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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership has been studied throughout history. Theories and concepts of leadership vary a great deal, from great man theories (leaders are born, not made) to interaction theories (leaders emerge only as a result of interactions within a group) (Bass, 1981). The sense of futility and confusion derived from a study of literature related to leadership was verbalized by Lombardo and McCall (1978):

Students of leadership — academics and practitioners alike — have no doubt discovered three things: (1) the number of unintegrated models, theories, prescriptions, and conceptual schemes of leadership is mind-boggling; (2) much of the literature is fragmentary, trivial, unrealistic, or dull; and (3) the research results are characterized by Type III errors (solving the wrong problem precisely) and by contradictions (Lombardo and McCall, 1978, p. 3).

The frustration and contradiction associated with the study of leadership have not deterred continuing efforts to develop leadership theories and/or definitions. Leadership is "... the process of influencing others to act to accomplish specified objectives" (Beach, 1980, p. 472). Based upon this definition, leadership becomes a set of skills and abilities which individuals can develop through experience and training. Today, leadership is seldom considered an inherited trait, but rather one which can be learned and improved.

Yukl (1981) concluded that there are three general approaches for improving leadership, which are: (1) selection, (2) training, and (3) situational engineering. In personnel selection, the position is analyzed to determine the traits and skills needed to fill the position adequately. An individual who meets those qualifications is selected to
fill the position. Situational engineering requires situation and position changes to meet the qualifications of a certain leader. But according to Yukl, "Training is the most widely used method for improving leadership" (Yukl, 1981, p. 279). Workshops and seminars are used to improve individuals' technical knowledge and human relations skills.

The development of secondary vocational agriculture students' leadership abilities has been one major aim of the Future Farmers of America since it was founded in 1928. As stated in the Official Manual, "The primary aim of the Future Farmers of America is the development of agricultural leadership, cooperation, and citizenship" (National Future Farmers of America, 1980, inside front cover). The activities and goals of the organization allow members to develop their leadership potential. The FFA appears to have been successful in developing leaders. In a survey of 280 agricultural leaders in Ohio, Hampson, Newcomb, and McCracken (1977) found that 49 percent of the sample were former FFA members.

The FFA was designed to be a member-centered organization. In a member-centered organization, the members determine their own needs and set goals based upon those needs. The members select and plan activities for reaching the goals they establish. Responsibility for conducting and evaluating the activities of the group rests with the membership.

In a member-centered organization, officers coordinate and facilitate members' activities. However, "leadership is not restricted to those individuals who hold chapter offices or major committee chairmanships."
Leadership can and should be exerted by every single member" (Bender et al., 1979, p. 145). Leadership experiences become important for all members if a member-centered organization is to be realized. Leadership training should provide

... opportunities for students to extend themselves into experiences which will bring out the best of their abilities. Too often students, because of lack of confidence in themselves, keep their abilities hidden or fail to identify their strong points. With encouragement and activity, many students 'find themselves' through the FFA (Jensen, 1978, p. 183).

A basic premise of the FFA is "learning by doing." Members develop their abilities by leading, organizing, and conducting the activities of the organization. For this reason, much of the work of the FFA is conducted through committees. Each chapter has standing committees that are responsible for carrying out portions of the annual program of activities. Committees allow more work to be accomplished, provide a democratic way of working, provide training in leadership and participation, and provide for a thorough study of a problem by a group (Bender et al., 1979). Thus, committees serve as foundation blocks for member-centered organizations such as the FFA. Committees must work effectively for the chapter to achieve its aims and purposes.

Statement of the Problem

Organized leadership training efforts in the FFA are usually directed toward officers. Leadership conferences and camps are held to acquaint officers with the duties and responsibilities of their positions. Officers are expected to assume major responsibility for enabling other chapter members to develop their leadership abilities.
Encouraging active participation in standing committees is one method for such development.

Training through committee work can be effective if members are willing to participate and cooperate. One of the major problems faced by officers was stated by Bender et al. (1979):

How well the organization serves depends on each individual member. The FFA can't make a leader out of someone who doesn't take part, who doesn't have a cooperative attitude, and who isn't willing to work with his fellow members for the good of the whole organization.... In short, opportunity really exists in individuals and the FFA organization provides ways and means of fulfilling and utilizing these opportunities in an organized, systematic manner (Bender et al., 1979, p. 12).

Therefore, providing leadership training becomes a two-way proposition. First, officers must provide opportunities for members to experience leadership situations and allow them to develop their abilities through these experiences. Secondly, members must be willing to accept responsibility in the chapter and take advantage of the opportunities available to them.

Often, officers find it easier to conduct the chapter program themselves rather than work through the committee system. Jensen (1978), a vocational agriculture teacher, stated that:

It's much more time consuming to teach someone else to organize activities than it is to do the organizing yourself.... Good FFA officers are hard workers and eager to carry out responsibilities. They are, however, often unwilling to delegate the responsibilities to other chapter members serving on committees.... The best organizational teaching comes from FFA officers who know how to organize and then delegate responsibility to others (Jensen, 1978, p. 183).
Members have increased opportunities to develop their leadership skills when officers delegate responsibilities. Therefore, officers need to learn to delegate responsibility to chapter members. Resource materials were developed as a part of this study to instruct officers in effective delegation. The materials focused upon using methods of delegation to develop a more member-centered chapter by placing increased responsibility upon members for carrying out the chapter's program of activities.

The problem for this research was to evaluate the resource packet on delegation by determining its effects upon chapter achievement. Does using the resource packet on effective delegation for FFA officer training affect chapter achievement?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate a resource packet on effective delegation designed for use by advisors of local FFA chapters with their officers. The specific objectives of this research were:

1. To determine if relationships exist between the following factors:
   a. tendency to delegate in the chapter;
   b. chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness as measured by composite ratings and scale scores;
   c. chapter activeness; and
   d. respondent position.
2. To evaluate the resource packet by comparing chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness among the following subgroups:
   a. packet only group;
   b. inservice group; and
   c. control group.

Background of the Study

The FFA was established as an intracurricular part of secondary vocational agriculture programs to enhance instruction in agriculture, particularly in the areas of agricultural leadership, cooperation, and citizenship. Both FFA and vocational agriculture have undergone major changes in recent years. Originally, FFA and vocational agriculture served a rather homogeneous group of young men from farms. But with the Vocational Education Amendments of 1963 and 1976, the FFA is now serving a diversified clientele. Some of the major changes have been the admittance of females to FFA, increased emphasis on agribusiness, expansion of programs and awards, and expansion of chapters into urban areas.

Due to these and other changes, an evaluation was needed to determine the role of the FFA in meeting the needs of today's youth who plan to pursue agricultural careers. The Agricultural Education Department, through a project funded by the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station, began such a study in 1980 (Carter, 1979). The specific objectives of the project were:
1. To determine how membership in agricultural youth organizations contributes to achieving the basic goals and objectives of agricultural education programs;

2. To determine personal values and/or benefits gained from participation in agricultural youth organizations;

3. To determine factors which influence the degree of participation and involvement by students in agricultural youth organizations; and

4. To develop and evaluate organized approaches for informing and teaching students about agricultural youth organizations.

A study (Carter, 1982) based on Objective 3 — to determine factors which influence the degree of participation and involvement by students in agricultural youth organizations — identified factors which increased or decreased member participation. Factors increasing member participation fit into two categories: (1) factors related to the chapter image, and (2) factors related to the role of the members in the organization. Several of the factors decreasing participation also dealt with the members' roles in the organization. Results of the study indicated that a member-centered organization helps increase member participation, while organizations which limit member responsibilities decrease participation. As a result of the study, a resource packet was developed to train officers in delegating responsibilities in an attempt to increase involvement and participation of members in the chapters. This study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the resource packet.
Definition of Terms

**Future Farmers of America (FFA)** refers to the intracurricular organization for students enrolled in secondary vocational agriculture classes.

**FFA Officers** refers to the six major officers of the FFA chapter as prescribed in the Official FFA Manual: president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, reporter, and sentinel.

**Sophomore FFA Members** are students enrolled in second year vocational agriculture classes who are active members of the local FFA chapter.

**Delegation** is a method of assigning tasks, responsibilities, and authority to members for planning and conducting chapter activities.

**Tendency to Delegate** refers to the officers' and advisors' inclination to use and attitudes concerning the use of delegation methods in carrying out the chapter program of activities.

**Overall Chapter Achievement** refers to three outputs of a chapter which indicate chapter success: chapter productivity, chapter drive, and chapter cohesiveness.

**Chapter Productivity** is the level of goal achievement attained by the chapter.

**Chapter Drive** refers to the motivation and commitment of chapter members to attain chapter goals.

**Chapter Cohesiveness** is the attraction between the chapter and its individual members.
Composite Ratings refer to calculated mean scores for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness based upon responses to items included in the Composite Chapter Achievement Questionnaire.

Scale Scores refer to chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness scores determined by single item ratings on the Chapter Achievement Scales Questionnaire.

Chapter Activeness is a rating of chapter productivity based upon a weighted list of completed activities.

Packet Only Group refers to the chapters whose advisors did not receive inservice training before conducting officer training sessions using the resource packet on effective delegation.

Inservice Group refers to the chapters whose advisors received inservice training before conducting officer training sessions using the resource packet on effective delegation.

Control Group refers to the chapters whose advisors conducted officer training sessions on delegation without use of the resource packet on effective delegation.

This project was reviewed and approved by the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research. The committee determined that the confidentiality of data was assured and that informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures. It was therefore concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected and that the potential benefits outweighed any possible risks.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to Literature Review

A review of literature was conducted to identify previous research related to this study. The review was divided into four sections for this study:

1. Future Farmers of America and Member-centered Groups;
2. Delegation;
3. Leadership Training; and
4. Evaluation of Group Achievement.

Future Farmers of America and Member-centered Groups

The Future Farmers of America (FFA) is an intracurricular part of vocational agriculture programs established under the auspices of the Smith-Hughes Act. The FFA serves as an adjunct to classroom instruction to develop agricultural leadership, citizenship, and cooperation for students enrolled in vocational agriculture at the secondary level (National Future Farmers of America, 1980).

Leadership competencies needed in the vocational agriculture curriculum were identified in a study of 214 Ohio agricultural leaders (Hampson, Newcomb, and McCracken, 1977). The respondents rated the importance of specific agricultural leadership competencies. Respondents perceived leading individuals and groups, and participation in committees and groups as important areas of leadership. Specific competencies identified included:
1. Encourage group participation;
2. Involvement of others in group decisions and actions;
3. Making decisions;
4. Accept and carry out responsibilities;
5. Demonstrate initiative in completing work;
6. Delegate responsibility to others; and
7. Promote committee member participation.

These competencies received mean ratings of 2.5 or better on a three-point importance scale.

Several studies were conducted to determine the relationship between participation in FFA and student development. The FFA was one of five national vocational education student organizations investigated by Rathbun (1974). His study considered the relationship between extent of student participation in a vocational education student organization and the development of personal qualities. Instructors, parents, and employers or college advisors of former FFA members perceived student participation in the organization to be significantly related to the development of leadership, citizenship, character, willingness to accept responsibility, confidence in self and work, and cooperative spirit and effort.

In another study, Ebbers (1968) determined that participation in FFA and other high school activities affected students beyond their high school years. Ebbers surveyed 400 junior and senior students enrolled at Iowa State University. The sample was equally divided between former FFA members and non-FFA members. Former FFA members
had consistently higher total participation scores at the university level. The study indicated that student participation in high school FFA chapters was related to their participation in college.

In a study of Iowa senior vocational agriculture students, Townsend (1981a) investigated the relationship between FFA participation and student personal development. A sample of 426 seniors enrolled in 54 vocational agriculture programs completed the Personal Development Inventory (PDI) and the FFA Activity Participation Inventory. The personal development competencies of leadership, occupational choice, home surroundings, agricultural orientation, scholarship, and overall personal development were positively correlated with FFA activity participation. Students with medium and high levels of FFA activity participation perceived their leadership competencies to be significantly higher than students with limited FFA activity participation.

The degree of member participation in the FFA was related to student development, but FFA chapters have continued to encounter difficulties related to member involvement and participation. Several studies identified problems associated with participation in FFA chapters.

Gilbertson, Rathbun, and Sabol (1975) determined reasons for non-participation in FFA by vocational agriculture students. Questionnaires were completed by 504 vocational agriculture students enrolled in 19 schools in California. Nonparticipating students felt the FFA chapter was run by the advisor, not the members.

Bail (1958) compared teacher and student attitudes toward FFA chapter operations. Students were significantly more favorable than
teachers on three concepts concerning chapter operations: (1) the chapter should have more local autonomy; (2) advisor control of the chapter should be limited; and (3) provisions should be made for increased student participation and responsibility in the organization at local, state, and national levels.

In 1973, Braker conducted a national survey to determine the image of the FFA as perceived by current active members and advisors. A major problem identified was the lack of involvement, interest, and participation by all members. Members felt students on the local level should have more responsibility for chapter operations.

Welton and Bender (1971) conducted a nationwide study of FFA participation levels and FFA chapter operations. All junior and senior students (2,773) enrolled in 112 vocational agriculture programs were surveyed. Thirty-four percent of the chapters identified active involvement of all members as a major problem in the chapter. Only 31 percent of the chapters had 50 percent or more of the chapter members involved in planning the annual program of activities. Over one-third of the responding members were not involved in any committee work within the chapter. Individual participation scores were positively related to the percent of members involved in planning the program of activities. Welton (1971, p. 11) stated "a key to increased student participation appears to be active student involvement in: (1) the planning of chapter activities; (2) leadership positions; and (3) committee responsibility."
Increased involvement in and responsibility for chapter operations was a need identified in these studies. The chapter leadership must "look for more ways of involvement based on individual skills and not as leadership expressed through chapter officers or contests. Many times the average or below average students seem to become lost in the myriad of activity" (Bundy and Ebbers, 1971, p. 10).

The need for member involvement in member-centered groups such as the FFA required a different approach to leadership than traditional groups like those found in business and industry. Bradford (1976) compared traditional leadership to group-centered leadership. In traditional leadership, the leader was responsible for group effectiveness, task oriented functions, and group maintenance functions. Group-centered leadership viewed those same responsibilities as functions of the group. The power of the leadership position as a source of influence over group members was emphasized and protected by traditional leadership; group-centered leadership de-emphasized its importance. Group-centered leadership saw the group as an entity, while traditional leadership viewed the group as a set of individuals. In group or member-centered leadership, the power and influence in the group belonged to all members, not just individuals in leadership positions.

In traditional groups, the leader controlled the final choice when decisions were made, but member-centered leadership made the group responsible for final decisions (Bradford, 1976). Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1976) developed a continuum of decision-making styles for groups which ranged from decisions made entirely by the leader to
decisions made by the group members. Each decision-making style was based upon the relative degree of leader authority and member freedom in reaching decisions. The decision-making style could vary and change along the continuum, since no one decision style was considered best for all situations. The selected style was to be based upon the forces affecting the decision. Situational forces considered were the type of organization, the effectiveness of the group, time pressures on the decision, and the type of problem involved (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1976). In a member-centered group, participative leadership and decision-making were found to be important for the proper operation of the group.

Stogdill (1974) summarized 60 studies of participative and directive leadership and group performance variables to determine trends in the relationships between the variables. He concluded that although group productivity did not vary consistently with directive and participative leader behavior, satisfaction and group cohesiveness tended to be related positively to the participative style of leadership.

Yukl (1981) cited several reasons for the apparent effects of participation on member satisfaction and performance. Participation increased member understanding of decisions which in turn increased their acceptance of and commitment to the decisions. When members influenced a decision, they tended to perceive the decision as their own, which increased their commitment to the decision and its success. Decision-making participation helped fulfill member needs for autonomy, achievement, self-identity, and growth. When decisions were made by
members, the group tended to apply social pressure on members to increase the acceptance of the decision (Yukl, 1981).

Summary of FFA and member-centered groups

The FFA was established to provide secondary vocational agriculture students opportunities for the development of identified leadership competencies. Reported studies established a relationship between FFA participation and student growth and development. In other studies, problems related to the involvement and participation of all members were recognized. Member involvement in member-centered groups like the FFA was considered essential because the power and influence of the group belonged to the members. Therefore, member-centered groups required a participative approach to leadership. Participative leadership involved group members in decision-making and resulted in their increased satisfaction and commitment to group decisions.

Delegation

In business management research studies, delegation was identified as one method which not only involved subordinates in decision-making, but which transferred responsibility and authority for making and implementing decisions to subordinates. McConkey (1974) defined delegation as

the achievement by a manager of definite, specified results, results previously determined on the basis of a priority of needs by empowering and motivating subordinates to accomplish all or part of the specified results (McConkey, 1974, p. 11).
Delegation increased managers' time for supervisory responsibilities and distributed the work load. Delegation improved the quality and acceptance of decisions (Yukl, 1981). A secondary reason for delegation was the development of subordinates' management abilities. Delegation allowed subordinates to become familiar with managerial responsibilities and made their jobs more interesting, challenging, and meaningful. Delegation provided members the tools and opportunities for their personal development (McConkey, 1974).

Comparison of effective versus ineffective leaders indicated that effective leaders tended to delegate more. Kahn and Katz (1960) reported major research findings from eight studies they had conducted through the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. In these studies, supervisors with better production records were compared to supervisors with poor production records in a variety of industrial, civilian, and military agencies. Highly productive supervisors spent more time in planning and organizing their sections' work than supervisors with poor production records. Another factor which differentiated between high- and low-producing supervisors was closeness of supervision or delegation. Low-producing supervisors checked up on employees frequently and gave detailed work instructions. Workers in productive groups reported they set their own pace and determined how to complete the work. Kahn and Katz concluded that greater freedom through delegation produced positive effects on groups. Individuals who controlled and directed their own work were more satisfied.
Stogdill and Shartle (1948) developed the RAD scales to study organizational responsibility, authority, and delegation. Stogdill and Scott (1957) used the RAD scales in a study of four large naval organizations. Subordinate responsibility and authority were related to their superior's responsibility, but not to the superior's authority. When superiors delegated freely, subordinates rated themselves high in responsibility, authority, and delegation. Executive officers on submarines delegated more freely when the commanding officers were higher in responsibility, authority, and delegation. However, the opposite was true for executive officers on landing ships. As the authority of executive officers increased, the responsibility, authority, and delegation of junior officers decreased. The researchers concluded that the responsibility, authority, and delegation behaviors of immediate superiors affected subordinates' behavior, but not always in a predictable manner. Superiors whose delegation was interpreted as work avoidance were perceived to be poor leaders. Also, in situations which required a high degree of control, overdelegation resulted in confusion and misdirected effort.

Solem (1958) studied two approaches to delegation. Supervisors attending a conference were divided into groups of four to six people. Each group was given a role-play problem. One individual was designated as the supervisor, the others played the roles of subordinates. The groups operated under conditions of limited delegation (supervisor decided upon the solution and presented it to the group) or full delegation (solution developed by the group, not the supervisor).
Full delegation received better ratings for solution quality, acceptance of solution by group members, satisfaction with solution by leader and group members. Solem concluded that the approach used by the supervisor determined subordinates' reactions to delegation. However, in a similar study using undergraduate students, there were no significant differences between full and limited delegation situations in solution quality, process used to achieve a solution, or acceptance of the solution by group members (Maier and Thurber, 1969).

The ability to delegate was considered the mark of a leader. Wilson stated that "delegation is perhaps one of the most difficult management concepts for many ... to implement and yet it is absolutely vital that it be done, and done well" (Wilson, 1976, p. 31). Yukl (1981, p. 273) concluded that "effective leaders are also more likely to use decision participation and delegation ... to elicit subordinate involvement and commitment."

Discussions of delegation techniques and methods indicated that delegation was a managerial skill that could be learned. Successful delegation consisted of several basic steps.

1. Determine what to delegate. Not all areas of responsibilities should be delegated. Group leaders have definite roles only they should complete.

2. Select appropriate members for the assignment of responsibilities. Use members' strengths or build upon previous experiences when selecting the delegatee. Do not overuse the same members.
Select members who could learn and grow through completion of the responsibility.

3. Agree upon the results needed within the limitations set with the delegatee. Delegation of responsibility indicates specific results, not methods. Mutual agreement on specific results and limitations indicates members' understanding and acceptance of those factors.

4. Set a schedule for reporting progress. Delegation allows members to plan and implement decisions without constant supervision. However, progress reports allow group leaders to remain knowledgeable of achievement toward specified goals and to coordinate groups working simultaneously.

5. Evaluate results. Members are accountable for what was accomplished, not how it was accomplished. Evaluation allows group leaders to determine problems which must be corrected for the effective transfer of responsibilities to group members (McConkey, 1974; Wilson, 1976; Yukl, 1981).

Delegation involved definite leadership behaviors and skills that could be learned. Those behaviors included skills in communication, motivation of members, evaluation, and leader-member relations (McConkey, 1974).

**Summary of delegation**

Delegation was used as a method for transferring responsibilities to subordinates or group members. While the results of studies related to delegation were not conclusive, delegation was considered to be an
important skill for leaders. Delegation consisted of leadership skills which could be developed by leaders.

Leadership Training

Leadership training programs have been developed to improve individuals' abilities to supervise and lead groups or subordinates. Program evaluations were conducted to determine the effectiveness of the training and of the methods used. Evaluations assessed changes in leaders' attitudes, managerial skills, and knowledge, and in the leaders' groups.

Distributive education (DE) leaders from 37 programs in Arizona attended a one-day leadership training workshop to increase their effectiveness in directing local chapters (Arizona Occupational Research Coordinating Unit, 1975). Workshop evaluations were completed at the end of the day and again five months later. The immediate evaluation indicated students perceived the training program to be effective and valuable to them. The five-month follow-up evaluation evaluated the benefits to the participating chapters. In nearly 71 percent of the responding chapters, 80 percent of the members participated in one or more chapter activities. Eighty-one percent of the participants had conducted similar leadership workshops at the local level. In a majority of the chapters, 60 percent of the seniors participated in regional or state level activities. The researchers concluded that the leadership training had a positive effect upon local chapters.

Herod (1968) studied the effects of short-term leadership training in an international fraternity for women. Fiedler's Least Preferred
Co-worker scale was completed by 78 collegiate chapter presidents of the Delta Gamma Fraternity. Ten members from each chapter completed the Ohio State University Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Prior to the leadership training, the presidents tended to be authoritarian in leadership style. A one-half day group leader training session was conducted for the presidents who attended the national conference. The training session dealt with the democratic approach to leadership. At the end of the training session, participants were more accepting of democratic ideals such as group consensus, equality of leaders and members, and full-group participation. However, a four-month follow-up study indicated most presidents reverted to the authoritarian leadership styles which they held prior to the workshop. It was concluded that significant change had not occurred, but the training did have merit. The researcher believed intervening variables beyond the control of the study accounted for the lack of change.

In 1978, Medina tested the Student Leadership Skills (SLS) instructional system. Three secondary school student councils in Oregon were randomly chosen to participate in the study. Two councils received the SLS training, while the third council did not receive training. Pre-tests, post-tests, and three-month follow-ups were administered to evaluate the system. The SLS-trained councils scored higher in all evaluation areas, but there were no significant differences in the trained and untrained groups in leadership skills and meeting behaviors.
In a course on problems in democracy, Cassel and Shafer (1961) conducted a leadership training program for 62 high school seniors. The training program included self-evaluation and analysis, assigned readings, discussions, and group activities. At the end of the program, the students completed a battery of tests to measure personality factors, leadership skills, social awareness, and sociometric ratings of the group. The results indicated significant leadership development and social insight growth had occurred. The researchers compared these results to a similar study of ninth and eleventh graders. In the other study, leadership skills and social awareness of students were compared over a two-year period. The students did not receive any form of leadership training, and there was no significant growth in these areas. Cassel and Shafer (1961) concluded that the leadership training had resulted in significant leadership development for the participants.

In several programs, the methods used for leadership training were evaluated. Levine and Butler (1952) compared the effectiveness of group discussions versus formal lectures as a method for changing socially undesirable behaviors. Foremen in an industrial plant consistently gave better ratings to employees in higher skilled jobs than employees performing lower skilled jobs. Management felt this "halo" effect was producing unrealistic job performance evaluations. The foremen were divided into three groups. One group (Group A) served as the control group and received no training. Group B had a one-hour group discussion of the problem. The foremen decided to solve the problem by rating each individual on actual job performance, not on
job type. Group C attended a one and one-half hour formal lecture on employee performance rating; errors in past ratings were pointed out in the lecture.

The employee ratings by the foremen in each of the three groups were compared at the next six-month evaluation. Only Group B (the discussion group) showed any differences in the mean ratings for each job level. Groups A and C were unchanged from their previous mean ratings of each job level. It was concluded that group discussion was superior to formal lecture methods in changing the foremen's behavior.

Latham and Saari (1979) used behavioral modeling techniques to train 20 first line supervisors. The behavioral modeling sessions were centered upon situational skills needed by supervisors. Each session consisted of a topic introduction by the trainer(s), a film demonstrating the learning points for the session, a group discussion of the film, and practice role plays by the participants. An 85-item situational question test was administered to the participants and to an equivalent control group. Training participants ranked consistently higher than the control group on their selected responses for each situation. Superintendents rated all supervisors, one month before the training began and one year after training. Pre-training evaluations of the two groups of supervisors, control and experimental, were equal. Post-training evaluations rated the training group higher in management skills than the control group. The researchers concluded that behavior modeling was effective in teaching management skills to first line supervisors and the program should be continued.
Hand and Slocum (1970) conducted a 28-week human relations training program for 42 managers. Control and experimental managers' human relations knowledge and attitudes, and behaviors were measured before and after training and again 90 days after the training was completed. No differences were detected between the control and experimental groups except for an increased understanding of self and others by managers in the experimental group. The researchers hypothesized that the on-the-job climate prevented the transfer of techniques from the training to the actual job situation.

Summary of leadership training

Leadership training affected participants' attitudes and behaviors. However, some leadership training had only short-term effects. Comparison of training methods showed group discussion to be superior to formal lecture in changing leader behaviors. Training methods such as behavioral modeling which used a variety of techniques were more effective than training using only one or two techniques. Leadership training was considered to be effective if behavioral changes were carried over to the job and persisted over time.

Evaluation of Group Achievement

Regardless of the underlying theory or concept of leadership used, most research studies established criteria for evaluation of leadership effectiveness. The most common criterion established was group achievement (Yukl, 1981). Group achievement was defined as the total outcomes experienced by the group (Stogdill, 1959). Group achievement included
two basic concepts: group effectiveness and group efficiency. Effectiveness or productivity was the extent to which the group was successful in attaining its task related objectives. Efficiency was the extent to which a group satisfied the needs of its members (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973).

Measures of group achievement varied a great deal. Researchers used objective measures of efficiency such as profit margins, sales increases, time on task, unit production costs, tasks completed, etc. when such information was available or appropriate. Sometimes the type of group task required subjective measures of effectiveness such as ratings of group productivity or decision quality. Objective measures of group efficiency were indirect measures such as member turnover, absenteeism, or number of grievances filed. Subjective measures of efficiency were more common such as member attitudes towards the group and the leader or satisfaction with group operations or group decisions (Yukl, 1981).

Group effectiveness was the one most common aspect considered in group achievement. Out of 89 leadership studies conducted between 1970 and 1975, 34 percent used effectiveness or productivity as the single criterion of leadership effectiveness (Bass, 1981). Swanson (1979) investigated the relationships between FFA chapter advisor leader behaviors and chapter effectiveness. Chapter effectiveness was measured by a weighted activity scale to determine the activities completed by the chapter. The completed activities were considered to be measures of the chapter's effectiveness or productivity.
Many researchers included both group efficiency and effectiveness as measures of leadership effectiveness. The measure used for group effectiveness and efficiency depended upon the type of group studied, the group goals, and the interest of the researcher.

Heyns (1949) investigated the effects of leader behaviors upon discussion groups. Four groups of undergraduate students discussed a personnel-relations problem for an hour. Each group was led by a graduate student who used either supportive accepting leader behavior or non-supportive, negative leader behavior. The effects upon the groups were measured by group member evaluations of group unity, feeling of group acceptance, satisfaction with group leader, and satisfaction with group decision.

Fox (1957) studied discussion group reactions to positive and negative leader behaviors. Four groups of nine college students discussed two controversial questions. Observers rated all interactions in the group discussions to provide indications of group permissiveness and cooperativeness. Using questionnaires, members of the groups rated their satisfaction with the solutions reached, satisfaction with group leader, friendliness of group members, and popularity of group members.

Christner and Hemphill (1955) investigated group reactions to leader behaviors in newly assembled B-29 crews. Crew members described their leader's behaviors and rated their crew's morale, cooperation, friendship, proficiency, and willingness to go to combat together. The descriptions and ratings were obtained at the beginning and end of
a ten-day training period to allow for pre- and post-training comparisons.

Fiedler and Meuwese (1963) studied military groups. They compared the effects of leadership style in tank crews, B-29 bomber crews, and antiaircraft artillery crews. Two measures of group achievement, effectiveness and cohesiveness, were used in each of the groups. Effectiveness was measured by time responses and target accuracy. Cohesiveness ratings for all groups were attained by using sociometric ratings of crew member attractiveness (popularity).

Katzell et al. (1970) studied the effects of inputs on group process and outputs. Group inputs were considered to be leader directiveness, task difficulty, and compatibility of group members. Seventy-six groups of three worked together to play a modified form of the parlor game "Twenty Questions." The groups consisted of two undergraduates from an introductory psychology course and one graduate student who acted as the group chairman. Output variables were time and number of questions needed to solve the problems, and subjects' ratings of satisfaction with their participation in the group.

Weschler, Kahane, and Tannenbaum (1952) compared two divisions of a department at a naval laboratory. The leaders of the two divisions displayed different leadership styles, directive or permissive. To compare the effects of the leader styles, all employees in each of the two divisions completed questionnaires. The employees indicated their level of job satisfaction; their satisfaction with the work group; and their perceptions of the level of productivity and morale of their own
work group, of their division, and of the laboratory as a whole. Evaluation of the leader behaviors was completed by comparing the responses of Division A to Division B.

As shown, the measures of group achievement varied a great deal. With the variety of measures used, comparison of leadership effects upon groups was extremely difficult. A systematic approach was needed to measure aspects of groups and group achievement which were common to all groups regardless of their goals, operations, or membership.

It was the need for a systematic description of groups which led to the development of the Group Dimensions Description questionnaire by the Ohio Leadership Studies group (Hemphill, 1956). The questionnaire was developed to measure "the characteristics by which differences among groups are to be described" (Hemphill, 1956, p. 1). The instrument consisted of 150 statements concerning group characteristics or attributes which yielded 13 group dimension scores. Group members responded to each statement on a five-point scale (definitely true to definitely false) to indicate the accuracy with which the statement described the group. Use of the Group Dimensions Description questionnaire provided a profile of individual member's perceptions and attitudes toward the group, and it provided a description of the group as perceived by its members.

Hemphill (1956) reported five studies in which the questionnaire was utilized. The studies included 100 miscellaneous groups such as a high school newspaper staff and a Sunday school class, 18 departments in a liberal arts college, women office workers employed by a large
insurance company, 9 college campus organizations affiliated with the Religious Council of a large university, and 19 staffs of a city school system. The reliabilities of the 13 group dimensions varied from .28 to .92.

Hemphill (1956) expressed optimism in the value of the Group Dimension Description questionnaire for future leadership research, but the questionnaire remained relatively unused and untested. In a critique of the instrument, Earle (1973) stated that the 13 dimensions were not as mutually independent as was desirable. Also, he was cautious about the use of questionnaires such as this that lacked current validity studies.

Another systematic approach to group achievement was developed by Stogdill (1959). Stogdill proposed a system model theory of groups which he believed explained group phenomenon. In Stogdill's theory, performances, expectations, and interactions of individuals within the group constituted the inputs of the system which were modified by the role structure and operations of the group. Group achievement which consisted of productivity, drive, and cohesiveness was the system output. Productivity was defined as accomplishment of group goals. Drive was seen as the degree of group arousal, motivation, enthusiasm, or intensity to which members invested energy in behalf of the group. Cohesiveness was the extent to which members reinforced each other's beliefs regarding the value of maintaining the identity of the group. Stogdill (1959) maintained that defining group achievement in terms of
productivity, drive, and cohesiveness explained the discrepancies often seen in leadership studies.

Stogdill (1965) investigated 27 industrial, retail, and governmental organizations to identify "complex relationships and factors that characterize exceptional circumstances as well as factors that are common to organizations in general" (Stogdill, 1965, p. 7). The subjects of the study were supervisors and managers and the work groups they supervised. Data from individuals in the work groups were combined to provide average descriptions of group performance, employee satisfaction, and supervisory leadership. The superiors of each manager or supervisor also provided descriptions of the work groups. Information and observations for 40 variables were obtained. Intercorrelations between the variables were factor analyzed to provide a system of relationships between variables which described the behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions of the supervisors, their superiors, and their subordinates. The factor analysis identified clusters of variables which described systems of relationships between supervisors' characteristics and behaviors, member satisfactions, and group performances.

The results of Stogdill's (1965) study indicated that supervisory behavior was related to employees' expectations as affected by group morale (drive) and cohesiveness. Supervisory consideration and delegation were not related to high group productivity. Supervisory structuring behaviors did not result in low productivity, low group freedom, nor low employee satisfaction with the company. The results indicated that supervisory behavior primarily affected employee attitudes, and those
attitudes directly affected the group's morale and cohesiveness. Supervisory behavior and employee attitudes were not consistently related to productivity. Productivity and cohesiveness were found to be negatively correlated in 22 of the 27 organizations. Productivity and group drive were positively correlated in 22 organizations. Group drive and cohesiveness were positively correlated in 15 organizations and negatively correlated in 11 organizations. When the drive-cohesiveness correlation was positive, the productivity-cohesiveness correlation tended to be a low negative or positive. Likewise, negative drive-cohesiveness correlations were associated with high negative productivity-cohesiveness correlations. Correlations between the three group variables indicated that the relationship between drive and cohesiveness tended to regulate the relationship between productivity and cohesiveness.

The degree and direction of the relationships between group productivity, cohesiveness, and drive were not identified by the literature. However, based upon the results of the above study, Stogdill's original theoretical model of groups, and results from many other leadership studies, an integrated model of group theory was proposed (Schriesheim, Mowday, and Stogdill, 1979). The model (see Figure 1) was an attempt to portray the relationships among group variables in such a manner as to provide "a conceptual framework upon which to build for future research" (Schriesheim, Mowday, and Stogdill, 1979, p. 124).
Figure 1. Leader-group interactions model (Schriesheim, Mowday, and Stogdill, 1979, p. 122)
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In the model, leadership behaviors affected group drive and cohesiveness. The relationship was moderated by other variables such as the stage of group development. Group drive and cohesiveness interacted to influence group productivity. This influence was affected by moderating variables such as group goal and nature of group task. Group drive, cohesiveness, and productivity were related to member satisfaction (+), turnover (-), and absenteeism (-). Other factors, some of which had not been identified, influenced group drive and cohesiveness.

The authors (Schriesheim, Mowday, and Stogdill, 1979) stated that the model should only be considered a framework for further exploration because it failed to specify all relationships between variables, and it did not provide procedures for evaluation of the consistency or inconsistency of the research findings. The authors felt the model explained the varied and mixed results from previous leadership research.

Summary of evaluation of group achievement

Leadership effectiveness was evaluated by its effects upon the group. Group achievement was the most common criteria for evaluating leadership effectiveness. Group achievement, like other concepts in leadership research, had different meanings. The efficiency and effectiveness of a group were considered to be two aspects of group achievement. Measures of group achievement varied depending upon the group goals, the type of group, and the apparent preference of the researcher. Hemphill developed a questionnaire to measure 13 group dimensions. Current validity studies were unavailable for evaluation of the instrument.
According to Stogdill, group achievement consisted of three factors, productivity, cohesiveness, and drive. Reported studies did not clarify the relationships between those factors in groups. An integrated model of group theory presented a graphic representation of the relationships among leader, moderating, and output variables of groups. The model was developed to provide a conceptualization of group process and interactions. The concept presented in the study was used as the basis of the current study.

Summary of the Review of Literature

Participation in the FFA was related to members' leadership development. Problems related to member involvement and participation were identified as a major concern. Leadership of a member-centered organization needed to be participative to involve members in the decision-making of the group. Delegation was identified as a method for increasing group member involvement in the decision-making of an organization. The attitude and approach to delegation used by the leader affected member reactions to and acceptance of delegated responsibilities. Delegation was a leadership skill that could be learned through training.

Leader training sometimes changed leader behaviors and attitudes. Training which used role playing, group discussion, and behavioral modeling was effective in changing leaders' actions on the job even after training was discontinued.

The ultimate test of effective leadership was its effects upon group achievement. Group drive, cohesiveness, and productivity were dimensions found to be common to all types of groups. Exact relationships
between the three variables and between the variables and leader behavior were not consistent for all groups. In the research presented, leader behavior affected group productivity, drive, and cohesiveness.
CHAPTER III. EXECUTION OF STUDY

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of a resource packet on delegation for FFA officer training by comparing group achievement of FFA chapters. The following methods and procedures were used to accomplish this purpose.

Design

The design for this research study was a randomized control-group posttest only experimental design (Van Dalen, 1973). A graphic representation of the study design was:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{R} & \text{X}_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\
\text{R} & \text{X}_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\
\text{R} & \text{X}_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

The graphic symbols are explained as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item R represented the random selection of the sample schools from the population and their subsequent random assignment to the three treatment groups.
  \item X\textsubscript{1} represented the group of FFA chapters in which the advisor conducted a training workshop for their FFA officers using the packet and without additional instructions (packet only group).
  \item X\textsubscript{2} represented the group of FFA chapters in which the advisor conducted a training workshop for the FFA officers using the packet after receiving inservice training on use of the packet (inservice group).
\end{itemize}
$X_3$ represented the group of FFA chapters in which the advisor conducted a training workshop for the FFA officers without additional materials such as the resource packet (control group).

$O_1$ represented the measurement of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness and overall achievement.

$O_2$ represented the measurement of officers' and advisors' tendency to delegate.

$O_3$ represented the measurement of chapter and advisor demographic information.

In determining the alpha level for this study, the author considered the seriousness of making a Type I error as opposed to making a Type II error. The study was to determine the effectiveness of a set of resource materials on delegation. Since other materials similar to these were not currently available, the researcher believed a Type II error was more serious. In reviewing the literature, it was noted that a vast majority of the studies set the level of significance at .05. However, Swanson (1979), in his study of chapter effectiveness, used an alpha level of .10. Since the group achievement of FFA chapters was not a well-explored area, the author was interested in indicators of the packet's effectiveness for use in FFA chapters. Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979, p. 159) stated, "in other settings, indicators of direction or trend might be important and would be evidenced by a less substantial departure from the null hypothesis. In these cases, a less conservative
level of significance (.10 or .20) might be used." For these reasons, the author selected .10 alpha level for the study.

Population

FFA chapters in the state of Iowa during the school year of 1982-83 served as the population for this study. The population was restricted to chapters with advisors who had taught in the same school during the 1981-82 school year. Chapters with beginning teachers or with teachers who had changed positions following the 1981-82 school year were excluded from the study.

Sample

A random sample of 60 chapters was desired for the study with 20 chapters in each of the treatment groups. Fifteen additional chapters (randomly selected) were to serve as alternates. Alternates were treated the same as chapters in the study sample to ensure they would meet the necessary criteria if needed.

A numbered list of all FFA chapters in Iowa was available for the sample selection. A list of 200 random numbers was generated to correspond with the chapter numbers. Each number was randomly assigned to one of three groups and each group number was then randomly assigned to a treatment level. Chapters not meeting the requirement of having the same advisor from the 1981-82 school year were deleted from the list. Letters explaining the study and requesting participation in the study were sent to each selected chapter meeting the study criteria. A copy of the letter requesting participation is found in Appendix A.
All of the chapters did not agree to participate; therefore, the number of alternate chapters was not equal for each treatment group. The final sample contained 20 chapters in the packet only group with four alternates; 20 chapters in the inservice group with two alternates; and 20 chapters in the control group with one alternate.

Description of Treatment Levels

An FFA officer training packet was developed as a part of the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station Project 2385, "The role of youth organizations for students interested in agricultural careers" (Carter, 1979). The purpose of the packet was to help chapter officers determine their roles in a member-centered group and to develop delegation skills in working with members in the chapter. The instructional materials were designed for use in a chapter officer training workshop. The packet was divided into three units: introduction, member-centered groups, and delegation methods. The introduction consisted of a team building activity to encourage cooperation and team work among the officer team. The second section introduced the basic concepts of member-centered groups and identified the FFA as a member-centered group. This section also considered the role of chapter officers in a member-centered organization. The delegation section was designed to help officers identify the steps of effective delegation and to evaluate the delegation process. Each section contained a stated desired student outcome and the specific objectives to be achieved. Activities and discussion topics were presented for advisor use in directing the workshop along with a summarized conclusion.
statement for each section. The workshop was to last at least six hours; however, it was recognized that the actual time spent in the workshop could vary according to the depth of group discussions.

The manipulated independent variable in this study was the use of the resource packet on delegation. All chapters were requested to conduct the officer training workshop on member participation and officer delegation by August 31, 1982. The study had three levels of the independent variable.

Packet only group

The packet only group received a copy of the resource packet on delegation in the mail during the week of July 12-16, 1982. Written instructions were included for use of the packet.

Inservice group

Advisors in the inservice group were required to attend a two-hour inservice session on use of the delegation packet during the State Vocational Agriculture Teachers Conference held in July. An overview of the packet was presented to the advisors along with examples of activities and instructions for using the packet. A copy of the inservice agenda and sample materials are found in Appendix B. The inservice group received their copies of the packet through the mail during the week of July 12-16, 1982, following the inservice session.

Control group

Advisors in the control group were requested to conduct a six-hour workshop on delegation and member participation. They received a
suggested outline for the workshop which identified the areas included in the packet (Appendix A). Actual content of the workshop was left to the individual advisor's discretion.

Instrumentation

Five instruments were developed to measure the dependent variables of the study. All instruments were administered at the end of the experimental period in January, 1983. Copies of the instruments are presented in Appendix C.

Composite Chapter Achievement Questionnaire

The instrument was designed to assess the respondents' perceptions of their chapter's productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. A list of statements which could describe a chapter was formulated from a review of the literature concerning group productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. The list was reviewed, amended, and edited by the researchers. The final instrument consisted of 35 statements. Eight statements were related to chapter productivity; twelve statements pertained to chapter drive; and fifteen statements were related to chapter cohesiveness. The 35 statements were rearranged in a random order.

The instrument was then reviewed by departmental faculty and graduate students for face validity. Also, the instrument was administered to a local chapter not included in the sample for clarification of instructions and terms used. Based upon the recommendations of these groups, the instrument was revised and finalized for the study.
Respondents were asked to determine the degree to which each item described their chapter and select a response from the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instrument was completed by the chapter advisor, the six major chapter officers, and all sophomore FFA members. Responses to this instrument were used to develop the composite ratings for chapter productivity, drive, cohesiveness, and overall achievement.

**Chapter Achievement Scales**

The instrument used three Thurston type scales to assess chapter drive, productivity, and cohesiveness. Each scale consisted of five statements which described five levels of the specified group achievement factor: chapter productivity, drive, or cohesiveness. The statements in each scale were based upon the definitions given for the three factors and each represented a distinct level or degree of that factor. Respondents were instructed to select the one statement on each scale which best described their chapter. These scales were used to determine the scale scores for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness.

**Tendency to Delegate Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was based upon a similar instrument developed by Dunbar (1968) called "Propensity to Delegate." Dunbar used the
questionnaire to determine county extension agents' inclinations to delegate responsibility and authority for identifying and training volunteer leaders. The questionnaire was revised for use with FFA officers and advisors. After revision, the questionnaire contained 15 questions. Respondents selected their answers to each item based on the following scale:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to the questions reflected FFA officers' and advisors' natural inclinations toward delegation.

**Chapter Activeness Scale**

The scale was developed as an objective measure of chapter productivity. Part I of the National Superior Chapter Award application contained a list of activities common to all superior FFA chapters as determined by the National FFA Association. The Chapter Activeness Scale consisted of items from Part I which were related to chapter productivity and which normally would have been completed between July 1 and December 31. Chapter presidents were requested to respond by circling "yes" for each item their chapter had completed or "no" for items not completed. A weighted activeness rating for the chapter was calculated from the responses.

**Demographic Information**

Information on chapter characteristics and operations which could affect the group achievement of the chapter was obtained from the
chapter advisor. The advisor's teaching tenure and a rating of chapter activeness were obtained. Advisors in the packet only and the inservice groups were requested to rate the quality of the resource packet on a scale of 0 to 99. A rating of 0 indicated the packet was unusable, while a rating of 99 indicated the packet was excellent.

Collection of Data

All chapters participating in the study were requested to complete the officer workshop prior to August 31, 1982. Letters reminding the chapters to complete the workshop were mailed to each chapter on August 1, 1982 (Appendix A). Since time was needed for the officers to initiate actions to use delegation in working with chapter committees, data were to be collected in January, 1983. A second letter (Appendix A) was sent on November 5, 1982, to each advisor of the participating chapters to determine the number of chapter officers, number of sophomore FFA members, and whether the officer training workshop had been completed. Based upon the information obtained from the returned postcards, it was determined that several of the chapters which had originally agreed to participate in the study failed to complete the officer training workshop. One teacher had moved at the beginning of the school year. Fifteen of the 60 chapters no longer met the study criteria; therefore, all eligible alternate chapters were needed in the study. The packet only group contained 19 chapters; the inservice group contained 16 chapters; and the control group contained 16 chapters, for a total of 51 chapters.
Instructions for administering the questionnaires and the appropriate number of questionnaires were sent to each chapter on January 4, 1983. Advisors were requested to have all sophomore FFA members, chapter officers, and themselves complete the appropriate questionnaires. Responses were recorded on computer scored answer sheets. The answer sheets and the two questionnaires requiring fill-in-the-blank responses were returned.

One chapter failed to return the questionnaires even after duplicate materials were sent and several follow-up phone calls were made. Instruments were received from 847 respondents in 50 chapters. Of the 50 chapters returning questionnaires, the questionnaires from one chapter were deemed unusable because the advisor responded with inappropriate scale values. Final data were collected from 828 respondents in 49 chapters: 18 chapters in the packet only group, 16 chapters in the inservice group, and 15 chapters in the control group. An informal assessment of the missing data indicated that the nonresponding chapter was not different from the responding chapters.

Analysis of Data

The data were transferred from the computer scored answer sheets to magnetic tape by the Iowa State University Testing Services. The information was then transferred to disc storage on the Wybur System of the Iowa State Computation Center for easier access to the data. All analysis and manipulation of the data were accomplished using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al., 1975) and the computer facilities of the Iowa State Computer Center.
The following description of the analysis procedures is an overview of the statistical treatment of the data. The data were analyzed at the individual and chapter levels.

**Modification of individual data**

Responses were recoded and modified to calculate individual composite ratings and scale scores for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness and for overall chapter achievement. Officer and advisor responses were modified to calculate individual tendency to delegate scores. Modifications applicable to specific instruments are explained in the following sections.

**Composite Chapter Achievement Questionnaire** The instrument was used to calculate chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness composite rating scores, and to calculate an overall chapter achievement score for each respondent. Individuals selected a response from 1 to 7 to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Any other value (blank, 8, 9, 10) was considered invalid and coded as missing data.

Composite ratings for overall chapter achievement, and chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness were calculated by summing the responses to the appropriate statements and dividing by the number of responses. Responses to at least three-fourths of the items for any one factor were needed to calculate a valid composite rating score. A composite rating was calculated for chapter productivity if at least 6 of the 8 items were answered; for chapter drive if at least 9 of the 12 items were answered; for chapter cohesiveness if at least 12 of the 15
items were answered; and for overall chapter achievement if at least 27 of the 35 items were answered.

**Chapter Achievement Scales**  Scale scores for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness were obtained for each respondent based upon their selected scale response. The Chapter Achievement Scales contained three scales with five statements in each scale. The statements were assigned a weighted value from one to five. If, for example, the respondent selected the first statement on the chapter drive scale, the response was given a value of one. A one indicated that the respondent perceived the chapter to have low group drive. A five indicated the respondent perceived the chapter to have high group drive. Values outside the 1-5 scale (0, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) were coded as missing data.

**Tendency to Delegate**  A mean tendency to delegate score was obtained for each officer and advisor. Respondents selected an answer from 1 to 5 for each item. All other values (blank, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) were coded as missing data. The respondent needed to answer at least 12 of the 15 items for a tendency to delegate score to be calculated.

**Modifications of chapter data**  In order to analyze the dependent variables within and between chapters, it was necessary to compute chapter level data. The following sections explain the modifications used to obtain chapter data.

**Chapter achievement**  SPSS subprogram AGGREGATE was used to formulate chapter level composite ratings of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness; scale scores for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness; chapter achievement; and tendency to delegate by
respondent type. A second AGGREGATE program computed grand mean scores on each dependent variable for each chapter. By aggregating all scores from each chapter, each respondent in the chapter, regardless of position, had equal weight in the resulting score.

Chapter Activeness Questionnaire An objective rating for chapter productivity was desired for analysis and comparison with the other subjective productivity ratings. Chapter presidents indicated the chapter activities completed by selecting a "yes" or "no" for each activity listed on the questionnaire. A "yes" was coded as 1 and a "no" was coded as 2.

A jury of experts rated each activity on a scale from 1 to 11 according to the relative importance of the activity as a measure of chapter productivity. The jury consisted of the following people:

Wayne Nattress, State FFA Advisor
Iowa Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

Joe Yedlick, Iowa Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association
Past President
North Linn Community High School
Coggin, Iowa

Dennis Miller, Vocational Agriculture Teacher
Starmont Community High School
Strawberry Point, Iowa

In addition to their qualifications as vocational agriculture educators, the jury members had all advised chapters that received at least four gold awards in the National Chapter Award Program at the national level.

The jury's responses were averaged to obtain a mean weighted value for each activity on the Chapter Activeness Questionnaire. The mean weighted values ranged from 6.66 to 11.00 on the 11-point scale, as shown
in Appendix C. For each item, an affirmative response was recoded with the appropriate mean importance weighting; a negative response was coded as zero. The responses were summed to calculate the weighted chapter activeness score.

**Demographic Information** The only modification required was the calculation of chapter membership percentage. The number of members in the FFA chapter was divided by the number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture and multiplied by 100 to determine the percentage of vocational agriculture students who were FFA members. Since FFA membership could include out-of-school members, percentages greater than 100 were recoded to 100 percent.

**Descriptive analyses**

**Analysis of data gathering instruments** All scales — composite ratings for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness; overall chapter achievement composite rating; and tendency to delegate scale — were analyzed for consistency using the SPSS subprogram RELIABILITY (Hull and Nie, 1979). A reliability alpha coefficient was calculated for each of the scales. Missing values were not included in the reliability analyses. If a case was missing a value, that case was not included in any of the reliability calculations.

**Analysis of chapter characteristics** SPSS subprogram FREQUENCIES was used to obtain means, medians, and standard deviations for selected interval level FFA chapter characteristics.
Inferential analyses

SPSS subprogram PEARSON CORR analyzed the relationships between selected chapter characteristics and the dependent variables. Significant relationships were identified by the correlation procedures. Also, the relationships between composite ratings and scale scores for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness were analyzed using subprogram PEARSON CORR.

Differences in respondents' perceptions of chapter achievement scores by respondent position (member, officer, advisor) were analyzed by subprogram ONEWAY. Duncan's Multiple Range test was used posteriori to determine where differences occurred among respondent groups.

Subprogram ONEWAY was used to analyze effects of the experimental treatment groups on composite chapter achievement ratings and officers' tendency to delegate scores. Analysis of covariance using subprogram ANOVA was used to remove effects that were related to chapter characteristics rather than the treatment groups.

Summary of the Research Procedure

The study was conducted during the 1982-83 school year to determine the effectiveness of a resource packet for FFA officer training by evaluating chapter achievement. A randomized control-group posttest only experimental design was used to compare chapter achievement among three treatment groups.

The study sample was selected from the population of FFA chapters in Iowa. The sample unit was FFA chapters, with responses from sophomore
members, FFA officers, and the advisor were used to analyze chapter achievement.

Five instruments were developed for the study to collect evaluation information. The Chapter Achievement Questionnaire collected information for calculating composite ratings for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness and overall chapter achievement. The Chapter Achievement Scales were single ratings of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. Tendency to Delegate Questionnaire measured advisors' and officers' natural inclinations toward delegation in the chapter. The other two instruments, Demographic Information and Chapter Activeness Rating, collected information about chapter operations and activities which possibly affected chapter achievement. Scores were first calculated for each individual respondent; chapter scores were the aggregated means for all respondents in a chapter.

Instruments were mailed to 60 FFA chapters in the sample and seven alternate chapters. Usable responses were received from 828 respondents in 49 chapters. The data were statistically analyzed using computer facilities at Iowa State University.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of a resource packet on delegation. Sixty FFA chapters in the State of Iowa were randomly selected to test the packet and were assigned to one of three treatment groups: 1) packet only group; 2) inservice group; and 3) control group. Responses were received from sophomore FFA members, chapter officers, and the chapter advisor in each chapter. The collected data were measures of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness; overall chapter achievement; tendency to delegate by the officers and the advisor; and chapter and advisor characteristics. The findings are presented in the following order:

1. Analysis of instrument reliability;
2. Descriptive analysis of chapters;
3. Correlational analyses of variables;
4. Comparison of respondent groups;
5. Comparison of treatment groups; and

Analysis of Instrument Reliability

Five composite type scales were used in this study. The scales — chapter productivity, chapter drive, chapter cohesiveness, overall chapter achievement, and tendency to delegate — consisted of multiple items which were combined to determine a mean score for each scale. In order to determine the linear reliability of the responses, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability was calculated for each scale.
Cronbach's alpha is the mean of all possible split-half coefficients (Cronbach, 1967). The reliability coefficients for all of the scales were above the .63 level as presented in Table 1. The reliability coefficient for overall chapter achievement (.89) was computed using all 35 items of the chapter achievement questionnaire. Based upon the reliability coefficients, the scales were considered to be acceptable for group measurement.

Table 1. Reliability coefficients for chapter achievement and tendency to delegate scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliabilityα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite productivity rating</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite drive rating</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite cohesiveness rating</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter achievement</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to delegate</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

αMissing cases excluded.

Descriptive Analyses of Chapter/Advisor Characteristics

Demographic information was collected from each chapter in the study. The means, standard deviations, and modes for the chapter/advisor characteristics are presented in Table 2. The average number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture programs was approximately 47. This compares to an average of 56 and 51 students as reported by Briers (1978) and Townsend (1981b), respectively. FFA membership
averaged about 49 members, which was slightly larger than the vocational agriculture enrollment due to out-of-school memberships. More than 67 percent of the chapters indicated they had 100 percent in-school membership. The average chapter membership was about 93 percent of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture, which was similar to the membership percentage reported by Townsend (1981b).

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, and modes for selected chapter/advisor characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in vo ag program</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in FFA chapter</td>
<td>49.14</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent FFA members</td>
<td>93.40</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of chapter standing committees</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor rating of chapter activeness</td>
<td>67.33</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total advisor tenure (years)</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years taught at present school</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisors had taught an average of more than 10 years with almost eight of those years in their present positions. Slightly more than 20 percent of the advisors were in their second year of teaching.

When advisors rated their chapter's activeness on a scale of 0 to 99, a mean of 67.33 was obtained. A score of 99 indicated the chapter was extremely active compared to other chapters; a score of 0 indicated the chapter was extremely inactive.
Chapter/advisor characteristics were compared among the three treatment groups to determine if experimental mortality had affected the random sample; there were no significant differences among the groups on any of the chapter/advisor characteristics.

Correlational Analyses of Variables

The first major objective of this study was to determine relationships among the interval level dependent and independent variables. Using the Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation, relationships were tested between (1) the dependent and independent variables, (2) the dependent variables and tendency to delegate scores, and (3) the different chapter achievement measures. Intercorrelations were computed to determine the relationships among chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness.

Since FFA chapters were the experimental units of the study, aggregated chapter means were used in the correlations. All probabilities were based upon a two-tailed test of significance since an expected directional relationship was not specified in the objectives.

Dependent and independent variables

Correlation coefficients were computed between selected chapter/advisor characteristics and composite ratings of chapter achievement to identify relationships between the variable pairs. Results of the correlations are shown in Table 3.
Table 3. Coefficients of correlation of chapter/advisor characteristics with composite chapter achievement ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter characteristic</th>
<th>Composite productivity</th>
<th>Composite drive</th>
<th>Composite cohesiveness</th>
<th>Overall achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in FFA chapter</td>
<td>(coef)\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob)\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent FFA membership</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop training time</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hours)</td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter activeness rating</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor rating of chapter</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activeness</td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years taught at present school</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total advisor tenure</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(years)</td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Coefficient of correlation (r).

\textsuperscript{b}Probability of coefficient.
The number of FFA members was significantly related to chapter productivity, chapter drive, and overall chapter achievement. The correlations indicated a slight positive relationship between the number of FFA members and each of the composite chapter achievement ratings except chapter cohesiveness. As the number of FFA members increased, the chapter productivity, chapter drive, and overall chapter achievement ratings tended to increase slightly.

The advisor's rating of chapter activeness compared their chapter to other FFA chapters on a 0 to 99 scale with a 99 indicating the chapter was extremely active. The correlations indicated that a moderate relationship existed between each of the chapter achievement measures and the advisor's rating of chapter activeness.

Correlations were calculated between the composite productivity rating and two additional measures of chapter productivity -- the chapter activeness rating and the advisor's rating of chapter activeness. The correlation between chapter activeness rating and composite productivity rating was not significant. A moderate correlation (.502) existed between the composite productivity rating and the advisor's rating of chapter activeness. As the composite productivity rating increased, the advisor's rating of chapter activeness also increased.

Correlations between the other chapter/advisor characteristics and measures of chapter achievement were not significant. The correlations were also extremely low, which indicated the variables were unrelated.
Dependent variables and tendency to delegate scores

One of the basic concepts for this research was that delegation by chapter leaders would affect chapter achievement. The correlation coefficients between tendency to delegate scores and composite chapter achievement ratings are presented in Table 4. Tendency to delegate was broken down into the aggregated officers' and the advisor's tendency to delegate scores. The total tendency to delegate scores was the aggregated mean (advisor and officers) for each chapter.

Table 4. Coefficients of correlation of composite ratings of chapter achievement with tendency to delegate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Tendency to delegate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite productivity rating</td>
<td>(coef) a</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob) b</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite drive rating</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite cohesiveness rating</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter achievement</td>
<td>(coef)</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers vs advisors</td>
<td>(coef) a</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob) b</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aCoefficient of correlation (r).

bCorrelation probability.

Significant relationships were found between the officers' scores and all of the chapter achievement ratings. Chapter drive and officers'
tendency to delegate had the strongest relationship as indicated by a correlation coefficient of .490. As officers' tendency to delegate scores increased, the composite chapter achievement ratings also increased.

Chapter drive was the only variable significantly related to the advisor's tendency to delegate. The coefficient indicated there was only a slight relationship. The advisor's tendency to delegate score was not significantly related to the other chapter achievement ratings.

Coefficients for total tendency to delegate were similar to the correlations shown by the officers' tendency to delegate. The total tendency to delegate score for each chapter was determined by all of the officers' scores and the advisor's score. Total tendency to delegate scores were related to each of the composite chapter achievement ratings with chapter drive being the strongest relationship.

The officers' tendency to delegate scores were correlated with the advisor's tendency to delegate scores. There was a significant relationship between the two scores, but the correlation coefficient (.327) was low. These results differed from relationships reported in the research literature which had indicated there was either a strong positive or a strong inverse relationship between supervisors' and subordinates' delegation.

**Composite ratings and scale scores for chapter achievement**

Chapter achievement was also measured using scale scores to determine the potential for measuring chapter achievement using single scales rather than multiple item ratings. The chapter achievement
scales described five levels for each achievement factor -- productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. Respondents selected the one statement in each scale which best described their chapter. The correlation coefficients between composite ratings and scale scores for chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness are presented in Table 5. The moderate correlations indicated a definite relationship existed between the two types of measures; however, they were not considered strong enough to substitute the scales for the composite ratings.

Table 5. Coefficients of correlation between composite ratings and scale scores of chapter achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite productivity rating with productivity scale score</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite drive rating with drive scale score</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite cohesiveness rating with cohesiveness scale score</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercorrelations between the dependent variables

In describing the Leader-Group Interaction model (Schriesheim, Mowday, and Stogdill, 1979), the relationships among the three chapter achievement ratings were not specified. Evidence from Stogdill's 1965 study indicated that the relationships among the variables were inconsistent.

To determine the relationships in this study, correlation coefficients were calculated among the composite ratings of chapter
productivity, drive, and cohesiveness (Table 6). All of the coefficients were highly significant and positive in direction. The relationship between chapter drive and cohesiveness was the strongest with a correlation coefficient of .828. The drive-productivity and productivity-cohesiveness coefficients had lesser magnitudes.

Table 6. Coefficients of correlation between composite ratings of chapter achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity with drive</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity with cohesiveness</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive with cohesiveness</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of the correlational analyses

Composite ratings of chapter achievement were related to the number of FFA members in the chapter, advisor's rating of chapter achievement, officers' tendency to delegate scores, and the scale scores for chapter achievement. The relationships between the composite ratings and the scale scores were not strong enough to indicate the scale scores could be substituted for the composite ratings. Officers' tendency to delegate scores were slightly related to the advisor's tendency to delegate. The relationships among chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness indicated they were positively related factors of group achievement.
Comparison of Respondent Groups

Ratings of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness and overall chapter achievement were obtained from sophomore FFA members, FFA officers, and the chapter advisor in each chapter. To test the effects of respondent position on measures of chapter achievement, the following hypotheses were formulated:

$H_{0,1}$: There are no significant differences among the respondent groups for:

a. chapter productivity
b. chapter drive
c. chapter cohesiveness
d. overall chapter achievement.

One-way analyses of variance were run to test the null hypotheses. Individual means for each chapter achievement measure were used in the comparisons. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variances was calculated to determine if variances among the groups were similar. The test was significant for each of the dependent variables except for the composite chapter productivity rating. This test indicated that the variances were not homogeneous; therefore, the $F$ values were suspect. A Kruskall-Wallis nonparametric one-way analysis of variance was run to determine if differences actually existed among the three respondent groups. Results of the Kruskall-Wallis test indicated that the $F$ values were valid. Therefore, the ANOVA test and its resulting $F$ values were used to examine the differences among respondent groups.
F values and F value probabilities obtained from the analyses of variance are presented in Table 7. When the F value was significant at the .10 level, Duncan's multiple range test (α=.10) was used as a posteriori test to determine where the differences occurred.

Table 7. Analyses of variance of composite ratings of chapter achievement by respondent type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite rating</th>
<th>Sophomore members (N=472)</th>
<th>Officers (N=306)</th>
<th>Advisors (N=49)</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>4.954</td>
<td>5.066</td>
<td>5.015</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>4.618</td>
<td>4.529</td>
<td>4.765</td>
<td>2.563</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2 &amp; 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>5.211</td>
<td>5.419</td>
<td>5.564</td>
<td>12.313</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 &amp; 2,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall achievement</td>
<td>4.949</td>
<td>5.033</td>
<td>5.165</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 &amp; 2,3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent group ratings of chapter productivity ranged from 4.954 to 5.066. The analysis yielded an F value of 2.068, but the value was not significant. The data supported the null hypothesis $H_{0_a}$; therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected. It was concluded that the sophomore members, officers, and advisors had similar ratings of chapter productivity.

When chapter drive was compared among the respondent groups, a significant (α=.10) difference was identified; therefore, the null
hypothesis $H_{1b}$ was rejected. Results of the post hoc test indicated
that advisors rated chapter drive higher than did the chapter officers. One explanation for this finding could be that FFA officers tend to be highly motivated and committed to working with the FFA chapter. They may have perceived chapter members to be less committed to the chapter than themselves and, therefore, rated chapter drive lower. The sophomore FFA members' rating of chapter drive were not significantly different from either of the other respondent groups.

Sophomore FFA members rated chapter cohesiveness and overall chapter achievement to be significantly lower than the officers and the advisors. $H_{1c}$ was rejected based upon the results of the ANOVA test. The sophomore members' lower ratings could be attributed to the fact that members based their ratings on their own level of identification and participation with the chapter; whereas, officers and advisors tended to have higher identification with the chapter due to their select positions in the chapter. Officers' and advisor's ratings of chapter cohesiveness were similar.

Significant differences existed among the respondent groups' ratings of overall chapter achievement; therefore, $H_{1d}$ was rejected. Advisors and officers rated overall chapter achievement significantly higher than did the sophomore FFA members. There was no significant difference between the advisors' and officers' ratings. This finding may be because officers and advisors hold recognized leader positions in the chapter, and they are involved in every activity of the chapter. In contrast, sophomore members tend to be involved in only those chapter
activities which are related to their specific interests. The degree of involvement may have affected individuals' ratings of overall chapter achievement.

Three of the four null hypotheses were rejected based upon the results of the analyses of variance. Ratings of chapter productivity did not differ significantly among the respondent groups, but chapter drive, chapter cohesiveness, and overall chapter achievement were significantly different.

Comparison of Treatment Groups

The second objective of this study was to compare treatment groups to determine if use of the resource packet on delegation affected chapter achievement and the leaders' tendency to delegate. One-way analyses of variance were used to test null hypotheses related to this objective. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance was not significant for any of the analyses; therefore, it was concluded that the variances of the groups were homogeneous. The results of the tests of the hypotheses are presented in the following sections.

Comparison of chapter achievement

Measures of chapter achievement were the primary criteria used to test the effectiveness of the resource packet on delegation. The null hypotheses tested were:

\[ H_{02} \]: There are no significant differences among the treatment groups for:

- a. chapter productivity
- b. chapter drive
c. chapter cohesiveness

d. overall chapter achievement.

Aggregated composite ratings of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness and overall chapter achievement ratings were compared among the three treatment groups. The number of chapters in each group, group means, and standard deviations for each of the dependent variables are presented in Tables 8 through 11. The analyses of variance indicated that while group means differed slightly on each variable, there were no significant differences among the groups for any of the chapter ratings.

Table 8. Analysis of variance of composite chapter productivity rating by treatment group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.969</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.970</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.986</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.975</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Analysis of variance of composite chapter drive rating by treatment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.528</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.599</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.546</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Analysis of variance of composite chapter cohesiveness rating by treatment group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.294</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.262</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.302</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.286</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Analysis of variance of overall chapter achievement by treatment group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.956</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.969</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.959</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.961</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

achievement ratings. Therefore, all of the above hypotheses (H₀₂ᵃ through H₀₂ᵈ) failed to be rejected. The three treatment groups were not significantly different on any of the chapter achievement ratings.

**Covariate analyses of chapter achievement**

In the previous correlational analyses, three independent variables were identified which were related to the chapter achievement ratings. Covariate analyses were used to control for the effects of the three variables in the chapter achievement ratings and to compare the adjusted...
means among treatment groups. The three independent variables used as 
covariates were aggregated tendency to delegate score (Table 12), 
advisor ratings of chapter activeness (Table 13), and number of FFA 
members (Table 14). Covariate analyses were computed for each of the 
aggregated chapter achievement ratings; however, only the overall 
chapter achievement analyses are presented because similar results 
were obtained for each of the variables.

Table 12. Comparison of overall chapter achievement by treatment group 
with tendency to delegate as covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate tendency to delegate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.873</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect (group)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Comparison of overall chapter achievement by treatment 
groups with advisor rating of chapter activeness as covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate advisor activeness rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.816</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect (group)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.981</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Comparison of overall chapter achievement by treatment groups with number of FFA members as covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate number in FFA chapter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.431</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect (group)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each of the analyses, the covariate significantly affected the overall chapter achievement score as indicated by the significant F values for the covariates. Ratings of overall chapter achievement were not significantly different in the three treatment groups; therefore, the null hypotheses (Ho2a through Ho2d) were not rejected, even with the covariate effects removed.

Comparison of tendency to delegate

Tendency to delegate scores were compared among the treatment groups to determine if use of the packet materials affected officers' and advisor's inclinations to use delegation methods. The null hypotheses related to the tendency to delegate scores were:

Ho3: There are no significant differences among the treatment groups for:
   a. the officers' tendency to delegate scores
   b. the advisor's tendency to delegate scores.
Aggregated officers' tendency to delegate scores were tested for differences based upon the null hypothesis $H_{03a}$. Means and standard deviations for the officers' tendency to delegate scores are presented in Table 15. The $F$ value from the analysis of variance was not significant; therefore, null hypothesis $H_{03a}$ was not rejected. The officers' tendency to delegate scores were similar in each of the treatment groups.

Table 15. Analysis of variance of officers' tendency to delegate by treatment group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.356</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.378</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference ($\alpha=.10$) was found between the treatment groups for advisor's tendency to delegate scores (Table 16). The null hypothesis $H_{03b}$ was rejected based upon the result of the ANOVA. Results of the Duncan's multiple range test indicated the advisors in the control group had significantly lower scores than advisors in the other two groups.

Evaluation of Packet Materials

In the two treatment groups which had access to the resource packet, the advisors evaluated the quality of the packet materials
Table 16. Analysis of variance of advisor's tendency to delegate by treatment group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.515</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 &amp; 1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.374</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on a 0 to 99 scale. A rating of 0 indicated the materials were unusable, while a 99 rating indicated the materials were excellent. Means and standard deviations for the packet only and inservice groups are presented in Table 17. The mean rating of the packet only group was higher (73.72) than the inservice group (68.00). Fifty percent of the advisors evaluated the materials with a rating of 70 or better, which indicated the packet quality was above average.

Table 17. Comparison of advisor's rating of packet quality by treatment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only</td>
<td>73.72</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.03</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>Median = 70.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The null hypothesis for comparison of the packet evaluations was:

$H_{04}$: There is no significant difference between the inservice and the packet only groups for evaluations of packet quality.

A pooled t-test was used to determine if the group means were significantly different. The mean packet evaluations by the two groups were not significantly different and the null hypothesis $H_{04}$ was not rejected.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Statement of the problem

Officers and advisors are responsible for ensuring the FFA operates as a member-centered organization. As a member-centered organization, the active involvement and participation of all members is important. Delegation is one method used by leaders to transfer responsibility and authority to group members. A resource packet on delegation was developed for training FFA officers. Was the packet effective?

Purpose and objectives

This study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the resource packet on delegation. Packet effectiveness was evaluated by measures of chapter achievement -- chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. The specific objectives were:

1. To determine if relationships exist between the following factors:
   a. tendency to delegate in the chapter;
   b. chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness as measured by composite ratings and scale scores;
   c. chapter activeness; and
   d. respondent position.

2. To evaluate the resource packet by comparing chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness among the following subgroups:
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a. packet only group;
b. inservice group; and
c. control group.

**Methodology**

FFA chapters in the State of Iowa served as the population of this study. The sample consisted of 60 randomly selected chapters which were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups — packet only, inservice, or control. Each chapter was asked to conduct a six-hour workshop on delegation and member participation for their FFA officers by August 31, 1982. Chapters in the packet only and inservice groups used the resource packet for the workshop. Advisors in the inservice group also received two hours of instruction on using the packet. The control group did not have access to the packet; they received a content outline of the packet.

The advisors were contacted in November of 1982 to determine if they had conducted the workshop as instructed. Fifty-one of the original chapters had completed the workshop.

Five instruments were designed for collecting the data. The chapter achievement questionnaire contained 35 items which were used to measure chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness and overall chapter achievement. The chapter achievement scales consisted of three five-item scales. Respondents selected the one item in each scale which best described their chapter; selected responses were used to determine chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness scale scores. The tendency to delegate questionnaire was completed by all officers and advisors.
The questionnaire contained 15 items used to identify respondents' natural inclinations toward delegation; a mean tendency to delegate score was calculated for each respondent. The chapter activeness rating consisted of a list of activities which chapters indicated they had or had not completed. Weights were assigned to each activity by a jury, and a summative chapter activeness score was calculated for each chapter. Demographic information pertaining to selected chapter and advisor characteristics was also obtained.

Data gathering instruments were mailed in January, 1983 to the 51 chapters which had conducted the officer workshops. Responses were received from 50 chapters; however, one set of responses was judged to be unusable. Usable data were collected from 828 respondents in 49 chapters.

The data were modified and analyzed using the Iowa State Computation Center facilities. Results of the analyses were used to identify the relationships and differences specified by the objectives of this study.

Conclusions

Based upon the data analyses and the findings of this study, the following conclusions related to the study objectives were formulated.

1. The scales used for the composite chapter achievement rating scores and the tendency to delegate scores were internally consistent at an acceptable level for measurement of group data.

2. The random assignment of chapters to the three treatment groups was successful. Variables which affected the chapter achievement
measures were randomly distributed among the groups. Chapter/advisor characteristics were similar for the three groups.

3. The average vocational agriculture program had an enrollment of approximately 47 students, and 93 percent of those students were also FFA members. The average FFA chapter had about 49 members. The larger FFA membership was accounted for by out-of-school memberships.

4. Chapter productivity, chapter drive, and overall chapter achievement were significantly related to the number of members in the chapter. Larger FFA chapter membership was related to increased chapter productivity, chapter drive, and overall chapter achievement. The size of the FFA chapter was not significantly related to chapter cohesiveness.

5. Advisor's rating of chapter activeness was related to chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness and to overall chapter achievement. The advisor's rating was strongly associated with chapter achievement.

6. The (weighted) chapter activeness rating was not significantly related to chapter productivity. The weighted scale contained only those activities which may have been completed prior to January of 1983. The rating was biased against chapters which are more active in the later half of the school year. Therefore, the current form of the chapter activeness scale was not useful in determining chapter productivity.

7. Advisor's tendency to delegate was not significantly related to chapter productivity, chapter cohesiveness, or overall chapter
achievement. There was a significant relationship between the advisor's tendency to delegate and chapter drive.

8. Advisor's tendency to delegate was related to the officers' tendency to delegate, but the relationship was not strong. Officers followed the example of the advisor in using delegation to some degree.

9. Officers' tendency to delegate was related to each measure of chapter achievement. When officer delegation increased, chapter achievement was strengthened as shown by the increased ratings of chapter productivity, drive, cohesiveness, and overall chapter achievement.

10. The three factors of chapter achievement were significantly related. The relationships between each of the chapter achievement ratings were highly related, which indicated that as one factor increased, the other two factors would also increase. Since the drive-cohesiveness relationship was the strongest, these two variables would tend to exert a positive influence on chapter productivity. When chapter drive and chapter cohesiveness are increased, the chapter productivity would also be expected to increase.

11. There were no significant differences in the respondent groups' ratings of chapter productivity. The null hypothesis $H_{0a}$ was not rejected, which indicated the respondent groups had similar ratings for chapter productivity.

12. Officers rated chapter drive significantly lower than did the advisors; therefore, the null hypothesis $H_{0b}$ was rejected. The advisors had the highest rating for chapter drive, while the officers
had the lowest ratings. The sophomore members were not significantly
different from either group.

13. Sophomore FFA members rated chapter cohesiveness and overall
chapter achievement significantly lower than did the officers or the
advisors. The null hypotheses $H_0^{1c}$ and $H_0^{1d}$ were rejected. Advisors
rated chapter drive higher than did the officers, but the difference
was not significant.

14. The packet did not affect chapter achievement. The null
hypotheses $H_0^{2a}$ through $H_0^{2d}$ were not rejected. The number of FFA
members, the advisor's rating of chapter activeness, and total tendency
to delegate were each used as covariates in the comparison of the
treatment groups. The covariates explained significant portions of the
differences in group means. However, when the group means were equated
using the covariates, the treatment groups still failed to show
significant differences. The combination of short-term training with
long-term measurement may have nullified the possible effects of the
packet. Also, the packet was used under a variety of conditions due to
the advisor's interpretation and application of the packet.

15. Officers' tendency to delegate scores were not significantly
different among the treatment groups; therefore, the null hypothesis
$H_0^{3a}$ was not rejected. Use of the packet in the treatment groups was
not related to the officers' delegation.

16. Advisors in the two groups which used the packet had
significantly higher tendency to delegate scores than advisors in the
control group. Null hypothesis $H_0^{3b}$ was rejected. Advisors who used
the packet materials were more inclined to use delegation methods in the operation of the FFA chapter. As a result, the packet materials were effective for the advisors, even though the effects did not immediately carry over to the chapter officers or to chapter achievement.

17. There were no significant differences in the rating of the packet materials between the two experimental groups. The null hypothesis Ho was not rejected. However, the inservice training was not considered to be effective because the mean packet rating by the inservice group was lower than the mean packet rating of the packet only group. This difference, while not significant, is difficult to explain theoretically.

18. The packet materials were usable and of acceptable quality. A majority of the advisors evaluated the packet as higher than average in quality.

Recommendations

This research study was conducted to identify relationships among variables associated with chapter achievement and to evaluate the effectiveness of the resource packet on delegation. Based upon the research findings, the following recommendations should be considered by individuals responsible for the operations of local FFA chapters.

1. Chapter evaluations should include measures of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. These three factors were identified by the literature as important aspects of chapter achievement. The relationships between the three factors and the advisor's rating of chapter activeness indicate they are important measures of
the level of chapter achievement. The chapter achievement ratings allow evaluations to consider factors beyond goal accomplishments for the improvement of the chapter. Also, evaluations incorporating all three factors would allow leaders to identify areas of chapter achievement which needed improvement as the study has shown that all three factors are positively related.

2. Composite chapter achievement ratings rather than the scale chapter achievement scores should be used to evaluate chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. The relationships between the scale scores and the composite ratings were not strong enough to indicate the scales could be substituted for the composite ratings of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. The reliability coefficients of the composite ratings indicated they were linearly related and were reliable group measures.

3. Officers should receive training in the use of delegation for the operation of the chapter. Officers' tendency to delegate was positively related to chapter achievement. Improvements in all factors related to chapter achievement were associated with the officers' delegation. Therefore, delegation training is important for improved chapter achievement and should be provided as a part of officer training.

4. Efforts must be made to increase member participation and involvement in the chapter. Limited involvement of members negates the intent of the organization. Sophomore members' ratings of chapter cohesiveness and overall chapter achievement suggested members were not involved in the overall operation of the chapter. Chapter leaders must
work to increase the responsibility and authority of members to ensure the chapter operates as a member-centered organization.

5. The resource packet should be used in teacher inservice meetings to instruct advisors in delegation methods. Advisors in the two packet groups were shown to have significantly higher tendency to delegate scores than advisors in the control group; therefore, advisor delegation was improved through the use of the resource packet. Since there was a relationship between the advisor's and the officers' tendency to delegate, improved advisor delegation would improve officers' delegation, which in turn is related to increased chapter achievement.

6. Based upon the findings of this research, it is not recommended that the packet be used under conditions similar to those of this study. However, under more controlled conditions with increased workshop time, more comprehensive training for workshop leaders, and the use of follow-up procedures, the packet may prove to be effective in increasing chapter achievement. Further research is needed to determine the effectiveness of the packet in other circumstances.

Recommendations for Further Research

During the process of this research study and upon consideration of the research findings, several questions were raised which were not adequately answered by the results of the study. Recommendations for future studies are as follows.

1. Conduct a study to compare pre- and post-year levels of chapter achievement within FFA chapters.
2. Investigate the relationships among other chapter and advisor characteristics which bear a relationship to chapter achievement.

3. Continue measurements of chapter productivity, drive, and cohesiveness to determine norm ratings and their interrelationship with chapter success.

4. Adapt and replicate this study for use with other voluntary organizations similar to the FFA.

5. Investigate the relationships between attitudes toward the FFA and ratings of chapter achievement.

6. Compare ratings of chapter achievement by members at different grade levels and at various participation levels within the FFA chapter.

7. Investigate the relationships between officer leadership styles and chapter achievement.

8. Determine the longitudinal effects of the packet for FFA officers.

9. Conduct a longitudinal chapter study with repeated usage of the resource packet on delegation and repeated measures of chapter achievement.

10. Conduct a replication of this study with trained personnel presenting the delegation packet workshops and directing follow-up procedures in the chapters.
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APPENDIX A. CORRESPONDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Requesting Participation in Study</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packet only group</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice group</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return postcard</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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Greetings! As another year comes to a close, we hope your year has been successful and rewarding.

Most teachers are satisfied with their FFA chapter's accomplishments, but they continue to seek answers to specific problems they have encountered. Advisors have shared that many of these problems center around participation. How can we get more students involved in FFA activities? We believe a solution needs to begin with the officers.

The Agricultural Education Department is conducting a project to help FFA officers learn how to delegate responsibilities to chapter members. Your chapter was randomly selected to participate in this project, and we need your help. Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Conduct six hours of training with your 1982-83 FFA officers on how to involve members in chapter activities.

2. Collect evaluative information in January from yourself, your officers and your members. This information will not be used to evaluate your FFA chapter.

Our final goal is to produce a tested resource packet for teachers' use in training FFA officers to use delegation in the chapter. We believe if the officers know how to delegate responsibilities to chapter members their FFA chapter will have stronger participation.

Please complete and return the enclosed self-addressed, stamped postcard by June 28, 1982. If you have any questions, contact us at (515)294-5872.

Sincerely,

Richard I. Carter
Associate Professor

Anna Beth Neason
Graduate Student
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Enclosure
Greetings! As another year comes to a close, we hope your year has been successful and rewarding.

Most teachers are satisfied with their FFA chapter's accomplishments, but they continue to seek answers to specific problems they have encountered. Advisors have shared that many of these problems center around participation. How can we get more students involved in FFA activities? We believe a solution needs to begin with the officers.

The Agricultural Education Department is conducting a project to help FFA officers learn how to delegate responsibilities to chapter members. Your chapter was randomly selected to participate in this project, and we need your help. Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Conduct a six hour training session by August 31, 1982 on delegation with your 1982-83 FFA officers, using a resource packet we will provide.
2. Attend an inservice program for using the resource packet on July 6, 1982 from 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. at the Summer Teacher's Conference.
3. Collect evaluative information in January from yourself, your officers and your members. This information will be used to evaluate the packet, not your FFA chapter.

Our final goal is to produce a tested resource packet for teachers' use in training FFA officers to use delegation in the chapter. We believe if the officers know how to delegate responsibilities to chapter members their FFA chapter will have stronger participation.

Please complete and return the enclosed self-addressed, stamped postcard by June 28, 1982. If you have any questions, contact us at (515)294-5872.

Sincerely,

Richard I. Carter  
Associate Professor

Anna Beth Neason  
Graduate Student
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Greetings! As another year comes to a close, we hope your year has been successful and rewarding.

Most teachers are satisfied with their FFA chapter's accomplishments, but they continue to seek answers to specific problems they have encountered. Advisors have shared that many of these problems center around participation. How can we get more students involved in FFA activities? We believe a solution needs to begin with the officers.

The Agricultural Education Department is conducting a project to help FFA officers learn how to delegate responsibilities to chapter members. Your chapter was randomly selected to participate in this project, and we need your help. Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Conduct a six hour training session by August 31, 1982 on delegation with your 1982-83 FFA officers, using a resource packet we will provide.

2. Collect evaluative information in January from yourself, your officers and your members. This information will be used to evaluate the packet, not your FFA chapter.

Our final goal is to produce a tested resource packet for teachers' use in training FFA officers to use delegation in the chapter. We believe if the officers know how to delegate responsibilities to chapter members their FFA chapter will have stronger participation.

Please complete and return the enclosed self-addressed, stamped postcard by June 28, 1982. If you have any questions, contact us at (515)294-5872.

Sincerely,

Richard I. Carter
Associate Professor

Anna Beth Neason
Graduate Student
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____ Yes - I agree to participate in this project and
meet the stated requirements.

________________________
Signature

________________________
School

____ No - I do not wish to participate in this project.
July 22, 1982

Greetings!

We appreciate your willingness to help in the leadership research project on chapter participation. The resource packet was mailed to you at school on July 9, 1982. If you have not received it yet, please call us at (515) 294-5872. We ask that you work with your officers using the packet before August 31, 1982.

The packet is designed to cover six hours of leadership training. You may use the packet in one day or split the workshop into two or three sessions. Tailor its use to fit your and your officers' schedules. The packet includes activities, handouts and transparency masters designed to stimulate student discussion. Be sure to read the whole packet before using it.

We will be mailing the instruments to obtain feedback on the packet's use and chapter member involvement on January 4, 1983. Once again, we would like to thank you for participating in this project. We hope the time you invest will prove beneficial to you and your chapter.

Sincerely,

Anna Beth Neason
Research Assistant

Dr. Richard I. Carter
Associate Professor
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July 22, 1982

Greetings!

We appreciate your willingness to help in the leadership research project on chapter participation. The resource packet was mailed to you at school on July 9, 1982. If you have not received it yet, please call us at (515) 294-5872. We ask that you work with your officers using the packet before August 31, 1982.

As stated in the inservice meeting at Des Moines, the packet is designed to cover six hours of leadership training. You may use the packet in one day or split the workshop into two or three sessions. Tailor its use to fit your and your officers' schedules.

We will be mailing the instruments to obtain feedback on the packet's use and chapter member involvement on January 4, 1983. Once again, we would like to thank you for participating in this project. We hope the time you invest will prove beneficial to you and your chapter.

Sincerely,

Anna Beth Neason
Research Assistant

Dr. Richard I. Carter
Associate Professor
Greetings!

We appreciate your willingness to help in the leadership research project on chapter participation. This is just a reminder that we are asking you to work with your officers for approximately six hours on increasing member participation and delegation. Please work with your officers before August 31, 1982.

Enclosed, you will find some suggested areas for working with your officers on participation. These are merely suggestions, if you have other areas of information you wish to cover during the workshop time, please feel free to do so. The main point is that you do work on member participation and delegation with your officers before August 31, 1982.

We will be mailing instruments for determining members participation and involvement in your chapter on January 4, 1983. Once again, we would like to thank you for participating in this project. We hope the time you invest will prove beneficial to you and your chapter.

Sincerely,

Anna Beth Neason
Research Assistant

Dr. Richard I. Carter
Associate Professor
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Enclosure
SUGGESTED WORKSHOP TOPICS

Importance of the officers working together as a team

FFA as a member-centered organization

Roles of the officers

Utilizing effective delegation to increase members involvement and participation

Reasons for using delegation

Steps in delegating
Greetings:

We hope you have completed your officer training program on member participation and delegation. Perhaps some of you were unable to complete the program before August 31, 1982 and hopefully you went ahead and completed it soon after that date.

We remind you that the instruments will be mailed in January. We ask that the instruments be completed by sophomore FFA members, your officers, and yourself. Please complete the enclosed postcard to indicate the number of officers and the number of students in your sophomore vocational agriculture class, and return it by November 19.

We appreciate your time and efforts in this study.

Sincerely,

Anna Beth Neason
Research Assistant

Richard I. Carter
Associate Professor

Enclosure
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FROM: (mailing address label)

We have completed officer training on member participation and delegation. ___ yes ___ no

____ Number of officers in chapter

____ Number of sophomore FFA members

__________________________
Signature
APPENDIX B. INSERVICE MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inservice Outline</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Delegation Resource Packet</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Activities</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE:

1. Introduce the packet to teachers.
2. Develop familiarity with procedures used in the packet.

I. Problems in the operation of an FFA chapter

II. Purpose of packet:

Desired Outcome:

Increase member involvement in chapter operations

Specific Objectives: Help officers:

1. clarify their responsibilities.
2. develop skills in effective delegation.

III. Overview of the packet:

Introduction

Member Centered Groups
  Characteristics
  Leadership Roles

Delegation
  What and Why
  Methods
    Planning
    Assigning
    Evaluating

IV. Sample packet activities

ACT 2.1 Member Centered Groups
HO 2.1

ACT 3.2a Delegation
ACT 3.2c
HO 3.1

V. Summary

Purpose of research
Time line
Type of instrumentation
OVERVIEW OF DELEGATION RESOURCE PACKET

General Information:

All colored sheets are for the advisor's use.

White pages are used as masters for handouts, activity sheets and transparencies.

EACH SECTION CONTAINS:

Teaching Plan
Activity sheets (ACT)
Information sheets (HO)
Transparency masters (TP)
Special Teacher's Instruction Sheets (TIS)
Teacher's Keys (KEY)

PACKET OUTLINE

Section 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Color - yellow

Contents

Section 1.0 Suggest Teaching Plan
ACT 1.0 Cryptogram
KEY 1.0 Teacher's Key for ACT 1.0

Section 2.1 MEMBER-CENTERED GROUP - Characteristics

Color - blue

Contents

Section 2.1 Suggested Teaching Plan
ACT 2.1 Organizational Characteristics
KEY 2.1 Teacher's Key for ACT 2.1
HO 2.1 Member-Centered vs Leader-Centered Groups
Section 2.2  MEMBER-CENTERED GROUPS - Leadership Roles

Color - blue

Contents

Section 2.2  Suggested Teaching Plan
ACT 2.2  Chapter Responsibilities
KEY 2.2  Teacher's Key for ACT 2.2
TP 2.2  Officer Responsibilities
TIS 2.2  Rules for Brainstorming

Section 3.1  DELEGATION - Rationale

Color - red

Contents

Section 3.1  Suggested Teaching Plan
ACT 3.1  Delegation Role Play
TP 3.1a  Effective Delegation
HO 3.1  Effective Delegation
TP 3.1b  Reasons for Delegation
TP 3.1c  Barriers to Delegation

Section 3.2  DELEGATION - Methods = Planning

Color - red

Contents

Section 3.2  Suggested Teaching Plan
ACT 3.2a  Delegation Inventory Sheet
KEY 3.2a  Teacher's Key for ACT 3.2a
ACT 3.2b  Tasks for Delegation
KEY 3.2b  Teacher's Key for ACT 3.2b
ACT 3.2c  Choosing the Delegatee
KEY 3.2c  Teacher's Key for ACT 3.2c
ACT 3.2d  Trust Building
TP 3.2  Planning
Section 3.3  DELEGATION - Methods = Assigning

Color - red

Content

Section 3.3  Suggested Teaching Plan
ACT 3.3  Motivating Members
HO 3.3a  Information for Task Completion
TP 3.3a  Authority
HO 3.3b  Authority and Feedback - Delegation Situations
TP 3.3b  Assigning Delegated Tasks

Section 3.4  DELEGATION - Methods = Evaluating

Color - red

Content

Section 3.4  Suggested Teaching Plan
HO 3.4a  Review of Delegation Process
HO 3.4b  Delegation Situations

Section 4.0  USING DELEGATION - Tools

Color - green

Content

Tools that officers may use during the year to increase their effectiveness as delegators.
Comparison of Organizational Characteristics

Directions: For each of the four groups below decide who should be responsible for each item listed. Three alternatives are listed for each group. Select the letter corresponding to the best alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>ARMY</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FORD MOTORS</th>
<th>FFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controls and directs the overall organization.</td>
<td>(P) = PENTAGON</td>
<td>(B) = SCHOOL BOARD</td>
<td>(B) = BOARD OF DIRECTORS</td>
<td>(A) = ADVISOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions for organization.</td>
<td>(O) = OFFICERS</td>
<td>(A) = ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>(O) = OFFICERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects leaders of the organization.</td>
<td>(E) = ENLISTED PERSONNEL</td>
<td>(T) = TEACHERS</td>
<td>(M) = MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carries out the decisions that are made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(E) = EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets goals of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(M) = MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans the activities of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) = ADVISOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides what will be done and when it is done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(O) = OFFICERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls and allocates the organization's resources (money, time, talent, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(M) = MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEMBER-CENTERED GROUPS vs LEADER-CENTERED GROUPS

#### BASIC PHILOSOPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER-CENTERED GROUPS</th>
<th>LEADER-CENTERED GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group serves to develop each individual member's abilities and to meet individual needs.</td>
<td>Leaders have the abilities needed for the group to operate efficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members are able and willing to make decisions and plan and conduct group activities.</td>
<td>Leaders are selected to control and plan activities for the group to carry out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership comes from the members of the group. Different members assume leadership as the situation changes.</td>
<td>Leadership rests only with the elected officers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### METHODS OF OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER-CENTERED GROUPS</th>
<th>LEADER-CENTERED GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members formulate and decide upon the group goals.</td>
<td>Leaders formulate and present group goals to the members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual members initiate and present ideas to the group for consideration.</td>
<td>Leaders select the best ideas and present them to the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority for group decisions rests with the members.</td>
<td>Leaders make decisions for the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members take initiative and assume leadership for planning and conducting group activities.</td>
<td>Leaders initiate and plan group activities and then assign work to individual members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members are given opportunities to develop leadership skills.</td>
<td>Only leaders receive training to develop leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members approve the use of group resources (money, members' talents, members' time, etc.).</td>
<td>Leaders decide on the use of group resources (money, members' talents and time, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each member has an opportunity to select and participate in various group activities.</td>
<td>Leaders select members to participate in activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Listed below are a variety of situations that might be found in an FFA chapter. Delegation is clearly advisable (yes) in some situations, while it would not be advisable to delegate (no) in others. Some situations are not directly related to the issue of delegation (does not apply). Read each of the following statements and select the most appropriate answer.

1. The task is difficult.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

2. Mistakes will be held against the officers.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

3. The officers enjoy doing the task even though others could do it.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

4. The task requires experience that the officers do not have.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

5. The task is time consuming and must be completed in a short time.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

6. The task occurs at the same time as several other activities.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

7. The task will be visible to the public.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

8. The task is a part of the officers' duties as outlined by the FFA manual.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

9. Members lack experience conducting the task.
   __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply

10. The task has important implications for the chapter.
    __ yes   __ no   __ does not apply
CHOOSING THE DELEGATEE

Directions: Delegate the following tasks to the most appropriate committee listed below.

SOE = Supervised Occupational Experiences
SCH = Scholarship
REC = Recreation
COP = Cooperation
CMS = Community Service
ALM = Alumni Relations
LED = Leadership
ESC = Earnings and Savings

SOE = Supervised Occupational Experiences
SCH = Scholarship
REC = Recreation
COP = Cooperation
CMS = Community Service
ALM = Alumni Relations
LED = Leadership
ESC = Earnings and Savings
SNA = State and National
PRC = Public Relations
ACT = Administration
ALM = Alumni Relations Activities
COM = Conduct of Meetings
SPC = A Special Committee

1. Secure a host family for an international student participating in the WEA program.
2. Conduct a members' project tour.
3. Assist the Jaycees in parking cars at the county fair.
4. Distribute food baskets at Thanksgiving.
5. Select a monthly star chapter member.
6. Write a chapter history.
7. Set up a telephone chain to keep all members informed of upcoming events.
8. Select programs for all FFA meetings.
9. Develop a phone and mailing list of former chapter members.
10. Sponsor a softball tournament.
11. Coordinate travel plans to the National FFA Convention.
12. Secure the use of a highway billboard for FFA Week.
13. Design a special t-shirt for chapter members.
15. Conduct the annual fruit sale.
16. Develop and administer a member participation point system.
EFFECTIVE DELEGATION =

PLANNING + ASSIGNING + EVALUATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Task Details</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback Desired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING - preparation for delegation.

What - the tasks that are appropriate for delegation.

When - the schedule needed for completion of the delegated task.

Who - the appropriate committee and/or individuals for the task.

ASSIGNING - the actual process of delegating a task and providing members with information needed to complete the task.

Motivation - the encouragement of members to accept responsibility for a task.

Task Details - the information needed for completion of the delegated task.

Authority - the right to make decisions and take actions for completion of the delegated task.

Feedback Desired - the check points set for the delegated task.

EVALUATING - determining the success or failure of the delegation.

Results - outcome of the delegated task.

Process - the steps followed during delegation.

Involvement - the participation of members in decisions related to the delegated task.
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Greetings:

Enclosed are the instruments for the project on member participation and delegation. We appreciate your assistance in this project. Please read through all of the instructions on the next page. The instruments need to be returned by Friday, January 21, 1983.

The following questionnaires are enclosed:

a. Member Questionnaire - (Green) To be completed by all members of your sophomore vocational agriculture class.

b. Officer Questionnaire - (Yellow) To be completed by all FFA chapter officers.

c. Advisor Questionnaire - (Orange) To be completed by the FFA advisor.

d. Chapter Productivity Rating - (White) To be completed by the FFA President.

e. Demographic Information - (White) To be completed by the FFA advisor.

Thank you.

Anna Beth Neason
Graduate Research Assistant

Richard I. Carter
Associate Professor

ABN/smw
TEACHER INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING QUESTIONNAIRES

Step 1. READ THE FOLLOWING PREPARED STATEMENT TO YOUR STUDENTS

Our FFA chapter has been selected to participate in a research project to evaluate members' involvement in FFA chapters.

Your responses to this questionnaire are important to the total project. Your responses will be kept confidential and will be combined with all responses from our chapter. Your grade will NOT be affected by your participation in this project.

DO NOT put your name, social security number, or any other identification on the answer sheet. Enter all answers on your answer sheet using a #2 pencil. Please be sure you complete all items on the questionnaire.

Step 2: Hand out computer answer sheets to students. Students are to use #2 pencils to complete the answer sheets.

Step 3: Have students enter the school number found in the upper right hand corner of the answer sheet in columns K, L, M under the special codes section of the answer sheet.

Step 4: Hand out the green questionnaires. Have students read the directions for each part of the questionnaire. All answers are to be entered on the answer sheet, not on the questionnaire itself.

Step 5: Have the officers complete the Officer Questionnaire (yellow).

a. Read the above prepared statement to your officers.

b. Have officers enter the school number found in the upper right hand corner of their answer sheet in columns K, L, and M under the special codes section of their answer sheet.

b. Have them read the instructions for each section and then complete the questionnaire.

Step 6: Have the FFA president complete the Chapter Activeness Rating (white).

Step 7: Complete the Advisor Questionnaire (orange). Be sure to enter the school number in the special codes section of your answer sheet.

Step 8: Place all answer sheets and the two white pages in the manila envelope. Attach the enclosed return address label to the envelope before mailing.

RETURN DEADLINE FOR THIS INFORMATION IS FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1983.

Your response is important. Thank you for your help.
The following items describe characteristics of chapters; they do not judge whether the characteristic is good or bad.

**DIRECTIONS:**

1. Read each statement carefully.
2. Using the scale below, rate the extent to which you feel the statement describes your chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You may use any number on the scale, but select only ONE number for each item. A "1" would indicate you strongly disagree that this statement is descriptive of your chapter, a "4" would mean that you neither agree nor disagree with the statement, and a "7" would indicate you strongly agree with the statement.

3. For each statement, blacken the number you wish to use in the appropriate blank on the answer sheet provided.

1. Each activity conducted relates to the goals of the chapter.
2. New individuals feel welcome in the chapter.
3. Members try to persuade others to remain in the chapter.
4. The officers are well liked by the chapter members.
5. The chapter is committed to achieve its goals.
6. Members like to work with other chapter members.
7. Members like to work on chapter activities.
8. Members readily volunteer for activities.
9. Members support the officers' decisions.
10. Members feel pressured to participate in chapter activities.
11. The officers follow through with their responsibilities.
12. Members try to recruit new members for the chapter.
13. Eligible members plan to join the chapter again next year.
14. Officers initiate most of the chapter's actions and decisions.
15. Members are willing to defend the chapter.
16. Chapter discussions drag on too long.
17. Members of the chapter work well together.
18. Most chapter activities are well planned and carried out smoothly.
19. Members can depend on each other for help.
20. The chapter members are enthusiastic about their work.
21. Members assume responsibility in the chapter.
22. Business meetings are conducted efficiently.
23. Members associate with other chapter members outside of chapter activities.
24. Members allow other activities to interfere with their participation in the chapter.
25. The chapter has a reputation for getting work done.
26. Members are recognized for their contributions to the chapter.
27. The chapter evaluates each activity.
28. Committees understand their responsibilities.
29. Members feel that their efforts contribute to the chapter's success.
30. The chapter conducts too many activities.
31. Members are required to abide by rules of the chapter.
32. Members hesitate to express conflicting opinions.
33. Members feel that chapter membership is worthwhile.
34. Members have an opportunity to get to know most of the other members.
35. Most members take an active part in chapter activities.
Questions 36, 37, and 38 describe different situations that could exist in an FFA chapter. Select the ONE statement under each situation that best describes your FFA chapter. Darken the corresponding number on your answer sheet.

36. SITUATION A

1. Members and officers will work on chapter activities if they have nothing else to do.

2. Most members choose other activities which conflict with chapter activities. The officers do the work of the chapter.

3. The officers and a small group of members work to achieve the chapter's goals. The rest of the members tend to choose other activities which conflict with chapter activities.

4. The members and officers are committed to achieving the chapter's goals. Few activities take priority over chapter activities.

5. All members and officers are highly committed to the chapter. Members seldom let other activities take priority over chapter activities.

37. SITUATION B

1. A few chapter activities are conducted; they do not relate to the program of activities.

2. Several chapter activities are conducted, but they do not relate to the program of activities.

3. Several of the activities listed in the program of activities are completed.

4. A majority of the activities listed in the program of activities are completed.

5. All of the activities listed in the program of activities are completed.
38. SITUATION C

1. Members are dissatisfied with their membership in the chapter. There is no cooperation or friendship among the members.

2. Members are indifferent about their membership in the chapter. Some members are friends, but there is little cooperation among them.

3. Members are satisfied with their membership. There is disagreement and a lack of cooperation in the chapter even though many of the members are friends.

4. Members are satisfied with their membership in the chapter. Although there is disagreement among the members, they cooperate together and are friends.

5. Members are very glad to be members of the chapter. There is seldom any disagreement among the members. They always cooperate together and are friends.
DIRECTIONS: Using the scale given below, answer each of the following questions about you and your chapter. Darken the corresponding answer on your answer sheet.

1  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |
---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Usually | Always |

43. Do the committees make work decisions for themselves?
44. Do you spend time doing things for members which they could do for themselves?
45. Do you make decisions that committees could handle?
46. Do you have difficulty meeting deadlines on chapter activities?
47. Do you feel you must be informed of committees' detailed activities?
48. Do you overrule committee decisions?
49. Do you feel chapter members have the ability to assume responsibilities?
50. Are you utilizing members as much as possible?
51. Do you prepare others to plan and conduct chapter activities?
52. Are committees allowed to solve problems for themselves?
53. Do committees consistently achieve the desired results?
54. Do committees seek or accept responsibilities?
55. Do committees work without constant supervision?
56. Does the same group of people plan and conduct chapter activities?
57. Do committees organize their own meetings?
### CHAPTER ACTIVENESS SCALE

**DIRECTIONS:** To be completed by the chapter president.

Please indicate which of the following activities your chapter has completed since July 1, 1982. Circle the "1" (yes) if your chapter has completed the activity and circle the "2" (no) if your chapter has not completed the activity.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Chapter sponsored an activity that helped beginning students develop their SOE programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Chapter sponsored an activity that improved students' SOE records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Chapter sponsored a cooperative sales activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Chapter cooperated with another school or community group, or FFA chapter in conducting an activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Chapter conducted a community service project or program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. All chapter officers received training for their positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Chapter held at least five regular chapter meetings this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. All standing committees meet on a regular basis and report at meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. The Executive committee meets at least once a month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. The chapter sponsored an activity to encourage scholarship among the members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Chapter had an article in the local newspaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. The chapter has conducted an activity to encourage 100% membership in FFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Chapter sent representatives to the National FFA Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. A chapter budget was developed for the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. The chapter conducted an activity to involve former FFA members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DIRECTIONS: Please provide the requested information for each item below. Enclose this sheet with the answer sheets when you return the questionnaires.

CHAPTER INFORMATION:

1. How many students are enrolled in vo-ag? _____

2. How many members are in the FFA chapter? _____

3. How many standing committees are used by the FFA chapter? _____

4. Are all members assigned to a standing committee? __ yes __ no

5. Are all vo-ag students required to join FFA? __yes __ no

6. How many hours did you spend with your officers on chapter participation and delegation? _____

7. How active is your chapter compared to other chapters in the state. Mark your response with an "X" on the scale below.

   0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 99
   |________|________|________|________|________|________|________|________|
   Extremely Inactive Average Extremely Active

TEACHER INFORMATION:

8. How many years have you been teaching vocational agriculture? _____

9. How many years have you taught at your present school? _____

10. Please rate the overall quality of the resource packet on effective delegation. Mark your response with an "X" on the scale below at your rating.

    0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 99
    |________|________|________|________|________|________|________|________|
    Not Usable Average Excellent

11. Please write any comments you have about the packet on delegation below or on the back of this sheet.
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DIRECTIONS: Please provide the requested information for each item below. Enclose this sheet with the answer sheets when you return the questionnaires.

CHAPTER INFORMATION:

1. How many students are enrolled in vo-ag? ____

2. How many members are in the FFA chapter? ____

3. How many standing committees are used by the FFA chapter? ____

4. Are all members assigned to a standing committee?  ____ yes  ____ no

5. Are all vo-ag students required to join FFA?  ____yes  ____ no

6. How many hours did you spend with your officers on chapter participation and delegation? ____

7. How active is your chapter compared to other chapters in the state. Mark your response with an "X" on the scale below.

    0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 99

    [____|____|____|____|____|____|____|____|____|____|____]

    Extremely Inactive Average Extremely Active

TEACHER INFORMATION:

8. How many years have you been teaching vocational agriculture? ____

9. How many years have you taught at your present school? ____
CHAPTER ACTIVENESS SCALE
(Jury Rating)

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY: Please rate the degree of importance you would attach to each item below using the following scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
Little or Average Utmost
No Importance Importance Importance

In evaluating the productivity of a chapter, how important are each of the following activities?

1. Chapter sponsored an activity that helped beginning students develop their SOE programs. 8.00
2. Chapter sponsored an activity that improved students' SOE records. 10.00
3. Chapter sponsored a cooperative sales activity. 9.33
4. Chapter cooperated with another school or community group, or FFA chapter in conducting an activity. 8.00
5. Chapter conducted a community service project or program. 10.33
6. All chapter officers received training for their positions. 10.00
7. Chapter held at least five regular chapter meetings this year. 11.00
8. All standing committees meet on a regular basis and report at meetings. 10.00
9. The Executive committee meets at least once a month. 10.67
10. The chapter sponsored an activity to encourage scholarship among the members. 7.67
11. Chapter had an article in the local newspaper. 10.33
12. The chapter has conducted an activity to encourage 100% membership in FFA. 8.33
13. Chapter sent representatives to the National FFA Convention. 8.67
14. A chapter budget was developed for the year. 7.33
15. The chapter conducted an activity to involve former FFA members. 6.67

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!!
APPENDIX D.

LIST OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY
### Schools and Advisors Participating in the Study

#### Packet only Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong-Ringsted Community</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Harvey Work, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford Community</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Gordon Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corning Community</td>
<td>Corning</td>
<td>Wayne Kordick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham Community</td>
<td>Earlham</td>
<td>James E. Gillespie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estherville Community</td>
<td>Estherville</td>
<td>Larry Stine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley Community</td>
<td>Kellerton</td>
<td>Richard Schwalbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Community</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>George Freese, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie Center</td>
<td>Guthrie Center</td>
<td>Jimmy Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanawha</td>
<td>Kanawha</td>
<td>Howard Drevs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley-Pierson</td>
<td>Kingsley</td>
<td>Kieth Byers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Community</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Ronald Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montezuma Community</td>
<td>Montezuma</td>
<td>Ronald Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampton Community</td>
<td>New Hampton</td>
<td>George Freidhof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postville Community</td>
<td>Postville</td>
<td>Gary White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riceville Community</td>
<td>Riceville</td>
<td>James Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Comm.</td>
<td>Sloan</td>
<td>Gary Heineman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Community</td>
<td>Thornburg</td>
<td>Michael L. Streigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly-Shell Rock Community</td>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>David Carlson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inservice Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audubon Community</td>
<td>Audubon</td>
<td>Tad Mueller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; M Community</td>
<td>Massena</td>
<td>Vernon E. Luers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community</td>
<td>DeWitt</td>
<td>Daniel Smicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Decatur Community</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Lewis L. Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central (Lee) Community</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Robert Dodds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delwood Community</td>
<td>Delmar</td>
<td>Mahlon Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griswold Community</td>
<td>Griswold</td>
<td>C. Tony Hunolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Valley Community</td>
<td>Marengo</td>
<td>Andrew Rowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake View-Auburn Community</td>
<td>Lake View</td>
<td>Dennis Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurens-Marathon Community</td>
<td>Laurens</td>
<td>Joe Pedersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashua Community</td>
<td>Nashua</td>
<td>Diane Rickels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odebolt-Arthur Community</td>
<td>Odebolt</td>
<td>Tom Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer Consolidated</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>Bill Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell-Swaledale Community</td>
<td>Rockwell</td>
<td>Dean Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Liberty Community</td>
<td>West Liberty</td>
<td>Richard Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Marshall Community</td>
<td>State Center</td>
<td>Norman Wagoner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron-Westfield Community</td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>John Ziniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algon Community</td>
<td>Algon</td>
<td>Bradley Greiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarion Community</td>
<td>Clarion</td>
<td>Wes Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon Rapids Community</td>
<td>Coon Rapids</td>
<td>Howard Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddyville Community</td>
<td>Eddyville</td>
<td>Donald Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Community</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Keith Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest City Community</td>
<td>Forest City</td>
<td>Larry Vold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manson Community</td>
<td>Manson</td>
<td>John Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Community</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>Gerald Galbraith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Ayr Community</td>
<td>Mount Ayr</td>
<td>Jack Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie City High School</td>
<td>Prairie City</td>
<td>Becky Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Valley Community</td>
<td>Rock Valley</td>
<td>Mark Polich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Page Community</td>
<td>College Springs</td>
<td>Jim Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Community</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Ronald Fransen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinton Community</td>
<td>Vinton</td>
<td>Duane Fisher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COPYRIGHT PERMISSION FOR USE OF LEADER-GROUP INTERACTIONS MODEL
April 13, 1983

Ms. Anna Beth Neason
201 Curtiss Hall
Agricultural Education Department
Iowa State University
Ames IA 50011

Dear Ms. Neason:

We are pleased to grant permission, without charge, for you to use in your Ph.D. dissertation (one-time use only) the table on page 122 of our publication CROSSCURRENTS IN LEADERSHIP, edited by James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson. Please give the following credit:


Best wishes,

Sincerely,

Mary Hastings
Assistant to the Director