflict between competing professional and employee principles that are inherent to modern organization itself.[17]

Green reported a study presenting several plausible causal models of the relationship between role accuracy (correct perception of what others expect) and job satisfaction. Evaluations supported the hypothesis that role accuracy operates only as a precondition to compliance (acting in accord with what others expect). Compliance, in turn, is a direct cause of job satisfaction. It is also an indirect cause because of its effect on performance evaluation. Thus, role accuracy causes compliance which in turn leads to job satisfaction as well as a favorable performance evaluation which in turn brings tangible rewards.[18]

IV. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND ROLE

Gross made the point that members of a social system or organization, whether it be composed of two persons or a multitude, must agree

---

[17]Ronald G. Corwin, Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools (Columbus: The Ohio State University, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Project Number 2637, 1966), p. 78.

[18]Charles N. Green and Dennis W. Organ, "An Evaluation of Causal Models Linking the Received Role with Job Satisfaction," Administrative Science Quarterly, March (1973), pp. 95-103.

to some extent on expectations for any given position. He underscores the fact that this degree of consensus is an empirical variable that can be studied and measured.[19]

An empirical examination of role definition must deal with two problems. The first is the question of who is defining the role or who is the subject population. Second is the problem of the focus or objective of the study. The investigator may concern himself with expectations that are expected of a role incumbent or with expectations that are appropriate in a particular situation. If the question of role variability is to be studied it becomes necessary to delineate the role definers and their relationship to the focal position under examination.

The investigator faces the problem of describing the norm or consensus related to a particular expectation. The role definer's or subject population's expectation may be expressed by some measure of central tendency, such as the mean, median or mode. This, however, may be misleading. Expectations should be described in terms of range of distribution of responses related to an expectation as well as a point expressed by a measure of central tendency.

---

[19] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 43.

If consensus on role definition is considered a variable then several questions arise. "How much consensus is essential to the effective functioning of a group, and on what aspects of group functioning?" "Are extreme degrees of consensus dysfunctional?" "Are there optimum degrees of consensus?" "How little consensus can there be without the group disintegrating?"[20]

Gross took as his subject population nearly half the superintendents in Massachusetts (N=105) and their school board members (N=508). He used the same data to study two sets of problems which he designated as macroscopic and microscopic. Microscopic problems were concerned with functioning of small groups comprised of a superintendent and his school board or only members of one school board. The macroscopic analysis focused on "role definitions of the 105 superintendents of the 508 school board members, or on the consensus between these two samples on their role definitions."[21]

Gross's analysis showed:

> ...that differences in the expectations position incumbents hold, which are the basis of different degrees of macroscopic consensus on role definition, can be in part accounted for by the fact that they occupy different positions in formal organizations of different

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 70-75.

[21] Ibid., pp. 95-96.

size. These are only two factors among many possible determinants of different expectations.[22]

Two hypotheses tested in the microscopic analysis were related to satisfaction and evaluation. The conclusion reached relative to satisfaction was that satisfaction and consensus are related within an interacting group of incumbents of the same position but not between a group and an incumbent of a counter position.

The evaluation hypothesis which stated the more consensus there is between the incumbents of two positions on their definitions of each other's roles, the more highly they will rate one another's performance was accepted for the superintendent's rating of the school board but was rejected for the school board's rating of the superintendent.[23]

Bible, Nolan and Brown, in a study of role definition consensus by extension executive committee members, found a lack of clarity in role definition among and between executive committee members and extension agents for a number of role expectations applicable to the executive committee member position. Relatively high consensus existed for one-third of the role expectations items. Access to

---

[22]Ibid., pp. 162-63.

[23]Ibid., pp. 219-20.

several role-learning opportunities was associated with agreement among committeemen on their role definition and also with satisfaction with the functioning of their committee. Such learning opportunities included job instruction and provision for observation and interaction within the county extension organization.[24]

Bible and McNabb analyzed role expectations and performance of county extension directors in Missouri. County directors rated most effective in performing selected administrative role segments had greater agreement with their county staff on role expectations than directors rated least effective. County directors had greater agreement on role expectations and performance for their role than did county staffs for the county director role. Greater agreement existed on role expectations than on role performance of the county director's administrative role. This was true for both directors and their staff.[25]

Wilkening concluded that degree of role fulfillment (extent to which an agent does that which he defines as his role) on the part of an extension agent varies with his personal orientation related to his status within the

---

[24]Bond L. Bible, Francena L. Nolan and Emory J. Brown, "Consensus on Role Definition of the County Extension Executive Committee Member," Rural Sociology, Vol. 26, June (1961), pp. 154-156.

[25]Bond L. Bible and Coy G. McNabb, "Role Consensus and Administrative Effectiveness," Rural Sociology, Vol. 31, March (1966), pp. 5-14.

organization. He suggests the hypothesis that "county extension workers will tend to conform to the expectations of those with whom they work at the local level or with those at higher levels, depending upon the nature of rewards they are seeking and upon their control of relationships at the respective levels."[26]

Clark and Abdullah conducted a study in California, Michigan, and Puerto Rico designed to define and analyze the role of the county extension director as perceived by extension staff. Total staff, including county directors, state administration, county staff and subject matter specialists, rated eight functions of the county extension director in order of importance as follows: (1) educational leadership, (2) organization and policy, (3) business management and finance, (4) personnel management, (5) administrative or public relations, (6) direction and coordination, (7) planning and programming, and (8) supervision. Educational leadership defined as developing and executing an educational program in the director's subject matter area and providing leadership in the areas of other advisors was perceived as the primary function of county extension director. Supervision defined as supervising other county staff, reviewing reports, appraising the individual's work, evaluating educational

---

[26]Eugene A. Wilkening, The County Extension Agent in Wisconsin (Madison: University of Wisconsin, Research Bulletin 203, 1957), p. 49.

accomplishments and recommending necessary changes was viewed as being least important.

In terms of role consensus a highly significant agreement between county directors and state administrative staff regarding the relative importance of administrative functions of the county director was found. In contrast low consensus existed between perceptions of county directors and non-administrative personnel.[27]

James found that in general county extension chairman and other staff had similar perceptions of what the county chairman role should be. However, county staff differed with county chairman in their perception of how the role was being carried out.[28]

Two implications resulting from Sweitzer's study of school principals were:

> 1. School principals should be aware that what they think others expect of them may not be what others really expect. The degree to which a principal has an accurate perception of what others expect of him probably influences his behavior and likely affects his subsequent relationships with others. The establishment of sufficient and adequate communication with both superiors and subordinates

---

[27]Robert C. Clark and Fawzi Abdullah, Functions of the County Extension Director in the Cooperative Extension Service (Madison: University of Wisconsin, Research Bulletin 255, 1965), pp. 3-20.

[28]Floren V. James, "The Role of the County Extension Agent, Chairman in Ohio," (unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1966), p. 25.

is necessary in order to prevent unnecessary errors and disparities in concepts about the principal's role behavior.[29]

2. Decisions regarding the hiring and assignment of a person as a school principal should include consideration of the extent to which his ideas of his own role and the role of others tend to correspond with the role expectations of others with whom he will interact in a specific situation.[30]

Studies related to performance prediction of extension agents reviewed by Cunningham showed that two variables, (1) having formal training as an undergraduate in education and (2) having personality traits that relate to cooperation, aggression, endurance and self-confidence, were most closely related to predicting effective performance.[31]

Cunningham concluded that leaders that could be classified in any of the following three groups were basically the same: (1) leaders who were high in both initiating structure and consideration, (2) leaders who were transactional (who could balance between needs of followers and expectations of the organization), and (3) leaders who practiced balance between group achievement and group maintenance. If leader behavior could

---

[29]Robert E. Sweitzer, Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Principals (Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, Cooperative Research Project Number 1329, 1963), p. 380.

[30]Ibid., p. 382.

[31]Clarence J. Cunningham, "Measures of Leader Behavior and Their Relation to Performance Levels of County Extension Agents," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1964), pp. 117-118.

adequately be measured, the above type leader could be identified, and it could be determined if this type leader was the most effective performer.[32]

An analysis of agent's performance related to initiating structure and consideration in the Cunningham study produced the following results: (1) the theory that the most effective leaders scored high on both initiating structure and consideration was supported; (2) least effective agents were those that scored below the median on both initiating structure and consideration; (3) data showed initiating structure to be more important than consideration in determining high performance even though supervisory and administrative staff perceived the ideal agent to score higher on consideration than structure; and (4) top ranking agents performed at a high level regardless of the type of individual with whom they worked.[33]

Johnson and Bledsoe, in a study of Georgia extension agents, used the LBDQ as the instrument to determine the relationship between behavior of the county extension chairman and morale of county staff. They found that staff morale and leader behavior of the county chairman were significantly and highly correlated. The data indicated that

---

[32] Ibid., p. 61.

[33] Ibid., pp. 112-114.

consideration score of the county chairman was almost as good a predictor of staff morale as the combination of consideration and initiating structure. Agents perceived their chairman more favorably in the interpersonal (consideration) relationship than in the job-oriented (initiating structure) dimension. In applying their findings they concluded that the chairman is responsible for initiating and implementing action programs to accomplish extension goals. Goal achievement is related to his ability to work with the staff. The chairman who is favorably perceived by his staff in personal interactions (consideration) was also perceived as being effective in planning and implementing extension programs.[34]

Halpin utilized the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire to measure the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration which represent fundamental and pertinent aspects of leadership skill. This instrument was administered to educational administrators and aircraft commanders. With both groups in Halpin's studies top performing leaders scored above the mean in both dimensions.[35]

The LBDQ was designed by John Hemphill to measure and describe

---

[34]Paul O. Johnson and J. C. Bledsoe, "Mr. Chairman, Your Behavior Affects Morale," Journal of Extension, Spring (1974), pp. 12-19.

[35]Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), pp. 81-127.

leader behavior. Many other persons contributed to its development and utility.[36]

Parker found in his study of perceived and expected roles of the department head that there was more conflict in the actual role dimension than in the ideal. Conflict in perception of the actual role existed to the greatest degree between department heads and faculty and to a lesser extent between administrators and department heads. Conflict in expectations for the ideal role existed to the greatest degree between administrators and faculty and to a lesser extent between department heads and faculty.[37]

Kaylor found that program developers (an emerging position in the Chattanooga School System) have adopted a role that is compatible with expectations held for them by the counter positions with which they interact most frequently. Perception of their role was also more compatible with the superordinate position closest to them, the principal, than with other administrative positions. An explanation for this finding could be that the program developers, faced with role conflict, chose for themselves

---

[36]Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (eds.), "Editor's Preface," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1957), p. vii.

[37]James C. Parker, "An Analysis of the Perceived and Expected Roles of the Department Head at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1972), p. 225.

a role that would result in the least degree of conflict with those with whom they experience almost constant contact. Also, the consensus between the program developers and those with which they most closely interact (teachers) could result from the fact that they were teachers immediately prior to becoming program developers and found it difficult to disassociate themselves completely from attitudes of the teacher group.[38]

V. SUMMARY

Role is a concept that may be utilized to study an individual's behavior and his relationship to a social system or an organization. Most educators have tended to assume role consensus exists for a given position. Research findings prove that expectations for a given position should be expressed as a range within parameters rather than as a specific point. This range or lack of consensus, in general, is greater in newly created positions such as that of extension leader. It is also greater when a new incumbent assumes an existing position.

Role expectations that are not clearly defined affect organizational effectiveness. A great deal of time and effort is used by those occupying interacting roles within an organization in an attempt to clarify expectations

---

[38]Kaylor, op. cit., p. 155.

when such a situation exists. This condition can lead to a role incumbent being perceived as ineffective because of incongruity between a position incumbent's expectations and expectations of those with whom he interacts.

Role consensus is a variable that can be studied and measured. Congruity among interacters within an organization can be increased.

Effective performance as an educator requires that the position incumbent constantly appraise the situation relative to expectations. Research supports the notion that, other variables being equal, the educator who is most aware of expectations for his position by those within his role set can perform at a higher level than one who does not possess this knowledge. This information becomes another tool to utilize in accomplishing organizational and personal goals.

The literature is not consistent in support of the idea that role consensus automatically leads to a higher level of performance. Rather the literature indicates that a knowledge of the state of consensus can be used to further organizational and personal goals. It seems that such knowledge over time would also lead to a greater degree of consensus.

Research studies in education related to consensus of perceived ideal and actual role by staff (subordinates most closely interacting with a position incumbent) indicate that high consensus and high performance

are correlated. The LBDQ has been used in several studies to determine perceived actual and ideal role related to a position. Degree of consensus or congruency is indicated by this relationship. The LBDQ has also been utilized as a criterion for designing other instruments to measure dimensions of leadership in specific organizations. In general, descriptions of leadership behavior vary with the role set under consideration. Thus, a school superintendent, his staff, and his school board (three role sets) would not necessarily agree concerning expectations for the superintendent position.

Studies also indicate that access to role learning opportunities can lead to role consensus. Role occupants tend to conform to expectations of the role sets that can provide the type of reward they seek. They also tend to conform to expectations of role sets (either at the local or higher levels) over which they perceive themselves as having some control of relationships.

A study of the newly created extension leader position in the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service concerning congruency of actual and ideal role and its relationship to extension leaders' performance has importance. In addition to accomplishing purposes of this study, it will contribute to the research base concerning role. Specifically, it will contribute to a more complete answer to the question--

is high congruency between ideal and actual role in an educational institution a predictor of high performance?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

I. INTRODUCTION

The basic purpose of this study was to assess and analyze the relationships that existed between the ideal and actual role of the extension leader as perceived by his staff and to determine the relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role and performance rating of the extension leader.

Methods and procedures used in implementing this purpose are described in this chapter. The population for the study, the development of the role study instruments, the measurement of role congruity, the performance rating used, the administration of the instruments, and the treatment of the data will be discussed.

II. POPULATION

The population for the study was all the county professional staff members who reported to the 95 county extension leaders in the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. The focal position of the study was the extension leader position, Tennessee Agricultural

Extension Service. Each person in the population was asked to participate except agents employed since December 31, 1972, agents acquiring a new estension leader since December 31, 1972 and agents with multi-county responsibilities. In the first two cases it was considered that agents had not had enough interaction with their leader to adequately appraise actual leader role. In the latter case the agent was responsible to more than one extension leader and would experience difficulty in evaluating his extension leader's actual role. The population with the above exceptions was surveyed.

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROLE STUDY INSTRUMENT

In early 1971 extension leaders developed their job descriptions. These descriptions were discussed with the extension leaders' immediate superior, the district supervisor, and were approved as official guidelines for performance of the extension leader. Even though each leader developed his own description with the approval of his immediate supervisor, a common thread of administrative and program responsibility was evident in each description. These 95 descriptions

were on file and were written in a manner that permitted item analysis.[1]

The job descriptions of the 95 extension leaders were studied and analyzed. These descriptions were categorized into 39 role item statements that characterized the position. Gross stated that categorizing expectations is relevant to role analysis. Such an organization of role items into role segments allowed for more detailed analysis.[2]

These 39 item statements were further classified into five role segments: (1) planning and educational leadership, (2) direction and coordination, (3) personnel management, (4) extension relations, and (5) finance and business management. This classification resulted in eight, twelve, eleven, four and four role items in each of the respective segments. These 39 items composed the questionnaire used in this study. The items were randomly ordered in the final instruments.

Two questionnaires were developed using these items. The first was designed to determine respondent's perception of what the ideal role of the extension leader should be. The second contained the

---

[1]Management by Objective-Job Descriptions, Vol. I and II, Agricultural Extension Service, The University of Tennessee, 1971, pp. 187-1025.

[2]Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 61.

identical 39 items in the same order and was designed to determine the respondent's perception of how their extension leader actually performed the function identified in the item statement. A scale of 1 to 5 was developed to permit the respondent to indicate his level of perception. Alternative responses on the actual dimension were: (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) occasionally, (4) usually, and (5) always. A cover page was developed to obtain additional data including title of respondent, size of professional staff, name of county, number of years employed by the extension service, and level of education.

It was assumed that as each extension leader and his supervisor had intensively involved themselves in developing the job description, that the 95 job descriptions included all items that would normally be considered the responsibility of an extension leader. Study of similar reports verified this assumption.

The author felt that some measure of role should be secured from an instrument other than one developed from extension documents. Accordingly, the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)[3]

---

[3]Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), pp. 88-89.

was modified and used. Respondents were asked to describe actual behavior of their extension leader on the LBDQ.

The questionnaire was pretested and checked for simplicity and face validity by a panel of two county staffs (seven persons) from different extension districts and three non-county extension personnel. Each panel member individually completed the instrument and in a personal interview with the author offered suggestions relative to face validity, completeness and simplicity of the instrument. The cover page was simplified and minor changes in wording of role items were made as a result of panel suggestions. The instrument was finalized after these interviews. The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix A. The 39 items are also categorized by role segments in Appendix A.

IV. ROLE CONGRUITY MEASURE

Two measures of congruity between ideal and actual role were used. Difference score$_1$ (D_1) and difference score$_2$ (D_2) were calculated for each role item. The sum of the respective differences scores for the 39 items resulted in the respective total difference score. In the same manner a difference score was computed for each role segment. Difference score$_1$ (D_1) was the total numerical difference between ideal and actual on a 1-5 scale regardless of whether actual scored lower or

higher than ideal. Difference score$_2$ (D_2) was the numerical difference between ideal and actual on a 1-5 scale only if actual scored lower than ideal. For example, if an item were scored 4 on ideal and 5 on actual the D_2 score would be 0 and the D_1 score 1. Thus D_1 included a measure of "over-performance" compared to ideal while D_2 disregarded "over-performance."

V. PERFORMANCE RATINGS USED

Job performance ratings for extension leaders for fiscal year, 1973, were obtained from the office of the Dean, Agricultural Extension Service, Institute of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee. These ratings were determined by the district supervisors and submitted to the Dean's office. The ratings were finalized after a discussion conference between the appropriate district supervisory staff and the office of the Dean. Extension leaders were rated on a five point scale. For fiscal 1973 all rated either 3.0 (below average), 4.0 (average), or 5.0 (above average). These ratings were used for salary adjustments and promotions and were used in this study. A reproduction of the instrument used as a basis for establishing performance ratings appears in Appendix A.

VI. ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

The data-gathering instruments were administered at district meetings (five) during April and May of 1973. Each respondent independently completed the questionnaire after a brief explanation by the author. The instruments were administered at the conclusion of the afternoon session of the first day of the conference. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaires and return them to the author on or before beginning of the morning session of the second day. Cards identifying each agent were prepared and given to the respondents when the completed instrument was returned. This procedure permitted the author to know agents not returning a questionnaire and at the same time preserved anonymity of the respondent other than as identified on the cover page.

One follow-up letter was mailed to those failing to return the instruments. This letter is reproduced in Appendix A. Over 90 percent of the population completed the questionnaire. No discernible pattern was evident related to length of service, size of staff or rating of extension leaders of those failing to respond.

VII. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

It was determined that at least two staff members must complete usable questionnaires on their extension leader in order for that county to be included in the study. Seventy-seven of the 95 counties met this criteria. Fifteen of these extension leaders were rated 3.0; 43 were rated 4.0; and 19 were rated 5.0. Number of respondents per county ranged from two to eleven. Respective respondents for agents rating 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0 were 45, 145, and 63.

The data from the questionnaires completed by the 253 respondents were processed on computer data cards. The University of Tennessee Computing Center was utilized in processing and analyzing data.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. INTRODUCTION

The basic purpose of this study was to assess and analyze the relationships that existed between the ideal and actual role of the extension leader as perceived by his staff and to determine the relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role and performance rating of the extension leader.

The following questions were explored and analyzed:

1. Is there a significant relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role (as perceived by staff members) and high performance rating of an extension leader?

2. Is there agreement among staff members as to role items and role segments that should constitute the job responsibilities of an extension leader?

3. Is there agreement among staff members as to the manner in which role items and segments are actually being carried out?

4. Is there a relationship between congruity of ideal and actual role and perceived leader behavior (as measured by the LBDQ) of the extension leader?

Presentation and analysis of data related to the questions will be presented and discussed in numerical order.

II. QUESTION ONE

Is there a significant relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role (as perceived by staff members) and high performance rating of an extension leader?

Relationships of the difference scores (D_1 and D_2) to performance rating was the primary basis for exploring and analyzing this question. Table I presents data concerning this relationship. Both total D_1 score and total D_2 score were found to be significantly correlated to leader performance at the 0.001 level. D_2 score proved to be more highly correlated than D_1 ($r = -0.229$ and -0.197). All five D_2 segment scores proved to be significantly correlated with performance at the 0.001 level. All D_1 segment scores except segment five were significantly correlated with performance at the 0.001 level. All D_2 segment difference scores were more highly correlated with performance than corresponding segment D_1 scores.

Difference score means of agents rating 3 and 5 were tested. Means of total D_1 and D_2 scores of leaders rating 3 and 5 were significantly different at the 0.001 level. Significance levels of D_1 and D_2 segment scores were listed in Table I.

TABLE I

RELATIONSHIP OF DIFFERENCE SCORES (D_1 AND D_2) AND LEADER'S PERFORMANCE RATING
1973

Type of Score *	Leader Rating ** 3 Mean Score	4 Mean Score	5 Mean Score	Correlation of Difference Score and Rating Kendall's	Sig. Level	Testing of Means of Leaders Rating 3 and 5 t-value	Sig. Level
Total D_1 Score 39 role items	42.3	31.0	28.6	-0.197	.001	4.64	.000
Total D_2 Score 39 role items	35.0	23.2	18.8	-0.229	.001	4.83	.000
D_1 Score-Segment 1 Planning and Educational Leadership	8.1	6.3	6.0	-0.137	.001	2.98	.004
D_2 Score-Segment 1	7.2	5.0	4.3	-0.181	.001	3.70	.000
D_1 Score-Segment 2 Direction and Coordination	14.7	9.6	8.8	-0.209	.001	4.92	.000
D_2 Score-Segment 2	13.1	7.9	6.5	-0.242	.001	5.03	.000
D_1 Score-Segment 3 Personnel Management	11.6	9.4	8.4	-0.156	.001	3.26	.001
D_2 Score-Segment 3	8.2	5.9	5.2	-0.181	.001	3.09	.003
D_1 Score-Segment 4 Extension Relations	3.9	2.8	2.2	-0.199	.001	4.61	.000
D_2 Score-Segment 4	3.3	2.4	1.4	-0.240	.001	5.10	.000

TABLE I (cont'd)

Type of Score	Leader Rating 3 Mean Score	Leader Rating 4 Mean Score	Leader Rating 5 Mean Score	Correlation of Difference Score and Rating Kendall's	Correlation of Difference Score and Rating Sig. Level	Testing of Means of Leaders Rating 3 and 5 t-value	Testing of Means of Leaders Rating 3 and 5 Sig. Level
D_1 Score-Segment 5 Finance and Business Management	4.0	2.9	3.1	-0.095	.013	2.16	.033
D_2 Score-Segment 5	3.2	1.9	1.5	-0.212	.001	4.10	.000

*D_1 - Total numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role also measured on a 1-5 scale.

D_2 - Numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role also measured on a 1-5 scale only if actual is less than ideal score.

**Relative rating of extension leader's performance on a scale of 1-5. Extension leaders were rated as three (below average), four (average), or five (above average).

The relationship of total ideal and total actual scores to performance was also explored. Results were presented in Table II.

Total actual score was significantly related to performance at the 0.001 level. In fact, the correlation coefficient was greater than the coefficient relating D_2 to performance. Actual total score for each segment was also significantly related to performance at the 0.001 level. Total ideal score was also significantly related to performance at the 0.003 level, but the correlation statistic was much lower. Means of extension leaders rating 3 and 5 were also tested for total ideal and actual score and the five segments of total ideal and actual score. All six means in the actual dimensions were significantly different at the 0.001 level. Only segment three in the ideal dimension was significantly different at the 0.01 level. Analysis indicated that total actual score was a better predictor of performance than total difference score; however, both were significantly related to performance as illustrated in Tables I and II.

The t-test was used to test for a significant difference in means by role item of actual score of extension leaders rating 3 and 5. Extension leaders rating 5 scored higher on all 39 role items. This higher score was significant at the 0.01 level for 31 of the 39 role items. Role items 2, 16, 23, 25, 31, 33, 34, and 35 were not

TABLE II

RELATIONSHIP OF IDEAL AND ACTUAL SCORES AND LEADER'S PERFORMANCE RATING
1973

Type of Score*	Leader Rating**			Correlation of Score and Rating		Testing of Means of Leaders Rating 3 and 5	
	3	4	5	Kendall's	Sig. Level	t-value	Sig. Level
Total Ideal Score 39 role items	160.9	164.8	166.8	0.015	0.003	-2.19	0.030
Total Actual Score 39 role items	133.5	149.6	157.9	0.263	0.001	-5.98	0.000
Ideal Score-Segment 1 Planning and Educational Leadership	32.4	33.1	33.7	0.119	0.002	-1.72	0.088
Actual Score-Segment 1	26.3	29.3	31.3	0.211	0.001	-4.79	0.000
Ideal Score-Segment 2 Direction and Coordination	49.7	51.0	51.5	0.083	0.025	-2.10	0.038
Actual Score-Segment 2	38.2	44.8	47.6	0.280	0.001	-6.38	0.000
Ideal Score-Segment 3 Personnel Management	44.7	45.9	47.6	0.132	0.001	-2.82	0.006
Actual Score-Segment 3	40.0	43.7	45.6	0.230	0.001	-4.80	0.000
Ideal Score-Segment 4 Extension Relations	17.7	18.4	18.2	0.038	0.183	-1.77	0.079

TABLE II (cont'd)

Type of Score	Leader Rating			Correlation of Score and Rating		Testing of Means of Leaders Rating 3 and 5	
	3	4	5	Kendall's	Sig. Level	t-value	Sig. Level
Actual Score-Segment 4	15.0	16.5	17.5	0.288	0.001	-6.15	0.000
Ideal Score-Segment 5 Finance and Business Management	16.4	16.4	15.9	0.066	0.058	1.04	0.302
Actual Score-Segment 5	14.0	15.5	16.0	0.184	0.001	-3.95	0.000

*Total Ideal Score - Total numerical score of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale for 39 role items.

Total Actual Score - Total numerical score of actual role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale for 39 role items.

**Relative rating of extension leader's performance on a scale of 1 to 5. Extension leaders were rated as three (below average), four (average), or five (above average).

significantly different. Using level of t value as an indicator role, items 29, 28, 37, 21, 12, 30, 24, 8, 38, and 11 ranked highest (see Appendix B). These could be considered as indicators of high performance. All 39 actual role items are listed in Appendix B giving the relationship of leaders rating 3 and 5 as expressed by the t-test.

Kendall's tau was also used to test each of the 39 role item actual scores with performance. All of the 39 role item actual scores were significantly related to performance at the 0.01 level except role items 33, train new staff members; and 34, coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas. Using size of correlation statistic as an indicator, role items 29, keep staff informed concerning extension policy; 37, maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee; 28, conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences; 7, develop county program that meets needs of people; 12, maintain official contacts with cooperating agencies; 30, promote a team approach to doing the extension job; 21, supervise office secretary; 8, help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall extension program; 24, counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities; and 11, keep public informed concerning the extension program, were the best indicators of performance. It was interesting to note

that the top ten items based on correlation levels were with one exception (role item 7) the same items that ranked highest when the t-test was used to test for significant differences in role item means of leaders rating 3 and 5. This further justified these items as indicators of high performance. Correlations for each of the actual role items are listed in Appendix B.

Data were also collected giving highest degree (BS or MS) attained and years of service in extension possessed by the extension leader. Relationship of both these items to performance was tested using Kendall's tau. Educational level was significantly related to performance at the 0.01 level. Years of service was not significantly related to performance. These results are listed in Table III.

Kendall's tau was the correlation statistic used to explore this question. Nie and others, in discussing choice of correlation statistic, stated:

> The chief difference between Spearman's r s and Kendall's tau seems to be that the Kendall coefficients are somewhat more meaningful when the data contain a large number of tied ranks.... As a rule of thumb, one might use tau more readily when a fairly large number of cases were classified into a relatively small number of categories and r s when the ratio of cases to categories

TABLE III

RELATIONSHIP OF PERFORMANCE OF EXTENSION LEADER, EDUCATIONAL LEVEL (BS AND MS) AND LENGTH OF SERVICE
1973

	Educational Level		Length of Service **	
	Kendall's Tau	Sig. Level	Kendall's Tau	Sig. Level
Leader's performance *	0.1073	0.005	-0.0898	0.017

*Relative rating of extension leader's performance on a scale of 1 to 5. Extension leaders were rated as three (beloe average), four (average), or five (above average).

**Years of service with Tennessee Extension Service.

is smaller. In general, the absolute value of tau tends to be slightly smaller than that of r.[1]

The t-test was used to test the difference scores for a significant difference in means between agents rating three and those rating five. Significance was tested at the 0.01 level for both Kendall's tau and the t-test.

Edwards discussed general considerations for use of the t-test and stated:

> Although we have assumed that X is a normally distributed variable, there is also considerable evidence to show that the t-test for the difference between two means is relatively insensitive to departures from normality in the distribution of X. We wish to emphasize that the t-test is a robust test, primarily sensitive to difference in means and relatively insensitive to non-normality of distribution and heterogeneity of variance, provided that $n_1 = n_2$ and that we also have a sufficient number of observations for each treatment. With $n_1 = n_2 \geq 25$, it seems reasonable to believe that a significant value of t obtained from the t-test offers adequate assurance that $u_1 \neq u_2$, regardless of whether or not $o_1^2 = o_2^2$, and despite the fact that X may not be normally distributed, provided that the departures from normality are of the same kind for both treatment populations, as would ordinarily be the case in experimental work.[2]

---

[1]Norman H. Nie, Dale H. Bent, and C. Hadlai Hull, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1970), p. 153.

[2]Allen L. Edwards, Experimental Design in Psychological Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), pp. 110-111.

III. QUESTION TWO

Is there agreement among staff members as to role items and role segments that should constitute the job responsibilities of an extension leader?

Data from the instrument used to determine agent's perception of the ideal role of the extension leader were used to explore this question. Consensus as to whether the role item should be a part of the job description of the extension leader was reported in terms of percentage of scores falling in the four (preferably should) and five (definitely should) categories. The levels of consensus were arbitrarily set at: no consensus (0-40 percent), low consensus (41-60 percent), medium consensus (61-80 percent) and high consensus (81-100 percent).[3] Results are listed in Table IV.

Twenty-two items were classified high consensus, nine medium consensus, six low consensus and two no consensus. The percentage of 39 items falling in each respective category was 56, 23, 15, and 5.

---

[3]James C. Parker, "An Analysis of the Perceived and Expected Roles of the Department Head at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1972), p. 225.

TABLE IV

CONSENSUS LEVELS BY ROLE ITEM FOR THE IDEAL ROLE OF AN EXTENSION LEADER - 1973

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
29--Keep staff informed concerning extension policy	High	99.6	0.107	1	1
26--Promote harmonious working relationship among staff	High	98.8	0.149	2	2
20--Know the needs of the people in the county	High	98.4	0.200	3	5*
30--Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job	High	98.0	0.192	4*	3
32--Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--- agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Development)	High	98.0	0.256	4*	9
28--Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences	High	97.6	0.214	6	5*

TABLE IV (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
18--Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively	High	97.2	0.217	7	4
8--Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program	High	96.8	0.377	8	10*
7--Develop county program that meets needs of people	High	95.7	0.276	9	7
37--Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee	High	95.3	0.302	10	8
11--Keep public informed concerning the Extension program	High	94.9	0.320	11	10*
12--Maintain official contacts with cooperating agencies	High	91.7	0.414	12	12
6--Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement	High	88.5	0.529	13*	17
21--Supervise office secretary	High	88.5	0.544	13*	15
17--Assist in formulating the county Extension budget	High	88.1	0.695	15	13
16--Orient new staff members	High	85.8	0.703	16*	14

TABLE IV (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
38--Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program	High	85.8	0.625	16*	19
15--Maintain office equipment in workable condition	High	85.4	0.741	18*	16
27--Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program	High	85.4	0.669	18*	18
24--Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities	High	84.2	0.594	20	23
2--Equitably distribute secretary's time	High	83.8	0.876	21*	20
3--Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program	High	83.8	0.857	21*	21
31--Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members	Medium	80.6	1.072	23	25*
36--Approve travel for all staff members	Medium	80.2	1.048	24	22

TABLE IV (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
14--Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program	Medium	79.4	0.847	25	25*
1--Be a leader in community affairs	Medium	79.1	0.719	26	24
19--Approve all leave for county staff members	Medium	77.5	1.011	27	25*
4--Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work	Medium	71.1	0.869	28	28
13--Evaluate performance of all county staff members	Medium	66.4	1.525	29	31
5--Approve all reports submitted to district and state office	Medium	65.6	1.113	30	29
23--Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins	Medium	62.1	0.982	31	30
39--Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program	Low	56.5	0.988	32	33

TABLE IV (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
33--Train new staff members	Low	52.2	0.990	33	32
25--Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program	Low	46.6	0.921	34	34
34--Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas	Low	42.7	1.194	35	35*
10--Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility	Low	41.9	1.042	36	35*
35--Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program	Low	41.1	1.006	37	37
9--Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders	No	24.1	1.110	38	38
22--Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders	No	16.6	1.061	39	39

*Tied scores.

**High consensus - Eighty-one to 100 percent of scores fell in the four (preferably should) and five (definitely should) categories.

Medium consensus - Sixty-one to 80 percent of scores fell in the four (preferably should) and five (definitely should) categories.

Low consensus - Forty-one to 60 percent of scores fell in the four (preferably should) and five (definitely should) categories.

No consensus - Zero to 40 percent of scores fell in the four (preferably should) and five (definitely should) categories

***Percentage of scores falling in four (preferably should) and five (definitely should) on a 1-5 scale.

The twenty-two role items on which there was high consensus should create little or not role conflict. The district supervisor, extension leader and staff of the extension leader all were in high agreement that these role items should be a part of the extension leader's role; the district supervisor and extension leader because they mutually developed the job description and the staff because of the way they completed the questionnaire designed to determine their expectations of the extension leader.

Likewise, the nine role items in the medium consensus classification should not create serious role conflict between the extension leader and his staff. Well over half the responses fell in the definitely should and preferably should categories. Role item 13 in the medium category drew the greatest percentage of definitely should not and preferably should not responses and this amounted to only 15.4 percent.

The six items classified as low consensus and the two items classified as no consensus, however, were likely to create role conflict and should be studied to determine why a lack of consensus existed. A record was not kept of the number of times the various role items were written or implied in the 95 extension leader's job descriptions; however, the author observed that the two items classed as no consensus appeared in job descriptions of a relatively small number of extension leaders.

This could account for the fact that item nine, coordinate use of all volunteer leaders, and item 22, coordinate training of all volunteer leaders, fell in the no consensus category. Apparently the majority of extension leaders and supervisors did not feel these two items should be a part of the job description. All 37 other role items were a written or implied part of the majority of the 95 extension leader job descriptions. It would seem that the extension staff felt that individual staff members responsible for a particular program area, for example, 4-H or home economics, should be basically responsible for using and training leaders in that area. The fact that these two items appeared in a relatively few job descriptions indicated that a majority of extension leaders and supervisors shared this thinking. Thus, it was assumed that these two items would create little role conflict.

The six role items classed as low consensus appeared or were implied in most descriptions. This condition indicated that role conflict related to expectations of the supervisor and extension leader as compared to staff existed. Three of these items were related to use of specialists. Role items 25, 35, and 39 are respectively--coordinate specialist assistance in planning (item 25), evaluating (item 35) and carrying out (item 39) the county extension program. The indication was that staff felt that the individual agent responsible for a program

area was better able to coordinate specialist assistance than the extension leader. Two items related to training fell in this category. These were, item 10, train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility and item 33, train new staff members. Again, the indication was that the staff perceived that a staff member with similar responsibility to the agent being trained could do a more effective training job than the extension leader. It was interesting to note that two related items, orient new staff members and counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities, rated in the high consensus category. Perhaps this indicated the degree to which staff felt the extension leader should perform in this area. Staff was apparently willing for the extension leader to orient and counsel but were not so willing to grant the training privilege. The sixth low consensus item, coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas (item 34), again indicated that the staff felt that staff members basically responsible for a program area could best coordinate sponsorship.

The variance was calculated for each item. In general, the items falling in the high consensus level possessed lower variance than those in the medium, low and no consensus levels.

The mean rank of each ideal role item was presented in Appendix B. This rank gave each step in the 1-5 scale equal weight,

while the level of consensus was based on percentages of scores falling at points 4 and 5 on the scale. This accounted for the differences between level of consensus rank and mean rank. A high percentage of definitely should (5) responses would cause the mean rank of an item to be higher than the level of consensus rank.

IV. QUESTION THREE

Is there agreement among staff members as to the manner in which role items and segments are actually being carried out?

Data from the instrument used to determine agent's perception of the actual role of the extension leader was used to explore this question. Consensus as to whether the role item was being performed by the extension leader at a satisfactory level was reported in terms of percentage of scores falling in the four (usually) and five (always) categories. Levels of consensus were arbitrarily set at: no consensus (0-40 percent), low consensus (41-60 percent), medium consensus (61-80 percent) and high consensus (81-100 percent). Results were listed in Table V.

Ten items were classified high consensus, 19 medium consensus, four low consensus and six no consensus. Percentage of the 39 items falling in each respective category was 26, 49, 10, and 15.

TABLE V

CONSENSUS LEVELS BY ROLE ITEM FOR THE ACTUAL ROLE OF AN EXTENSION LEADER - 1973

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
19--Approve all leave for county staff members	High	97.6	0.349	1	1
36--Approve travel for all staff members	High	96.0	0.386	2	2
37--Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee	High	92.5	0.493	3	3
20--Know the needs of the people in the county	High	89.7	0.430	4	10*
28--Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences	High	86.6	0.890	5	4
17--Assist in formulating the county Extension budget	High	85.0	0.944	6	4*
5--Approve all reports submitted to district and state office	High	84.1	0.911	7	7
13--Evaluate performance of all county staff members	High	83.0	0.881	8	6
15--Maintain office equipment in workable condition	High	82.2	0.782	9	9
21--Supervise office secretary	High	81.0	0.845	10	10*

TABLE V (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
7--Develop county program that meets needs of people	Medium	80.7	0.756	11	8
12--Maintain official contacts with cooperating agencies	Medium	79.5	0.616	12	13
29--Keep staff informed concerning Extension policy	Medium	78.3	0.861	13	12
23--Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins	Medium	75.5	0.932	14	22
32--Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Development)	Medium	75.1	1.071	15	15
27--Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program	Medium	73.9	0.821	16	14
30--Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job	Medium	73.1	1.099	17	16
16--Orient new staff members	Medium	72.7	1.118	18	17

TABLE V (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
18--Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively	Medium	72.4	1.058	19	18
26--Promote harmonious working relationship among staff	Medium	71.2	1.180	20	20*
8--Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program	Medium	70.7	0.954	21	20*
38--Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program	Medium	69.6	0.970	22	19
31--Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members	Medium	68.0	0.961	23	24
11--Keep public informed concerning the Extension program	Medium	67.6	0.796	24	23
3--Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program	Medium	67.2	0.892	25	25*

TABLE V (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
14--Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program	Medium	66.0	1.130	26	27
1--Be a leader in community affairs	Medium	64.8	0.755	27	25*
2--Equitably distribute secretary's time	Medium	63.2	1.160	28	29
6--Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement	Medium	62.9	1.617	29	28
24--Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities	Low	55.0	1.050	30	30
33--Train new staff members	Low	49.4	1.307	31	32
4--Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work	Low	47.5	1.138	32	31
39--Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program	Low	43.9	1.346	33	33
25--Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program	No	38.7	1.409	34	34

TABLE V (cont'd)

Role Item	Level of Consensus**	Percentage of Scores Falling in 4 and 5***	Variance	Consensus Rank	Mean Rank
35--Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program	No	35.2	1.401	35	35
10--Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility	No	31.6	1.304	36	37
34--Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas	No	28.9	1.272	37	36
9--Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders	No	16.2	1.273	38	38
22--Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders	No	13.5	1.267	39	39

*Indicates tied ranks.

**High consensus - Eighty-one to 100 percent of scores fell in the four (usually) and five (always) categories.

Medium consensus - Sixty-one to 80 percent of scores fell in the four (usually) and five (always) categories.

Low consensus - Forty-one to 60 percent of scores fell in the four (usually) and five (always) categories.

No consensus - Zero to 40 percent of scores fell in the four (usually) and five (always) categories.

***Percentage of scores falling in four (usually) and five (always) categories.

If the assumption was that all 39 items should be a part of the job description of the extension leader, then the ten items classified as high consensus should create little or no role conflict. Likewise, the 19 role items in the medium consensus classification should not create serious role conflict among the extension leader, his staff, and his supervisors as well over half the responses fell in the always and usually categories. Role item 39 in the medium category drew the greatest percentage of never and seldom responses and this amounted to 24.9 percent.

The four items classified as low consensus and the six items classed as no consensus, however, were likely to create role conflict and should be studied to determine why a lack of consensus relative to high performance existed. The assumption was that extension leaders and supervisors were in agreement that these ten items should be performed at a high level. The same logic applies to role items nine and 22 as discussed under Question 2. These two items fell in the no consensus classification and as these two appeared in a relatively small number of extension leader's job descriptions it was assumed that little role expectation conflict for these two items existed between supervisors and the extension leader's staff.

Six of the remaining items classified low consensus and no consensus (items 25, 35, 39, 10, 33, and 34) were categorized either low

or no consensus in the ideal dimension. Presumably these items were being performed at the approximate level that the extension leader's staff felt they should. The reasons for low ideal expectations for these role items discussed under Question 2 were applicable to actual performance expectations by staff.

Two role items (item 4), assist other staff in implementing their assigned area of work, and (item 24), counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities, moved respectively from the high and medium classification into the low consensus category. These two items expressed similar responsibilities and indicated low consensus on performance of the extension leader related to helping staff members perform effectively relative to their assigned areas. It perhaps indicated an expressed need by staff for the extension leader to take more interest in what staff did and to take the initiative in counseling with staff concerning implementation of their assigned responsibilities.

Actual expectations in the medium consensus level were recorded for 15 role items that scored high in the ideal dimension. These were items 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, and 38. As these items fell only one level and remained within the medium level serious conflict was assumed not to exist. However, actual performance was one level below ideal expectations. Extension leaders would do well

to take note of staff expectations and upgrade performance related to these items.

Six items ranked high consensus in both the ideal and actual dimensions. These were items 15, 17, 20, 21, 28, and 37. Less role conflict or more agreement on actual relative to ideal expectations existed on these items than on any others. The supervisor, extension leader, and extension leader's staff were in agreement that not only should these items be a part of the job description of the extension leader but that these were also being carried out at a high level. Perhaps these were common denominations that could be used in developing consensus on other role items.

Four items scored medium consensus in both the ideal and actual dimensions. These were items 1, 14, 23, and 31. No serious role conflict was indicated but staff expectations relative to ideal and actual were a level below supervisor's and extension leader's expectations if it was assumed that their expectations were at the high consensus level.

Four items moved from medium ideal expectation to high actual performance. These were items 5, 13, 19, and 36. Extension leader's staff perceived that the leader "over-performed" these role items. These four, respectively, approve all reports submitted to district and

state office, evaluate performance of all county staff members, approve all leave for county staff members, and approve travel for all staff members, were in a sense "given responsibilities" by extension administration and were being performed at a high level even though the extension leader's staff perceived the ideal to be at the medium level. No serious role conflict was indicated but extension leaders should recognize staff perceptions in this area and handle these "givens" keeping in mind the concept of consideration and needs of the individual. Frequencies, means, variance, mean rank, and consensus level are listed for each actual role in Appendix B. The relationship between mean scores of each ideal and actual item was also explored. These data are listed in Appendix B.

V. QUESTION FOUR

Is there a relationship between congruity of ideal and actual role and perceived leader behavior (as measured by the LBDQ) of the extension leader?

The t-test was used to compare leaders ranking above the mean on both initiating structure and consideration with leaders scoring below the mean in both dimensions. This comparison was made for each actual role item and segment. Leaders ranking above the mean scored significantly

higher at the 0.01 level on all role segments and on all role items except item 17. Apparently both groups performed equally well related to this item, assist in formulating the county extension budget. Segment comparisons are listed in Table VI. Role item comparisons are listed in Appendix B.

Correlation of initiating structure score and consideration scores with difference scores (including total difference scores and segment difference scores) was tested at the .01 level using Kendall's tau. Re- results were summarized in Table VII. All proved to be significantly correlated. Initiating structure was more highly correlated with all the difference scores than consideration. A comparison of Table I and VII revealed that both initiating structure and consideration were more highly correlated with the difference scores (D_1 and D_2) than were leaders' performance ratings.

The correlation of initiating structure and consideration with total actual score and performance rating of extension leaders was tested. Results are summarized in Table VIII. Initiating structure and consideration were more highly correlated with total actual score than were performance leader ratings (see Table II).

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL ROLE BY SEGMENTS* OF EXTENSION LEADERS RANKING ABOVE THE MEAN (GROUP I) IN BOTH INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION WITH EXTENSION LEADERS RANKING BELOW THE MEAN (GROUP II) IN BOTH DIMENSIONS (t-test) 1973

	Segment I	Segment II	Segment III	Segment IV	Segment V	Total Actual**
Group I	31.59	48.75	46.61	17.41	16.26	160.58
Group II	25.10	38.10	38.28	15.19	13.81	130.49
	t=8.02- 0.000	t=10.09- 0.000	t=10.16- 0.000	t=6.64- 0.000	t=6.88- 0.000	t=10.13- 0.000

*Segment I - Planning and educational leadership; Segment II - Direction and coordination; Segment III - Personnel management; Segment IV - Extension relations; Segment V - Finance and business management.

**Total actual - Total numerical score of actual role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale for 39 role items.

TABLE VII

RELATIONSHIP OF INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION TO TOTAL DIFFERENCE SCORES* AND DIFFERENCE SEGMENT SCORES*
(KENDALL'S TAU)
1973

	D_1 Total and Sig. Level	D_1 Seg. I** and Sig. Level	D_1 Seg II** and Sig. Level	D_1 Seg III** and Sig. Level	D_1 Seg. IV** and Sig. Level	D_1 Seg. V** and Sig. Level
Initiating Structure	-0.529 0.001	-0.399 0.001	-0.483 0.001	-0.444 0.001	-0.419 0.001	-0.309 0.001
Consideration	-0.486 0.001	-0.360 0.001	-0.478 0.001	-0.418 0.001	-0.384 0.001	-0.237 0.001

TABLE VII (cont'd)

	D_2 Total and Sig. Level	D_2 Seg. I and Sig. Level	D_2 Seg. II and Sig. Level	D_2 Seg. III and Sig. Level	D_2 Seg. IV and Sig. Level	D_2 Seg. V and Sig. Level
Initiating Structure	-0.527 0.001	-0.467 0.001	-0.494 0.001	-0.492 0.001	-0.403 0.001	-0.383 0.001
Consideration	-0.506 0.001	-0.422 0.001	-0.491 0.001	-0.481 0.001	-0.382 0.001	-0.376 0.001

*D_1 - Total numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role also measured on a 1-5 scale. D_2 - Numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role also measured on a 1-5 scale only if actual is less than ideal.

**Segment I - Planning and educational leadership; Segment II - Direction and coordination; Segment III - Personnel management; Segment IV - Extension relations; Segment V - Finance and business management.

TABLE VIII

RELATIONSHIP OF INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION TO TOTAL ACTUAL SCORE AND PERFORMANCE RATING (KENDALL'S TAU)
1973

	Total Actual *		Performance Rating **	
	Kendall's Tau	Sig. Level	Kendall's Tau	Sig. Level
Initiating Structure	0.607	0.001	0.245	0.001
Consideration	0.532	0.001	0.179	0.001

*Total actual - Total numerical score of actual role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale for 39 role items.

**Performance rating - Relative rating of extension leader's performance on a scale of 1 to 5.

VI. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Table IX summarized leader performance ratings and its relationship to the apparent five best indicators of performance, namely, difference scores (D_1 and D_2), total actual score, initiating structure and consideration. The data in this study indicated that of the five factors, total actual score was most highly correlated with extension leader performance. Initiating structure score was second, difference score (D_2) third, difference score (D_1) fourth, and consideration fifth. Thus, the instrument developed by the author produced the most highly correlated factor with performance (total actual score).

TABLE IX

RELATIONSHIP OF PERFORMANCE RATING TO SEVERAL PREDICTORS OF PERFORMANCE
(KENDALL'S TAU)
1973

	Total D_1 **		Total D_2 ***		Total Actual ****		Initiating Structure	
	Tau	Sig. Level	Tau	Sig. Level	Tau	Sig. Level	Tau	Sig. Level
Performance Rating *	-0.197	0.001	-0.229	0.001	-0.263	0.001	0.245	0.001

TABLE IX (cont'd)

	Consideration	
	Tau	Sig. Level
Performance Rating	0.179	0.001

*Performance rating - Relative rating of extension leader's performance on a scale of 1 to 5.

**Total D_1 - Total numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role measured on a 1-5 scale.

***Total D_2 - Numerical difference between perception of ideal role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale and actual role measured on a 1-5 scale only if actual is less than ideal.

****Total actual - Total numerical score of actual role of the extension leader measured on a 1-5 scale for 39 role items.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

This study was prompted because of a change in the role of the extension leader position in the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service which occurred in December 1970. The extension leader was granted, for the first time, line authority over other members of the county extension staff. This change was in accord with the trend in organizational pattern of agricultural extension services across the United States.

In early 1971 extension leaders developed their job descriptions. These descriptions were discussed with the extension leaders' immediate superior, the district supervisor, and were approved as official guidelines for performance of the extension leader. Even though each leader developed his own description with the approval of his immediate supervisor, a common thread of administrative and program responsibility was evident in each description. These 95 descriptions were on file and were written in a manner that permitted item analysis.

The literature supported the assumption that a leader to be most

effective in attaining organizational and personal goals must be aware of how others perceive his role. In turn he must be willing to conform to a degree with expectations of those with whom he most closely interacts.

II. STUDY SUMMARY

Recognizing that the behavior of the extension leader is influenced by his role perception and the role expectations that others have for him, this study was launched to clarify understanding relative to role perception and role expectations related to the extension leader position.

Specifically, the problem explored was concerned with measuring the gap that existed between the perceived ideal role and perceived actual role of the extension leader as perceived by his staff. Further, how did this gap that existed between ideal and actual affect performance of the leader.

The following questions were explored and analyzed.

1. Is there a significant relationship between high congruity of ideal and actual role (as perceived by staff members) and high performance rating of an extension leader?

2. Is there agreement among staff members as to role items and role segments that should constitute the job responsibilities of an extension leader?

3. Is there agreement among staff members as to the manner in which role items and segments are actually being carried out?

4. Is there a relationship between congruity of ideal and actual role and perceived leader behavior (as measured by the LBDQ) of the extension leader?

Job descriptions of the 95 extension leaders were analyzed and categorized into 39 role item statements that characterized the position. These items were classified under five role segments, planning and educational leadership, direction and coordination, personnel management, extension relations, and finance and business management. Respectively, these segments were composed of eight, twelve, eleven, four, and four role items.

These 39 items composed the questionnaires. Two questionnaires were developed using these items. The first was designed to ascertain the respondent's perception of what the ideal role of the extension leader should be. The second was composed of the identical 39 items in the same order and was designed to determine the respondent's perception of how their extension leader actually performed the function identified in the role item statement. A scale of 1 to 5 was developed to allow the respondent to indicate his level of perception. Alternative responses related to the ideal dimension were: (1) definitely should not, (2) preferably should

not, (3) may or may not, (4) preferably should and (5) definitely should. Corresponding responses on the actual dimension were: (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) occasionally, (4) usually and (5) always.

In order to score a perception of role from an instrument not developed from extension documents the LBDQ was modified and used. Respondents were asked to describe actual behavior of their leader on the LBDQ. The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix A. The role items are also classified by role segment in Appendix A.

The data gathering instruments were administered at district meetings in early 1973. One follow-up letter was mailed to those who failed to return the completed questionnaire at the meetings. This letter is reproduced in Appendix A. Over 90 percent of the population completed questionnaires.

The population for the study was all county professional staff members who reported to the 95 county extension leaders. Focal position was the extension leader position, Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Agents employed since December 31, 1972, agents in counties acquiring a new extension leader since December 31, 1972 and agents with multi-county responsibility were not asked to participate.

Two measures of congruity between ideal and actual role were used. Difference score$_1$ (D_1) and difference score$_2$ (D_2) were calculated

for each role item. Sum of the respective difference scores for the 39 items resulted in the respective total difference score. A difference score was computed for each role segment in this same manner. Difference score$_1$ (D_1) was the total numerical difference between ideal and actual on a 1-5 scale regardless of whether actual scores were lower or higher than ideal. Difference score$_2$ (D_2) was the numerical difference between ideal and actual on a 1-5 scale only if actual score was lower than ideal. By definition D_1 included a measure of "over performance" compared to ideal while D_2 disregarded "over performance."

Job performance ratings for fiscal year 1973 for extension leaders were used in this study. These were the official ratings used for salary adjustments and promotions. All extension leaders rated either 3.0 (below average), 4.0 (average), or 5.0 (above average). A reproduction of the instrument used as a basis for establishing performance ratings appeared in Appendix A.

It was determined that at least two staff members must complete usable questionnaires on their extension leader in order for that county to be included in the study. Seventy-seven of the 95 counties met this criterion. Fifteen of these leaders rated 3.0, 43 rated 4.0, and 19 rated 5.0. Respective number of respondents for agents rating 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0 were 45, 145, and 63. The data from questionnaires completed

by the 253 respondents were processed for the computer. The University of Tennessee Computing Center was utilized in processing and analyzing data.

III. FINDINGS

Findings related to the four questions will be discussed in numerical order.

Question 1

Relationship of the difference scores (D_1 and D_2) to performance rating was the primary basis for exploring and analyzing this question. Total D_1 score and D_2 score were both found to be significantly correlated to leader performance at the 0.001 level using Kendall's tau. Total D_2 score proved to be more highly correlated with performance than D_1 ($r = -0.229$ and -0.197). All D_2 segment scores were more highly correlated than corresponding D_1 segment scores and all D_2 correlations were significant at the 0.001 level. Difference score means of agents rating 3 and 5 were tested using the t-test. Means of total D_1 and total D_2 scores of extension leaders rating 3 and 5 were significantly different at the 0.001 level. Table I, page 50, presented this data. Thus the smaller the gap or difference between an extension leader's actual performance as perceived by his

staff and their perception of the ideal role of an extension leader the higher the performance.

The relationship of total ideal and total actual scores to performance was also tested. Results were presented in Table II, page 53. Total actual score was significantly related to performance at the 0.001 level. In fact the correlation coefficient was greater than the coefficient relating D_2 to performance. Actual total score for each segment was also significantly related to performance at the 0.001 level. Total ideal score was significantly related to performance at the 0.003 level, but the correlation statistic was much lower.

The t-test was used to test for a significant difference in means by role items of actual score of extension leaders rating 3 and 5. Extension leaders rating 5 scored numerically higher on all 39 role items. This higher score was significant at the 0.01 level for 31 of the 39 role items. Means for items 2, 16, 23, 25, 31, 33, 34, and 35 were not significantly different. Using level of t value as an indicator role items 29, 28, 37, 21, 12, 30, 24, 8, 38 and 11 ranked highest. These could be considered indicators of high performance. All 39 role items are listed in Table X in Appendix B giving the relationship of leaders rating 3 and 5 as expressed by the t-test.

Kendall's tau was also used to compare each of the 39 role item actual scores with performance. All were significantly related to performance at the 0.01 level except role items 33 and 34. Using size of correlation statistic as an indicator role items 29, 37, 28, 7, 12, 30, 21, 8, 24, and 11 were the best indicators of performance. The top ten items based on correlation levels are with one exception (role item 7) the same items that ranked highest when the t-test was used to test for significant differences in role item means of leaders rating 3 and 5. This further justified these nine items as indicators of high performance. Correlation for each of the actual role items were listed in Table XI in Appendix B. When role segments were studied no discernible pattern was evident related to performance.

In summary congruence and performance were found to be correlated. Total actual score, however, proved to be the most highly correlated with performance and thus the best indicator of performance. Individual role items 29, 37, 28, 12, 30, 21, 8, 24, and 11 were the most highly correlated with performance. No discernible pattern was evident relating role segments and performance. Further research could develop a combination of role items that would be more highly correlated with performance.

Question 2

This question was concerned with the study of consensus as to whether role items and segments should be a part of the job description of an extension leader as perceived by his staff. The data from the instrument used to determine agent's perception of the ideal role of the extension leader were used to explore this question. Consensus as to whether the role items should be a part of the job description of the extension leader was reported in terms of percent of scores falling in the four (preferably should) and five (definitely should) categories. Levels of consensus were arbitrarily set at: no consensus (0-40) percent), low consensus (41-60 percent), medium consensus (61-80 percent), and high consensus (81-100 percent). Table IV, page 60, listed results.

Twenty-two items were classified high consensus, nine medium consensus, six low consensus and two no consensus.

The 22 role items on which there was high consensus and the nine items in the medium consensus classification should not create serious role conflict. The district supervisor, extension leader and staff of the extension leader were all in high or medium agreement that these should be a part of the job description of the extension leader; the district supervisor and extension leader because they mutually developed the job description and the staff based on their completion of the instrument designed to ascertain their expectations of the extension leader.

The six items classified as low consensus and the two categorized no consensus were likely to create role conflict. The two items classed as no consensus appeared in a relatively small number of extension leaders' job descriptions. A majority of extension leaders and supervisors did not feel it desirable that these two items (nine and twenty-two) be included in the job descriptions. It was apparent that the extension leader's staff felt likewise. Thus, it was assumed that these two items would create little or no conflict.

The six role items classed as low consensus appeared or were implied in most descriptions. This indicated that role conflict related to expectations of the supervisor and extension leader as compared to staff existed. Three of these items were related to use of specialists. Role items 25, 35, and 39 were respectively, coordinate specialist assistance in planning (item 25), evaluating (item 35) and carrying out (item 39) the county extension program. This appeared to indicate that the staff felt that the individual agent responsible for a program area was better able to coordinate specialist assistance than the extension leader. Two items related to training fell in this category. These were item 10, train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility and item 33, train new staff members. Again, the indication appeared to be that the staff perceived that a staff member

with similar responsibility to the agent being trained could do a more effective training job than the extension leader. Two related role items, orient new staff members and counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities, rated in the high consensus category. Perhaps this indicated the degree to which staff felt the extension leader should or was able to perform in this area. Orient and counsel indicated the extension leader determined direction and parameters but did not indicate that the leader conducted specific training to implement a specific assignment.

The sixth low consensus item, coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas, appeared to indicate that the staff felt that staff members basically responsible for a program area could best coordinate sponsorship.

In summary, if the assumption was that all 39 role items as perceived by supervisors and extension leaders should be a part of the job description of an extension leader then the staff agreed at the high consensus level on 22 items. Medium consensus by staff existed on nine items. Thus in this study staff, extension leaders, and supervisors agreed that these 31 items ideally should be a part of the job description. Two items were classified no consensus. These items appeared in a minority of extension leaders' job descriptions. Thus it was assumed

that on these two items, consensus existed among staff, extension leaders and supervisors that these should not be a part of the extension leader's role. The six low consensus items were considered likely to create conflict between staff and the extension leader. Three of these were related to specialist assistance in the county program, two to training staff members, and one to securing sponsorship. Thus in this study staff felt these items should be a part of the job description of the extension leader at the low consensus level while extension leaders and supervisors were assumed to consider these high consensus items. When role segments were studied no discernible pattern was evident related to consensus level of role segment.

Question 3

Data from the instrument used to determine agent's perception of actual role of the extension leader were used to explore this question. Consensus as to whether the role item was being satisfactorily performed was reported in terms of percentage of scores falling in the four (usually) and five (always) categories. Levels of consensus were arbitrarily set at: no consensus (0-40 percent), low consensus (41-60 percent), medium consensus (61-80 percent), and high consensus (81-100). Table V, page 70, listed results. Ten items were classified high consensus, 19 medium, four low and six no consensus.

If the assumption was that all 39 items should be a part of the job description then findings of this study indicated that the ten high consensus and 19 medium consensus items should not create serious conflict among the leader, his staff, and his supervisors. The four items classified low consensus and the six items classed as no consensus, however, were likely to create role conflict and should be studied to ascertain why a lack of consensus related to high performance existed. Role items nine and twenty-two appeared in relatively few job descriptions and as discussed under question 2 should create little conflict. Six of the remaining items classified low and no consensus in the actual dimension were categorized low consensus (items 25, 35, 39, 10, 33, and 34) in the ideal dimension. Findings indicated that these items were being performed at the approximate level that the extension leader's staff felt they should. These items were related to specialist assistance, training staff, and securing sponsorship.

Two role items, assist other staff in implementing their assigned area of work and counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities, moved respectively into the low consensus actual division from the medium and high consensus ideal categories. These two items expressed similar responsibilities and indicated low consensus on performance of the extension leader related to helping staff perform effectively relative to their assigned areas. Staff expectations according

to this study were for higher performance related to these two items.

Actual expectations in the medium consensus level were recorded for 15 items that scored high in the ideal dimension. These items fell only one level and remained within the little or no conflict area (high or medium consensus); however, actual performance is one level below ideal expectations.

Six items ranked high consensus in both the ideal and actual dimensions. Less role conflict or more agreement on actual relative to ideal expectations exists on these items than on any others. The supervisor, extension leader, and leader's staff were in agreement that not only should these be a part of an extension leader's job description but that these items are actually being performed at a high level. Perhaps these common denominators can be used in developing consensus on other items.

Four items were medium consensus in both the ideal and actual dimensions. No serious role conflict is indicated but staff expectations relative to ideal and actual were a level below supervisors and extension leader's expectations if it was assumed that their expectations were at the high consensus level.

Four items moved from medium ideal expectations to high actual performance. Leader's staff perceived that the leader "over performed"

these role items. These four, respectively, approve all reports submitted to district and state office, evaluate performance of all county staff members, approve all leave for county staff members, and approve travel for all staff members, were in a sense "given responsibilities" by extension administration and were being performed at a high level even though the leader's staff perceive the ideal to be at the medium level.

Question 4

The t-test was used to compare leaders ranking above the mean on both initiating structure and consideration with those scoring below the mean in both dimensions. This comparison was made for each actual role item and actual role segment. Leaders ranking above the mean scored significantly higher at the 0.01 level on all role segments and on all role items except item 17. Both groups apparently performed equally well related to this item, assist in formulating the county extension budget. Thus extension leaders in the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service that ranked above the mean in the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration were perceived by their staff to perform at a higher level relative to role segments and items in this study than those ranking below the mean in these dimensions. This was in accord with findings of similar studies conducted with educational administrators and

with personnel in extension services of other states.

The correlation of difference score (D_1 and D_2) with initiating structure and consideration scores was tested using Kendall's tau. Both D_1 and D_2 were significantly correlated with both these dimensions at the 0.01 level. Initiating structure was more highly correlated with the difference scores than consideration. The correlation of initiating structure and consideration with total actual score and performance rating was also tested using Kendall's tau. Both dimensions were significantly correlated with total actual and performance rating at the 0.01 level. Initiating structure was more highly correlated than consideration. Table VIII, page 84, listed results.

Performance Rating and Its Relationship to Several Predictors

Several indicators of performance were examined and developed in this study including difference score$_1$ (D_1), difference score$_2$ (D_2) total actual score, initiating structure score and consideration score. All proved to be significantly related to performance at the 0.01 level using Kendall's tau. Total actual score proved to be most highly correlated followed by initiating structure, difference score$_2$ (D_2), difference score$_1$ (D_1) and consideration. Table IX, page 86, listed results. The five indicators listed above proved to be highly correlated with one another as listed in Tables VIII and IX.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were drawn from this study.

1. Congruity of ideal and actual role as perceived by an extension leader's staff was correlated with performance. The greater the congruity or the smaller the gap between ideal and actual the higher the performance. Total actual score, however, proved to be more highly correlated with performance than the congruity scores (D_1 and D_2). Based on results of this study it may be concluded that the extension leader who performs the role items at the highest level will also receive the highest performance rating and presumably perform at the highest level. High performance, in terms of a leader's job description, leads to a high performance rating.

2. Using size of correlation statistic as an indicator actual role items 29, 37, 28, 12, 30, 21, 8, 24, and 11 were the most highly correlated with performance and could be considered the best indicators of performance. It may be concluded that these nine actual role items compose a performance indicator role segment.

3. Staff of extension leaders consider that of the 39 ideal role items tested, 31 (22 high consensus/nine medium consensus) should ideally be a part of the job description of an extension leader. The other eight fell in the low consensus and no consensus levels and the

potential for role conflict existed related to these items. Two items related to coordinating training and use of all volunteer leaders appeared in only a small number of job descriptions. These two items were for this reason not considered to be serious potential conflict items. Three of the remaining were related to specialist use in planning, implementing and evaluating the county extension program; two to training personnel; and one to coordinating securing of sponsorship for all program areas. All three levels concerned district supervisors, extension leaders and county staff should study these six items, particularly, the first five and ascertain why these items were ideally perceived to fall in the low consensus level.

4. Staff of extension leaders considered that of the 39 actual role items tested, 29 (ten high consensus/19 medium consensus) were being performed in a satisfactory manner. The other ten fell in the low consensus and no consensus levels and if the assumption was that all 39 should be a part of the description then these were not considered to be adequately performed. Role items nine and 22 appeared in only a limited number of job descriptions and thus were assumed to create little conflict. Six of the remaining items were classified low consensus in the ideal dimension and thus presumably were being performed at about the level the extension leaders' staff felt these should. These items

related to specialist assistance, training staff and securing sponsorship. These were the six items discussed in conclusion three above. District supervisors, extension leaders, and county staff should study these items, particularly the three related to specialist assistance and two related to staff training, to ascertain why these were perceived as being performed at the low consensus level. It may be concluded that extension leaders need more insight into ways specialists can assist in a county program. The extension leaders' staff may be expressing a desire that the extension leader delegate more responsibility related to use of specialists in county programs. Likewise, extension leaders need insight into effective ways of training other staff members to improve performance and training new staff members.

5. Two actual role items, assist other staff in implementing their assigned area of work and counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities, moved into the low consensus division from respectively the medium and high consensus categories. The second mentioned item was the only one that moved down two levels (from high to low) when ideal and actual were compared. The first item is the only item that moved from medium to low when comparing ideal and actual. These are the only two items that moved from the little or no conflict level (high or medium consensus) in the ideal dimension to the conflict

level (low or no consensus) in the actual dimension. Thus staff actual perception in general met staff ideal expectation except for these two role items.

Staff expectations were for higher performance related to these two items. This finding perhaps indicated an expressed need or desire by staff for the leader to take more interest in what staff is doing and exercise initiative in counseling with staff in implementation of their assigned area.

6. Six items ranked high consensus in both the ideal and actual dimensions. Perhaps these are common denominators that can be used in developing consensus on other items.

7. Four items moved from medium ideal expectations to high actual performance. These four "over performed" items, approve all reports submitted to district and state office, evaluate performance of all county staff members, approve all leave for county staff members, and approve travel for all staff members, were in a sense "given" responsibilities by extension administration. No serious role conflict was indicated, but leaders should recognize staff perceptions in this area and handle these "givens" with consideration.

8. No discernible pattern was evident related to role segments. Perhaps study of consensus levels (both ideal and actual) and correlation

of individual role segments with performance could lead to a significant classification of role items into segments. The nine actual role items discussed in conclusion two could possibly be developed into a performance indicator segment.

9. Generally speaking, actual perception of performance of role items was at the approximate level of ideal expectation. This statement is based on the fact that only two role items moved up or down more than one level or moved from the little or no conflict level to the low or no consensus level. These two items were discussed under conclusion five. Thus there appeared to be relatively little conflict between the total ideal dimension and the total actual dimension as perceived by staff. Role conflict between staff and the extension leader was assumed when an actual role item fell into the low or no consensus level.

10. Leaders ranking above the mean on both initiating structure and consideration scored significantly higher on all role segments and all role items, except item 17, than did leaders ranking below the mean in both these dimensions. This was in accord with findings in other studies conducted with educational administrators.

11. The indicators of performance developed and/or used in this study, namely, difference score$_1$ (D_1), difference score$_2$ (D_2), total actual score, initiating structure score and consideration score were more highly

correlated with one another than with performance. This on one hand testified to the validity of the data-gathering instruments and on the other hand points up the fact that many other factors enter into performance evaluation other than the 39 role items developed in this study or the job description of the person being evaluated.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The role items related to use of specialists in planning, implementing and evaluating the county extension program fell in the low consensus level on both the ideal and actual dimensions. Study concerning the role of the specialist related to the county extension program is recommended. Specifically, role expectations and perceptions of the county staff for specialist staff and role expectations and perceptions of the specialist staff for county staff should be explored and analyzed.

2. The role items related to training new staff members and training other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility fell in the low consensus level on both the ideal and actual dimensions. Study as to who is training new staff members and how training new staff members is actually being carried out is recommended. The district supervisory staff has traditionally concerned itself with training new staff members. Likewise, county staff having

similar responsibilities have traditionally trained new staff members. Perhaps study would reveal that persons other than the extension leader are perceived as having the responsibility for training new staff members. After determination is made of what actually exists related to training new staff members determination can be made as to what should exist. A similar study is recommended related to training staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility.

3. The assumption was made in this study that the district supervisor's and extension leader's expectation was at the high consensus level for each role item. This assumption was justified because both were involved in developing the description and presumably placed items in the description because of mutual agreement. A study is recommended to test this assumption. Perceptions and expectations of the supervisory staff and extension leaders should be included in the study.

4. The literature supports the notion that other variables being equal, the leader who is most aware of expectations for his postion by those within his role set can perform at a higher level than one who does not possess this knowledge. Findings of this study provide general knowledge concerning expectations and perceptions of the county staff for the extension leader. These findings should be made available to extension leaders and county staff as a beginning point toward increased understanding concerning expectations and perceptions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1957.

Banton, Michael. Roles. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Byrn, Darcie (ed.). Evaluation in Extension. Washington, D.C.: USDA, Division of Extension Research and Training, 1956.

Corwin, Robert G. Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 1966.

Culbertson, Jack A. and Stephen P. Hencley (eds.). Educational Research: New Perspectives. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1963.

Edwards, Allen L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Engelhart, Max D. Methods of Educational Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1972.

Foskett, John M. Role Consensus: The Case of the Elementary School Teacher. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1969.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.

Hare, A. Paul. Handbook of Small Group Research. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Hodgson, Richard C., Daniel J. Levinson and Abraham Zaleznik. The Executive Role Constellation. Boston: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1965.

Jackson, J. A. (ed.). Role. London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Kahn, Robert L., Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn and J. Diedrick Snook. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Kelsey, L. D. and C. C. Hearne. Cooperative Extension Work. Ithaca: Comstock Publishing Company, 1955.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Lindzey, Gardner and Elliot Aronson (eds.). The Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol I, Second edition. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1968.

Nie, Norman H., Dale H. Bent and C. Hadlai Hull. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1970.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Sanders, H. C. (ed.). The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Stogdill, Ralph M. and Alvin E. Coons (eds.). Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1957.

Sweitzer, Robert E. Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Principals. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1963.

B. PERIODICALS

Bible, Bond T. and Coy G. McNabb. "Role Consensus and Administrative Effectiveness," Rural Sociology, Vol. 31, March (1966).

Bible, Bond T., Frnacena T. Nolan, and Emory J. Brown. "Consensus on Role Definition of the County Extension Executive Committee Member," Rural Sociology, Vol. 26, June (1961).

Clark, Robert C. "Principles of County Administration," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Fall (1969).

Green, Charles N. and Dennis W. Organ. "An Evaluation of Casual Models Linking the Received Role with Job Satisfaction," Administrative Science Quarterly, March (1973).

Johnson, Paul O. and J. C. Bledsoe. "Mr. Chairman, Your Behavior Affects Morale," Journal of Extension, Spring (1974).

Slocum, Walter T. "Specialization and Change in Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Fall (1969).

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Cunningham, Clarence Junior. "Measures of Leader Behavior and Their Relation to Performance Levels of County Extension Agents." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1964.

James, Floren V. "The Role of the County Extension Agent, Chairman in Ohio." Unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, 1966.

Kaylor, James Edwin. "Examination of an Emerging Organizational Position with Selected Techniques of Role Analysis." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1972.

Parker, James C. "An Analysis of the Perceived and Expected Roles of the Department Head of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1971.

D. BULLETINS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS

Clark, Robert C. and Fawzi Abdullah. Functions of the County Extension Director in the Cooperative Extension Service, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Directory, University of Tennessee, Institute of Agriculture, Knoxville, 1974.

Extension Program Development and Its Relationship to Extension Management Information Systems, Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University, 1974.

The University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service Handbook, Knoxville, 1973.

Wilkening, Eugene A. The County Extension Agent in Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin, 1957.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Questionnaires Designed to Study the EXTENSION LEADER POSITION

Please answer the following question:

I. Title (check one) - Extension Leader _____

Extension Agent, Associate Extension Agent or Assistant Extension Agent _____

II. Size of Professional Staff (check one)
Three or less ___
Four ___
Five or more ___

III. Name of County _____

IV. Number Years Employed by Extension (as of January 1, 1973)_____

V. Highest Level of Formal Education Completed (check one)
Bachelor's ___
Master's ___

IDEAL ROLE OF THE EXTENSION LEADER

Assume that each of the following statements was derived from the job description of an Extension Leader. Read each statement carefully

and decide if you feel this statement should be a part of the job description.

Indicate how you feel by selecting the most appropriate number from the list below and placing it to the left of the statement.

5. Definitely should
4. Preferably should
3. May or may not
2. Preferably should not
1. Definitely should not

____1. Be a leader in community affairs.

____2. Equitably distribute secretary's time.

____3. Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program.

____4. Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work.

____5. Approve all reports submitted to district and state office.

____6. Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement.

____7. Develop county program that meets needs of people.

____8. Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program.

____9. Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders.

____10. Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility.

____11. Keep public informed concerning the Extension program.

____12. Maintain official contacts with cooperating agencies.

____13. Evaluate performance of all county staff members.

____14. Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program.

____15. Maintain office equipment in workable condition.

____16. Orient new staff members.

____17. Assist in formulating the county Extension budget.

____18. Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively.

____19. Approve all leave for county staff members.

____20. Know the needs of the people in the county.

____21. Supervise office secretary.

____22. Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders.

____23. Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins.

____24. Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities.

____25. Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program.

____26. Promote harmonious working relationship among staff.

____27. Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program.

____28. Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences.

____29. Keep staff informed concerning Extension policy.

____30. Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job.

____31. Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members.

____32. Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Develop.).

____33. Train new staff members.

____34. Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas.

____35. Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program.

____36. Approve travel for all staff members.

____37. Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee.

____38. Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program.

____39. Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program.

ACTUAL ROLE OF THE EXTENSION LEADER

Assume that each of the following statements was derived from the job descriptions of an Extension leader. Read each statement carefully and decide if you feel <u>your</u> Extension leader (yourself, if you are an Extension leader) actually performs the function in the statement.

Indicate how you feel by selecting the most appropriate number from the list below and placing it to the left of the statement.

5. Always
4. Usually
3. Occasionally
2. Seldom
1. Never

____1. Be a leader in community affairs.

____2. Equitably distribute secretary's time.

____3. Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program.

____4. Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work.

____5. Approve all reports submitted to district and state office.

____6. Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement.

____7. Develop county program that meets needs of people.

____8. Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program.

____9. Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders.

____10. Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility.

____11. Keep public informed concerning the Extension program.

____12. Maintain official contacts with cooperating agencies.

____13. Evaluate performance of all county staff members.

____14. Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program.

____15. Maintain office equipment in workable condition.

____16. Orient new staff members.

____17. Assist in formulating the county Extension budget.

____18. Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively.

____19. Approve all leave for county staff members.

____20. Know the needs of the people in the county.

____21. Supervise office secretary.

____22. Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders.

____23. Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins.

____24. Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities.

____25. Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program.

____26. Promote harmonious working relationship among staff.

____27. Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program.

____28. Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences.

____29. Keep staff informed concerning Extension policy.

____30. Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job.

____31. Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members.

____32. Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Development).

____33. Train new staff members.

____34. Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas.

____35. Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program.

____36. Approve travel for all staff members.

____37. Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee.

____38. Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program.

____39. Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program.

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Following is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your Extension Leader (yourself if you are an Extension Leader). Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe as accurately as you can the behavior of your extension leader.

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

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

1.	He does personal favors for staff members.	A B C D E
2.	He makes his attitudes clear to the staff.	A B C D E
3.	He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the staff.	A B C D E
4.	He tries out his new ideas with the staff.	A B C D E
5.	He acts as the real leader of the staff.	A B C D E
6.	He is easy to understand.	A B C D E
7.	He rules with an iron hand.	A B C D E
8.	He finds time to listen to staff members.	A B C D E

9.	He criticizes poor work.	A B C D E
10.	He gives advance notice of changes.	A B C D E
11.	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.	A B C D E
12.	He keeps to himself.	A B C D E
13.	He looks out for the personal welfare of individual staff members.	A B C D E
14.	He assigns staff members to particular tasks.	A B C D E
15.	He is the spokesman of the staff.	A B C D E
16.	He works without a plan.	A B C D E
17.	He maintains definite standards of performance.	A B C D E
18.	He refuses to explain his actions.	A B C D E
19.	He keeps the staff informed.	A B C D E
20.	He acts without consulting the staff.	A B C D E
21.	He is slow to accept new ideas.	A B C D E
22.	He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.	A B C D E
23.	He treats all staff members as his equals.	A B C D E
24.	He encourages the use of uniform procedures.	A B C D E
25.	He gets what he asks for from his superiors.	A B C D E
26.	He is willing to make changes.	A B C D E
27.	He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by staff members.	A B C D E
28.	He is friendly and approachable.	A B C D E

29.	He asks that staff members follow standard rules and regulations.	A B C D E
30.	He fails to take necessary action.	A B C D E
31.	He makes staff members feel at ease when talking with them.	A B C D E
32.	He lets staff members know what is expected of them.	A B C D E
33.	He speaks as the representative of the staff.	A B C D E
34.	He puts suggestions made by the staff into operation.	A B C D E
35.	He sees to it that staff members are working up to capacity.	A B C D E
36.	He lets other people take away his leadership in the staff.	A B C D E
37.	He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the staff members.	A B C D E
38.	He gets staff approval in important matters before going ahead.	A B C D E
39.	He sees to it that the work of the staff members is coordinated.	A B C D E
40.	He keeps the staff working together as a team.	A B C D E

THANK YOU. Your cooperation is appreciated. I believe the contribution you have made will be of value to our Extension organization.

LETTER REGARDING QUESTIONNAIRE

The University of Tennessee
Institute of Agriculture

Agricultural Extension Service
605 Airways Boulevard
Jackson, TN 38301
May 9, 1973

Dear Co-worker:

According to my records you did not turn in the questionnaire designed to study the Extension Leader Position.

Your completed questionnaire will contribute a great deal to the study. Enclosed is another form, in case you have misplaced yours, along with an envelope in which to return it.

Your help is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Gene W. Turner
Associate District Supervisor

GWT/mad/mjd

INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL RATING FORM

Name_____ Rank_____ Department_____

Years on staff_____ Years in present rank_____ Years professional experience_____

Distribution of time: Extension_____% Research_____% Teaching_____%

	Ext.	Res.	Teach.
1. Leadership. Provides guidance, obtains cooperation of others			
2. Initiative. Creativity, motivation, imagination, enthusiasm			
3. Reliability. Loyalty, integrity, commitment to organization			
4. Cooperativeness. Adaptability, ability to work with others			
5. Personality. Interpersonal and public relations, emotional stability, attitude, bearing			
6. Professionalism. Image projected, work habits, professional development			
7. Communication. Speaking			
8. Writing			
9. Competence. Depth of knowledge, skill, intellectual breadth			
10. Planning. Establishes objectives, priorities, procedures and organization			

	Ext.	Res.	Teach.
11. Implementing. Follows through with innovative and appropriate methods to accomplish planned objectives			
12. Evaluation. Critical assessment of results of extension, research, teaching			
13. Reporting. Publications, progress and terminal reports to clientele and administration			
Total Score			
Average Score			
Overall Rating (weighted by distribution of time)			

Remarks. If appropriate on potentials or problems

Potential: Problems:

Completed by_____ Title_____ Date_____

Adm. Form 51

GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING RATING FORM

I. Keep in mind that the purpose is to rate the individual in his present job assignment.

II. Be objective. Do not allow your rating to be influenced by personal consideration. Guard against allowing recent events or isolated cases to influence rating unduly.

III. In rating individuals it is necessary to have standards of behavior and performance against which the person is rated but above all avoid stereotyping. In rating on personal characteristics--leadership, initiative, reliability, cooperativeness and personality--the base for comparison should be those standards of personal conduct and behavior which are accepted and condoned for professional people in the community. In rating on job performance characteristics--professionalism, competence, communication, planning, implementation, evaluation and reporting--the base of reference should be those standards of performance in his profession and job.

The 13 characteristics should be scored using the following scale:

5--Far exceeds the standards for the characteristic
4--Exceeds the standard for the characteristic
3--Meets the standard for the characteristic
2--Marginal performance as related to the standard for the characteristic
1--Far below the standard for the characteristic

IV. Summary of Rating

Compute an average score for the 13 characteristics. Based on the average score the person's overall rating should be:

EXCELLENT - Average score of 4.5 or above. This individual possesses exceptional competence with outstanding personal qualities, skill, and performance.

ABOVE AVERAGE - Average score between 3.6 and 4.4. Overall performance goes beyond acceptable standards.

AVERAGE - Average score between 2.5 and 3.5. Overall performance meets acceptable standards.

BELOW AVERAGE - Average score between 1.6 and 2.4. Overall performance is marginal or less than level desired. Not promotable so long as problem(s) prevail. A formal plan for improvement is required. If progress is not made in reasonable time the person should be reassigned or replaced.

POOR - Average score of 1.5 or below. Overall performance clearly indicates failure to meet minimum standards. Requires re-examination of job assignment and/or formal plan of action for considerable improvement. Continued lack of progress indicates the individual should be replaced.

ROLE ITEMS CLASSIFIED BY SEGMENTS

Segment I - Planning and Educational Leadership

3. Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program.

7. Develop county program that meets needs of people.

14. Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program.

20. Know the needs of the people in the county.

25. Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program.

35. Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program.

38. Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program.

39. Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program.

Segment II - Direction and Coordination

4. Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work.

5. Approve all reports submitted to district and state office.

8. Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program.

9. Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders.

18. Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively.

22. Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders.

24. Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities.

27. Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program.

28. Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences.

29. Keep staff informed concerning Extension policy.

30. Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job.

32. Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Development).

Segment III - Personnel Management

2. Equitably distribute secretary's time.

6. Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement.

10. Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility.

13. Evaluate performance of all county staff members.

16. Orient new staff members.

19. Approve all leave for county staff members.

21. Supervise office secretary.

26. Promote harmonious working relationship among staff.

31. Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members.

33. Train new staff members.

36. Approve travel for all staff members.

Segment IV - Extension Relations

1. Be a leader in community affairs.

11. Keep public informed concerning the Extension program.

12. Maintain official contacts with cooperating agencies.

37. Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee.

Segment V - Finance and Business Management

15. Maintain office equipment in workable condition.

17. Assist in formulating the county Extension budget.

23. Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins.

34. Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas.

APPENDIX B

TABLE X

COMPARISON OF LEADERS' RATING 3 (Group I) AND 5 (Group II) BY ACTUAL ROLE ITEM - 1973

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	1--Be a leader in community affairs	3.53	0.881	-3.09	0.003
2		4.03	0.782		
1	2--Equitably distribute secretary's time	3.40	1.097	-2.14	0.035
2		3.86	1.105		
1	3--Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program	3.34	0.939	-3.62	0.000
2		3.97	0.842		
1	4--Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work	3.02	1.011	-3.43	0.001
2		3.70	1.042		
1	5--Approve all reports submitted to district and state office	3.98	1.011	-2.55	0.013
2		4.44	0.857		

TABLE X (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	6--Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement	3.11	1.289	-3.31	0.001
2		3.90	1.201		
1	7--Develop county program that meets needs of people	3.81	0.825	-4.24	0.000
2		4.46	0.758		
1	8--Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program	3.38	1.033	-4.61	0.000
2		4.22	0.812		
1	9--Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders	2.04	0.999	-3.15	0.002
2		2.67	-.063		
1	10--Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility	2.64	1.009	-2.55	0.012
2		3.16	1.125		

TABLE X (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	11--Keep public informed concerning the Extension program	3.47	0.830	-4.45	0.000
2		4.17	0.814		
1	12--Maintain official contacts with co-operating agencies	3.72	0.800	-4.87	0.000
2		4.41	0.638		
1	13--Evaluate performance of all county staff members	4.02	0.897	-2.63	0.010
2		4.48	0.895		
1	14--Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program	3.26	1.031	-4.37	0.000
2		4.08	0.903		
1	15--Maintain office equipment in workable condition	3.77	1.047	-2.95	0.004
2		4.30	0.775		
1	16--Orient new staff members	3.68	1.045	-2.31	0.023
2		4.14	1.030		

TABLE X (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	17--Assist in formulating the county Extension budget	3.91	1.080	-3.08	0.003
2		4.51	0.878		
1	18--Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively	3.49	1.081	-3.31	0.001
2		4.16	1.003		
1	19--Approve all leave for county staff members	4.47	0.905	-3.07	0.003
2		4.87	0.458		
1	20--Know the needs of the people in the county	3.91	0.620	-3.56	0.001
2		4.33	0.596		
1	21--Supervise office secretary	3.79	1.020	-4.87	0.000
2		4.54	0.591		
1	22--Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders	2.09	0.996	-2.60	0.011
2		2.62	1.156		

TABLE X (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	23--Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins	3.68	1.144	-2.05	0.044
2		4.10	0.911		
1	24--Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities	2.96	0.908	-4.70	0.000
2		3.81	0.981		
1	25--Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program	3.00	1.022	-2.13	0.036
2		3.44	1.161		
1	26--Promote harmonious working relationship among staff	3.49	1.061	-3.74	0.000
2		4.22	0.958		
1	27--Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program	3.51	0.997	-3.67	0.000
2		4.17	0.853		
1	28--Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences	3.74	1.259	-5.50	0.000
2		4.73	0.574		

TABLE X (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	29--Keep staff informed concerning Extension policy	3.36	0.987	-7.56	0.000
2		4.56	0.667		
1	30--Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job	3.36	1.131	-4.80	0.000
2		4.30	0.835		
1	31--Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members	3.57	0.903	-2.27	0.025
2		3.98	0.975		
1	32--Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Development)	3.62	1.095	-2.91	0.005
2		4.19	0.913		
1	33--Train new staff members	3.21	0.999	-1.57	0.118
2		3.54	1.175		

TABLE X (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	34--Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas	2.72	0.971	-1.78	0.079
2		3.08	1.126		
1	35--Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program	2.77	0.983	-2.12	0.036
2		3.19	1.105		
1	36--Approve travel for all staff members	4.45	0.928	-3.31	0.001
2		4.89	0.444		
1	37--Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee	4.30	0.832	-5.15	0.000
2		4.92	0.414		
1	38--Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program	3.40	0.948	-4.60	0.000
2		4.21	0.845		
1	39--Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program	2.89	0.983	-3.54	0.001
2		3.59	1.057		

TABLE XI

R ELATIONSHIP OF EACH ACTUAL ROLE ITEM WITH PERFORMANCE
(Kendall's tau) - 1973

Role Item	Kendall's Tau	Significance Level	Tau Rank Top Ten
1--Be a leader in community affairs	0.159	0.001	
2--Equitably distribute secretary's time	0.138	0.001	
3--Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program	0.177	0.001	
4--Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work	0.180	0.001	
5--Approve all reports submitted to district and state office	0.148	0.001	
6--Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement	0.169	0.001	
7--Develop county program that meets needs of people	0.254	0.001	4
8--Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program	0.235	0.001	8
9--Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders	0.159	0.001	
10--Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility	0.131	0.001	
11--Keep public informed concerning the Extension program	0.227	0.001	10
12--Maintain official contacts with cooperating agencies	0.250	0.001	5
13--Evaluate performance of all county staff members	0.183	0.001	
14--Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program	0.219	0.001	

TABLE XI (cont'd)

Role Item	Kendall's Tau	Significance Level	Tau Rank Top Ten
15--Maintain office equipment in workable condition	0.146	0.001	
16--Orient new staff members	0.137	0.001	
17--Assist in formulating the county Extension budget	0.185	0.001	
18--Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively	0.186	0.001	
19--Approve all leave for county staff members	0.222	0.001	
20--Know the needs of the people in the county	0.194	0.001	
21--Supervise office secretary	0.237	0.001	7
22--Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders	0.140	0.001	
23--Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins	0.119	0.002	
24--Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities	0.231	0.001	9
25--Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program	0.121	0.002	
26--Promote harmonious working relationship among staff	0.202	0.001	
27--Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program	0.183	0.001	
28--Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences	0.292	0.001	3
29--Keep staff informed concerning Extension policy	0.354	0.001	1
30--Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job	0.240	0.001	6
31--Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members	0.121	0.002	

TABLE XI (cont'd)

Role Item	Kendall's Tau	Significance Level	Tau Rank Top Ten
32--Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Development)	0.153	0.001	
33--Train new staff members	0.094	0.013	
34--Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas	0.087	0.019	
35--Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program	0.103	0.007	
36--Approve travel for all staff members	0.222	0.001	
37--Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee	0.316	0.001	2
38--Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program	0.224	0.001	
39--Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program	0.171	0.001	

TABLE XII

FREQUENCIES, MEAN, VARIANCE, MEAN RANK, AND CONSENSUS LEVEL OF EACH IDEAL ROLE ITEM - 1973

Role Item		Ideal Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
1	Absolute Frequency	1	6	46	87	113	0.719	4.21	24	Medium
	Percent Frequency	0.4	2.4	18.2	34.4	44.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.4	2.8	20.9	55.3	100.0				
2	Absolute Frequency	7	4	30	78	134	0.876	4.30	20	High
	Percent Frequency	2.8	1.6	11.9	30.8	53.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.8	4.3	16.2	47.0	100.0				
3	Absolute Frequency	5	8	28	80	132	0.857	4.29	21	High
	Percent Frequency	2.0	3.2	11.1	31.6	52.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	5.1	16.2	47.8	100.0				
4	Absolute Frequency	3	11	59	91	89	0.869	4.00	28	Medium
	Percent Frequency	1.2	4.3	23.3	36.0	35.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	5.5	28.9	64.8	100.0				
5	Absolute Frequency	9	7	71	65	101	1.113	3.96	29	Medium
	Percent Frequency	3.6	2.8	28.1	25.7	39.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	3.6	6.3	34.4	60.1	100.0				
6	Absolute Frequency	1	1	27	87	137	0.529	4.41	17	High
	Percent Frequency	0.4	0.4	10.7	34.4	54.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.4	0.8	11.5	45.8	100.0				

TABLE XII (cont'd)

Role Item		Ideal Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
7	Absolute Frequency	0	1	10	33	209	0.276	4.78	7	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.4	4.0	13.0	82.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.4	4.3	17.4	100.0				
8	Absolute Frequency	2	1	5	60	185	0.377	4.68	10*	High
	Percent Frequency	0.8	0.4	2.0	23.7	73.1				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.8	1.2	3.2	26.9	100.0				
9	Absolute Frequency	32	43	117	44	17	1.110	2.88	38	No
	Percent Frequency	12.6	17.0	46.2	17.4	6.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	12.6	29.6	75.9	93.3	100.0				
10	Absolute Frequency	12	16	119	58	48	1.042	3.46	35*	Low
	Percent Frequency	4.7	6.3	47.0	22.9	19.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	4.7	11.1	58.1	81.0	100.0				
11	Absolute Frequency	0	0	13	54	186	0.320	4.68	10*	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	5.1	21.3	73.5				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	5.1	26.5	100.0				
12	Absolute Frequency	0	0	21	70	162	0.414	4.56	12	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	8.3	27.7	64.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	8.3	36.0	100.0				
13	Absolute Frequency	19	20	46	72	96	1.525	3.81	31	Medium
	Percent Frequency	7.5	7.9	18.2	28.5	37.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	7.5	15.4	33.6	62.1	100.0				

TABLE XII (cont'd)

Role Item		Ideal Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
14	Absolute Frequency	3	10	39	84	117	0.847	4.19	25*	Medium
	Percent Frequency	1.2	4.0	15.4	33.2	46.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	5.1	20.6	53.8	100.0				
15	Absolute Frequency	3	5	29	54	162	0.741	4.45	16	High
	Percent Frequency	1.2	2.0	11.5	21.3	64.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	3.2	14.6	36.0	100.0				
16	Absolute Frequency	3	3	30	50	167	0.703	4.48	14	High
	Percent Frequency	1.2	1.2	11.9	19.8	66.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	2.4	14.2	34.0	100.0				
17	Absolute Frequency	4	3	23	56	167	0.695	4.50	13	High
	Percent Frequency	1.6	1.2	9.1	22.1	66.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.6	2.8	11.9	34.0	100.0				
18	Absolute Frequency	0	0	7	37	209	0.217	4.80	4	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	2.8	14.6	82.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	2.8	17.4	100.0				
19	Absolute Frequency	5	13	39	68	128	1.001	4.19	25*	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.0	5.1	15.4	26.9	50.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	7.1	22.5	49.4	100.0				
20	Absolute Frequency	0	0	4	46	203	0.200	4.79	5	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	1.6	18.2	80.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	1.6	19.8	100.0				

TABLE XII (cont'd)

Role Item		Ideal Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
21	Absolute Frequency	0	4	25	71	153	0.544	4.47	15	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	1.6	9.9	28.1	60.5				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	1.6	11.5	39.5	100.0				
22	Absolute Frequency	37	37	137	25	17	1.061	2.79	39	No
	Percent Frequency	14.6	14.6	54.2	9.9	6.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	14.6	29.2	83.4	93.3	100.0				
23	Absolute Frequency	5	11	80	74	83	0.982	3.87	30	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.0	4.3	31.6	29.2	32.8				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	6.3	37.9	67.2	100.0				
24	Absolute Frequency	0	6	34	107	106	0.594	4.24	23	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	2.4	13.4	42.3	41.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	2.4	15.8	58.1	100.0				
25	Absolute Frequency	4	20	11	65	53	0.921	3.56	34	Low
	Percent Frequency	1.6	7.9	43.9	25.7	20.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.6	9.5	53.4	79.1	100.0				
26	Absolute Frequency	0	0	3	31	219	0.149	4.85	2	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	1.2	12.3	86.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	1.2	13.4	100.0				
27	Absolute Frequency	1	6	30	70	146	0.669	4.40	18	High
	Percent Frequency	0.4	2.4	11.9	27.7	57.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.4	2.8	14.6	42.3	100.0				
28	Absolute Frequency	0	0	6	41	206	0.214	4.79	5*	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	2.4	16.2	81.4				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	2.4	18.6	100.0				

TABLE XII (cont'd)

Role Item		Ideal Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
29	Absolute Frequency	0	0	1	26	226	0.107	4.89	1	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	0.4	10.3	89.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	0.4	10.7	100.0				
30	Absolute Frequency	0	0	5	37	211	0.192	4.81	3	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.0	2.0	14.6	83.4				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.0	2.0	16.6	100.0				
31	Absolute Frequency	7	16	26	78	126	1.072	4.19	25*	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.8	6.3	10.3	30.8	49.8				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.8	9.1	19.4	50.2	100.0				
32	Absolute Frequency	0	1	4	59	189	0.256	4.72	9	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.4	1.6	23.3	74.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.4	2.0	25.3	100.0				
33	Absolute Frequency	4	17	100	63	69	0.990	3.70	32	Low
	Percent Frequency	1.6	6.7	39.5	24.9	27.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.6	8.3	47.8	72.7	100.0				
34	Absolute Frequency	16	15	114	52	56	1.194	3.46	35*	Low
	Percent Frequency	6.3	5.9	45.1	20.6	22.1				
	Cumulative Frequency	6.3	12.3	57.3	77.9	100.0				
35	Absolute Frequency	13	15	121	62	42	1.006	3.41	37	Low
	Percent Frequency	5.1	5.9	47.8	24.5	16.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	5.1	11.1	58.9	83.4	100.0				

TABLE XII (cont'd)

Role Item		Ideal Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
36	Absolute Frequency	7	11	32	59	144	1.048	4.27	22	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.8	4.3	12.6	23.3	56.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.8	7.1	19.8	43.1	100.0				
37	Absolute Frequency	0	2	10	31	210	0.302	4.77	8	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	0.8	4.0	12.3	83.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	0.8	4.7	17.0	100.0				
38	Absolute Frequency	1	4	31	79	138	0.625	4.38	19	High
	Percent Frequency	0.4	1.6	12.3	31.2	54.5				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.4	2.0	14.2	45.5	100.0				
39	Absolute Frequency	6	19	85	83	60	0.988	3.68	33	Low
	Percent Frequency	2.4	7.5	33.6	32.8	23.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.4	9.9	43.5	76.3	100.0				

*Tied ranks.

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCIES, MEAN, VARIANCE, MEAN RANK, AND CONSENSUS LEVEL BY EACH ACTUAL ROLE ITEM - 1973

Role Item		Actual Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
1	Absolute Frequency	0	17	72	105	59	0.755	3.81	25*	Medium
	Percent Frequency	0.0	6.7	28.5	41.5	23.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	6.7	35.2	76.7	100.0				
2	Absolute Frequency	9	35	49	105	55	1.160	3.64	29	Medium
	Percent Frequency	3.6	13.8	19.4	41.5	21.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	3.6	17.4	36.8	78.3	100.0				
3	Absolute Frequency	4	19	60	108	62	0.892	3.81	25*	Medium
	Percent Frequency	1.6	7.5	23.7	42.7	24.5				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.6	9.1	32.8	75.5	100.0				
4	Absolute Frequency	8	38	87	70	50	1.138	3.46	31	Low
	Percent Frequency	3.2	15.0	34.4	27.7	19.8				
	Cumulative Frequency	3.2	18.2	52.6	80.2	100.0				
5	Absolute Frequency	4	14	22	74	139	0.911	4.30	7	High
	Percent Frequency	1.6	5.5	8.7	29.2	54.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.6	7.1	15.8	45.1	100.0				
6	Absolute Frequency	20	30	44	72	87	1.617	3.70	28	Medium
	Percent Frequency	7.9	11.9	17.4	28.5	34.4				
	Cumulative Frequency	7.9	19.8	37.2	65.6	100.0				

TABLE XIII (cont'd)

Role Item		Actual Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
7	Absolute Frequency	3	9	37	110	94	0.756	4.20	8	Medium
	Percent Frequency	1.2	3.6	14.6	43.5	37.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	4.7	19.4	62.8	100.0				
8	Absolute Frequency	3	21	50	98	81	0.954	3.92	20*	Medium
	Percent Frequency	1.2	8.3	19.8	38.7	32.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	9.5	29.2	68.0	100.0				
9	Absolute Frequency	74	61	77	33	8	1.273	2.37	38	No
	Percent Frequency	29.2	24.1	30.4	13.0	3.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	29.2	53.4	83.8	96.8	100.0				
10	Absolute Frequency	29	69	75	58	22	1.304	2.90	37	No
	Percent Frequency	11.5	27.3	29.6	22.9	8.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	11.5	38.7	68.4	91.3	100.0				
11	Absolute Frequency	0	16	66	98	73	0.796	3.90	23	Medium
	Percent Frequency	0.0	6.3	26.1	38.7	28.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	6.3	32.4	71.1	100.0				
12	Absolute Frequency	0	6	46	112	89	0.616	4.12	13	Medium
	Percent Frequency	0.0	2.4	18.2	44.3	35.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	2.4	20.6	64.8	100.0				
13	Absolute Frequency	5	8	30	71	139	0.881	4.31	6	High
	Percent Frequency	2.0	3.2	11.9	28.1	54.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	5.1	17.0	45.1	100.0				

TABLE XIII (cont'd)

Role Item		Actual Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
14	Absolute Frequency	6	34	46	101	66	1.130	3.74	27	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.4	13.4	18.2	39.9	26.1				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.4	15.8	34.0	73.9	100.0				
15	Absolute Frequency	3	10	32	102	106	0.782	4.18	9	High
	Percent Frequency	1.2	4.0	12.6	40.3	41.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	5.1	17.8	58.1	100.0				
16	Absolute Frequency	6	23	40	88	96	1.118	3.97	17	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.4	9.1	15.8	34.8	37.9				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.4	11.5	27.3	62.1	100.0				
17	Absolute Frequency	6	11	21	64	151	0.944	4.36	4*	High
	Percent Frequency	2.4	4.3	8.3	25.3	59.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.4	6.7	15.0	40.3	100.0				
18	Absolute Frequency	5	22	43	92	91	1.058	3.96	18	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.0	8.7	17.0	36.4	36.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	10.7	27.7	64.0	100.0				
19	Absolute Frequency	3	1	2	34	213	0.349	4.79	1	High
	Percent Frequency	1.2	0.4	0.8	13.4	84.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	1.6	2.4	15.8	100.0				
20	Absolute Frequency	0	5	21	152	75	0.430	4.17	10*	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	2.0	8.3	60.1	29.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	2.0	10.3	70.4	100.0				

TABLE XIII (cont'd)

Role Item		Actual Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
21	Absolute Frequency	3	13	32	96	109	0.845	4.17	10*	High
	Percent Frequency	1.2	5.1	12.6	37.9	43.1				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.2	6.3	19.0	56.9	100				
22	Absolute Frequency	85	67	67	25	9	1.267	2.23	39	No
	Percent Frequency	33.6	26.5	26.5	9.9	3.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	33.6	60.1	86.6	96.4	100.0				
23	Absolute Frequency	6	19	37	121	70	0.932	3.91	22	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.4	7.5	14.6	47.8	27.7				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.4	9.9	24.5	72.3	100.0				
24	Absolute Frequency	5	38	71	91	48	1.050	3.55	30	Low
	Percent Frequency	2.0	15.0	28.1	36.0	19.0				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	17.0	45.1	81.0	100.0				
25	Absolute Frequency	22	53	80	57	41	1.409	3.17	34	No
	Percent Frequency	8.7	20.9	31.6	22.5	16.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	8.7	29.6	61.3	83.8	100.0				
26	Absolute Frequency	5	31	37	87	93	1.180	3.92	20*	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.0	12.3	14.6	34.4	36.8				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	14.2	28.9	63.2	100.0				
27	Absolute Frequency	0	17	49	97	90	0.821	4.03	14	Medium
	Percent Frequency	0.0	6.7	19.4	38.3	35.6				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	6.7	26.1	64.4	100.0				

TABLE XIII (cont'd)

Role Item		Actual Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
28	Absolute Frequency	5	12	17	72	147	0.890	4.36	4*	High
	Percent Frequency	2.0	4.7	6.7	28.5	58.1				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	6.7	13.4	41.9	100.0				
29	Absolute Frequency	1	16	38	86	112	0.861	4.15	12	Medium
	Percent Frequency	0.4	6.3	15.0	34.0	44.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.4	6.7	21.7	55.7	100.0				
30	Absolute Frequency	5	24	39	88	97	1.099	3.98	16	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.0	9.5	15.4	34.8	38.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	11.5	26.9	61.7	100.0				
31	Absolute Frequency	5	15	61	93	79	0.961	3.89	24	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.0	5.9	24.1	36.8	31.2				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.0	7.9	32.0	68.8	100.0				
32	Absolute Frequency	7	18	38	93	97	1.071	4.01	15	Medium
	Percent Frequency	2.8	7.1	15.0	36.8	38.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	2.8	9.9	24.9	61.7	100.0				
33	Absolute Frequency	15	40	73	76	49	1.307	3.41	32	Low
	Percent Frequency	5.9	15.8	28.9	30.0	19.4				
	Cumulative Frequency	5.9	21.7	50.6	80.6	100.0				
34	Absolute Frequency	26	67	87	47	26	1.272	2.92	36	No
	Percent Frequency	10.3	26.5	34.4	18.6	10.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	10.3	36.8	71.1	89.7	100.0				

TABLE XIII (cont'd)

Role Item		Actual Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Variance	Mean	Mean Rank	Consensus Level
35	Absolute Frequency	33	48	83	61	28	1.401	3.01	35	No
	Percent Frequency	13.0	19.0	32.8	24.1	11.1				
	Cumulative Frequency	13.0	32.0	64.8	88.9	100.0				
36	Absolute Frequency	2	3	5	32	211	0.386	4.77	2	High
	Percent Frequency	0.8	1.2	2.0	12.6	83.4				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.8	2.0	4.0	16.6	100.0				
37	Absolute Frequency	0	7	12	46	188	0.493	4.64	3	High
	Percent Frequency	0.0	2.8	4.7	18.2	74.3				
	Cumulative Frequency	0.0	2.8	7.5	25.7	100.0				
38	Absolute Frequency	4	16	57	88	88	0.970	3.95	19	Medium
	Percent Frequency	1.6	6.3	22.5	34.8	34.8				
	Cumulative Frequency	1.6	7.9	30.4	65.2	100.0				
39	Absolute Frequency	21	42	79	71	40	1.346	3.26	33	Low
	Percent Frequency	8.3	16.6	31.2	28.1	15.8				
	Cumulative Frequency	8.3	24.9	56.1	84.2	100.0				

*Indicates tied rank.

TABLE XIV

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDEAL AND ACTUAL PERCEPTIONS BY ROLE ITEMS - 1973

Role Item		Mean	Variance	Difference in Means	Variance	Kendall's tau	Sign. Level	T Value	2 Tailed Prob.	Difference Rank
1	Ideal	4.205	0.719	0.391	1.008	0.306	.001	6.20	0.000	27
	Actual	3.814	0.755							
2	Ideal	4.296	0.876	0.656	1.553	0.142	.001	8.38	0.000	11
	Actual	3.640	1.160							
3	Ideal	4.288	0.857	0.478	1.402	0.175	.001	6.43	0.000	19
	Actual	3.810	0.892							
4	Ideal	3.996	0.869	0.537	1.543	0.211	.001	6.88	0.000	16
	Actual	3.458	1.138							
5	Ideal	3.956	1.113	-0.348	1.418	0.305	.001	-4.65	0.000	36
	Actual	4.304	0.911							
6	Ideal	4.415	0.529	0.719	1.727	0.239	.001	8.71	0.000	7
	Actual	3.696	1.617							
7	Ideal	4.779	0.276	0.660	0.924	0.099	.009	10.92	0.000	10
	Actual	4.119	0.756							
8	Ideal	4.680	0.377	0.759	1.151	.151	.001	11.25	0.000	5
	Actual	3.921	0.954							
9	Ideal	2.885	1.110	0.518	1.281	.391	.001	7.27	0.000	17
	Actual	2.368	1.273							

TABLE XIV (cont'd)

Role Item		Mean	Variance	Difference in Means	Variance	Kendall's tau	Sign. Level	T Value	2 Tailed Prob.	Difference Rank
10	Ideal	3.451	1.042	0.549	1.479	.294	.001	7.19	0.000	14
	Actual	2.901	1.304							
11	Ideal	4.684	0.320	0.783	1.020	.070	.047	12.33	0.000	4
	Actual	3.901	0.796							
12	Ideal	4.557	0.414	0.435	0.843	.185	.001	7.54	0.000	21
	Actual	4.122	0.616							
13	Ideal	3.814	1.525	-0.494	1.806	.251	.001	-5.85	0.000	37*
	Actual	4.308	0.881							
14	Ideal	4.194	0.847	0.454	1.272	.322	.001	6.41	0.000	20
	Actual	3.739	1.130							
15	Ideal	4.451	0.741	0.273	1.032	.241	.001	4.27	0.000	32
	Actual	4.178	0.782							
16	Ideal	4.482	0.703	0.514	1.474	.219	.001	6.73	0.000	18
	Actual	3.968	1.118							
17	Ideal	4.498	0.695	0.142	1.084	.321	.001	2.17	0.031	33
	Actual	4.356	0.944							
18	Ideal	4.798	0.217	0.842	1.245	-.005	.454	12.00	0.000	2
	Actual	3.956	1.058							
19	Ideal	4.190	1.011	-0.601	0.939	.236	.001	-9.86	0.000	39
	Actual	4.790	0.349							
20	Ideal	4.787	0.200	0.613	0.572	.116	.003	12.89	0.000	12
	Actual	4.174	0.430							

TABLE XIV (cont'd)

Role Item		Mean	Variance	Difference in Means	Variance	Kendall's tau	Sign. Level	T Value	2 Tailed Prob.	Difference Rank
21	Ideal	4.474	0.544	0.308	1.032	.218	.001	4.83	0.000	29
	Actual	4.166	0.845							
22	Ideal	2.794	1.061	0.561	1.080	.462	.001	8.59	0.000	13
	Actual	2.233	1.267							
23	Ideal	3.866	0.982	-0.043	1.288	.337	.001	-0.61	0.543	35
	Actual	3.909	0.932							
24	Ideal	4.237	0.594	0.688	1.263	.214	.001	9.73	0.000	9
	Actual	3.549	1.050							
25	Ideal	3.565	0.921	0.399	1.177	.438	.001	5.85	0.000	26
	Actual	3.166	1.409							
26	Ideal	4.854	0.149	0.937	1.297	.043	.153	13.08	0.000	1
	Actual	3.917	1.180							
27	Ideal	4.399	0.669	0.371	1.100	.250	.001	5.64	0.000	28
	Actual	4.028	0.821							
28	Ideal	4.790	0.214	0.431	0.976	.169	.001	6.94	0.000	22*
	Actual	4.360	0.890							
29	Ideal	4.889	0.107	0.735	0.964	-.004	.460	11.90	0.000	6
	Actual	4.154	0.861							
30	Ideal	4.814	0.192	0.834	1.219	.084	.023	12.02	0.000	3
	Actual	3.980	1.099							

TABLE XIV (cont'd)

Role Item		Mean	Variance	Difference in Means	Variance	Kendall's tau	Sign. Level	T Value	2 Tailed Prob.	Difference Rank
31	Ideal	4.186	1.072	0.292	1.327	.271	.001	4.04	0.000	30
	Actual	3.893	0.961							
32	Ideal	4.723	0.256	0.715	1.117	.201	.001	10.77	0.000	8
	Actual	4.008	1.071							
33	Ideal	3.696	0.990	0.285	1.626	.247	.001	3.55	0.000	31
	Actual	3.411	1.307							
34	Ideal	3.462	1.194	0.541	1.940	.193	.001	6.18	0.000	15
	Actual	2.921	1.272							
35	Ideal	3.415	1.006	0.403	1.201	.409	.001	5.85	0.000	25
	Actual	3.012	1.401							
36	Ideal	4.273	1.048	-0.494	1.124	.172	.001	-7.41	0.000	37*
	Actual	4.767	0.386							
37	Ideal	4.775	0.302	0.134	0.712	.139	.001	2.53	0.012	34
	Actual	4.640	0.493							
38	Ideal	4.380	0.625	0.431	1.190	.246	.001	6.28	0.000	22*
	Actual	3.949	0.970							
39	Ideal	3.680	0.988	0.415	1.203	.401	.001	6.02	0.000	24
	Actual	3.265	1.346							

*Indicates tied rank.

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL ROLE BY ITEMS OF EXTENSION LEADERS RANKING ABOVE THE MEAN (Group I) IN BOTH INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION WITH EXTENSION LEADERS RANKING BELOW THE MEAN (Group II) IN BOTH DIMENSIONS (t-test) - 1973

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	1--Be a leader in community affairs	4.04	0.831	4.05	0.000
2		3.51	0.936		
1	2--Equitably distribute secretary's time	4.03	0.938	6.35	0.000
2		3.06	1.097		
1	3--Coordinate evaluation of all phases of the county Extension program	4.19	0.716	6.77	0.000
2		3.32	1.075		
1	4--Assist other staff in implementing their assigned areas of work	3.86	0.995	6.21	0.000
2		2.92	1.066		
1	5--Approve all reports submitted to district and state office	4.48	0.803	4.22	0.000
2		3.91	1.095		
1	6--Encourage county staff to continue professional improvement	4.03	1.128	4.66	0.000
2		3.14	1.402		

TABLE XV (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	7--Develop county program that meets needs of people	4.42	0.777	6.18	0.000
2		3.67	0.863		
1	8--Help each staff member understand their relationship to the overall Extension program	4.33	0.729	7.46	0.000
2		3.37	1.070		
1	9--Coordinate use of all volunteer leaders	2.67	1.125	4.66	0.000
2		1.92	1.078		
1	10--Train other staff members to improve performance in their assigned area of responsibility	3.23	1.113	5.12	0.000
2		2.38	1.142		
1	11--Keep public informed concerning the Extension program	4.19	0.830	5.27	0.000
2		3.51	0.922		
1	12--Maintain official contacts with co-operating agencies	4.40	0.656	6.22	0.000
2		3.73	0.784		
1	13--Evaluate performance of all county staff members	4.54	0.791	4.89	0.000
		3.90	1.052		

TABLE XV (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	14--Coordinate carrying out of all phases of the county Extension program	4.25	0.750	9.10	0.000
2		3.03	1.128		
1	15--Maintain office equipment in workable condition	4.47	0.650	6.31	0.000
2		3.73	1.002		
1	16--Orient new staff members	4.35	0.871	7.10	0.000
2		3.33	1.124		
1	17--Assist in formulating the county Extension budget	4.46	0.912	1.79	0.075
2		4.21	0.998		
1	18--Maintain working conditions that allow each staff member to perform effectively	4.40	0.764	7.73	0.000
2		3.38	1.072		
1	19--Approve all leave for county staff members	4.91	0.292	3.41	0.001
2		4.60	0.902		
1	20--Know the needs of the people in the county	4.39	0.555	6.17	0.000
2		3.82	0.734		

TABLE XV (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	21--Supervise office secretary	4.33	0.796	3.49	0.001
2		3.86	1.003		
1	22--Coordinate training of all volunteer leaders	2.53	1.175	4.49	0.000
2		1.82	1.003		
1	23--Maintain adequate supply of educational bulletins	4.10	0.890	4.57	0.000
2		3.46	1.002		
1	24--Counsel other staff members in regard to their assigned responsibilities	3.95	0.968	6.65	0.000
2		3.04	0.918		
1	25--Coordinate specialist assistance in planning the county Extension program	3.36	1.251	3.90	0.000
2		2.69	1.108		
1	26--Promote harmonious working relationship among staff	4.42	0.766	8.99	0.000
2		3.18	1.159		
1	27--Coordinate reporting of all phases of the county Extension program	4.35	0.709	6.91	0.000
2		3.49	0.936		

TABLE XV (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	28--Conduct regularly scheduled county staff conferences	4.70	0.589	5.20	0.000
2		4.08	1.090		
1	29--Keep staff informed concerning Extension policy	4.59	0.630	7.72	0.000
2		3.71	0.982		
1	30--Promote a team approach to doing the Extension job	4.51	0.663	9.11	0.000
2		3.29	1.196		
1	31--Delegate responsibility for certain work areas to appropriate staff members	4.19	0.880	5.46	0.000
2		3.40	1.073		
1	32--Encourage staff members to recognize importance of all areas of work (example--agric., home ec., 4-H, and Res. Development)	4.41	0.731	7.63	0.000
2		3.35	1.215		
1	33--Train new staff members	3.70	1.157	5.66	0.000
2		2.79	1.061		

TABLE XV (cont'd)

Group	Role Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Prob. 2 Tailed
1	34--Coordinate securing of adequate sponsorship for all program areas	3.25	1.141	4.97	0.000
2		2.45	1.089		
1	35--Coordinate specialist assistance in evaluating the county Extension program	3.21	1.204	3.72	0.000
2		2.58	1.146		
1	36--Approve travel for all staff members	4.91	0.292	4.10	0.000
2		4.54	0.907		
1	37--Maintain official contacts with county agricultural committee	4.80	0.499	3.45	0.001
2		4.45	0.907		
1	38--Coordinate planning of all phases of the county Extension program	4.35	0.810	7.83	0.000
2		3.28	1.005		
1	39--Coordinate specialist assistance in carrying out the county Extension program	3.47	1.210	4.27	0.000
2		2.78	1.040		

VITA

Gene Warren Turner was born in Detroit, Michigan, May 31, 1925. His family moved to a farm near Watertown, Tennessee, in 1928. He attended elementary and high school in Watertown. Shortly after graduation from high school he entered the Army and served two years, including overseas services. After discharge from the Army he attended Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville, Tennessee for two years, then transferred to the University of Tennessee at Knoxville and graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Agriculture, majoring in animal husbandry in August, 1950.

He was employed by Southern States Cooperative, Schafer Feed Company, and Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company before joining the Agricultural Extension Service, University of Tennessee in January, 1953. He served as assistant extension agent in Hardeman County and later as county agent in Decatur County before taking a year of study leave beginning in September, 1960.

After the year of leave he worked in Lawrence County as assistant extension agent and received a Master of Science degree in Agriculture, majoring in agricultural economics in 1962. In September, 1963, he transferred to Knoxville and worked as an extension specialist two years with the Department of Resource Development

followed by two years with the Department of Agricultural Economics. In September, 1966, he moved to Jackson, Tennessee as Supervisor-Agricultural Programs. He was granted a year of study leave beginning in September, 1971 and returned to the University of Tennessee and completed requirements for a Doctor of Education degree with a major in educational administration and supervision in August, 1974. He returned to Jackson as associate district supervisor with the Agricultural Extension Service after the year of leave and is presently serving in this position.

He is married to the former Charlotte Ann Thigpen of Memphis, Tennessee; they have two sons, Wesley and Glenn.