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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

From contemplation one may become wise, but knowledge comes only from study (Newton, 1921, p. 805).

This study was conceived with the hope that it would make a contribution to the field of knowledge dealing with delegation of leadership. It consisted of providing training in leadership and delegation through the use of a resource packet to 4-H youth who were attending two leadership camps. It was an experimental study, utilizing random assignment of youth to subgroups. Adult advisors who provided the training were themselves trained, before the start of the camps, in how to use the resource packet.

The assessment of the effectiveness of the resource packet was multi-faceted in order to include various factors that might be related to delegation. Individual participation was rated as was camper attitude toward delegation. A questionnaire assessing camper perception of group achievement included subscales measuring group drive, cohesiveness, and productivity. Another measure of productivity was provided by panels of community board members who evaluated group presentations at the conclusion of the camps. Demographic data and leadership styles were also considered as factors that might be related to delegation of leadership.

The initial impetus for the study arose from concerns both with tasks of voluntary groups and also with socialization needs of members of groups. A look at the tasks of voluntary groups ascertained the importance of such groups in contemporary society. For example, farm
commodity, community betterment, and youth groups have worked toward improvement of health, education, and welfare of the citizens of rural communities. They have planned and conducted activities intended to benefit those around them while enhancing their own development.

In recent years, however, planning and conducting of activities have become increasingly difficult for the leaders of such groups as their time commitments have changed. There has been a trend toward rural people holding an outside job while also farming, and this has decreased the amount of time they could give to an organization such as 4-H. Women who worked outside the home continued to volunteer but needed to limit the number of hours they spent (Whaples and Bordelon, 1983). A higher percentage of youth has been working as well as going to school. All these trends indicate a decrease in the time a leader can devote to a voluntary organization. Yet as government funds were cut, the need for voluntary organizations continued to grow along with the need for effective leadership. Delegation of leadership has been a method with potential for increased sharing of leadership responsibilities and a spreading out of time commitments.

Another aspect of leadership delegation was related to the socialization of the members. This study examined the relationship of the effectiveness of the groups to the participation of the members. Tai (1968) found that as the participation of 4-H'ers increased, their satisfaction with the group increased. Elected officers who divided the authority and responsibility for completing the activities of the
group among committees and individuals were allowing members to increase their participation and involvement.

An assessment of the effectiveness of the resource packet should help to answer some questions about leadership training for 4-H youth. Hopefully, the study will lead to both knowledge and wisdom concerning delegation. Subsequent sections will set the stage for the review.

Statement of the Problem

One of the nine objectives of the 4-H program as listed in the 4-H Update was related directly to the learning and practicing of leadership skills (USDA, 1983). In a subheading of the objective, developing skills to assume elected and appointed leadership positions in groups was specifically mentioned.

Training grounds for developing leadership skills have been club officer positions, junior leadership projects, and county, area, and state councils. However, the most concentrated leadership training has occurred at the state leadership camps held each summer. These camps have assumed that leadership can be taught and does not need to be an inborn characteristic. They have also assumed that leadership is a process in which all the members of a group may participate, rather than a characteristic belonging to just one person.

The materials used to teach leadership at the camp have been in use since 1976 and have never been formally compared to any others. It was thought possible that new materials would be effective in teaching leadership. However, proven materials to teach leadership and specifically leadership delegation have been scarce. Handy (1976,
p. 426) said, "Delegation is one of those topics that has fascinated the practitioner and those who write for him, but has been largely ignored by the researchers."

The set of materials tested in this study was a resource packet developed by Anna Beth Neason and Richard I. Carter as part of an Iowa State University Experiment Station study. They were tested with FFA groups as part of a doctoral study (Neason, 1983). Future testing may prove them to be useful with adult groups as well as with youth and in urban as well as rural settings.

This study attempted to answer the research problem: Was the resource packet effective in teaching delegation of leadership to 4-H youth? Subproblems were: How were the characteristics of youth related to measures of group effectiveness? How was delegation related to measures of group effectiveness?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to assess the effectiveness of a resource packet designed to teach youth to delegate leadership. Specific objectives were to:

1. Identify characteristics of youth as to:
   a. sex
   b. grade
   c. activity level
   d. pretest leadership styles.

2. Determine effectiveness of packet by comparing subgroups using the following measures:
a. participation
b. tendency toward delegation
c. Posttest leadership styles
d. group presentation ratings
e. group effectiveness
   (1) drive
   (2) cohesiveness
   (3) productivity
   (4) overall.

3. Determine if relationships exist among the following:
   a. characteristics of youth and posttest leadership styles
   b. individual tendency toward delegation and group effectiveness
   c. individual participation and tendency toward delegation
   d. individual participation and group presentation ratings.

Null Hypotheses

There is no significant difference (α=.05) among experimental and control groups in Camp 1 and Camp 2 as to:

1. Participation
2. Tendency toward delegation
3. Posttest leadership styles
4. Group presentation ratings
5. Assessment of group effectiveness.
Need for the Study

The primary need for the study was for research on delegation with voluntary youth groups. Related needs were for research on delegation training and for training sessions utilizing realistic situations and measurements of behavioral change.

The primary need for research on delegation was reinforced by Stogdill (1974, p. 423), who asserted "There is a notable lack of research that tests the effects of training in different styles of leadership." McCall and Lombardo (1978) also saw the need and included delegation in their discussion of neglected variables and concepts in leadership research.

The related need for research on training, specifically research in which group achievement is examined, was advocated by Stogdill.

The real criterion of the effect of training, then, is whether or not it results in change in the performance or response of the group supervised by the leader. In terms of this criterion, few studies have been designed to measure the effects of training (Stogdill, 1974, p. 189).

Fiedler and Chemers (1974) concurred that effectiveness was the most important research question of the day. In this study, effectiveness was measured by group achievement using the concepts of drive, cohesiveness, and productivity. Schriesheim et al. (1979) mentioned drive and cohesiveness as variables that have been largely ignored. Bass (1981) agreed that group drive had been neglected. He proposed a search for the relationships between the concepts of drive, motivation, performance, and structure or delegation.
Another related need was for realistic evaluation of materials and training. Leadership training programs have traditionally been evaluated by attitude change or knowledge change. These summative types of evaluation neglected the study of behavioral changes. Argyris (1976) saw the need for true-to-life training sessions and materials that would help change the behaviors of leaders and their groups.

In summary, leadership delegation with voluntary youth groups was ripe for research. Others in the field had voiced a need for the study of delegation and had suggested specific measurements and training.

Background Information

Iowa State University, a land-grant college founded in 1868 under the Morrill Act of 1862, has been engaged in the three basic functions of a land-grant college -- teaching, research, and service. The service part mandated the sharing of the resources of the University with the people in the state. 4-H has been the primary youth-serving program of the Cooperative Extension Service. Leadership development has been over the years an important part of the program of the Extension Service. A week-long leadership conference has been held twice each summer since 1949 at the Iowa 4-H Camping Center located on the Des Moines River northwest of Madrid, Iowa.

Delegates have come from varied backgrounds with most being 4-H'ers. Delegates were expected to be at least 16 years old and to have completed at least their junior year of high school. It was felt that delegates
between their junior and senior years in high school would have opportunities to use the training in leadership positions in youth groups upon their return home.

In 1983, participants spent five days at camp, from 10:00 a.m. on Monday until 3:00 p.m. on Friday. Training occurred both formally and informally, and evaluation also was both formal and informal. This study focused on the formal evaluation and was the first such evaluation since 1969. Baker (1969) completed a master's thesis in Extension Education on changes in knowledge and attitudes toward leadership of 4-H members attending this camp and found that there was a high significant difference in the delegates' knowledge pretest scores and both the posttest and follow-up test scores. The conclusion was that the leadership camp was an effective method of teaching leadership.

The value of the camp has not been tested since as part of a master's or doctoral study. The teaching method underwent a major change in 1976 when the current emphasis on community leadership began, and this study will help to evaluate whether training on delegation might replace all or part of the currently used community leadership materials.

**Definition of Terms**

**Leadership:** The process of interpersonal influence which moves a group from assessment of its needs and strengths toward attainment of objectives and goals. An important aspect of leadership is initiation and maintenance of group structure.

**Youth:** Young people attending leadership camp.
**Camp:** Week-long workshop held at the state 4-H camp each summer; designed to teach community leadership skills to youth.

**Advisors:** Adults, both volunteer and extension staff, who spent the week of camp living and working with youth.

**Packet:** A set of instructional materials designed to help advisors teach youth how to delegate leadership.

**Group effectiveness:** Extent to which group achieved its goals as measured by productivity, cohesiveness, and drive.

**Group productivity:** Level of goal achievement attained by group.

**Group cohesiveness:** Attraction between group and its individual members.

**Group drive:** Motivation and commitment of group members to attain group goals.

**Delegation:** Sharing of leadership role by giving responsibility with authority for planning and carrying out of group tasks to members of the group.

**Subgroups:** Experimental and control groups in each of the two camps.

**Assumptions**

1. A group can be described in terms of the delegation taking place within the group.
2. Members of a group perceive and learn.
3. Learning has an effect on people's actions.
4. People vary in ways perhaps as yet unthought of and unmeasured.
5. A person in his relations with others desires to increase his personal satisfaction.
6. All persons seek social approval rather than social disapproval.

7. All groups and organizations generate an informal prestige system.

8. Personal characteristics can be changed.

9. People can be taught to delegate.

Summary

Groups can be a powerful, creative force, accomplishing feats no individual can do alone. Agricultural people have traditionally been rugged individualists, very proud of doing things themselves and reluctant to accept the yoke of a group. Yet, if they are to make changes, they need to use the force of the group. Hopefully, this study will point out one way to harness that force.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research findings and opinions of other authors formed the basis for this study; their theories and interpretation helped to set the direction of this research. The relevant research was reviewed in three categories: delegation of leadership, leadership training for 4-H youth, and methods of assessing effectiveness.

Delegation of Leadership

Delegation as a leadership style is one of the newer concepts in leadership theory. The evolution of leadership theory has gone from an emphasis on individual leadership traits to a recognition of the importance of group process and interaction.

One of the first and most famous studies of leadership styles was one conducted with groups of young boys by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939). They compared democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire styles of leadership. For years, the democratic style was considered to be the best even though the findings on group productivity were not clear.

The Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) study was important because it focused on participation of group members in decisions of the group. Early twentieth century studies were concerned only with the leader, and the "Great Man" theories manifested that concern.

Chiefs, kings, leaders, and other great men have been written about since written history began. Bass (1981) stated that although the word "leadership" did not appear until the first half of the
nineteenth century in British writing, "leader" was in the English language as early as 1300. Other languages have had similar words meaning simply chief or king.

Chiefs, kings, leaders, or whatever -- early historical figures were outstanding mainly because of military prowess. Although it was difficult to research their leadership qualities, biographies and autobiographies were used in descriptive research to outline the early Great Man theory. For example, in the fourth century, B.C., a Greek historian named Xenophon wrote about the leadership abilities of Cyrus, the Great (translation by Dakyns, 1914). Peter Drucker (1954), a recognized management specialist, thought Xenophon's book "Cyropediae" was an excellent book about leadership. Cyrus, at the height of his conquests, controlled most of the middle East. Dakyns (1914) reported that people who had never seen Cyrus and never expected to meet him were nevertheless delighted to be under his rule. Cyrus possessed the traits of sociability, popularity, and cooperativeness that researchers in the early twentieth century found to correlate very highly with leadership (Stogdill, 1974). The so-called trait theories of leadership evolved from the desire of others to emulate great men.

Shortly after the Great Man theory and the related trait theories were advanced, researchers began to wonder if environmental factors such as the time, place, and circumstances were related to the emergence of a leader. The assumption arose that leadership was a function of the occasion rather than residing in the qualities of the individual. Thus, a whole set of environmental studies appeared, mainly during the
years 1909 to 1941 (Stogdill, 1974). For example, Schneider (1937) found that the number of great military leaders in England was proportional to the number of English wars.

The next theories to appear were the personal-situational theories. They were the first indication of an interest in the participation of group members. These theories combined Great Man and environmental theories rather than considering one or the other as the only source of leadership. The personal-situational or interactive approach became popular after World War II and was studied as late as 1964 (Stogdill, 1974). The personal-situational advocates not only looked at the interaction of leadership traits and environmental factors, they also looked at the nature of the group and at leadership as a relationship between group members.

An outgrowth of this was research on task related versus relationship related behaviors of group leaders. Fiedler and Chemers (1976) found that in very favorable or in very unfavorable situations, a leader who was task-oriented helped to increase group productivity. In situations that were moderately favorable, a leader who was relationship-oriented was usually more effective. That is, task motivated leaders tended to perform best at the extremes of situational favorableness, while relationship motivated leaders performed best in the middle. Other researchers also studied task and relationships. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) perceived that situations with high task and low relationship needs required an authoritarian or telling kind of leadership. A high task and high relationship situation required
a selling style of leadership; a high relationship and low task, a participative leadership style; and a low relationship, low task, a delegative style. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) felt that when the group members were high in maturity, willing and able to take responsibility, delegation was the appropriate style. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) delineated four effective leadership styles -- selling, telling, participating, and delegating. The leader who used the telling style identified the problem, considered alternative solutions, chose one, and told followers what to do. The group members did not participate in decision-making. In the selling style, the leader also made the decision, but instead of simply announcing it, tried to persuade group members to accept it by emphasizing benefits. The participative leader gave the group a chance to influence the decision from the beginning and the leader and group shared in selecting a solution. The delegating style, in contrast, assumed that individuals and committees were capable of making decisions and responsible enough to implement them. The leader participated in the discussion of alternative solutions and then delegated the problem to members of the group.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) averred that all of these styles could be effective styles, that leaders often used a combination of styles, and that the style to be used depended upon a set of circumstances. Delegation was an appropriate choice for voluntary groups such as 4-H groups, because it was to be used with established groups in which the leader trusted the members and considered them capable. It
encouraged the participation and involvement of members and helped to train future leaders for the group.

The next theories to appear were the interaction-expectancy theories, the humanistic theories, and the exchange theories. There was a lot of overlapping and these last three theories all dealt with social interactions in groups. The interaction-expectancy theory suggested that what was likely to happen in a group depended a great deal on what had happened before. Continued interactions shaped the pattern of what was expected. Humanistic theories built on this idea, but in general had their main concern with providing freedom for individuals to reach their goals while at the same time maintaining organizational effectiveness. McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y studies suggested that organizations that treated workers as responsible and loyal would maximize production. Wynne and Hunsaker (1975) disagreed as did several others because they found that productivity was not related to good relationships.

Recent leadership theories included social exchange theories which supported the view that members and leaders gave services to the group and in return received benefits. Behavioral, perceptive, and cognitive theories were the newest leadership theories. All of the new theories emphasized interaction and participation of group members.

From the oldest to the newest, McCall and Lombardo (1978) traced the path of leadership research beginning with the Lewin, Lippitt, and White 1939 study. Stogdill (1974) and the revision of his volume
by Bass (1981) presented comprehensive treatments of leadership research from earliest times to the present. The Lewin, Lippitt, and White study popularized the term laissez-faire. Since then, other terms have come into vogue such as great man, traits, situational critique, leadership styles, functional leadership, leaderless leadership, bureaucratic leadership, charismatic leadership, group-centered, reality-centered, leadership by objective, contingency model, situational, transactional, interpersonal accommodation, path-goal, initiating structure, and consideration. The models most related to this study were the situational and contingency models because they emphasized involvement of members. Delegation was a way of aiding that involvement.

Interest in delegation as a leadership style is relatively new in voluntary groups, but the business field has long been interested in delegation. Zander (1977) declared that as long ago as 1959, managers were developing an increasing interest and skill in participative management styles. For that reason, an Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) search using the business management data base was done at the Iowa State University Library.

Businesses have been interested in delegation as a method of helping to reach the business objective of profit. Business management theory as outlined by Mackenzie (1969) recognized five functions: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling. Delegation was a subheading under "directing" and entailed assigning responsibility and exacting accountability for results.
Voluntary organizations have also been interested in delegation as a help to realization of goals. Informal groups such as 4-H, FFA, and agricultural commodity groups have all been interested in a strong officer and committee system because it has facilitated the sharing of the work involved with group tasks. Relationship benefits could occur as well. Beal et al. (1962) found that the more a member participated, the more favorable were his attitudes toward the group and the greater his feeling of concern for and identity with the group. Beal et al. (1962) also found that having representatives make decisions or getting a careful "sell job" on a decision was not a substitute for the members actually participating in the decision.

Not everyone agreed that delegation was the answer to a group's problems. The main objection was that it took too much of the group's meeting time to set up a delegative system. Delegation also seemed to be harder to do in very small or very large groups. Carnes (1980) found that committees were often ridiculed. He said:

Membership on a committee is almost sufficient in itself to cause ripples of laughter over 'What kind of camel is your committee going to invent?' (Carnes, 1980, p. 61).

Part of the problem with committees may have been that committees have gotten the difficult problems, the controversial matters, the items that have been neither clearly defined nor easily resolved. Perhaps wrong committees have been appointed, wrong sized, or with the wrong members or leadership. Carnes (1980) suggested that action committees needed to be quite small and made up of supporters of the
action, while committees for investigation and recommendation needed to be quite large and include every possible opinion.

Researchers agreed that delegation was a method of securing participation by group members and had some specific advantages. For example, Campbell (1956) found that subordinates regarded as better leaders those supervisors who delegated more freely. Baumgartel (1957) studied laissez-faire, participative, and directive leadership with research and development groups and found that the researchers ranked higher in 13 out of 14 categories when they worked under participative leadership as compared to laissez-faire or directive leadership.

One problem with participation of members was that there tended to be less member participation as groups became larger; however, Indik (1965) found this was not inherent in size and might be avoided through control of organizational processes. The communication linkage was found to be the most common problem in delegating effectively. Problems with communication in large organizations reduced the level of interpersonal attraction among members. Indik (1965) recommended compensating for this by taking steps to insure high rates of internal communication.

Lack of communication and low member participation may be detrimental to a group. Ley (1966) found a high correlation, .76, between the rate of turnover and the subjects' rating of their foremen as authoritarian.

Several writers extolled the advantages of member participation and felt it was worth the extra time it took. Stogdill (1959) followed
this line of thinking, and agreed that attempts to reach consensus were not a meaningless pastime. Consensus legitimized the role system, helped members know what behavior was expected, and helped define how free they were to make suggestions and initiate actions.

A paradox in defining the areas of freedom was found in a study by Bovard (1951). It suggested that members of participating groups had paradoxically more freedoms and also more restraints than leader-led groups. They were more free at the beginning of group interaction because they knew the boundaries of behavior. After a period of time, they were more likely to conform to group norms because they cared about the opinion of others. Leader-led groups were not informed about group expectations at the beginning of the group interaction and so they were more cautious. After a period of time, they still did not know how the rest of the group felt and so they were more free to do as they pleased.

Some researchers investigated the relative status of people within the group. Mabry and Barnes (1980) found some evidence that those who interacted more frequently attained higher status, achieved greater influence, and were assigned more leadership roles by other members.

Hoffman et al. (1965) examined influence and participation with 75 subjects using an "assembly problem" and found that the more a member participated in the discussion, the more influence he attempted and the more he actually had. A finding related to the research method he used was that timed clock verbal participation correlated highly with solution-related times the subject talked. Total time correlated
with the total acts was .85 and percent time correlated with percent acts was .76. A finding contrary to what might be expected was that subject satisfaction was not found to be related to quality of solution. Satisfaction was, however, directly related to the influence people exercised over decisions.

Not every study gave positive marks to participation. Fox (1957) found that participation rated superior in friendliness, group satisfaction with leaders, and capacity for changing people's minds. However, in every case it took longer for the completion of the discussion, sometimes three times as long. Another negative view was presented by Berkowitz (1953), who found that cohesiveness and satisfaction decreased when members other than the designated leader performed leadership roles. Mullen (1965) detected no difference in production among three groups that had three very different managers, one permissive, one recessive, and one authoritarian. All three groups produced approximately the same in an insurance company which was highly standardized.

Perhaps because it was highly standardized with definite work flows, policies, and procedures, it was possible for any style of manager to succeed. This might lead to the conclusion that the most important contribution delegation can bring is to provide a structure with definite jobs for each officer and each committee. Stogdill (1974) found that provision of structure to a group showed up consistently in studies as a valued attribute of leadership. Katzell et al. (1970) were representative of those who found that structure made problem
solving easier and promoted more compatibility among group members. Stogdill (1974) reported that most individuals regarded a clearly defined and stable system of positions as an advantage. Structuring goals, norms, rules, traditions, rituals was seen as a positive step. The group tasks could be subdivided into segments of related operation and specific group members could be assigned or delegated to specific positions within those segments.

Stogdill and Scott (1957) cited a report which found that it might take a while for an individual to establish his position as leader of a group and once having established that status, he became much more willing to delegate. Stogdill and Scott talked about delegation as needing to meet these two conditions: first, telling the person what he was expected to do and with whom he was expected to cooperate, and secondly, giving him a sufficient but not excessive amount of freedom. If these two conditions were met, members seemed to be able to tolerate almost anything. If they were not, there was no compensation. If a member's role was vague and undefined, his freedom of action was inhibited.

Status and delegation correlated at .35, Stogdill and Scott (1957) found. Those in higher status positions delegated more fully than those in lower status positions. Closely related to status were responsibility and authority. Stogdill and Shartle (1948) discovered that the more responsibility one had, the more he delegated and also the more authority one had, the more he delegated.
Stogdill and Scott (1957) also cited reports showing that high salary was related to delegation. Stogdill and Scott found that the higher the responsibility and authority of superiors, the less their subordinates tended to delegate, presumably because the subordinates were afraid of not knowing all the answers when needed. Delegation was sometimes a mixed blessing and in some organizations, leaders who delegated freely were described as low in consideration. When superiors were demanding, subordinates were less likely to delegate. The amount of delegation from top on down through the organization was shown to vary by size of the organization.

Participation may be related to delegation in that delegating responsibility and authority necessarily involves participation in some of the decisions. Another concept that may be related to delegation is group cohesiveness and the trust among group members that is a component of that cohesiveness. It is possible that one of the major deterrents to delegation is lack of trust in others' ability to perform tasks. Dimock (1970) considered the factors affecting group cohesion. He found that a group which worked with an outside group on a task became itself cohesive. The cohesiveness was greater than when the group competed against another group in a task, which is what is usually thought of as a builder of group spirit. At any rate, interaction and participation in planning usually increased group cohesiveness.

Not all of the studies related to cohesiveness and trust came out positively. Blake et al. (1962) found that cohesiveness was not
related to productivity. Deep et al. (1967) learned in a study of business graduate students that the well-acquainted groups did not do as well, presumably because they trusted too much; they were overconfident of each other's dependability and did not check back as often as did those in newly-formed groups. Friedlander (1967) expressed a concern that training in group dynamics didn't necessarily have a positive effect and he cited several studies. His own study produced the following results when four work groups were compared with eight similar groups which did not receive training. Over 100 subjects were involved and an analysis of co-variance was made to adjust differences before training. Those trained had greater participation, greater influence with one another, and were more effective at solving problems. The training did not increase intragroup trust and confidence, approachability of the chairmen, or the general evaluation of group meetings.

Some of the trainings specifically on delegation came up with more favorable conclusions. Maple (1977) developed a plan for teaching delegation which he called the GAP method. "G" stood for goal, obtaining a specific goal; the "A" stood for approach, developing an effective approach; and the "P" stood for plan, designing an action plan. The heart of the GAP method was the action plan, a salient feature of which was the commitment by each person involved since he or she was required to say what they would do.

Solem (1958) conducted two studies involving 456 supervisors attending a foremen's conference. He used two different management
problems. In part of the groups, the foreman made the decisions; in the other groups, he or she accepted the decision which had been delegated. When the foreman made the decision, he tended to misjudge importance of the group values and to overlook opportunities for rewarding group members. It also left the foreman unhappy because selling his decision was a lot less pleasant experience than accepting the decision which had been delegated.

Trecker and Trecker (1979) made a list of topics that needed to be covered when teaching delegation. Identified were: how many committees were enough; which things were best done by committees and which by individuals; what methods were desirable to recruit people; what time frames worked; how delegation might be evaluated or measured; how recognition might be given.

Trecker and Trecker (1979) were concerned about measuring how well the delegated job had been done. Other researchers have been concerned with measuring whether delegation has actually occurred. Beal et al. (1962) had a check list to measure delegation with such questions as "Do you often decide it is easier to do it yourself than to involve others?" and "Do you prefer to have greater control and less participation?" Stogdill (1965) developed a "RAD" scale (responsibility, authority, and delegation). Questions ranged from "I have not found it advisable to delegate authority to my assistants" to "I make decisions only when consulted in unusual circumstances, authorizing my assistants to exercise a high degree of authority and responsibility in making decisions."
McConkey (1974) observed delegation from the viewpoint of the person being delegated to and samples of his questions were, "Can I plan ahead without asking?" and "Can I act without fear of having authority revoked?" McConkey also noted some symptoms of poor delegation such as constant pressure, criticism of subordinates, slow decision-making, secrecy.

McConkey (1974) was observing delegation from the management theory angle as did most of the researchers cited. There was a paucity of material on leadership delegation in volunteer groups and particularly sparse research in leadership delegation in informal youth groups such as FFA and 4-H. Most of the studies cited related just to the populations from whence they came and extrapolating their results to volunteer youth groups would be risky. They did provide a theory base and a place from which to start.

These studies suggest that delegation is an important part of the group process and is related to the structure of the group, the participation within the group, and the amount of trust or cohesiveness. Some researchers have tried to measure delegation and some have tried to measure the teaching of delegation.

Leadership Training for 4-H Youth

Even though 4-H has been in existence for over 80 years as an informal, educational program for youth, there seems to have been very little research done on any of its programs or methods. In the 4-H Update (USDA, 1983), it was stated that 4-H has been the youth education program of the Cooperative Extension Service. Its mission has been:
... to assist youth in acquiring knowledge, developing life skills and forming attitudes that will enable them to become self-directing, productive and contributing members of society (USDA, 1983, p. 1).

Almost five million boys and girls were involved in 4-H, most of them between the ages of nine and nineteen, according to the USDA's most recent statistics (USDA, 1983). A good share of these youth participated in some kind of leadership training as a part of their 4-H experience. This was consistent with the nine objectives of the 4-H program, one of which spoke directly to learning and practicing leadership skills (USDA, 1983). Subheadings under that leadership objective were:

- Learn principles of leadership.
- Demonstrate effective participation in 4-H clubs, groups and committees.
- Demonstrate effective group decision making.
- Develop skills to effectively assume elected and appointed roles for leading groups.
- Practice leadership skills by helping others learn.
- Develop ability to communicate effectively (USDA, 1983, p. 2).

The essence of 4-H philosophy is conveyed in these objectives. The 4-H program was further defined in the 4-H curriculum design publication (USDA, 1982). Some of the salient features were its tie to the land-grant university system through the extension service, its staffing at the local level by volunteers, its focus on the development of youth and adults in family and community settings, and its support by both public and private organizations at the local, county, state, and national level.

An indicator of such support was this statement by the National Food and Energy Council president, Kenneth L. McFate:
The National Food and Energy Council encourages its member power suppliers to become actively involved in 4-H energy programs because the practical educational activities of 4-H are a vital part of helping our nation's youth mature into thoughtful leaders and wise decision-makers of tomorrow. Our members can help local Extension educators develop sound programs and wise, well-informed leaders (National 4-H News, 1983, p. 14).

The "sound programs" mentioned were voluntary learning experiences. The curriculum design publication (USDA, 1982) conceptualized the sound programs as sequenced learning experiences which were locally determined and action-oriented. The action-oriented approach was a corollary of the 4-H motto, "Learning by Doing."

This last concept may account for some of the paucity of research. The "Learning by Doing" focus perhaps has attracted professionals who have found the developing and managing of programs a higher priority than research and evaluation.

A summary of some of the research follows. Leadership training in general will be discussed first and then training specifically for 4-H youth. Researchers often found little value in training. Perhaps some of the problem lay in the large number of variables possible in a training situation. Bass declared:

Research indicates, not unexpectedly, that the effectiveness of training depends on the trainee, the trainer, composition of the training group, follow-up reinforcement and feedback and particularly on whether there is congruence between the training and organizational environment for which the trainer is being prepared (Bass, 1981, p. 598).

Fiedler and Chemers (1974) agreed that the situation and preferred style of the leader made a difference in effectiveness of training. They defined leadership training:
Leadership training essentially is leadership experience compressed in time. We distill the experiences of others into rules and guidelines and we simulate typical problems in leadership situations (Fiedler and Chemers, 1974, p. 145).

It would not be fair to prejudge leadership training without ascertaining that it had been properly researched. Stockton (1980) reviewed the literature from 1965 to 1979 and found little on training of group leaders. Since then, Lowry (1982) studied the training of school guidance personnel. She found no changes in personality characteristics or behavior after training, using a leader effectiveness and adaptability scale. Davis (1981), who studied school principals, found that leadership training which might be helpful to an extroverted personality type might be detrimental to another, introverted type.

Ellis (1982), who also used the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description scale developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1973), found no changes in leadership or effectiveness of groups after training. Perry (1980) and Kelly (1980) failed to find evidence that leadership training produced results, although Chavis (1981) did.

Argyris (1976) took a group of executives and worked with them for four years, attempting to change their leadership behavior. He felt he and his colleagues were successful, but it took many difficult sessions and Argyris's conclusion was that training in leadership -- actually making a difference in people's behavior in practical back home situations -- was very hard to accomplish.

Handy (1976) provided additional insight into why training might not be effective. He found that training often dealt with only one aspect of a much more complex situation. The leader and his or her
abilities were only one part of many forces which affected a situation.

Studies which did show some effects were usually attitudinal effects. Stogdill (1974) felt that it was not enough to demonstrate that training for leadership produced behavior change and attitude change. Change in the leader was significant only if it produced an impact on the follower group.

Not only were there many studies which showed no value to leadership training, but also those which did show positive correlations may have been flawed. Fiedler and Chemers (1976) cited specific examples of lack of control in some studies which did show positive results from leadership training. They called the managerial grid developed by Blake and Mouton (1964), what many consider an ideal leader training package, an attractive theory with many enthusiastic supporters but without convincing evidence for its value.

Several of the leadership training studies dealt specifically with 4-H youth. One of the questions asked was whether 4-H'ers needed leadership skills, and if they did, which skills. A related question was whether leadership skills could be learned in the 4-H program. Larkin (1980) investigated the leadership skills needed by 4-H club members as perceived by 4-H extension agents. He identified nine skills and found that most skills were rated above average in both importance and emphasis by the agents. The agents felt that they were teaching 4-H'ers the following leadership skills: management skills,
decision-making, group process, understanding self, relationships, citizenship, communication, and parliamentary procedure.

Larkin (1980) found that agents believed the 4-H program effectively taught leadership. Hamer's study (1981) also produced positive results. He found in his study of personality traits in 4-H participants that leadership skills were being acquired. In a study of 4-H program quality in Iowa, Bogue (1977) also found the 4-H program to be an effective teacher. The study used the Vincent and Olson School Evaluation Services and discovered that for those clubs evaluated, the quality was exceptional when compared to national school norms. The four general categories used as criteria were individualization, interpersonal regard, creativity, and group activity. As Bogue (1977) explained, the 4-H traditions of youth serving as officers, of group discussions before making decisions, of a variety of projects for members to work on, of having members educate each other by giving demonstrations or talks, all appeared to give 4-H clubs an educational setting and instructional process which was superior. The whole 4-H system of club officers, county and state councils was designed to give youth opportunities to learn and practice leadership skills, and Bogue's (1977) study indicated the design succeeded.

Agriculture and home economics have traditionally been associated with 4-H and these content areas are still viable, but "life skills" such as leadership have historically been important also. An example of early emphasis on leadership is a quote from Paul Taff, the first state leader of 4-H in Iowa:
The people I remember most are the ones I helped give a little broader program of club work than animals and garments -- the ones who became club leaders and had something to say about developing the individual (Reeder, 1979, p. 59).

Taff's statement gave an indication of early 4-H interest in leadership; other items indicated present-day interest. Iowa's 4-H leadership project worksheet, project guide, and project handbook were rewritten (Iowa Coop. Ext. Serv., 1979a,b,c). The Spencer area piloted ten self-study Leadership Project Modules (1978). In 1982, the Creston area used a similar method to teach leadership. Probably the most concentrated effort to teach leadership has been the state 4-H leadership camps which were utilized for this study. Although the camps have been in existence for 34 years, have reached over 5,000 youth, and have been evaluated every year, the only formal study done on them was Baker (1969). He found that the campers did gain in leadership knowledge.

Another thesis done with a 4-H audience was Tai's (1968). He visited 25 club meetings, observed 325 4-H'ers, and found that 28 percent of the people attending said nothing beyond "yes" to the roll call. He also found that the more people talked, the more they enjoyed the meeting and rated it a successful one. Tai's (1968) study on participation seemed to be related to the current view of leadership as a process involving group members.

The number of studies involving 4-H leadership was very small, but they all indicated that the leadership program in 4-H had been effective.
Methods of Assessing Effectiveness—Scales and Measurements

It was difficult to find scales or measurements that would be appropriate for this study because most of the delegation research has been done with business and industrial groups. Both the voluntary nature of the groups and the young age of the subjects caused problems in finding appropriate instruments.

The differences between business and industrial groups and those that are voluntary were delineated by Cull and Hardy (1974), who thought the whole field of voluntary action research was just beginning a phase of intensive development and growth. They divided types of voluntary groups into five: service, issue or cause oriented, self-expressive, occupational, and philanthropic. They neglected to mention educational, which is the type that encompasses 4-H and all other groups that exist to help members learn skills and values.

A search of the literature for a scale suited to a youth camp unearthed very little that could be used. Several recent dissertations, for example, Palmer (1982), used the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1973). This is a set of 12 questions and has been well-researched and validated. However, it seemed intended for an adult audience.

Another widely used instrument was the Hemphill (1956) Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). It looked at initiation of structure and consideration for welfare but did not address specifically delegation of leadership. Fiedler's (1967) LPC scale (Least Preferred Co-worker) was another well-known instrument which
was not specific to delegation. Bass (1981) said the LPC and the LBDQ in some form had dominated leadership research for the past 20 years. He lamented the fact that the research had been so concentrated in these two areas.

A scale which did look at delegation was one of the Stogdill and Shartle (1948) RAD scales. These scales were attractive because they exhibited high reliabilities, but they were suited for business, government, and military organizations rather than voluntary youth groups.

A number of other collections of scales and measurements were perused: Buros (1972) Mental Measurements, Shaw and Wright's (1967) scales for the measurements of attitudes, Barclay's (1972) Classroom Climate Inventory, Likert's (1967) Measurement Scales for Climate, and the Pfeiffer and Jones Handbook (1976). Neason (1983) developed and tested two scales to measure group effectiveness and attitudes toward delegation with FFA chapters, and these seemed most nearly suitable for the study. Also, the Problem-Solving Decision-Making Style Inventory developed by Hersey and Natemeyer (1982) proved to be a 12-question, easily readable and understandable instrument to assess leadership styles.

Since some of the scales needed would have to be developed specifically for the study, it seemed wise to research the objectives and criteria for the development of instruments. Dimock (1970) analyzed and evaluated group growth and cited changes that could be evaluated.
1. Changes in behavior. This was the most desirable measure, but the tools were limited.

2. Changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aptitudes (KASA).

Cooper and Harrison (1976) elaborated on the first point. They asserted that the most valid data were descriptions of actual behavior, such as "You sat next to me," or expressions of personal feeling, e.g., "I feel warm and strong." They felt that less valid but complementary data were interpretations such as "You sat by me because you felt isolated." Still less valid data were "we" statements, old feedback, and nonspecific generalizations such as "Some members of the group just don't listen."

Yuzuk (1961) followed this line of reasoning. He differentiated between evaluative items and descriptive items and believed the descriptive items were bias-free. The following was an example:

   Evaluative - 'My foreman takes time to show us how to do things.'

   Descriptive - 'My foreman showed me how to (do something) (#) times in the past three days' (Yuzuk, 1961, p. 33).

Yuzuk (1961) did not like attitudinal measurements and believed very strongly in using scale items which were specific and meaningful. He asserted that research investigations have found no consistent correlation between attitudes and output.

Gardner and Thompson (1956) also reviewed scales and repeated what statistics textbooks said, that other things being equal, scales vary in their general usefulness from the ratio scale (most useful)
through the interval and ordinal down to the nominal (least useful). It is difficult for social science scales to be strictly interval scales, but a reasonable approximation will justify the computation of means, standard deviations, and product-moment correlations.

Gardner and Thompson (1956) added that precision in measurement is bought at a price, i.e., length of test, time of administration, cost, etc. The more reliable the distribution of scores obtained with a scale, the greater its utility. However, it is also true that the more economical of time and expense and the easier the administration, scoring, and analysis, the greater its usefulness.

Gardner and Thompson (1956) also investigated the reliability of some types of measurements. Since this study asked subjects to rate each other on their level of participation in the group, it was relevant to look at Gardner and Thompson's work in this area. They said that the mean of ratings received by a given individual N (e.g., \( r(x) \) n) represents the average group member's evaluation of the individual's social value to the group plus residual errors of measurement. This type of score was often used in the assessment of individuals and Gardner was interested in the stability of the rating over a five-week period. He found that stability using test-retest to be extremely high. The product moment correlation based on 29 pairs of scores ranged from .85 to .96 in five different situations with three of the five above .95.

The level of participation in the group might have been measured in other ways. Hoffman et al. (1965) found that participation was related
to members' satisfaction with group decisions and Holmes (1969) did a study in which the group leader rated members' participation.

This study was also interested in having participants rate their own level of activity of their schools and communities. Bernberg (1950) was one of several researchers who found this type of personal assessment to be a valid indication.

In another instrument in this study, panelists were asked to rate the group presentations on six different points. A semantic differential scale was used and Borgatta and Bohrnstedt (1970) listed some of the problems with such a scale. They used as an example Fiedler's (1967) Least Preferred Co-worker scale, which has been very commonly used in the social sciences. It is a semantic differential scale and may be inaccurate. For one thing, intervals in a semantic differential scale have a tendency to be unequal. For another, inaccurate responses may be elicited because of response styles; that is, some respondents may tend to extremes, others may tend to mark every item the same.

A search was made for valid, reliable instruments because the advantages of using already developed instruments are many. For example, the six scales developed by Hage and Aiken (1969) to study centralization, formalization, and task routines have been widely used. Not only were there many studies available on them, but there were also critical examinations, such as the one by Dewar et al. (1980), which criticized the reliability and validity of part of the scales. At first glance, the Hage and Aiken (1969) scale on centralization seemed usable because it measured the extent of delegation, but it was not
suitable for a youth camp group because of its heavy business orientation.

Unsuitability was the problem with all of the scales and measurements reviewed with the exception of Neason's (1983), which was revised and used, and Hersey and Natemeyer's (1982), which was used intact. However, even those which were unsuitable provided an impetus and a guide for the development of the instruments used in this study.
CHAPTER III. EXECUTION OF STUDY

This study was executed to evaluate the effectiveness of a resource packet designed to teach delegation of leadership. Following sections will describe the research design that was used, including statistical design, population, treatment level, instrumentation, data collection, and analyses.

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.

Design

The study used a control group-experimental group design. The study was repeated at two separate camps during the summer of 1983, using the same resource materials and five data collecting instruments. In the first camp, the instrument on leadership styles was used both as a pretest and a posttest. In the second camp, it was used as a posttest only. Thus, for most of the study, a posttest only control group design was enacted. It can be represented graphically as:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
R & X_1 & 0_1 \\
R & X_2 & 0_2
\end{array}
\]
Participants in each camp were randomly assigned to small groups called color groups and then were randomly assigned to either treatment or control. Those which were treatment groups were taught using the experimental resource packet.

The symbols are explained as follows:

- **R** Random selection
- **X** Treatment
- **O** Group.

**R** - Random selection and assignment from the population. The sample was stratified by sex, so that males and females were equally divided among the groups. The proportion of males to females was radically different from the general population as only 27.4 percent of the participants were male.

**X** - Treatment. Both groups received treatment, experimental \((X_2)\) with the resource packet and control \((X_1)\) with the same materials which had been used successfully since 1976. Participants in both treatment groups were taught by advisors who received training in the use of the resource materials they were teaching.

**O** - Group. The observations of the control group \((O_1)\) and the experimental group \((O_2)\) were made using five instruments.

Leedy (1980) emphasized the importance of randomization in the posttest only control group design, a design which was used for most of the study. A small part of the study related to leadership styles used a pretest and followed the Solomon four design. This design, proposed by Solomon (1949), is considered a powerful design. Leedy called
it "our most powerful experimental approach." However, it was developed mainly to eliminate pretest influence and was used here for that reason. This was a modified version of the Solomon four because there was a time lag between the two collections of data. A true random assignment should eliminate need for a pretest; however, this study used a small number of subjects and assurance of equality is more difficult with small groups (Campbell and Stanley, 1971).

The first leadership camp was held June 20 to June 24, 1983. The second leadership camp was held July 11 to July 15, 1983. Both camps were held at the State 4-H Camping Center, Madrid, Iowa.

Population

The population for the study consisted of high school students in Iowa with an interest in leadership training. The population also included potential campers who would be attending the state 4-H leadership camp over the next few years. Using a present group and generalizing from its results to future campers was appropriate, according to Weinberg and Schumaker (1974), who asserted that the science of sampling statistics or statistical inference made it possible to use a small group of subjects to make statements about a large population of similar subjects "including even those as yet nonexistent."

Sample

Youth at the two camps self-selected themselves by enrolling in the camps. They were not randomly picked from the total population for participation. Youth signed up for the session which suited their
summer schedule. However, there is no reason to believe that the youth comprising the sample were different in interests and aptitudes from the population.

Fifty-three Iowa counties were represented with one to five youth. There were 72 youth in the first camp and 44 in the second. Four blacks and one Asian were enrolled in the camps, which meant the minority population was too small to use any analysis based on race.

This study included only those 106 campers who participated in the entire camp. Ten campers either arrived late, left early, or were indisposed. Only those who stayed the entire week and who were able to fill out all the instruments were included in the analyses.

The sample size was rather small, which meant the degrees of freedom would be small and t-distribution tables would be used rather than normal curve when determining correlations. Hinkle et al. (1979) described degrees of freedom as the "number of observations minus the number of restrictions." For t-tests, this translated to the number of cases minus one, since if the value of cases equalled a certain total, all except the last one were free to vary in value. The degrees of freedom were important because as Weinberg explained, "As the number of degrees of freedom increases, the dependability of the estimate increases" (Weinberg and Schumaker, 1974, p. 182).

Since the only true randomization performed was assigning campers to color groups and to either experimental or control groups, statistically, the findings were applicable only to the two leadership camps held in 1983. Practically speaking, however, the results could be
generalized to future campers at the state 4-H leadership camps in the next few years and even to other voluntary groups who might be studying leadership. This type of randomization was approved by Hinkle et al. (1979), who believed that it was possible to make statistical inferences based on random assignment to treatment levels. Generalizing from the sample to the larger population in such a situation depends upon logic rather than statistics.

Description of Treatment Levels

There were two treatment levels, training with the packet of resource materials and training using the previously prepared materials. The treatment level was the independent variable. This was a functional design (Leedy, 1980) because the independent variable was controllable as opposed to a factorial design in which the researcher could not manipulate the independent variable.

Treatment

The campers were divided into color groups in each of the two camps. Half of the color groups were designated as experimental groups and were taught using the resource packet on delegation. The first camp was divided into nine color groups, each with an advisor and eight or nine youth. Five of the color groups were experimental. The second camp was divided into six groups, with three being experimental. Four control groups from the first camp and three from the second camp were taught using the same leadership training materials which had been used since 1976.
Resource Packet

The packet entitled "A Resource Packet on Effective Delegation" was developed by Neason and Carter (1982) as part of an Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station project. It was developed for use with FFA officers and was modified for use in this study so as to be suitable for any voluntary group. The packet contained an introductory section on team building and a section on leadership roles and characteristics of member-centered groups. The section on delegation included a rationale for using delegation as well as specific suggestions for planning, assigning, and evaluating.

Each of the sections included a teaching plan, activities, student handouts, and keys. A variety of techniques for participant involvement was suggested. Masters for transparencies were included in the original packet and were reproduced on flip-charts for the camp setting. The packet was designed for at least six hours of contact teaching time, and six hours and forty-five minutes were allotted for it in the camp schedule. All of the packet was taught in the first two days of the camps. The remainder of the camp schedule was the same for both experimental and control groups. A good share of the remaining time was spent in color groups preparing for the group presentation they were expected to give at the end of camp to adults representing community boards and councils. Representative portions of the resource packet appear in Appendix E. Camp schedules are in Appendix A.
Training of Advisors

Each camp had two co-directors, one of whom was from the state 4-H staff. They helped train 15 adult advisors at weekend training sessions held directly before each camp. The researcher trained those advisors who would work with the experimental groups and one of the co-directors trained those advisors who would work with the control group. A training schedule appears in Appendix A. Contents of the packet as well as appropriate methodology were reviewed. Approximately four hours were spent in acquainting the advisors with the materials to be used by their respective groups. For the remainder of the training, both sets of advisors were trained together.

No data collection was done on advisors because their numbers were so small. It was possible for them to exert a great deal of influence on the youth, since a large amount of camp time was spent working in small color groups. They were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. The adults served primarily as teachers for the first two days, as friends and advisors for the last three. They also were cabin counselors at night.

The advisors ranged in age from 25 to 55. About half were Extension professionals and para-professionals; the others were volunteers. For one, this was her first teaching experience.

Instrumentation

The dependent variables were measured by five instruments. One was developed by a camp co-director, one was purchased from University Associates, Inc., and three were developed by the researcher. All
instruments except the demographic ones were completed in the camp setting. Copies are included in Appendix C. The five instruments are described in the following paragraphs.

**Demographic instrument**

A standard camp application form was prepared by one of the camp co-directors. The three items of interest to the study were sex, school grade, and level of activity. For the last item, youth were asked to assess their own activity level in their community, school, or neighborhood.

**Assessment of leadership style**

The Problem-Solving Decision-Making Style Inventory (Perception of Self) developed by Paul Hersey and Walter E. Natemeyer (1982) was used to assess usable leadership styles. It was used as a posttest in both camps and as a pretest in the first camp. This inventory was copyrighted by the Center for Leadership Studies and was purchased from Learning Resources Corporation, San Diego, California.

The inventory consisted of 12 questions with two possible responses for each question. The youth were asked to decide which of the possible responses best reflected their leadership style. Responses were keyed to four styles: telling or authoritative, selling or consultative, participating or facilitative, and delegating or delegative. The style with the highest score was considered the primary style, but any style receiving six or more points out of a possible 36 was considered a usable style for that person.
Hersey and Natemeyer's (1982) inventory was chosen because it was simple, easily administered and scored. Hersey and Blanchard's (1973) scale had better documentation than this inventory, but it was a longer, more complex instrument and questionable for a youth audience.

**Evaluation sheet for participation in color group**

An evaluation instrument to assess the participation of each member by other members of the color group was constructed. It was a semantic differential type scale with seven possible numbers along the scale and bipolar descriptors at the extremes. Youth were asked to evaluate themselves and the other members of the color group as to how much each contributed to the group's activities.

**Leadership camp questionnaire**

Likert-type scales were used both for the group achievement questions and for those measuring individual attitudes toward delegation. It was important in a camp setting and with a youth audience to utilize a questionnaire which was reasonably short, attractive in appearance, and easy to complete. In reference to Likert scales, Wentling (1980) said, "Ratings can be made on a number of statements within a short period of time and require only a minimal amount of space on the instrument."

The group achievement questions were revised from those used by Neason (1983) to evaluate the resource packet with FFA groups. She had field tested the questions with students and had found the instrument to have acceptable face validity as well as the following reliabilities:
overall achievement, .631; drive, .772; cohesiveness, .784; and tendency
to delegate, .720. The 27 questions were arranged randomly and
independently with one-third of them measuring group drive, one-third
group cohesiveness, and one-third group productivity.

Questions assessing the individual's attitude toward delegation
were on the same single sheet as the group achievement questions and
both were designed for use with an answer sheet. The questions were
developed by the researcher and Richard I. Carter of the Agricultural
Education Department at Iowa State University, utilizing characteristics
of delegators and barriers to delegation as outlined by Haynes (1980).

Group presentation rating

An evaluation sheet was used to rate color group presentations
given the last day of camp. Each presentation was rated on six criteria,
two related to the topic, three to the presentation, and one to overall
impression. An adult panel of three members representing community
groups such as school boards, city councils, funding bodies rated each
presentation.

The rating instrument, a semantic differential one utilizing bi-
polar adjectival descriptors, was designed by the researcher. A jury
of five people who had served on the panels in previous years reviewed
the instrument and weighted the six criteria. A list of jury members
and of panel members and presentation topics is included in Appendix A.

Panel members were trained in the use of the instrument by the
researcher at the camp. They arrived at the camp an hour before the
first presentation and watched portions of videotapes of presentations
given at previous camps. The instrument was discussed and examples
given. Each panel was responsible for rating three presentations, with
experimental and control groups intermingled. The training of the
panels was the same for both camps, but panel members were different.
A copy of the training outline is in Appendix A.

Collection of Data

All data were collected on the site at both camps. The demographic
data were completed at home by the youth and turned in as they registered
for camp. Several campers forgot their sheets, but completed the
demographic data during registration.

A pretest was used at the first camp and was administered before
lunch the first day. Youth were seated at tables by color groups while
the researcher explained the test. Advisors helped in distributing and
collecting pretests.

All of the other data were collected at the end of the camps.
Panel presentation rating sheets were given to panel members during
their orientation and were collected at the close of the morning after
the presentations. Instruments completed by the youth were distributed,
completed, and collected after lunch and before the close of camp at
2:00 p.m. Youth were seated around tables in color groups. The
researcher introduced the instruments and explained the scoring. A
copy of the introduction is in Appendix D.
Analysis of Data

Data collected from the youth were checked and typed into a microcomputer using Apple II Communications software developed by Horton (1982). Using a modem connection, the communications disk and the Wylbur editor, the data were transferred from the microcomputer to the main-frame computer at the Computation Center, Iowa State University. Subsequent analyzation was performed using computer facilities at the Computation Center. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS*) (Nie, 1983) served as the basis for statistical routines.

Data modification procedures

After the data were stored on the disk, procedures were employed to modify and reduce the data to a form which would accomplish the objectives of the study. Data were collected from each individual youth and the individual served as the experimental unit used to evaluate treatment effects.

Modification of leadership style data

Leadership style data were recorded by youth on the Problem-Solving Decision-Making Style Inventory (Perception of Self) developed by Hersey and Natemeyer (1982). The inventory was a four-page set including scoring instructions and data interpretation as well as 12 questions to be answered.

Several modifications were made on leadership style data. It was typed into the microcomputer in raw score form and raw scores were used in inferential analysis. For descriptive purposes, raw scores were recoded so that any style with a score of six or more for an individual was identified as a usable style.
Modification of participation data Youth rated other youth in their color groups as well as themselves on the extent of their participation in group activities. Ratings for each individual on a seven-point scale were averaged to two decimal places and typed into the microcomputer. These individual ratings were used in inferential analysis. For descriptive purposes, the ratings were recoded into logical groups.

Modification of Leadership Camp Questionnaire The questionnaire contained 58 questions, 27 of them on group achievement and 25 on attitudes toward delegation. Five of the achievement questions and six of the delegation questions were negatively posed and were recoded before being analyzed. Blanks and zeros were coded as missing values.

Modification of group presentation ratings Each presentation was rated by three adult panel members. Since the rating range was from 1 to 7, the highest possible score for each criteria was 21 points. Ratings were carried out to one decimal place because some panel members marked half-way between the numbers and this was counted as 6.5, for example. The ratings were multiplied by the weighting factors assigned them by the jury and a mean was computed.

Descriptive Analyses

Analysis of demographic data

SPSSX program CROSSTABS was used to describe categorical variables for youth characteristics: grade, sex, activity level as perceived by youth, and usable leadership styles as measured by the pretest. This
procedure produced a chi-square measure and a level of significance. The alpha = .05 level was used throughout this study.

Analysis of dependent variable data-gathering instruments

The scales used to measure attitudes toward delegation and group effectiveness were analyzed for reliability using SPSS program RELIABILITY. The total scales were analyzed as well as the subscales measuring drive, cohesiveness, and productivity. The reliability coefficient alpha was computed for each. Missing values were not included in reliability analyses. If a case was missing a value, that case was not included in any of the reliability calculations.

Inferential Analyses

SPSSX program T-TEST calculated the effects of treatment levels on leadership styles, participation, attitudes toward delegation, group achievement, and presentation ratings. The SPSS program ANOVA was used with a covariate factor (pretest leadership styles) to remove the effect of the pretest from the leadership style measures.

SPSS program PEARSON CORR calculated the Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation for selected pairs of variables. Correlations were assessed for the following: characteristics of youth and leadership styles, attitudes toward delegation and group achievement measures, attitudes toward delegation and rating of participation, rating of participation and rating of presentation.
Summary of Research Procedure

The study was conducted during the summer of 1983 to evaluate the effectiveness of resource materials on leadership/delegation with 4-H youth attending two leadership camps. Effectiveness was assessed in terms of (1) attitude toward delegation, (2) group effectiveness (productivity, drive, cohesiveness), (3) level of member participation, (4) presentation to panel, (5) change in leadership style. Instruments were developed to measure these plus an additional instrument was used to collect demographic data. Two treatment levels were used: training with the resource packet and training using previously developed materials.

A posttest only control group design was used primarily. For one portion of the study, pretest and posttest measures were used in the first camp. All data were collected at the camps.

The study involved two camps, one a replica of the first. The same materials were used in both camps and youth characteristics were tested for differences between the two camps as well as between the treatment groups.

Training of advisors and panels as well as the administration of data collecting instruments was done by the researcher. Subsequently, data were statistically analyzed using computer facilities at Iowa State University.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a packet designed as a resource for teaching delegation of leadership. The impetus for the study was Tai's (1968) findings on the importance of member participation. The packet was a modification of one used by Neason (1983) in a similar study with FFA officers. Testing of the packet with 106 high school youth was done at two state 4-H leadership camps held during the summer of 1983 at the state 4-H camp near Madrid, Iowa.

Collected data were measures of: campers' tendency toward delegation, extent of participation within small groups, youth characteristics, and group effectiveness as indicated by productivity, cohesiveness, and drive. Findings are presented as follows:

1. Descriptive analyses of youth characteristics.
2. Analyses of instrument reliability.
3. Comparison of treatment levels.
4. Correlational analyses of variables.

Descriptive Analyses of Youth Characteristics

Demographic data on sex, grade, and activity level were collected from each camper in the study; a pretest to assess leadership style was also given to participants in Camp 1. Tables 1 through 4 were developed to give a profile of campers. Analyses of demographic information were included in these tables as a check for the randomization of campers in the groups. The youth were randomly assigned and
half received training in delegation of leadership via the experimental packet and half received leadership training using previously developed materials. Chi-square analyses were done on sex, grade, and activity level, and there were no differences ($\alpha=.05$) between experimental and control groups for any of these variables. A $t$-test was computed on leadership style pretests, and again, no significant differences ($\alpha=.05$) were found.

Activity level was an assessment made by each youth of his or her participation in school and community activities. There were four possible choices, three of which are listed in Table 1. None of the campers chose the least active choice, and therefore it is not listed. When both camps were considered, over 90 percent of the youth considered themselves either "active" or "very active." Three participants (4.7 percent) in Camp 1 rated themselves "not very active" compared to six (14.2 percent) in Camp 2.

Data on the numbers and percentages of males and females are presented in Table 2. Total participation included 77 girls and 29 boys, which meant that over 70 percent were female. Camp 1 had 18 boys and 46 girls, while Camp 2 had 11 boys and 31 girls. The number of boys versus girls has been out of balance at the state 4-H leadership camps since the 1976 Civil Rights legislation was enacted. Prior to that, each county was asked to send one boy and one girl. Because the imbalance was expected, random assignment to small groups for treatment was stratified by sex.
Table 1. Activity of youth by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity level</th>
<th>Camp 1</th>
<th>Camp 2</th>
<th>Combined camps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not very active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.376 \quad x^2 = 1.199 \quad x^2 = 3.318 \]
\[ p = .185 \quad p = .549 \quad p = .190 \]
Table 2. Sex of youth by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Camp 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Camp 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined camps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.160 \quad \quad x^2 = 0.123 \quad \quad x^2 = 0.286 \]
\[ p = 0.689 \quad \quad p = 0.726 \quad \quad p = 0.593 \]
Camp 1, held during June, was a larger camp (64 youth) than Camp 2 (42 youth) held in July. Campers were allowed to choose which date they preferred and more chose the earlier date. However, the percentage of females was very similar for Camps 1 and 2, with 71.9 and 73.8 percent, respectively.

The high school grade level of participants was also skewed, but intentionally so. Advance information and publicity encouraged the attendance of eleventh graders and a majority of the youth had finished eleventh grade (Table 3). This was consistent with Baker's (1969) findings. Less than 6 percent of both camps were high school graduates. There was a difference in the proportions of tenth and eleventh graders in the two camps. Camp 1 had a higher proportion of eleventh graders, approximately 60 percent, compared to Camp 2, which had slightly more than 40 percent. In contrast, Camp 2 had a higher proportion of tenth graders (52.3 percent) than Camp 1 (34.4 percent).

The instrument used to assess leadership styles was used as a pretest in Camp 1; results are presented in Table 4. Scoring of the leadership style instrument distributed a total of 36 points among the four leadership styles, a theoretical average of nine points per style. The four styles (telling, selling, participating, and delegating) represented a continuum from directive leadership to a more participative approach. The two means of the middle styles were higher than the means of the extremes, giving the appearance of a normal distribution across the continuum of leadership styles.
Table 3. Grade of youth by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Camp 1</th>
<th>Camp 2</th>
<th>Combined camps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.025 \quad x^2 = 1.59 \quad x^2 = .034 \]

\[ p = .599 \quad p = .452 \quad p = .983 \]
Table 4. Leadership styles of youth by treatment level as measured with pretest in Camp 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>t value</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.355</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.576</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.065</td>
<td>2.863</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.030</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.065</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.906</td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.161</td>
<td>2.557</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.212</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of descriptive analyses

The majority of the 106 youth in the study were eleventh graders and considered themselves active in their communities. About 70 percent were female. Participants preferred using the selling and participating styles of leadership.

Analysis of Instrument Reliability

Five multiple item scales were used in this study. An overall scale to measure group effectiveness consisted of subscales measuring productivity, cohesiveness, and drive. The subscales each contained nine items with a total of 27 items for the overall scale. Another scale consisting of 25 items was used to measure tendency toward delegation.
To determine the linear reliability of responses, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability was calculated for each scale. The split half reliability of a scale can be measured with Cronbach's alpha, since it is the mean of all possible split half coefficients (Nie, 1983).

In Table 5, the reliability coefficients of all five scales are shown to range from .658 to .897. The productivity scale had the lowest reliability, but was considered acceptable.

The instruments used to measure group effectiveness and tendency toward delegation were developed from instruments used in a similar study by Neason (1983). Neason's study involved high school sophomores; this study had juniors and seniors as well. Neason found the reliabilities to be acceptable, and in all instances the reliabilities were higher in this study.

Comparison of Treatment Levels

An objective of the study was to determine effectiveness of the resource packet by comparing responses of the treatment group with the control group. Measures used to assess effectiveness were: participation, tendency toward delegation, leadership styles, group presentation ratings, and group effectiveness.

Participation was chosen as a measure because encouraging member involvement was a major thrust of the camps. The null hypothesis tested was:

$$H_{01}: \text{There is no significant difference (}\alpha=0.05\text{) between experimental and control groups in individual participation.}$$
Table 5. Reliability coefficients for scales measuring group effectiveness and tendency to delegate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability alpha&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall group effectiveness</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to delegate</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Missing cases excluded.

The hypothesis was tested for participants involved in Camp 1, Camp 2, and both camps combined; results are reported in Table 6. In all cases, there were no significant differences (α=.05), and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. In Camp 1, the mean participation of campers assigned to the control group was higher than the mean participation of individuals in the experimental group. However, for Camp 2, the magnitude of the means for the two groups was reversed. The mean participation for the combined camps was practically the same.

Participation was important, but the main emphasis of the camps was on learning leadership skills. A 25-question scale was used to measure campers' tendency toward the use of delegation as a leadership style. The null hypothesis tested was:

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant difference (α=.05) between experimental and control groups in tendency toward delegation.
Table 6. Individual participation by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.822</td>
<td>5.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.743</td>
<td>6.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined camps</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.790</td>
<td>5.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the analyses are presented in Table 7. The hypothesis was rejected for Camp 2 but failed to be rejected for Camp 1 or the combined camps. There was a significant difference (p=0.013) in the tendency toward delegation between treatment groups in Camp 2. The experimental group mean was higher than the control group mean, indicating that respondents in the experimental group exhibited significantly higher tendencies to delegate.

Differences between the camps became obvious from testing HO2. The use of the experimental packet was more effective in increasing participants' tendency toward delegation in Camp 2, which had more tenth graders and fewer participants.

Comparisons by treatment level for leadership styles are presented in Tables 8 through 17. Styles have been researched since the days of Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) and their study of authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire styles. The titles of styles have changed over the years but interest has continued (Bass, 1981);
Table 7. Tendency toward delegation by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.393</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.388</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

however, there has been a lack of research to test the effects of training on leadership styles. This research was designed to address that concern. The null hypotheses tested for the styles were:

HO₃: There is no significant difference (α=.05) between experimental and control groups in leadership styles:

a. Telling
b. Selling
c. Participating
d. Delegating.

The control group had a higher mean (6.077) than the experimental group (5.02) for the telling or authoritative style of leadership; however, the difference was not significant at the .05 level, and HO₃b failed to be rejected (Table 8). It was expected that the control mean would be higher, since delegation was emphasized in the experimental packet and campers were encouraged to use a participative rather than a directive leadership style.
Table 8. t-test of leadership style, telling, by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.258 2.569</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.546 2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.810 2.960</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.191 3.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.077 2.714</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.020 3.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less directive than the telling style on the leadership continuum used by Hersey and Blanchard (1982) was the selling or persuasive style. There was no significant ($\alpha=.05$) difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups for the selling style. $H_{0b}$ failed to be rejected (Table 9) for Camp 1, Camp 2, and both camps combined. The means ranged from 10.381 to 11.182 for the selling style compared to means of 4.191 to 6.258 for the telling style.

The third leadership style to be analyzed was the participating style. For this style, $H_{0c}$ failed to be rejected (Table 10). However, the experimental means were higher than the control means in Camp 1, Camp 2, and both camps combined.

The last style, delegating, was of particular interest because the packet of materials focused on leadership delegation. As in previous analyses of the styles, $H_{0d}$ failed to be rejected in Camp 1, Camp 2, and both camps combined (Table 11). The means of the
Table 9. t-test of leadership style, selling, by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.768</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.182</td>
<td>1.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.381</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.571</td>
<td>2.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.731</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.944</td>
<td>1.664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. t-test of leadership style, participating, by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.097</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.546</td>
<td>2.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.667</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.667</td>
<td>2.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.923</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.593</td>
<td>2.430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. t-test of leadership style, delegating, by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.677</td>
<td>2.761</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>3.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.333</td>
<td>2.633</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.619</td>
<td>2.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.346</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.630</td>
<td>3.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental groups were in every case higher than the means of the control groups.

Leadership style data were modified and analyses were made to determine whether differences had been overlooked in previous analyses of raw data. One modification consisted of recoding scores into usable and unusable leadership styles and computing chi-squares to test $H_0$. Participants were considered able to use a style if they scored six or more points for that style. This modification was based on the scoring and interpretation provided in the Hersey and Natemeyer (1982) instrument.

Results for the telling style appear in Table 12. A significant (.018) difference between control and experimental groups was found for the combined camps. The control group had higher scores on the telling style than the experimental group. Based on chi-square analyses
Table 12. Chi-square comparison of leadership style, telling, by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control (Unusable style)</th>
<th>Control (Usable style)</th>
<th>Experimental (Unusable style)</th>
<th>Experimental (Usable style)</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.482</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined camps</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.571</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the telling leadership style, \(H_0^3\) was rejected for the combined camps; however, it failed to be rejected for Camp 1 and for Camp 2.

For the selling and participating styles, chi-squares could not be computed because all of the youth had given six or more of the possible 36 points to these two styles of leadership. They were considered usable styles for everyone in the study.

It was possible to compute a chi-square analysis for the delegating style, and results are presented in Table 13. There were no significant differences (\(\alpha=.05\)) for Camp 1, Camp 2, and combined camps, and the null hypothesis \(H_0^3\) failed to be rejected.

In Camp 1, the instrument assessing leadership styles was used both as a pretest and a posttest. The pretest provided a profile of the participants' leadership styles prior to training. When a pretest is used, there is the possibility that it will influence the results of the posttest (Campbell and Stanley, 1971). Therefore, pretest
Table 13. Chi-square comparison of leadership style, delegating, by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unusable style</td>
<td>Usable style</td>
<td>Unusable style</td>
<td>Usable style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined camps</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scores were used as a covariate to test $H_{O3}$ and to determine if removing their effects would make a difference.

Results of the analyses in Camp 1 of the four leadership styles are presented in Tables 14-17. In each of the analyses except for the participating style (Table 16), the pretest significantly ($\alpha=.05$) affected the posttest leadership style scores. The posttest leadership scores were not significantly different ($\alpha=.05$) between the experimental and control groups for any of the four styles. Therefore, null hypothesis $H_{O3}$ failed to be rejected.

The next comparison assessed productivity using ratings of group presentations given by participants. The null hypothesis tested was:

$H_{O4}$: There is no difference ($\alpha=.05$) between experimental and control groups in group presentation ratings.

Small group presentations were rated by panels of adults on criteria related to content and delivery. Therefore, in testing $H_{O4}$, analyses were made by group rather than by individual.
Table 14. Comparison of leadership style, telling, by treatment level with pretest 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.019</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.171</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Comparison of leadership style, selling, by treatment level with pretest 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.662</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.011</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Comparison of leadership style, participating, by treatment level with pretest 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Comparison of leadership style, delegating, by treatment level with pretest 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.351</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of comparing group presentation ratings in the combined camps by treatment group are shown in Table 18. There was a significant difference ($\alpha=.05$) between the group taught with the experimental packet and the control group. The control group had a higher mean rating than the experimental group. This indicated that presentations given by those in the control group were considered to be of higher quality. Results should be interpreted with care because the number of group presentations was small (15) and ratings were made by five different sets of panel members.

One objective of the study was to analyze the instructional packet by comparing treatment levels on measures of group effectiveness. The null hypotheses tested were:

$H_0$: There is no significant difference ($\alpha=.05$) between experimental and control groups as measured by:

a. Group drive
b. Group cohesiveness
c. Group productivity
d. Overall group effectiveness.

Table 18. Group presentation ratings by treatment level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment levels</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Panel ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of drive, cohesiveness, and productivity as indicators of group effectiveness was suggested by Stogdill (1965), who considered all three variables to be organizational outputs. Assessment of these outputs was made using a 27-item scale with nine questions for each measure.

Questions about group drive centered around the characteristics of enthusiasm, persistence, and willingness of members to volunteer. Hypothesis $H_{0.5a}$ was tested in Camp 1, Camp 2, and both camps combined, and results are presented in Table 19. The hypothesis was rejected for Camp 2; the experimental mean was significantly ($\alpha=.05$) greater than the control. This indicated that the campers taught via the experimental packet scored higher on drive. Null hypothesis $H_{0.5a}$ failed to be rejected in Camp 1 and the combined camps, which was consistent with results obtained with the variable, tendency to delegate.

The second measure of group effectiveness tested was cohesiveness. Cohesiveness was defined as the attraction between a group and its individual members. Questions were based on such concepts as closeness, concern, and support. Analyses (t-test) were computed to discover if the use of the packet with its emphasis on the delegation of leadership had made any difference in group cohesiveness.

Results of the analyses appear in Table 20, and there was a significant difference ($\alpha=.05$) between treatment levels in Camp 2. The difference was also significant at the .01 level. The mean score for cohesiveness of the experimental group was greater than the mean.
Table 19. Comparison of drive by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.372</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.226</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.397</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.942</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined camps</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.382</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.505</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Comparison of cohesiveness by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.065</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.155</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.138</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.656</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined camps</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.094</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.350</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
score of the control group. For Camp 1 and the combined camps, $H_{05d}$ failed to be rejected.

In contrast to the results for drive and cohesiveness measures, results for productivity measures did not vary by camp. The relationship between productivity and leadership style has not been clearly established (Bass, 1981) and perhaps that is why the results for productivity did not follow those for cohesiveness and drive. Productivity scores were based on nine questions dealing with such aspects as goal achievement, efficiency of operation, and time required to complete tasks.

Hypothesis $H_{05c}$ failed to be rejected for Camp 1, Camp 2, and the combined camps (Table 21). There was not a significant difference ($\alpha=.05$) in productivity between the treatment levels. For Camp 1, the variances were significantly different using Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance; therefore, the t-test probability was calculated using the separate variances formula.

The measures, drive, cohesiveness, and productivity, were combined into a composite scale, group effectiveness. Stogdill's (1965) study of 27 organizations supported grouping these measures together to assess group goal achievement.

In analyzing the results of composite group effectiveness measures, a significant difference ($\alpha=.05$) between the treatment levels was found for Camp 2, and $H_{05d}$ was rejected (Table 22). In Camp 2, the mean of the experimental group scores was higher (6.065) than the mean of the control group scores (5.633). These results were not surprising for
Table 21. Comparison of productivity by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control Mean</th>
<th>Control S.D.</th>
<th>Experimental Mean</th>
<th>Experimental S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.351</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.185</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.365</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.598</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined camps</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.357</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.346</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. Comparison of overall group effectiveness by treatment level and camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Control Mean</th>
<th>Control S.D.</th>
<th>Experimental Mean</th>
<th>Experimental S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>t prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.597</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.520</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.633</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.065</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined camps</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.612</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.734</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Camp 2, since significant differences had been found for two of the three measures comprising the composite scale. For Camp 1 and the combined camps, no significant differences were found, and $H_{0_{ird}}$ failed to be rejected in both cases.

**Summary of treatment level comparisons**

The group using the experimental packet scored significantly higher in Camp 2 on overall group effectiveness, drive, cohesiveness, and tendency toward delegation. In Camp 1 and the combined camps, there was no difference.

The control group received higher marks on group presentations to panels. Ratings of participation and productivity did not differ between the treatment levels. There was no difference in selling, participating, and delegating leadership styles, but the mean of the telling style was higher for the control group.

**Correlations**

Computations of Pearson product moment coefficients were made for characteristics of campers and selected variables. Tables 23 through 25 include comparisons of activity level, sex, and grade of respondents with leadership styles. Probabilities were based upon a two-tailed test of significance, since the direction of the relationships could not be specified in advance of the analyses. Missing values were deleted on an analysis by analysis basis.

Correlational coefficients of activity level and leadership style were computed to determine whether a higher or lower activity level
might be associated with a particular leadership style. The leadership style scores used in the analyses were raw scores with a possible range of zero to 36. The activity rating was included in the camp application form and consisted of a self-rating with four possible choices. The purpose was to assess the individual's level of participation in school and community groups. The application asked for a list of activities as well as a self-rating. The self rating was used rather than a count of various activities because of variances in size of school, type of activity, and depth of involvement.

There were no significant correlations between activity level and leadership style at the .05 level (Table 23). Based on the correlation coefficients, there was no relationship between the self-rated activity level of the youth and any of the four leadership styles.

A correlation coefficient was calculated comparing the sex of respondents to their leadership styles. There were no significant correlations (α=.05) between the sex of the respondents and three of the leadership styles (Table 24). The participative style, however, had a significant correlation (α=.05), although the coefficient was low (.201). Girls tended to utilize a participative style of leadership more than did boys. For the three other styles, there was no relationship between leadership scores and whether participants were male or female. Results obtained supported evidence presented by Bass (1981) that there is no consistent pattern in leadership styles for males or females.
Table 23. Correlation between activity level and leadership style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Activity level (Correlation coefficient)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Correlation between sex and leadership style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Sex (Correlation coefficient)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficients were also calculated from grade level in high school compared with leadership styles of the youth. Grade level rather than age was chosen, because high school youth are commonly separated by grade level for social, educational, and extracurricular activities. Most tenth graders are 16; eleventh graders, 17; and twelfth graders, 18.

Results are presented in Table 25. Grade level was significantly correlated with both telling and delegating leadership styles, but in
Table 25. Correlation between grade in school and leadership style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Grade in school Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

opposite directions. As the grade level increased, the tendency toward a telling style of leadership increased. As grade level decreased, the tendency toward a delegating style of leadership increased. Both correlations were less than .26.

Movement to more participative styles as youth became older did not occur, rather the opposite was observed. These findings were inconsistent with studies reviewed by Bass (1981), which showed leadership changing to a more participative style as maturation occurred.

In addition to examining the relationships of youth characteristics, correlations were computed for treatment level measures. The first correlation calculated was between two variables, tendency to delegate and group effectiveness. Tendency to delegate was measured by a 25-question attitudinal instrument designed to determine how willing and able an individual was to share leadership with other members. Group effectiveness was assessed using 27 questions related to group productivity, cohesiveness, and drive.
The three subscales of group effectiveness plus the overall measurement were positively correlated with a tendency toward delegation. Presented in Table 26 are the coefficients which were above .5 except for productivity (.420). Bass (1981) reported that productivity was not consistently related to leadership style. This study found that it was positively correlated at a low level with tendency toward delegation.

The relationship between participation and selected variables was studied because of the emphasis in 4-H upon participation in leadership experiences (USDA, 1983). Correlation coefficients were not significant either for participation with tendency toward delegation or for group presentation ratings (Table 27). There was no obvious relationship between participation and tendency toward delegation or group presentation ratings.

The relationship between participation and group effectiveness was analyzed and presented in Table 28. Participation was measured using the mean of ratings given to each individual by members of his or her small group. Gardner and Thompson (1956, p. 85) reported such a measure to be stable and to have a high reliability. Effectiveness was assessed using 27 questions related to drive, cohesiveness, and productivity.

The correlation coefficients for participation and the measures of group effectiveness were significant ($\alpha=.05$) and positive. They ranged from .240 for drive to .295 for productivity.
Table 26. Correlation between tendency toward delegation and measures of group effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Tendency toward delegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Correlation between participation and selected variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency toward delegation</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group presentation ratings</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Correlation between participation and measures of group effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group effectiveness</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To determine the relationship among the three measures of group effectiveness — drive, cohesiveness, and productivity, correlation coefficients were calculated and are displayed in Table 29. Correlations were significant and positive in direction, indicating that as one increased, so did the others. The relationship between drive and productivity was the strongest with a correlation coefficient of .689. The relationship of cohesiveness with productivity had the lowest coefficient (.611). These findings were consistent with the relationships between the measures reported by Neason (1983).

Table 29. Correlations among measures of group effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive with cohesiveness</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive with productivity</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness with productivity</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of correlations

There were no significant correlations between leadership style and activity level or sex of the campers except for the participating style, which was utilized more by females than males. Tenth graders were more likely than eleventh and twelfth graders to use the delegating style of leadership; the opposite was true for the telling style.

Participation was not related to tendency toward delegation or group presentation ratings. Participation and tendency toward
delegation were significantly correlated with overall group effectiveness, drive, cohesiveness, and productivity. Tendency toward delegation had a stronger correlation than did participation. The three measures of group effectiveness were significantly interrelated.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Statement of the problem

Developing the leadership skills of youth has been and continues to be a priority of the 4-H youth program. Youth in all project or subject matter areas are expected to assume leadership roles in activities related to their projects. In the national 4-H award programs, evidence of leadership skills is one of the three main criteria for receiving awards (USDA, 1983).

To facilitate the development of leadership skills, opportunities and teaching materials are needed. A number of methods of teaching leadership to 4-H youth are currently being used. The method evaluated by this study was the use, in a camp setting, of a packet of resource materials on leadership delegation. Training youth in the use of delegation was chosen because of its potential for responsible involvement of youth in group leadership roles. The packet had been developed for FFA officers and tested in a school setting. This study evaluated it with high school aged 4-H youth in two week-long camp settings.

Purpose and objectives

This study was conducted to assess the effectiveness of a resource packet designed to aid in teaching delegation of leadership. Packet effectiveness was evaluated by measures of group productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. Specific objectives were to:
1. Identify characteristics of youth as to:
   a. sex
   b. grade
   c. activity level
   d. pretest leadership styles.
2. Determine effectiveness of packet by comparing subgroups using the following measures:
   a. participation
   b. tendency toward delegation
   c. posttest leadership styles
   d. group presentation ratings
   e. group effectiveness
      (1) drive
      (2) cohesiveness
      (3) productivity
      (4) overall.
3. Determine if relationships existed among the following:
   a. characteristics of youth and posttest leadership styles
   b. individual tendency toward delegation and group achievement
   c. individual participation and tendency toward delegation
   d. individual participation and group presentation ratings.

Methods and procedures
The study was conducted with 106 high school youth attending two state 4-H leadership camps held at the Iowa State 4-H Camp, Madrid, Iowa, during the summer of 1983. A control group, experimental group
design was implemented by randomly assigning campers to small groups. The groups were taught leadership skills by advisors who were either employees of the Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service or volunteer adults. Half of the groups were taught using the resource packet and half using previously developed materials. The packet was developed by Neason and Carter and had been tested previously with FFA officers (Neason, 1983).

The direct teaching time spent on leadership delegation was close to seven hours. Advisors who functioned both as group facilitators and as cabin counselors received training at weekend sessions preceding each camp.

The second camp was a replica of the first with the same materials and same instruments. However, in the first camp only, the instrument on leadership styles was used both as a pretest and a posttest. In the second camp, it was a posttest only.

The leadership style instrument, "Problem-Solving Decision-Making Style Inventory," was developed by Hersey and Natemeyer (1982) and purchased from Learning Resources Corporation. Two other instruments were part of a 52-item questionnaire. They were adaptations of attitudinal instruments developed by Neason (1983) to measure tendency toward delegation and group effectiveness (drive, cohesiveness, and productivity) with FFA officers.

Campers self-rated the extent of their involvement in school and community activities and rated themselves and others on level of participation in small groups at camp. An additional behavioral type
rating was the panel rating. At the end of camp, each small group presented a proposal to a panel of adults representing city councils, school boards, and funding bodies. These adult panel members rated each group on presentation quality.

All data were collected at camp and were modified and analyzed using Iowa State University Computation Center facilities. Results were used in identifying characteristics of participants, differences between the treatment levels, and relationships among the variables as well as checking reliability of the instruments and randomization of the sample.

Conclusions

Conclusions based on analyses of the data are summarized in four categories:

1. Youth characteristics
2. Instrument reliability
3. Comparison by treatment level
4. Correlations.

Youth characteristics

1. Randomization was effective and there were no significant differences in characteristics of youth by sex, grade, school and community activities, and pretest leadership styles.

2. There was no difference between the treatment levels in involvement of members in group activities. More than 90 percent of
participants rated themselves as "active" or "very active" in school and community groups.

3. As anticipated, the camps attracted more females than males. Over 70 percent was female, and random assignment stratified by sex was justified.

4. The two camps differed in the number of participants and the proportion of tenth to eleventh graders; Camp 2 was a smaller, younger group.

Instrument reliability

1. Scales used for assessing drive, cohesiveness, productivity, and overall group effectiveness were internally consistent at an acceptable level.

2. The scale used to assess individual tendency toward delegation was deemed reliable.

Comparison by treatment level

1. Campers in treatment and control groups had similar ratings on their self-assessed level of participation in small groups.

2. In Camp 2, experimental level participants had higher scores than control level participants in tendency toward delegation. This was not true for Camp 1 or both camps combined.

3. Posttest scores for the Problem-Solving Decision-Making Style Inventory (Hersey and Natemeyer, 1982) appeared to have a normal curve distribution for the four leadership styles: telling, selling, participating, and delegating. The distribution found for youth was
consistent with the distribution found with adult groups by Hersey and Natemeyer (1982). There was a posttest difference between treatment levels for the telling style, which was apparent in the chi-square analysis of usable and unusable styles, but not in the t-test of raw scores.

4. Presentations to adult panels were rated significantly higher for participants in the control group than for participants in the experimental group. The panel ratings were given to small groups rather than individuals; therefore, only 15 observations were used in this analysis rather than the 106 normally used. The small number of observations should be considered when interpreting the results.

5. A significant difference (α=.05) in the overall measure of group effectiveness plus the drive and cohesiveness subscales was found in Camp 2. Productivity was the only measure of effectiveness for which treatment levels in Camp 2 did not register a difference. When Camp 1 and both camps combined were considered, there were no differences in drive, cohesiveness, productivity, and overall group effectiveness.

Correlations

1. The self-rated participation of youth in school and community activities was not significantly related to any of the four leadership styles.

2. There was no conclusive evidence that the variable sex was correlated with leadership style. Only the participative style had a significant correlation, indicating there was a tendency for females
to assign higher values than males to a participative style of leadership. There were no correlations between telling, selling, and delegating leadership styles and the variable, sex.

3. School grade level was significantly related to two of the leadership styles. As grade level increased from tenth to eleventh to twelfth, scores of the telling style of leadership also increased. The opposite was true for delegating. The correlations were based mainly on tenth and eleventh graders, since twelfth graders made up less than 6 percent of the total.

4. Overall group effectiveness and its three subscales — drive, cohesiveness, and productivity — were significantly and positively related to the variable, tendency toward delegation. Correlations centered around .5 with productivity having the lowest correlation and overall effectiveness the highest.

5. The extent of camper participation in small group activities was not related to how well the group did in the presentation to a panel the last day of camp.

6. Campers' participation in group activities was not related to their attitude toward delegation.

7. Member participation in group activities was significantly and positively related to drive, cohesiveness, productivity, and overall group effectiveness. As members increased their level of involvement, group achievement rose. Correlations were between .240 and .295.
8. Drive, cohesiveness, and productivity were significantly and positively interrelated with each other above the .5 level. As one increased, the others increased. The relationship between drive and productivity was the strongest (.689).

Recommendations

This research study assessed the effectiveness of a packet of resource materials designed to teach leadership delegation to youth. Based upon the findings, the following recommendations are made to those responsible for providing leadership training to 4-H youth.

1. Provide youth with the opportunity to compare a personal assessment of their participation with how others view their involvement in group activities. This has the potential of increasing their participation level, which was positively correlated in this study with group effectiveness.

2. Continue to test the packet and attempt to identify the variables that affect its effectiveness. The resource packet made a difference in the second camp, which was a younger, smaller camp, but other variables may have been responsible for the packet's being effective in one camp and not the other.

3. Help youth develop the ability to use a wider range of leadership styles, realizing the difficulty involved in personality change. Help them understand that different situations may require different leadership styles.

4. Assist youth in assessing their personal leadership styles and identifying situations to fit those styles.
5. Continue to evaluate the materials used at the state 4-H leadership camp and the goals of the camp in relation to the materials.

6. Consider encouraging sophomores rather than juniors to attend state 4-H leadership camps. Younger campers may be more receptive to leadership training.

7. Plan learning situations to encourage the maximum in member participation.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Conduct a longitudinal study of the state 4-H leadership camps to determine effectiveness of materials for groups.

2. Investigate the relationship of age/grade level of youth to leadership styles so that there will be more research on youth leadership.

3. Replicate in voluntary group settings research on delegation which has been done with business groups. Most of the research has been done with adults in work settings; there is a need for research with youth and adults in voluntary groups.

4. Measure group productivity using a variety of measurements such as attitudinal questionnaires, observations, and interviews.

5. Continue investigation of relationships between participation and measures of group effectiveness: drive, cohesiveness, and productivity.

6. Compare differences between youth and adult leadership styles.

7. Use the instruments which measured group effectiveness in other situations. Their reliability has been tested in this study and
in Neason's (1983).

8. Continue to validate for volunteer groups the Problem-Solving Decision-Making Style Inventory developed by Hersey and Natemeyer (1982).

9. Identify situations and conditions which determine the most appropriate leadership style.

10. Determine factors that influence the quality of leadership training.

11. Assess the effectiveness of the resource packet with adult voluntary groups in addition to youth organizations.

12. Investigate the effect of the in-service training of advisors on the usefulness of the resource materials.

13. Study the influence of adult characteristics on the productivity of groups they advise.
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APPENDIX A. SCHEDULES AND CORRESPONDENCE
MONDAY

10:00  Registration and Move In

11:00  Session 1  
      Climate Setting  
      (Total group/Cabin Group)

12:00  Lunch

1:30   Session 2  
      Why Individuals Join Groups/  
      Environmental Factors  
      (Color Group)

4:00   Session 3  
      Group Goal Setting  
      (Color Group/Total Group)

5:00   FREE TIME*  
      Swim

6:00   Dinner

7:00   Session 4  
      Organizing for the Week  
      (Community Meeting)

8:00   Special Topics (Optional)

9:00   Session 5  
      Planning Group Activity  
      Evening Thoughts

11:00  In cabins

TUESDAY

7:00   "Wake-up" (Prep for day)

8:00   Breakfast and task  
      responsibilities

9:00   Looking at the Day Ahead  
      (Total Group)
      Session 6  
      Attitudes Toward Leadership  
      Group Leadership Concepts  
      (Color Group)

11:00  FREE TIME* or planning meetings

12:00  Lunch

1:00   Leisure or planning time

1:30   (Community Meeting)

2:00   Session 7  
      Group Member Roles  
      (Color Group)
105

Session 8
Exploring communities/
Creative Problem Solving
(Col or Group)

4:30 FREE TIME*
Swim from 4:30 to 5:30
6:00 Dinner
7:00 Leisure or Planning Time
7:30 Special Topics (Optional)
8:30 Evening Activities
Evening Thoughts
11:00 In cabins

WEDNESDAY
6:00 Optional Canoeing**
from 6:00 to 8:00
Up to 12 campers
7:00 "Wake-up" (Prep for day)
8:00 Breakfast and task responsibilities
9:00 Looking at the Day Ahead
(Total Group)
9:30 Session 9
Identifying the Problem
Forces Affecting the Problem Situation
(Color Group)
11:00 FREE TIME* or planning meetings
Swim
12:00 Lunch
1:00 Board buses to town
1:30 Session 10
Information Gathering
• Conferences
• Interviews
• Surveys
(Color Group)
5:30 Pizza Supper
6:30 Board buses to camp
7:00 Leisure or Planning Time
7:30 Special Topics (Optional)
8:30 Evening Activities
Evening Thoughts
11:00 In cabins

THURSDAY
6:00 Optional Canoeing**
from 6:00-8:00
Up to 12 campers
7:00 "Wake-up" (Prep for day)
8:00 Breakfast and task responsibilities
9:00 Looking at the Day Ahead
(Total Group)
9:30 Session 12
Techniques for presenting group problems
(Color Group)
11:00 FREE TIME* or planning meetings
Swim
12:00 Lunch
1:00 Leisure or planning time
1:30 (Community Meeting)
2:00 Session 13
Preparation and critique of group presentations
(Color group)
4:30 FREE TIME*
Swim from 4:30 to 5:30
6:00 Dinner
7:00 Leisure or planning time
7:30 Special Topics (Optional)
8:30 Evening Activities
Evening Thoughts
11:00 In cabins

FRIDAY
7:00 "Wake-up" (Prep for day)
8:00 Breakfast and task responsibilities
9:00 Session 14
Group Presentations
(Color Group/Total Group)
5:30 Pizza Supper
6:30 Board buses to camp
7:00 Leisure or Planning Time
7:30 Special Topics (Optional)
8:30 Evening Activities
Evening Thoughts
11:00 In cabins

1:15 Session 15
Evaluation and Looking Ahead
(Color Group/Total Group)
2:30 Homeward Bound!

*FREE TIME
During free time, there are several options available.

1. Swimming: The camp pool is open to Elm Village at this time.

2. Other: The camp has other equipment (softball, volleyball, basketball, etc.) that can be used during free time. Staff members have a sheet listing the options available.

**CANOEING
Elm Village has scheduled two early morning canoe trips. Up to 12 campers can go each time. There will be a sign-up sheet posted in the lodge.
PURPOSE: 1. Familiarize staff with content and schedule of workshop.
2. Build group rapport among staff.
3. Become acquainted with camp facilities.
4. Understand and prepare for staff roles of a) facilitator, and b) resource person.
5. Understand teenagers (delegates coming to the workshop).
6. To understand expectations of delegates.

SCHEDULE: Saturday

1:00   Arrive, get located
1:30-2:30 Climate setting (session 1, 2)
2:30-3:30 Group goal setting (session 3)
3:30-5:00 Being a group facilitator
5:00-7:00 Dinner, free time, family time
7:00-8:00 Evening activities (session 5) - include families
8:00-9:00 Evening thoughts with campfire - include families

Sunday

8:00-9:00 Breakfast and wake-up
9:00-10:00 Worship
10:00-11:00 Understanding teens
11:00-12:00 Group leadership (sessions 6-7)
12:00-1:30 Lunch, free time, family time
1:30-3:30 Problem solving (sessions 8-14)
3:30-5:00 Staff assignments for tasks, individual planning time
6:00-8:00 Dinner
7:00   Individual planning, preparations for week ahead

P.S. There will be an opportunity to use the confidence course and possibly take a canoe trip if the river is usable. We will schedule these activities after all arrive and we see who would like to participate.
Dear Leadership Workshop Delegate:

Welcome to the State Leadership Workshop July 11-15. You will be part of a group of about 50 youth delegates and 9 adult staff.

We will be living at Elm Village at the State 4-H Camping Center near Madrid. See map enclosed. Registration is from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on Monday, July 11.

Several important pieces of information are enclosed. Be certain to read them over, complete the forms, and bring them to camp with you. Also, note that your parents are asked to sign one of the forms. (Remember to bring the Health Statement with you. We must have this on file.)

During the week, we will focus especially on **community** leadership, how problems are identified and resolved in local communities and how decisions are made. So we would like to have you think about what you consider to be problems in your community before you come. Please read the enclosed Participant Information Sheet carefully. It explains what this workshop is all about. And if you can attend a meeting of a local government group, as we suggest on the enclosed information sheet, it would be helpful to you as we work throughout the week.

Your mailing address at camp will be: State Leadership Workshop, Elm Village, State 4-H Camping Center, Madrid, Iowa 50156. Telephone (515) 795-3338.

A list of delegates is enclosed if you would like to combine transportation.

---

The Iowa Cooperative Extension Service's programs and policies are consistent with pertinent federal and state laws and regulations on non-discrimination regarding race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, and handicap.

Iowa State University and U.S. Department of Agriculture cooperating
June 29, 1983

We are looking forward to a good week and know you are too. It will be busy with time for both work and fun. If for some reason you cannot attend this workshop, we need to know before the first day of camp. No refunds will be made once the workshop has started.

Let us know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Glen Thompson
Extension Recreation Specialist

Jim Meek
Extension Resource Development Specialist

Enclosures
SUGGESTIONS FOR DELEGATES

To make your week at camp the most comfortable and to be ready for every occasion, you will want to bring:

1. Health Statement (don't pack this in your suitcase! It needs to be turned in on arrival).
2. Camp Clothing
   a) bring plenty of casual clothes to last for five days at camp -- be prepared for hot, cool, rainy, and/or dry weather!
   b) comfortable shoes (bring a change in case of wet shoes)
   c) towels, wash cloths, soap and other toilet articles
   d) swimming suit
3. Bedding - a sleeping bag or bed roll, with several blankets, and pillow if desired.
4. Other
   a) flashlight
   b) notebook, paper and pencils
   c) mosquito repellent (this is a must!)
5. Optional
   a) music or instrument if you sing or play
   b) resources (such as books, poems, readings, game ideas) that could be used in planning campfires, evening thoughts and parties
   c) if you wish, 2 or 3 records of the kind of music you can dance to. We suspect one or more of the evening activities might include some dancing. Please put your name and county on each record.
6. T-shirts and other canteen materials along with snacks will be available. You may want to bring a little extra cash along with you.

Village Regulations

Non-Negotiable Items

Drugs The use of and/or consumption of illegal drugs and intoxicants is not permitted at the Iowa 4-H Camping Center. (Prescription drugs need to be checked in with the Camp Nurse.)
Smoking In the interest of fire prevention, smoking is not allowed in sleeping cabins. Use designated smoking areas only.

Other Expectations

Hours Men and women will be in their respective cabin and restroom area by 11:00 p.m. and in their cabins and lights out by 11:30 p.m.
Leaving Camp Participants are expected to be in full time attendance from Monday morning through Friday afternoon at 2:00 p.m. If you foresee problems with this expectation, the Leadership Workshop Director must be notified prior to your arrival at camp. Please contact Don Broshar or Glen Thompson at 33 Curtiss Hall, ISU, Ames, Iowa 50011, phone (515) 294-3760.
Use of Vehicle After unloading, all vehicles will be parked in the central parking lot near Linden Lodge. Permission must be obtained from your Workshop Director to use your vehicle for any reason during the Workshop.
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
YOUTH COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

WHAT: A 5-day workshop sponsored and conducted by the Iowa 4-H program of Iowa State University Extension service. It is designed to provide participants with leadership skills to help them become effective members of their communities.

WHEN AND WHERE: Session I - June 20-24; Session II - July 11-15
Both workshop sessions are held at the State 4-H Camping Center near Madrid, Iowa.

WHO: Youth who have completed their sophomore or junior year in high school, approximately equal numbers of young men and young women.

WHY: Communities constantly need new and dynamic leaders who have the ability and courage to confront the difficult problems of the times. This workshop is designed to help you become more aware of your personal abilities and to begin to develop skills that will assist you in helping your own community face the difficult problems in the future.

PROGRAM CONTENT:
1. Understanding groups and how they make decisions - you will be involved in both small and large group settings.
2. Self awareness training - understanding individual strengths and weaknesses and helping develop more confidence.
3. Problem solving resources and strategies - how to locate community resources and use them to solve the problems identified by the participants.

STAFF: Staff will be members of Iowa State University Extension, faculty of area high schools, personnel from youth serving organizations, and resource persons from participating communities. The staff serve as counselors to groups of eight youth, assisting with problem solving activities throughout the week.
1. The Directors of the Community Leadership Workshops will plan and develop a workshop which will attempt to make available to you:

   a) more understanding of yourself
   b) opportunity to develop skills in expressing your ideas
   c) new ways in which you can react to problems in your community
   d) knowledge of resources that are available to assist you in solving problems
   e) different ways to communicate with people
   f) open or free time for individual or group activities
   g) some different ways of looking at the world
   h) fun as well as work

2. The Directors of the Community Leadership Workshops expect that you will:

   a) show respect and concern for each person at the workshop
   b) listen to yourself and others
   c) be willing to try new things
   d) try to develop a willingness to understand and accept others
   e) be willing to cooperate with your fellow workshop participants
   f) share your uniqueness with the workshop community
   g) attend full time, from 10:00 a.m. Monday through 2:00 p.m. Friday, unless permission to be excused is obtained prior to coming to the workshop
   h) participate in all scheduled activities of the workshop
   i) abide by the rules and regulations made by the workshop directors and/or the workshop community
   j) share what you learn with people in your home community

3. The Directors of the Community Leadership Workshops would like you to complete two assignments prior to attending. They are:

   a) attend one meeting of a local government group such as the city council, county board of supervisors, school board, planning and zoning commission, or parks and recreation board.

   b) complete and bring your health card and the talent questionnaire with you to camp.
February 20, 1984

Ms. Julia Gamon  
Iowa State University  
Dept. of Agricultural Education  
223 Curtiss Hall  
Ames, IA 50011  

Dear Ms. Gamon:

Thank you for your interest in our Problem Solving and Decision Making Instruments.

We are pleased to grant you permission to include a copy of Hersey and Nate­meyer's Problem-Solving and Decision-Making Style Inventory/Perception of Self (306-GA) in the appendix of your doctoral dissertation. This permission is granted for one-time and for dissertation use only.

Thank you for your request. Best wishes for the successful completion of your degree.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Maureen Shriver  
Director of Administrative Services  

MS/VS  

cc: Richard I. Carter, Ph.D.
Welcome to the 4-H Youth Leadership Workshop. Your role as a panel member is of vital importance to the young people as they learn to present their thoughts and ideas to you as a member of a board, commission, or council regarding a community project proposal which they have prepared. The young people have been learning about leadership skills this week and their presentation to you will be the culmination of their combined efforts to study a community problem and to put together a proposal to solve this problem. Previous evaluations of this leadership camp indicate that for many young people, their panel presentation to you is the most important event of this week.

Based on our previous experience, we would like to present the following guidelines to you as panel members.

1. Please make your role playing as a panel member as realistic as possible and deal with the young people as if they were formally presenting a proposal in the community.

2. Remember that for the majority of young people who will be making their formal presentation today, this is their first experience in making a formal presentation before a group of adults. Try to be friendly and supportive in your formal and informal interaction with the young people but remember this is an important learning experience.

3. Please allow 15-20 minutes at the conclusion of the presentation for feedback to the youth group regarding their group performance. It is helpful to take notes during each presentation for the purposes of this feedback. The young people have found it helpful for each panel member to comment not only on the content of the proposal (structure and information presented in the proposal) but also on the process or method of delivery of the proposal.

4. Please close the panel presentation in a positive manner so as to encourage the young people to continue to strive to be leaders and to participate in community activities.

5. You may wish to make a few comments at the conclusion to the adult advisor or counselor of the youth group regarding the performance of his group.

6. If you are able to stay for lunch, may we encourage you to have lunch with some of the young people that you interacted with this morning and provide further feedback on their group and individual performance.

7. On behalf of the young people and the staff, we thank you for your participation.

The 4-H and Youth Staff
OUTLINE FOR TRAINING FOR PANEL MEMBERS

1. Introductions
2. Thank you and importance of panel
3. Procedures – Topics, locations and duties of panel members
   (using Guidelines for Panel Members)
4. Video tape of a presentation
   Beginning (38), data presentation (115), budget (200),
   questions (335), conclusion (468)¹
5. Rating forms
6. Review and questions

¹Numbers refer to starting points on videotape.
May 9, 1983

Dr. Alvera Stern  
Youth & Shelter Services  
232½ Main  
Ames, Iowa 50010

Dear Dr. Stern:

This is the proposed score sheet for the presentations to the panel at the 4-H Leadership Camp.

Could you please fill in the percentages blanks with what you think each item should be worth? The total should add up to 100%.

If you have some suggestions for changes that would make this easier for you and other panel members to use, just write them on the sheet.

Sincerely,

Julia Gamon  
Assistant State Leader  
4-H & Youth Programs

Also sent to:  
Glen Thompson, State Extension Recreation Specialist  
Roy Hougen, Don Broshar, Charlotte Smith, Assistant State Leaders, 4-H and Youth.
WEIGHTINGS OF GROUP PRESENTATION RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury Members</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Topic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involvement</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delivery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PRESENTATION TOPICS - CAMP 1**

**Linden-Panel:** Kelly O'Neill, Charles Hammer, Barb Wood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Teenage substance abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>Teenage vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Youth recreation needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elm-Panel:** Don Tripp, Keith Whigham, Georgene Shank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>Grant Committee</td>
<td>Child abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>Student lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Butternut-Panel:** Milley Gonzalez, Paul Coates, Howard Shapiro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. brown</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Child abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. brown</td>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Retail renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Parent, teen relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Teenage alcoholism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elm-Panel: John Hilgerson, Milley Gonzalez, Charlotte Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Crime and substance abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>State Legislators</td>
<td>Teenage pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>Child neglect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shelter-Panel: Alvera Stern, Shirley Karas, Richard Zbaracki
APPENDIX B. PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY
## Color Group Assignments

### Blue - Mary TeWinkel
1. Mark Eberling  
2. Michele Knipper  
3. Anne Kirpes  
4. Luke Sieverding  
5. Kim Zelhart  
6. Jill Sorensen  
7. Janelle Jacobs  
8. Linda Ryan

### Orange - Evelyn Beavers
1. Lori Muench  
2. Becky Mayer  
3. Neil Gerst  
4. Michele Leininger  
5. Connie Holst  
6. Darren Hora  
7. Chris McGowan  
8. Marsha Mohr

### Black - Verlee Hein
1. Donna Boatman  
2. Lisa Kersten  
3. Amy Kennedy  
4. Karen Mohrfeld  
5. Vonda Fisher  
6. Craig Dostal  
7. Jim Tincher  
8. David Frey

### Red - Clair Hein
1. Lori Sivesind  
2. Gregory Halbur  
3. Susan Hucker  
4. Tammy Brehm  
5. Debra Buscher  
6. Michael David Bronson  
7. Linda Beenken  
8. Kelley Kolacia

### Yellow - Dan Weigel
1. Darci Shell  
2. Karen Nicholson  
3. Tom Schoffelman  
4. Nicki Tjaden  
5. Robin Woodley  
6. Lisa Fahrenkrog  
7. Eric Johnson  
8. Bobbi Jones

### White - Ester Cox
1. Lisa Croft  
2. Neal Johnston  
3. Jennifer Miller  
4. Jacque Stephens  
5. Jodi Schulte  
6. Karol Blake  
7. John Velky  
8. Lisa Engelhardt
Green - Jan Porter
1. Becky Schellenberg
2. Craig Rupp
3. Curtis McAllister
4. Suzanne Vincent
5. Randy Hentzel
6. Michelle Frick
7. Lynn Hill
8. Laurie Mitchell

Dark Brown - Jerry Vincent
1. Diane Kuempel
2. Christine Smith
3. Ken Lane
4. Melinda Hanson
5. Angie Poldberg
6. Deb Corpman
7. John Roach
8. Sara Thompson

Light Brown - Suzanne Moore
1. Beverly A. Greif
2. Sandy Jennings
3. Julie Cornelius
4. Sonja Wold
5. Carol Lee
6. Denise Rhodes
7. Roland Christensen
8. Wray T. Carroll

Directors: Don Broshar
Mike Biedenfelt
STATE LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
State 4-H Camping Center
Madrid, Iowa
Session II, July 11-15, 1983

Color Group Assignments

Red - Gerry Walter
1. Joe Cavil
2. Steve Jacobs
3. Mary Houghtaling
4. Jeanette Lolbach
5. Margaret DeBrown
6. Kimberly Van Dyke
7. Diana Ohr

Blue - Julie Olsen
1. Todd Schminke
2. John Eganhouse
3. Malinda Patch
4. Jackie Stuber
5. Jackie Ricklefs
6. Marguerita DeBrown
7. Alison Odland
8. Lu Ann Besch

White - Rebecca Shultz
1. Rick Langel
2. Jon McAlexander
3. Lisa Young
4. Susan Fehr
5. Marcia Zahrobsky
6. Jennifer Peters
7. Karen Loutsch

Yellow - Sam Steel
1. Kurtis Mollenbeck
2. Razali Bin Mat Zin
3. Amy Bockwoldt
4. Jane Richards
5. Robin Shaffer
6. Susan Stoneking
7. Debra English

Orange - Bernadette Yanda
1. Brenton VanHorn
2. David Cheers
3. Gretta Goldsworthy
4. Diane Binneboese
5. Jaci Juhl
6. Beth Kellar
7. Heidi Nilan

Green - Catherine Hoag
1. Erik Iverson
2. James Hockett
3. Mary Martin
4. Melissa Fehr
5. Sarah Clark
6. Beth Teggatz
7. Wendy Arp
8. Doris Flickinger

Directors: Glen Thompson
Jim Meek
Group effectiveness was assessed using Part I - Group Achievement with the following subscales:

Drive - Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20
Cohesiveness - Questions 1, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 27
Productivity - Questions 6, 7, 9, 11, 18, 19, 22, 25, 26.

Attitude toward delegation was assessed using Part II - Individual Attitudes - questions 27 through 52. Negatively worded questions that were recoded were:

Nos. 2, 4, 10, 18, 25, 28, 30, 32, 34, 42, 45.
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APPENDIX D. INFORMED CONSENT

Instructions to Campers about Questionnaires

Note: Please read this to campers and then pass out the questionnaires. Ask campers to return their completed questionnaires to you.

You've come to the end of a week full of leadership experiences. Please help us evaluate what has happened this week by filling out some questionnaires. Your thoughtful and careful responses will help as we plan leadership training for future sports.

Please note that a number of the questions refer to a "group." Think of the color group you were in this week whenever you see the word "group."

Completing the questionnaire is optional, although we hope you will participate. We are comparing two different sets of leadership training materials and your answers will help to determine which set is used in another year. Your answers will be completely confidential and you will be identified only by number. The numbers will make it possible to combine together all of one person's scores. The scores will be looked at only by number, not by name.
APPENDIX E. EXAMPLE OF MATERIALS IN THE RESOURCE PACKET
Leadership Styles

Role Playing

Desired Participant Outcome:
Participants will become familiar with the different leadership styles.

Specific Objectives:
1. Participants will be able to identify four basic leadership styles when they observe them in situations.
2. Participants will be able to list characteristics of each style.
3. Participants will be able to judge the appropriateness of a style for a particular situation.

Teaching Procedure:
1. Using TP 5, 6, 7, 8, and HO2, describe the four leadership styles: Telling, Selling, Participating, and Delegating. Explain that different situations call for different leadership styles.
2. Divide the group into four sections. Each group needs to select one person to be the chairman.
3. Give each group one of the approaches in ACT 6.4. Before they begin, ask the group members to be ready to discuss:
   A. Leadership style used.
   B. Characteristics of the style.
   C. Appropriateness of the style for the situation and factors that influenced its effectiveness.
4. Give the group 5-10 minutes to prepare; then have each situation acted out. After each role play, have the group discuss what happened in relation to the above points.
5. After all group have presented and discussed the role plays, pass out leadership jeopardy, ACT 5 and ask participants to choose the most appropriate style.
6. Give correct answers. Find which ones were missed the most and discuss those some more. Emphasize that different situations call for different styles.
Typical Patterns of Leadership Behavior

Telling:

The leader identifies a problem, considers alternative solutions, chooses one of them, and then tells his followers what they are to do. The leader may or may not consider what the group members will think or feel about the decision, but they clearly do not participate directly in the decision-making. Coercion may or may not be used or implied.

This method is appropriate to use with new groups, new situations, and crisis occasions or any time the group is not familiar with the problem and needs strong leadership.

Selling:

The leader makes the decision without consulting the group. However, instead of simply announcing the decision, the leader tries to persuade the group members to accept it. The leader points out that the organizational goals and the interest of the group members have been considered. The leader sells the decision by emphasizing the benefits to the members from carrying it out.

This method is appropriate to use when groups have a little familiarity with the situation but still need direction and support from the leader.

Participating:

The leader gives the group members a chance to influence the decision from the beginning. The leader presents a problem and relevant background information, then asks the members for their ideas on how to solve it. In effect, the group is invited to increase the number of alternative actions to be considered. The leader and members share in the decision making and select the solution that seems to be most promising.

This method is effective with on-going groups that have the background and experience to suggest solutions to problems.

Delegating:

The leader participates in the discussion of alternative solutions to the problem. The leader then identifies individuals and committees who are capable and knowledgeable and gives them the authority to make decisions and the responsibility to carry-out activities.

This method is appropriate with established groups in which the leader trusts the members and considers them capable. It encourages the participation and involvement of members as it trains future leaders for the group.
Leadership Style Situations

Leadership Style-Telling

You are the social committee for your group. The chairman has called a meeting to select a fall social event. These decisions must be made:

1. What type of activity will be held
2. Who can come to the activity
3. What the cost will be and who will pay for it

The chairman presents the situation to the committee but in the end the chairman decides the group will:

A. Have a hayride
B. Everyone may bring a friend
C. The group will pay the cost out of the Treasury

Leadership Style-Selling

You are the social committee for your group. The chairman has called a meeting to plan a fall social event. The chairman presents the situation to the committee, but the chairman has decided to:

A. Have a Halloween party
B. Just for the members
C. Everyone will bring 50 cents to pay for it

The chairman should sell the idea to the group by pointing out the benefits of the idea and answering all questions or doubts about it. It should be the final decision.

Leadership Style-Participation

You are the social committee for your group. The chairman has called a meeting to plan a fall social event. The chairman presents the situation to the committee and together they consider all ideas and pick the ones that seem to have the most support.

Leadership Style-Delegating

You are the social committee for your group. The chairman has called a meeting to plan a fall social event. The chairman presents the situation to the committee, then leads a short discussion of alternative solutions. Next the chairman appoints one of the committee members to poll a sample of the group members for their preferences, asks another person to look into the group's finances and get estimates of costs of different activities and asks another person to check on the availability of places, and dates that are possible.
You are the social committee for your group. The chairman has called a meeting to plan a fall social event. The chairman presents the situation to the committee, then leads a short discussion of alternative solutions. Next the chairman appoints one of the committee members to poll a sample of the group members for their preferences, asks another person to look into the group's finances and get estimates of costs of different activities and asks another person to check on the availability of places, and dates that are possible.