1985

Leader Behaviors of the Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor

Adrian William Ton
Loyola University Chicago

LEADER BEHAVIORS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISOR

by

Adrian William Ton, Jr.

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

January 1985

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the leader behaviors of the special education technical assistance supervisor. Four research questions were formulated for this purpose:

1. What leader behaviors are perceived as relevant to the effectiveness of the position of special education technical assistance supervisor?
2. What perceived conflicts exist between the three groups consisting of executive directors, technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the ideal leader behaviors of the technical assistance supervisors?
3. What conflicts exist among the special education technical assistance supervisors, between their perceived ideal leader behaviors and their perceived specific leader behaviors?
4. What conflicts exist between special education technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the former group's perceived leader behaviors?

The participants included executive directors of special education cooperatives, technical assistance supervisors employed by the cooperatives and school district administrators within the cooperatives. Participants were placed in one of five groups. Each group received one of three modified versions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII), entitled LBDQ-XII Ideal, LBDQ-XII Self and LBDQ-XII Specific.

The criterion of 4.0, "often," (1=Never and 5=Always) was used to identify important leader behaviors. Four subscales were considered

important ideal leader behaviors by all three groups, Demand Reconciliation, Initiation of Structure, Integration and Consideration. Executive directors also included Persuasiveness, Role Assumption and Predictive Accuracy as important. Technical assistance supervisors listed Per-suasiveness, Role Assumption and Integration as important. Using chi-square at the $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance, no differences were found between the three groups on any of the subscales.

When comparing the technical assistance supervisor ideal leader behaviors with perceived self behaviors only, two subscales showed significant differences, Demand Reconciliation and Tolerance of Uncertainty.

When comparing the technical assistance supervisors' perceived self behavior with that of a district representative's perception of a specific technical assistance supervisor, only two subscales showed significant differences, Demand Reconciliation and Tolerance of Uncertainty.

The results tend to describe ideal leader behaviors that bring organization to the system, the ability to know what is coming next, accepting divergent views and establishing order. These activities are to be done in a manner that is considerate and thoughtful.

While there appears to be general agreement regarding the relative importance of the leader behaviors on the LBDQ-XII, the technical assistance supervisors indicated some potential conflict in two areas.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Philip Carlin, for his direction, patience and support throughout my studies and the preparation of this project; additionally, to Dr. Max Bailey for his interest and guidance as a member of the dissertation committee; finally, to Dr. Karen Gallagher for her encouragement and assistance in the compilation and analysis of the data as well as a member of the dissertation committee.

My deepest appreciation is extended to Dr. R. Lanier Britsch for his encouragement in pursuing advanced degrees, Mr. Arthur Dykstra for his example of a leader, and most especially to Mrs. Janis Freeman for her support and the opportunity to pursue my studies while on the job.

A special thanks goes to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Adrian W. Ton, Sr., for their support, both financial and emotional. Also to Ms. Nancy Snyder who has not only provided expert typing services but the necessary "technical assistance." Lastly, to Dr. Todd Hoover and the staff of The Loyola University Computer Services Center for their assistance.

Finally, my most sincere love and affection for the sacrifices of my family during the course of this undertaking. My wife, Winnie, my son, William Peter, and my daughter, Kristen Susan, have been a constant source of love and encouragement. Their patience, support and understanding during the course of my studies has been a source of continued strength.

VITA

Adrian William Ton, Jr., is the son of Adrian William and Alice Louise (Ludwig) Ton. He was born September 20, 1947, in Chicago, Illinois.

The author attended the Chicago Public Schools and graduated from Christian Fenger High School in June, 1965. He was awarded a Bachelor of Arts degree, majoring in History, from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, in August, 1969. A Master of Arts degree in Special Education-Trainable Mentally Handicapped was awarded in December, 1972, from Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, Illinois.

In September, 1969, the author became a teacher in the Chicago Public Schools. During his five-and-one-half-year tenure he held teaching positions at the W.E.B. DuBois Elementary School and the Holden Special Education Center. Class assignments included Trainable Mentally Handicapped, Educable Mentally Handicapped and Special Education Workshop. In 1973 he co-authored an E.S.E.A. Title III Project, "The Holden Motor Coordination Laboratory" and became the first instructor of the project.

During January, 1975, the author became a teacher for the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities at the Howe Developmental Center, Tinley Park, Illinois. The class included severely and profoundly retarded adults. In June, 1977, he was promoted to Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent.

During July, 1978, the author became the principal of the SPEED Satellite Program in Chicago Heights, Illinois. This was a multi-site

program for behavior disordered, learning disabled and educable mentally handicapped students.

He is currently employed by Lansing Elementary School District 158 as principal of Oak Glen Elementary School (K-6) and district director of special education.

At the present time he is a member of The Loyola Chapter of the Phi Delta Kappa, Illinois Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children. He has served as an adjunct professor at National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois, and Governors State University, University Park, Illinois, and is currently the extension coordinator of the Homewood-Flossmoor site of National College of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

OVERVIEW

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the position of special education technical assistance supervisor. The study will be a beginning point for investigating similar interdistrict and/or cooperative positions. School districts have had to decrease personnel and programs in recent years due to the reduction in numbers of students and funding. In some areas this has resulted in districts sharing certain aspects of their operations, i.e., special education, curriculum, vocational services, even business functions such as purchasing. In special education these arrangements have included the sharing of personnel. Research should begin to identify characteristics of these positions and the people working in them.

The old saying, "No man can serve two masters," brings to mind the potential for conflict that persons working in two or more districts may encounter. Research in the area of role conflict must entail a close look at the expected characteristics as well as the perceived characteristics of the people involved.

The present study will analyze one type of interdistrict position, namely the special education technical assistance supervisor. It will utilize the perceptions of the supervisors, special education executive directors, and local education agency personnel, i.e., district representatives. Both the ideal characteristics and specific characteristics will be identified using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-

Form XII (hereafter referred to as LBDQ-XII, See Appendix A). Such an undertaking may improve the body of knowledge regarding the specific position and perhaps provide a model for future analysis of similar interdistrict positions.

Research Questions

The following questions were examined as part of this study:

1. What leader behaviors are perceived as relevant to the effectiveness of the position of special education technical assistance supervisor?
2. What perceived conflicts exist between the three groups consisting of executive directors, technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the ideal leader behaviors of the technical assistance supervisors?
3. What conflicts exist among the special education technical assistance supervisors, between their perceived ideal leader behaviors and their perceived specific leader behaviors?
4. What conflicts exist between special education technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the former group's perceived leader behaviors?

Justification of the Study

The position of technical assistance supervisor is not new to the field of education. The position has existed in numerous forms, including reading specialist, curriculum consultant, and vocational coordinator, for many years. Additionally, numerous studies have been completed using the principal in the role of technical assistance supervisor. Perhaps due to the relative newness of special education, the dearth of advanced degree programs in this area and the emergence of the concept of technical assistance, little research has been done regarding the special education technical assistance supervisor.

That the position of technical assistance supervisor has received little attention is not surprising when one considers that the concept of technical assistance has received meager space in the literature as well. Clifford and Trohanis note that, "Because of the rapid emergence of technical assistance organizations into educational settings, there exists an information gap on the subject of technical assistance practices and organizations."[1]

A literature search was conducted during October, 1983, utilizing the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC). The descriptors included leadership behavior, principals, and supervisors. This resulted in finding 45 titles, of which only twelve were related to special education technical assistance supervision/supervisors.

---

[1] Richard M. Clifford and Pascal L. Trohanis, ed., Technical Assistance in Educational Settings (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1980), p. vi.

A second review was completed during December, 1983. The Comprehensive Dissertation Index Database was investigated utilizing similar descriptors. This resulted in finding 133 studies; however, only three studies included information regarding the special education technical assistance supervisor.

An ERIC review was completed during September of 1984 using the descriptors "technical assistance" and "education." This search yielded a total of 93 titles with only about fifteen titles related to special education.

It is obvious from the general lack of information that the present study is justified.

Limitations of the Study

1. Twenty-five (25) special education cooperatives from nine counties in northeastern Illinois were included. These cooperatives include 329 public school districts with a total student population of 683,411 and a handicapped student child count of 90,632.
2. Only districts that participate in special education cooperatives were included. Several districts within the geographic area provide their own technical assistance supervision and, therefore, were not included.
3. The study utilized a survey-type instrument to obtain data.
4. A self-selection bias must be considered since all participants who returned questionnaires did so voluntarily.

5. Executive directors had the option of identifying technical assistance supervisors. Even though the research used a standard definition, there was no way to verify the executive director's selection.

Definition of Terms

APPROVAL: A letter from the Illinois Board of Teacher Certification indicating that the person is qualified for a specific position and, therefore, the district is eligible for partial reimbursement of that person's salary.

AREAS OF EXCEPTIONALITY OR PROGRAMS: Refers to a specific handicapping condition and/or the program related to that condition, i.e., mental retardation, learning disability, deaf, blind, etc.

CERTIFICATION: The process of applying for and receiving a specific certificate issued by the Illinois Board of Teacher Certification.

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE: Most districts designate a person as "director" of special education. The official title may vary and include coordinator, supervisor, administrative representative, director of pupil personnel services, etc. The relevant factors include that the person (1) is designated by the district to be responsible for special education programs and services within the district and (2) serves as a liaison between the district and cooperative. These persons may or may not hold any special education credentials. In some instances, they have other district responsibilities. In cases where no person was so designated, other district administrators were used, e.g. building principals or superintendents.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Executive directors are responsible for special education programs and services among the member districts of a special education cooperative. Their actual authority varies from line supervision to no control of district special education personnel, depending on the organization of the cooperative. However, in cooperatives that employ personnel such as technical assistance supervisors, executive directors usually are line supervisors for that position.

The term "executive director" is being used arbitrarily to identify the chief administrator of a special education cooperative. The title may vary from cooperative to cooperative. The requirements for the position are listed in the section for Administration of Special Education Approval and include:

1. Proper Administrative Certificate (Type 75)
2. Master's Degree
3. Required Courses (30 semester hours distributed among these areas)
    a. Survey of Exceptional Children
    b. Special methods courses (three areas of exceptionality)
    c. Supervision of Programs for Exceptional Children
    d. Educational Psychological Diagnosis and Remedial Techniques
    e. Guidance and Counseling.[2]

Functionally, the executive director is employed by the member districts to administer special education programs and services within

---

[2] Illinois State Board of Education, Special Education Certification and Approval Requirements and Procedures, (Springfield, Illinois: by the author, 100 Morth First Street, 1982), p. 12.

the cooperative and its districts in accordance with the needs and desires of the member district.

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-FORM XII SUBSCALES: The LBDQ-XII consists of one-hundred (100) statements describing leadership characteristics in twelve (12) categories (called subscales):

1. Representation: speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)
2. Demand Reconciliation: reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system. (5 items)
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty: is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)
4. Persuasiveness: uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)
5. Initiation of Structure: clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)
6. Tolerance of Freedom: allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. (10 items)
7. Role Assumption: actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)
8. Consideration: regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)
9. Production Emphasis: applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)
10. Predictive Accuracy: exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.

11. Integration: maintains a closely knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts. (5 items)

12. Superior Orientation: maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status.[3] (10 items)

LINE SUPERVISION: The activities of a person who has primary responsibility for the day-to-day operation of a school or agency, usually the building principal in a school.

MEMBER DISTRICTS: Districts that are legally associated within a special education cooperative.

RELATED SERVICES: These are mandated services which must be provided as either a diagnostic service or supplementary educational service, i.e., psychology, social work, speech and language, etc.

SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVES/JOINT AGREEMENTS: Special education cooperatives in Illinois, excluding regional and single district programs, are organized to meet a variety of needs. In all instances, the cooperatives are bound together by formal agreements and have a "board," usually comprised of member district superintendents, their representatives or members of the respective boards of education. Cooperatives also must employ an "executive director" who is approved by the Illinois State Board of Education. Except for these few similarities each cooperative is unique in structure, services and programs provided.

---

[3] Ralph M. Stogdill, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII: An Experimental Revision (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1963), p. 3.

SPECIAL EDUCATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISOR: The School Code of Illinois and The Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, (hereafter after cited as "Rules and Regulations") require each district have available a state-approved special education technical assistance supervisor:

> All special education programs and services shall be provided with state-approved supervisory services, specific to the nature of the program or service. Supervisory personnel shall provide consultation to and coordination of special education programs and services.[4]

Requirements for approval in these positions are contained in the "Special Education Certification and Approval Requirements and Procedures" and a memorandum from the State Superintendent of Education (see appendix B). While the specific credentials vary from area to area, they may be summarized in two ways:

1. The person must have at least a master's degree and/or a specified number of hours in the area, two years teaching experience in the specific area and the appropriate supervisory certification.
2. The person must have a general administrative certificate endorsed for either administration or supervision (Type 75, "principal's certificate") and a teaching certificate or approval in the area of exceptionality or related service in which the assistance is to be rendered.

---

[4] Illinois State Board of Education, Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, (Springfield, Illinois: by the author, 100 North First Street, 1979), p. 12.

STAFF SUPERVISION: The activities of a person responsible for providing assistance of a technical nature to members of an organization. A reading specialist may assist classroom teachers.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: The provision of quality content and/or process expertise via a responsive, continuous and external system to assist clients and their organization to change or improve for the better.[5]

---

[5] Pascal L. Trohanis, "Technical Assistance and the Improvement of Services to Exceptional Children," Theory Into Practice 21 (Spring, 1982): 120.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Leadership or leader behavior is a frequently discussed and researched topic. However, there are nearly as many definitions and research models as there are writers in the field, making specificity, much less agreement, nearly impossible. To use one definition or methodology should not be viewed as an attempt to negate others but rather to add to the wealth of information about leadership.

Three men dominated the pre-World War I literature on leadership, Fredrich W. Taylor, Henri Fayol and Max Weber.[1] Taylor, the American, had a scientific and engineering background. His concept of "scientific management" sought to bring about the most efficient system for the least amount of money. Therefore, the leader was one who could coordinate as many tasks as possible in order to accomplish the job at hand as efficiently as possible. The Frenchman, Fayol, believed that trained administrators were needed at the top of the organization to plan, organize, command, coordinate and control operations. Therefore, he saw leadership in terms of those types of skills and completely different from the technical skills of the engineers or workers. Germany's Weber is best known for his description of a bureaucracy. He viewed the organization as having highly specialized units working toward a common goal functioning in a rational and impersonal manner. The leader

---

[1] Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970), pp. 5-8.

required considerable technical skill in a specific area. Interpersonal skills were unimportant since employee activities followed standard policies and procedures.

Following World War I, Luther Gulich and Lyndall Urwick espoused a trait theory of leadership built from Fayol's five characteristics. Their model, often referred to as the "classical model," includes planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. It is represented by the anagram "POSDCoRB." Aside from the trait approach, Gulich and Urwick developed another concept related to the present study. Their concept of "integrated dual supervision" wherein there is one supervisor for administration and one for "technical supervision" appears to be a forerunner of the model used herein.[2]

For some time the study of leader traits dominated the literature. There appears to have been two concurrent approaches to leadership trait research. The first was to study the lives of great men in order to deduce those characteristics that made them great. The second was to study the personality traits of men in leadership positions within the military, politics and business. While this method yielded long lists of traits, it also resulted in numerous contradictions. In 1948 Ralph Stogdill examined 124 trait studies dating from 1904 to 1948. Finding little, if any, consistency with personality traits and their relationship to leadership, he concluded that:

---

[2] Bertram M. Gross, "The Scientific Approach to Administration," Behaviorial Science and Educational Administration, in The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 41-44.

> A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers.3

Returning to the mid-thirties, the study of scientific management took a different approach as a result of a series of efficiency experiments at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne plant in Chicago. Research was being conducted to test the effect of illumination on productivity. The data for these experiments proved not only inconsistent but contradicted scientific management principles. Ultimately, two social scientists, Elton Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger determined that:

> ...the workers were reacting more to the positive concern of the experimenters about their working conditions than the actual physical changes in illumination. The response later came to be called the "Hawthorne effect."4

The impact of this finding was that there is a human element that must be factored into production. Thus researchers began to study the sociology of organizations and leadership. Hemphill completed numerous studies demonstrating that situations caused a variance in leader behaviors. For example, group size had an effect on the style of leadership, i.e., the leader of a large group tended to be more impersonal and demanding, while leaders in smaller groups tended to be more personal and cooperative.[5] Research was conducted using both observations

---

[3] Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, 25 (January 1948): 64.

[4] Fritz J. Roethlisberger, The Elusive Phenomena, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), p. 46.

[5] Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1956), p. 11.

and interviews of leaders and subordinates in both structured and unstructured situations. Such concepts as potential leadership, permissive leadership, persuasive leadership, et.al., became common.

Halpin summarizes this history of leadership research to this point and attempts to explain the behavioral approach in the introduction of his study entitled The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents:

> Historically, in most disciplines there is a tendency for new movements or emphasis to arise in revolt against the orthodoxies of a given period. These new movements later tend to crystallize into orthodoxies of the next period, and fresh countermovements arise in turn... Leadership research is currently (1956) in the process of following this type of development course. Early research was marked by a search for traits of leadership that would discriminate between leaders and nonleaders. The situational emphasis which has characterized research during the past decade arose as a protest against the earlier trait approach... Even now, within research circles, a gradual but growing counterreaction is taking shape--a drawing away from the extreme situational position, with increasing recognition that the truth probably is in an area of middle ground.6

Halpin goes on to critically define leader behavior as opposed to leadership, the title of his work notwithstanding. He states:

> What we wish to avoid is the use of the word (leadership) in the sense that implies the existence of an unidimensional attribute, capacity or power... The basic phenomena with which we deal are leadership acts or the behavior (emphasis his) of leaders and their group members.7

The study of leadership to this point of the review has evolved from a trait approach in the classical model to a situational approach in sociological model and finally to a behavioral approach. This evolution continues in an effort to determine a definition of leaderhship.

---

6 Halpin, Superintendents, p. 13.

7 Ibid., p. 14.

The Measurement of Leadership

In a review of the literature related to the measurement of leader behaviors, Schriesheim and Kerr found more than 120 so-called "leadership scales." Additionally, they note that in the period between 1960 and 1976 less than three percent have been used more than "a few times" and that in reality only three scales have been used sufficiently to provide a basis for statistical analysis. The three scales are Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale, the University of Michigan Four-Factor Scale (sometimes called the "Survey of Organizations"), and four instruments developed through the Ohio State Leadership Studies.[8] A review of these instruments will provide background into the complexity of such a study and some basis for analysis.

The Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (hereafter referred to as LPC) was developed by Fred E. Fiedler and used in conjunction with his Contingency Model Theory of leadership. The theory attempts to correlate leader effectiveness within various group situations. The LPC was developed to determine leadership styles. It requires the person to "think of all the people with whom he has ever worked and describe the one person he found it most difficult to work with." This is done by responding to 16 to 20 pairs of words on a bipolar scale of eight points, for example:[9]

---

[8] Chester A. Schriesheim and Steven Kerr, "Theories and Measures of Leadership: A Critical Appraisal of Current and Future Directions," in Leadership: The Cutting Edge, ed. James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977), p.19.

[9] Fred E. Fiedler and Martin M. Chemers, Leadership and Effective Management, (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1974), p. 75.

Pleasant	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Unpleasant
Helpful	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Frustrating
Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Interesting
Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Cheerful

The LPC score is the sum of the item scores. A high score indicates that the least preferred coworker was described in relatively favorable terms and reflects a motivation toward working with others. A low score indicates the least preferred coworker is more task oriented.[10]

In order to correctly interpret the instrument and theory one must consider a rather complex system (see figure 1).[11] The factors correlated in this model are the LPC scores and leader effectiveness. However, the latter factor depends on three situational variables that have multiple components. These variables determine the degree of leader influence over the group and are defined as:

1. Leader-member relations: Appears to be the most important variable and describes the loyalty of the group or is the leader well liked by subordinates.
2. Task structure: Describes how the work of the group or person being supervised is structured. A highly structured task has more detailed procedures and can be easily monitored. An unstructured task has few guidelines and is, therefore, more difficult to monitor.

---

[10] Fred E. Fiedler, "Personality and Situational Determinants of Leader Behavior," in Current Developments in the Study of Leadership, ed. Edwin A. Fleishman and James G. Hunt (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), p. 44.

[11] Thomas J. Sergiovani and Robert J. Starratt, Supervision: Human Perspectives, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company), pp. 120-121.

Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership

Effective Style-->Task Oriented			Relations Oriented			Task Oriented		
Leader Influence->	Favorable			Intermediate			Unfavorable	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Leader-Member Relations	G O O D			M O D E R A T E			P O O R	
Task Structure	Structured		Unstructured		Structured		Unstructured	
Leader-Position Power	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W

Figure 1

3. Leader position power: Has to do with the relative strength (s) or weakness (w) of the leader, by virtue of his position. For example, an army officer has more position power than a PTA president.

Fiedler found that leaders who were task oriented (low LPC) performed best in situations where they had either highly favorable influence or where they had little influence over their group, while the relation-oriented person (high LPC) performed best in situations that were intermediate in favorableness.[12]

Documentation regarding the LPC is provided by Fiedler based on over 800 groups from 1951 to 1963 representing the U. S. Navy, chemical research teams, hospital ward aides, and others. The data are reported in each of the eight situations (octants). He states that, with the exception of octant II, correlations between LPC and performance are as predicted.[13] Reliability scores using the split-half method range from .90 to .95, while test-retest reliability reportedly varies from .30 to .90. Variations in reliability results are accounted for by the variety of ages and the maturity of respondents as well as the length of time between tests and life experiences between test sessions.[14]

In a critique of the LPC, Schriesheim and Kerr cite numerous studies which call into question the validity of the instrument.

---

[12] Fiedler, "Personality and Situational Determinants," p. 44.

[13] Fiedler and Chemers, Leadership and Effective Management, pp. 81-83.

[14] Ibid., p. 98.

Additionally, they take exception with some of the test-retest reliability results stating that a coefficient of .31 or .23 after only eight weeks is unacceptable. Their conclusion, based on the data presented, is that "the evidence does not support its continued usage."[15]

Ashour echoes their critique when he states that:

> The model is not really a theory since it doesn't explain how a leader's LPC score has a causal effect on group performance. The model makes predictions without explaining the reason for the prediction.[16]

More recently Rice, in defense of Fiedler's Contingency Theory, finds that after being used for twenty-five years in leadership research, there is considerable support for the model.[17] Yukl concludes that, "as further research is conducted, many of the questions about the model's validity and utility will probably be resolved in the coming years."[18]

A series of leader behavior studies was conducted at the University of Michigan. The early work began during the late 1940's and early 1950's by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn, among others. They found that effective leaders concentrated their efforts on such supervisory functions as planning, scheduling and providing necessary equipment as well as being considerate of subordinates. Additionally, they found

---

15 Schreisheim and Kerr, Theories and Measures, p. 22-27.

16 Ahmed S. Ashour, "The Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness," Organizational Behavior and Human Development 9 (June 1973): 354.

17 R. W. Rice, "Construct Validity of the Least Preferred Co-Worker Score," Psychological Bulletin 85 (November 1978): 1236.

18 Gary A. Yukl, Leadership in Organizations, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981), p. 139.

that effective leaders used general supervision such as goal setting and allowing subordinates to determine procedures rather than close supervision which is more authoritarian.[19]

Later, Rensis Likert, also from the University of Michigan, theorized five categories of supervisory behavior:

1. Principle of supportive relations: The leadership process will provide the subordinate with a sense of personal worth and importance.
2. Group methods of supervision: Subordinates will be part of one or more groups that effectively use individual capabilities to meet the goals.
3. High performance goals: The leader must set high performance goals and establish the importance of achieving them.
4. Technical knowledge: The leader must possess adequate skills to handle the technical problems encountered by the group.
5. Coordinating, scheduling and planning: The leader represents the views, goals, values and decisions of his group and the other groups to which he belongs. These relationships form a linking of the group to the rest of the organization and result in two-way communication through which the leader's influence may be exercised.[20]

---

[19] David G. Bowers and Stanley E. Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership," Administrative Science Quarterly 11 (September 1966): 240-245.

[20] Bowers and Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness," pp. 245-46.

Having reviewed the previous research as well as other available studies, Bowers and Seashore concluded that there was considerable overlap to the various theories. Their synthesis of the literature yielded four factors that defined leadership:

1. Support: Behavior that enhances someone else's feeling of personal worth and importance.
2. Interaction facilitation: Behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close mutually satisfying relationships.
3. Goal emphasis: Behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goals or achieving mutually satisfying relationships.
4. Work facilitation: Behavior that helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning and providing resources such as tools, materials and technical knowledge.[21]

In addition to the above factors, the Four-Factor Scale takes into account two situational roles. The first measures supervisory leadership, while the second measures peer leadership. The rationale for this is stated as:

> Instead, it was proposed that leadership as defined in terms of support, goal emphasis, work facilitation and interaction facilitation may be provided by anyone in a work group for anyone else in that work group. In this sense, leadership may be either "supervisory" or "mutual"; that is, a group's needs for support may be provided by a formally designated leader, by members for each other, or both; goals may be emphasized by the formal leader,

---

[21] Ibid., p. 247.

by members to each other or by both; and similarly for work facilitation and interaction facilitation.[22]

With this theoretical background a survey was developed consisting of over one-hundred items placed into the previously mentioned four factors and two leadership situations, for example:

I. Supervisory leadership
"To what extent is (does) your supervisor..."

A. Support
"attentive to what you say?"

B. Goal emphasis
"encourage people to give their best effort?"

C. Work facilitation
"show you how to improve your performance?"

D. Interaction facilitation
"encourage people who work for him to work as a team?"

II. Peer leadership
"To what extent are (do) people in your work group..."

A. Support
"friendly and easy to approach?"

B. Goal emphasis
"encourage people to give their best effort?"

C. Work facilitation
"help you find better ways to do a better job?"

D. Interaction facilitation
"emphasize a team goal?"[23]

Responses are given on a Likert-style format ranging from 1 to 5, where 1 equates to a very little extent and 5 equates to a very great extent.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 249.

[23] James C. Taylor, "An Empirical Examination of a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership Using Smallest Space Analysis," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 6 (November 1971), p. 252.

In the initial study to verify the theory, Bowers and Seashore used their questionnaire to study forty agencies of a nationwide insurance company. They developed seven factors to measure the agencies' performance, including business growth, business volume, manpower turnover, regional managers' performance, staff-clientele maturity, advanced underwriting and business costs. These were correlated with the four factors and found significant beyond the .05 level of confidence, 2-tail.[24]

Taylor provided a more systematic analysis of the theory and questionnaire using data from a series of experiments conducted at an oil refinery, an insurance company and a plastics manufacturer. Using a technique known as "smallest space analysis," he determined that four factors existed as separate measurable entities. Further, he found that the questionnaire, now known as the "Survey of Organizations," had a test-retest reliability of .78 over a six-week period. However, it achieved only a .43 coefficient of reliability over a thirteen-month interval.[25]

In reviewing the Four-Factor Scales, Schriesheim and Kerr report considerable difficulty in analyzing the data due to the variety of methods used in reporting the results. Some authors report the four factors individually; others combine the four to gain an overall average score. Nevertheless, they conclude that the internal reliability is very good at .80. Test-retest reliability scores have been reported as

---

[24] Bowers and Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness," pp. 255-57.

[25] Taylor, "An Empirical Examination," p. 265.

low at .04 over one year. They note that the response scales do not reflect equal intervals. Finally, they warn against a possible halo effect, which is the inability of the respondent to differentiate individual characteristics from an overall impression. They warn against using it without taking these factors into consideration.[26]

The Ohio State Leadership Scales consist of four separate scales by different authors: the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (hereafter referred to as the LBDQ) by Andrew Halpin, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII) by Ralph M. Stogdill, The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (hereafter referred to as the SBDQ) and the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (hereafter referred to as the LOQ), both by Edwin A. Fleishman. During the late 1940's and early 1950's the above-mentioned men and others began to research the concept of leadership under the direction of John Hemphill. Struggling with the concept of leadership as a trait that someone possesses, the group began to seek other definitions. An early definition of leadership was "interpersonal influence directed through the communication process toward the attainment of some goal of goals." Certain concepts are embodied in this definition, including:

1. Leadership involves attempts to influence others.
2. That all interpersonal relationships can involve elements of leadership.

---

[26] Schriesheim and Kerr, "Theories and Measures," pp. 27-32.

3. The attempt to affect the behaviors of others.

4. The focus on attainment of goals within the group.[27]

Using key elements of this definition, they were able to generate over 1,800 descriptive statements which were placed into ten categories. The first LBDQ included 150 of these statements or fifteen items for each of the ten categories. Fleishman describes the excitement when the group completed the data analysis on the definitive study of U. S. Air Force crews by Halpin and Winer. Out of the study came a leadership definition that includes Consideration and Initiation of Structure as its major components.[28]

Consideration is defined as "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff."[29] Initiation of Structure is defined as "leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure."[30] These two characteristics form the theoretical backbone of three of the scales that came out of The Ohio State Leadership Studies, namely the LBDQ, LOQ, and SBDQ. They are also a part of the

---

27 Edwin A. Fleishman, "Twenty Years of Consideration and Structure," in Current Developments in the Study of Leadership, ed. Edwin A. Fleishman and James G. Hunt (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), pp. 3-5.

28 Ibid., pp. 5-9.

29 Halpin, Superintendents, p. 4.

30 Ibid., p. 4.

LBDQ-XII. More importantly, they form the foundation for many ensuing leadership theories either explicitly or implicitly.[31]

The most recent revision of the LBDQ consists of forty items (thirty are scored) which represent the Consideration and Initiation of Structure dimensions of leadership, fifteen items for each. Halpin describes the LBDQ as "a technique whereby group members may describe the leader behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations."[32] Respondents are given a series of statements such as:

Consideration

1. He does personal favors for group members.
8. He finds time to listen to group members.
20. He acts without consulting the group. (reflected item)

Initiation of Structure

4. He tries out his ideas with the group.
16. He schedules work to be done.
24. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. (no items are reflected)[33]

---

[31] James M. Lipham, "Leadership and Administration," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, in The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Daniel Griffiths, ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 138.

For a comparison of various leadership theories, the reader is referred to:

Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Robert Blake and Jane Mouton, The Managerial Grid, Houston: Gulf, 1964.

William J. Reddin, Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

[32] Andrew W. Halpin, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957), p. 1.

[33] Ibid, pp. 4-6.

Each statement is followed by five responses--always, often, occasionally, seldom and never. The respondent chooses one that best describes the leader.

The LBDQ has been used in numerous studies, including business, armed forces and education. The manual indicates a correlation exists between an aircraft commander's leader behavior and the evaluation of his performance by both superiors and crew members. Those judged to be effective leaders scored above average in both dimensions. Another reported study indicates that departments in a liberal arts college with a reputation for being well administered had leaders who scored high on both dimensions.[34] The test manual indicates an estimated reliability coefficient, using the split-half method, of .83 for Initiation of Structure and .92 for Consideration.[35]

The LOQ contains forty items which describe how often the supervisor believes he should act as the items portray. It, therefore, measures the supervisor's attitude toward leader behavior as opposed to his subordinates. For example:

1. Put the welfare of your unit above the welfare of any person in it. (Always, Often, Occasionally, Seldom, Never)

7. Ask for more than the persons under you can accomplish. (Often, Fairly Often, Occasionally, Once in a while, Very Seldom)

16. Stress importance of being ahead of other units. (A great deal, Fairly much, To some degree, Comparatively little, Not at all)[36]

---

[34] Ibid., p. 2.

[35] Ibid., p. 1.

[36] Edwin A. Fleishman, Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1960), pp. 1-3.

The response items are scored 5 to 1. Consideration and Initiation of Structure are represented by twenty items each.

Fleishman reports that the internal consistency reliabilities range from .60 to .89, while the test-retest reliability coefficients range from .67 to .80 for one to three months. Several different criteria were used to establish validity. In most, not all, cases the measures used were merit ratings, peer ratings, etc., and provided relatively low validity scores. The author states that there is a need for more validation studies.[37]

The SBDQ was developed for use in industrial settings. Fleishman indicates that, while the LBDQ is appropriate for military and certain "other situations," a need existed for such an instrument in industry. The development of the SBDQ began after Halpin's Air Force study was completed, and its development from that point parallels the development of the LBDQ.[38]

The purpose of the questionnaire is to have subordinates describe their supervisor's leader behaviors. It consists of 48 items representing Consideration (28 items) and Initiation of Structure (20 items):

---

[37] Edwin A. Fleishman, "The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire," in Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, ed. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957), pp. 124-33.

[38] Edwin A. Fleishman, "A Leader Behavior Description for Industry," in Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, ed. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957), pp. 103-04.

Consideration

He sees that a foreman is rewarded for a job well done.
He criticizes a specific act rather than a particular individual.
He is friendly and easily approached.

Initiation of Structure

He encourages slow-working foreman to greater effort.
He offers new approaches to problems.
He stresses being ahead of competing work groups.39

The respondents complete a Likert-style response format. The labels of the response items vary, although they are scored the same (A=5, B=4, etc.). The response labels are:

A. always, often, a great deal
B. often, fairly often, fairly much
C. occasionally, to some degree
D. seldom, once in a while, comparatively little
E. never, very seldom, not at all40

Fleishman provides the following psychometric data relative to the SBDQ based on a series of experiments at a major industrial site. Test-retest reliabilities over an eleven-month period for Consideration and Initiation of Structure were .87 and .75, respectively. When a different sample of men were used (due to changes in personnel) to provide data about the same supervisors, the coefficient dropped, as expected, but not as far as expected, to .58 and .46, respectively. Validity was assessed by comparing questionnaire results to criteria such as proficiency ratings, absenteeism, accidents and grievances. The correlations are generally low. Fleishman states, "Although the need for

---

39 Ibid, pp. 108-09.

40 Edwin A. Fleishman, "Twenty Years of Consideration and Structure," p. 10.

additional evidence is great, there is sufficient evidence here that the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire scores are predictive of other independent leadership criteria."[41]

The LBDQ-XII was developed by Ralph M. Stogdill, one of the early researchers at The Ohio State University. While acknowledging that Consideration and Initiation of Structure were important behaviors in the study of leadership, he believed "that two factors were insufficient to account for the variance in leader behaviors."[42] During a series of studies, which are summarized in the LBDQ-XII Manual, he determined that there were twelve behaviors that are characteristic of leaders. He developed a 100-item questionnaire to describe the behaviors. These items were identified using a procedure known as factor analysis.[43] The definitions of the subscales are included in chapter 1, and a copy of the questionnaire is in appendix A.

There are two major differences between the LBDQ-XII and the other instruments discussed in this review. First, it lacks a strong theoretical foundation. Stogdill appears to simply want to describe leader behaviors rather than develop an all-encompassing theory of leadership. Second, rather than two or four factors, it contains twelve. He makes no claim that these characteristics are the only ones in existence.

---

41 Fleishman, "Leader Behavior Description for Industry," pp. 114-15.

42 Ralph M. Stogdill, Omar S. Goode, and David R. Day, "New Leader Behavior Description Subscales," Journal of Psychology 54 (September 1962): 259.

43 Ibid., pp. 260-61.

According to some authors, The LBDQ-XII does a more accurate job of describing the behaviors it is measuring by including the twelve subscales.[44] Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that in this review only a few studies used all twelve subscales. In fact, Stogdill used only six subscales when he presented an article on the validity of the LBDQ-XII.[45]

In 1975 Bartol and Wortman used the LBDQ-XII to determine perceived differences in the leader behaviors of male and female supervisors in a hospital setting. Using all twelve subscales, they found no significant differences between the leader behaviors of male versus female supervisors as described by subordinates. However, they did find that the sex of the subordinate had an effect on the perception of the leader. Specifically, they found females rated their superiors higher on all subscales and significantly higher on Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Initiation of Structure and Consideration than did male subordinates.[46]

Another study used the LBDQ-XII to correlate five measures of the political beliefs of school superintendents with their leader behaviors. The authors stated that, while not conclusive, the results did indicate

---

[44] Chester A. Schriesheim and Steven Kerr, "Psychometric Properties of The Ohio State Leadership Scales," Psychological Bulletin 81 (November 1974): 758.

[45] Ralph M. Stogdill, "Validity of Leader Behavior Descriptions," Personnel Psychology 22 (Summer 1969): 153.

[46] Kathryn M. Bartol and Max S. Wortman, Jr., "Male Versus Female Leaders: Effects on Perceived Leader Behaviors and Satisfaction in a Hospital," Personnel Psychology 28 (Fall 1975): 533-46.

certain political beliefs were related to the leader behaviors of school superintendents.[47]

Mitchell, et.al., used the LBDQ-XII as a measure of leader behavior along with several scales developed by Fiedler to measure situational characteristics. Their purpose was to determine if knowledge of the leader's performance (good or bad) would effect the ratings provided by non-participant observers. They found that situational variables were highly influenced by the observers' knowledge of performance, while perception of leader behaviors were not effected.[48]

Frost used an adaptation of the LBDQ-XII in a study of first- and second-level officers in an urban fire department. The adaptation regrouped items from Consideration, Initiation of Structure and Production Emphasis subscales into five factors entitled Consideration, Production Emphasis, Structure, Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. Other variables included the boss' intelligence, years of experience and various role perceptions. Using a multiple regression design, he found that the behavior of the immediate supervisor is related to the subordinate's perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity.[49]

---

47 Eldon J. Null and William H. Smead, "Relationships Between the Political Orientation of Superintendents and Their Leader Behavior as Perceived by Subordinates," The Journal of Educational Research 65 (November 1971): 103.

48 Terence R. Mitchell, James R. Larson, Jr., and Stephen G. Green, "Leader Behavior, Situational Moderators and Group Performance: An Attributional Analysis," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 18 (April 1977): 254.

49 Dean E. Frost, "Role Perceptions and Behavior of the Immediate Superior: Moderating Effects of the Prediction of Leadership Effectiveness," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 31 (February 1983): 123.

Schriesheim used the Consideration and Initiation of Structure subscales from several of The Ohio State Leadership studies, including the LBDQ-XII, to study the so-called "hi-hi" leadership style. Other instruments that were used included Stogdill's Job Satisfaction Scale and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Multiple regressions were calculated with satisfaction as the dependent variable. The results indicated that some job satisfaction of subordinates was not related to high scores on the two subscales.[50]

The aforementioned studies are cited primarily to illustrate how the LBDQ-XII has been used in various research models. Initially, as proposed by Stogdill, it was used to describe and compare characteristics of leaders. It has also been used to measure leader behaviors as a dependent variable in certain studies. As allowed for in the manual, the LBDQ-XII has been adapted to fit various types of experimental situations. Finally, it has been used as a measure in the field of leadership theory. Much of the research utilizes the LBDQ-XII in its "short form" consisting of Consideration and Initiation of Structure subscales only.[51]

There is a tendency to consider The Ohio State Leadership Scales as equivalent since they are primarily a measure of Consideration and

---

50 Chester A. Schriesheim, "The Great High Consideration-High Initiating Structure Leadership Myth: Evidence on its Generalizability," The Journal of Social Psychology 116 (April 1982): 221.

51 Daniel R. Ilgen and Donald S. Fujii, "An Investigation of the Validity of Leader Behavior Descriptions Obtained by Subordinates," in Journal of Applied Psychology 61 (October 1976): 648-51.

Initiation of Structure. Schriesheim and Stogdill[52] and later Schriesheim and Kerr[53] completed factorial comparisons of the various scales. They determined that the SBDQ includes items that are punitive and arbitrary. For example, they cite the following items from the Initiation of Structure subscale:

Item 2: He rules with an iron hand.

Item 3: He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.

Item 13: He "needles" foremen under him for greater effort.[54]

Both the SBDQ and LBDQ include measures of production emphasis on the Initiation of Structure subscale. For example:

Item 13: He "needles" foremen under him for greater effort.

Item 14: He encourages overtime work.

Item 15: He stresses being ahead of competing work groups.[55]

In conclusion, the LBDQ-XII appears to more accurately define Consideration and Initiation of Structure due to the fact that these subscales contain fewer extraneous items than the other scales. This is due in part to the factor-analysis approach used in determining the items and the inclusion of ten additional subscales. Two of the more recent reports include the LOQ. As with the SBDQ and LBDQ, the researchers tend to find extraneous items that have been factored out of

---

52 Chester A. Schriesheim and Ralph M. Stogdill, "Differences in Factor Structure Across Three Versions of The Ohio State Leadership Scales," Personnel Psychology 28 (Summer 1975): 204-05.

53 Schriesheim and Kerr, "Psychometric Properties": 756-65.

54 Ibid., pp. 757-58.

55 Ibid., p. 757.

LBDQ-XII. Again their conclusion is that the scales are not equivalent.[56]

Greene summarized some of the researchers' frustration with leadership studies:

> As evidenced by some recent research and numerous comments made at leadership paper sessions conducted at meetings of leading professional associations and even the last Leadership Symposium itself, more than a few researchers seem to be directing their efforts at finding further fault with leadership as a viable area for research or have simply "given up" and "moved on" to what evidently appears to them to be more productive areas (that is, "the ship sprung a few leaks and some of us appear to be abandoning it or perhaps even trying to sink it").57

Nevertheless, Yukl in 1981 presented a framework for the study of leadership which he calls the Integrating Framework for Research on Leadership Effectiveness. This is an eclectic approach which includes research from leader traits, leader behavior, leader power and situational variables within it. The framework provides a basis for using research from each of these areas of study. In essence, Yukl is arguing that trait, situational and behavioral studies of leadership should again be considered a valid part of the literature. However, in order to make them more relevant they must be used together (not necessarily at the same time) to give a more accurate view of leadership in a given situation. Therefore, rather than using one research model to negate

---

[56] Schriesheim and Kerr, "Theories and Measures': 19-22.

Schriesheim and Kerr, "Psychometric Properties": 756-764.

Schriesheim and Stogdill, "Differences in Factor Structure": 191-205.

[57] Charles N. Greene, "Disenchantment with Leadership Research: Some Causes, Recommendations and Alternative Directions," in Leadership: The Cutting Edge, ed. James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977), p. 57.

the others, he finds mutual support among them in attempting to define leadership.[58]

Technical Assistance

The concept of technical assistance, while relatively new to the field of education, has antecedents in such fields as agriculture, engineering, business and industry. Since the mid-1970's the Department of Education has attempted to establish various technical assistance systems in an effort to stimulate educational change. Some of these programs are known as Technical Assistance Systems, Outreach Programs, Leadership Training Institutes and Regional Resource Centers.[59]

Trohanis traces the conceptual development of technical assistance from six interrelated contributions.[60] The first area is that of planned organizational change. The key to this issue is where the impetus for change originates. Bennis offers two potential sources. One is to allow change to come as an automatic adjustment to alterations in the environment or society. The second is for there to be deliberate forethought and planning regarding the need for change.[61] If one assumes the latter, the next question is how to effect change. There are several strategies that may be used to accomplish this. The

---

58 Yukl, Leadership, pp. 268-85.

59 David L. Lillie and Talbot Black, "Principles and Procedures in Technical Assistance: An Approach to Educational Change," Educational Technology 16 (October 1976): 33.

60 Trohanis, "Technical Assistance and Improvement," p. 120.

61 Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, "Planned Change in America," in The Planning of Change, ed. Warren G. Bennis, et.al., (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Company, 1976), p. 15.

so-called empirical-rational approach suggests that people are rational and will follow those ideas that are in their own interest. The normative-re-educative approach theorizes that people's behaviors are based on norms and commitments. As change agents are able to change norms, then commitments will subsequently change. Finally, there are power change strategies. These allow for the change agent who has legal, authoritative, personal or coercive power to effect change.[62] Trohanis emphasizes that technical assistance involves "implementing deliberate interventions to bring about change.[63]

Another contribution to technical assistance comes from the work of Havelock dealing with dissemination and diffusion of innovations that will assist clients in establishing better programs. He describes six strategies for these activities:

1. Building a relationship - thereby establishing rapport.
2. Diagnosing the problem - providing some type of needs assessment.
3. Acquiring relevant resources - for determining what options are available.
4. Choosing a solution - what appears most appropriate.
5. Gaining acceptance - of the solution by the client.

---

62 Robert Chin and Kenneth D. Benne, "General Strategies for Effecting Change in America," in The Planning of Change, ed. Warren G. Bennis, et.al. (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Co., 1976) p. 75.

63 Trohanis, "Technical Assistance and Improvement," p. 120.

6. Stabilizing the innovation and generating self-renewal - such that the program continues after the change agent has left.[64]

When the change agent effectively uses these, dissemination and diffusion of useful information can be accomplished.

Ordinarily when discussing technical assistance, as in the present work, it deals with the training or retraining of adults. Knowles has provided considerable insight into this process. His concept of "androgogy" is presented as the adult version of "pedagogy."[65] He states that adults will learn only those things which have meaning for them in their life, as opposed to children, who have to learn a curriculum which is presented to them. Therefore, change agents must have information and/or concepts which have meaning or are useful to adults. Knowles draws the parallel to this type of education with the ancient methods of Socrates, Confucius, Cicero and even Jesus, among others, who only taught adults. He reminds us that the education of children is a relatively recent concept.[66]

The fourth contribution comes from the literature on consulting. Lippitt and Lippitt define consultation as:

> ..a two-way interaction - a process of seeking, giving and receiving help. Consulting is aimed at aiding a person, group, organization or larger system in mobilizing resources to deal with

---

64 Ronald G. Havelock, The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973), pp. 11-15.

65 Malcom Knowles, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species, second edition (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1978), p. 49.

66 Ibid., p. 51.

> problems, confrontations and change efforts. The values, intentions and behaviors of consultative interaction differ from those of leadership, supervision, evaluation, therapy and friendship.[67]

They describe eight potential roles the consultant may need to embrace at various times in order to be effective. These range along a continuum from nondirective to directive, respectively:

1. Objective observer/reflector - raises the questions.
2. Process counselor - observes problems as well as the resolution process.
3. Fact finder - gathers data.
4. Alternative identifier - finds options and assesses consequences.
5. Joint problem solver - offers alternatives and participates in decision-making process.
6. Trainer/educator - teaches the client.
7. Information expert - provides policy guidelines.
8. Advocate - proposes the guidelines.[68]

Trohanis describes the fifth area as policy development and implementation. He believes that technical assistance personnel must be aware of the institutional arrangements, operating procedures, administrative organization and informal organization of people as they are working with a client.[69] These observations will enhance their effectiveness.

---

[67] Gordan Lippitt and Ronald Lippitt, The Consulting Process in Action, (La Jolla, California: University Associates, Inc., 1978), p. 1.

[68] Ibid., pp. 30-41.

[69] Trohanis, "Technical Assistance and Improvement," p. 120.

The sixth contribution, according to Trohanis, is that of a growing body of literature on technical assistance.[70] The organizational plan of the technical assistance system is one of the key factors in how well it will function. Generally, there is a technical assistance agency and one or more clients. They agree that a relationship should exist between them. Stedman has defined two types of organizational plans, proximal and distal.[71]

In the proximal plan, the technical assistance agency employs staff members who have special knowledge and/or experience in the specific content area. These staff members then provide the expertise to the client as needed or requested. The special education cooperatives and technical assistance supervisors in the present study follow the proximal plan.

The distal plan has the technical assistance agency maintaining a "talent bank" of experts who can be called upon as needed to provide technical assistance to the client.

When describing the overall functioning of the technical assistance system, Lillie and Black state:

> One of the main principles that sets technical assistance systems apart from other consultative services is their ability to respond comprehensively across all areas of organizational needs of the client.72

---

70 Ibid., p. 120.

71 Donald J. Stedman, "Some Technical Assistance System Design Considerations," in Technical Assistance in Educational Settings, ed. Richard M. Clifford and Pascal L. Trohanis (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1980), pp. 20-21.

72 Lillie and Black, "Principles," p. 35.

In order to accomplish this, three major areas of concern need to be addressed including service delivery mechanisms, content and outcomes.[73] The delivery mechanism describes how the services are to be rendered. Several options, including visitations, topical workshops, consultations, printed/audio-visual materials, etc., may be used as the mechanism. Content would generally be determined when the agency and client design the system. In a special education system content might include child find, testing, individual education programs (IEP), mainstreaming, etc. The content should be specific to the needs of the client. The outcomes of the system must be considered. They may include knowledge/awareness, skill development, product development or decision/change.

Several authors have described a model for the delivery of technical assistance services.[74] The client informs the agency of its goals, activities, mandates, time lines, finances and any other aspects which will provide information about the client's situation. Then a needs assessment should be conducted to determine critical areas of concern. This process may take a variety of forms ranging from a client's self-assessment to the technical assistance agency conducting such an assessment. Following this process, the client's needs should be prioritized. An agreement is written which includes the objectives, methods and evaluative criteria for the delivery of services provided by the agency. Having written an agreement, the technical assistance

---

73 Trohanis, "Technical Assistance and Improvement," pp. 122-23.

74 Lillie and Black, "Principles," p. 33.
Trohanis, "Technical Assistance and Improvement," pp. 125-26.
Stedman, "Technical Assistance System Design," p. 24.

agency delivers the service as specified therein. Lastly, the agency and client evaluate the effectiveness of the services delivered and the entire process. This may or may not lead to another needs assessment, which begins the process again. This model for the delivery of services is used for both proximal and distal systems.

Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisors

Burrello and Sage present a well-documented history of the development of special education leadership roles.[75] Earlier in this century and until recently, the roles of supervisor have been intermingled with that of the administrator, hence the term "leadership role." Early special education programs were for those children who were obviously handicapped, such as deaf and blind. When special schools were established, the administrator was most often one who was familiar with the clinical (technical) aspects of educating children with that specific disability.

> The assumption that technical expertise, as a requirement for instructional practice, has dictated similar expertise as a requirement for administration has generated and reinforced a mystique of specialness which has encouraged the segregated system concept. This was stated by Ayer and Barr who justified the existence of the specialist role, 'owing to the special nature of instruction offered in connection with the classes...it was necessary from the beginning to place them in charge of special teachers...special subject...soon led to special supervision...'[76]

---

75 Leonard C. Burrello and Daniel D. Sage, Leadership and Change in Special Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979), Chap. 2 and 3 passim.

76 Ibid., p. 14.

When these programs existed, they usually were separate schools and frequently were residential. The impact of early separation of special education and "technical expertise" clearly are felt in special education today.

Little research data exists about the growth of special education leadership positions except to observe the development of professional organizations. The National Association of State Directors of Special Education began in 1938 with thirteen states represented. Now all states are represented as well as territories, the District of Columbia and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[77] The Council for Administrators of Special Education was formed in 1951 with twenty-four members. It is currently a division of the Council for Exceptional Children and included over 3600 members by 1978.[78]

Two studies were conducted by the United States Office of Education during the 1950's. The main focus was on the preparation of teachers but included sections on administrators and supervisors. After reviewing two studies, Burrello and Sage conclude that "...an analysis of working time spent on various functions also showed considerable overlap between the director (administration) and supervisor roles."[79]

Burrello and Sage conclude their review of special education leadership developments, through 1970, by stating:

> One impression is that circumstances under which the field of special education developed have predestined the leadership roles

---

77 Ibid., p. 16.

78 Ibid., p. 15.

79 Ibid., p. 18.

of the field to begin with and retain over time an emphasis on the technical, the clinical and the personal involvement with particular client service needs.80

In Illinois, as early as 1960, the need for technical assistance was included in the Rules and Regulations. However, according to a former state director of special education, little was done to enforce the rule. Qualifications for persons in these positions as well as duties were left to the local education agencies. Technical assistance supervision was little more than a public relations effort.[81]

During the 1970s the growth of special education was rapid. There are several reasons for this, including the general climate of the times regarding minorities and their rights, litigation and legislation. The case of Wyatt v. Stickney provides only a brief mention that there be persons capable of providing supervision in specific areas other than general administration.[82] The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, in its Standards for Facilities for the Mentally Retarded, required supervisors in technical areas including education, speech pathology, psychology, social work, etc.[83] However, these do not appear to have provided significant impetus for the development of technical assistance supervision in public education. Rather, it appears that

---

80 Ibid., p. 30.

81 Telephone conversation with Mr. Vernon Frazee, former Illinois State Director of Special Education, May 10, 1983.

82 Wyatt v. Stickney, 344 F. Supp. 387, 392 (M.D. Ala. 1972).

83 Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals - Accreditation Council for Facilities for the Mentally Retarded, Standards for Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded (Chicago: By the Author, 875 North Michigan Avenue, 1975), pp. 51, 110, 88, and 104.

this type of service grew from the perceived need for specialized assistance in curriculum and programming.[84]

The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) does not provide a mandate for technical assistance supervision except by the state to local districts regarding implementation and monitoring various aspects of the law. It does require that local education agencies provide a "comprehensive system of personnel development."[85] In the late seventies the need to train or retrain teachers to work in special education, as well as educate handicapped students in the regular classroom, was a major concern. Technical assistance supervision emerged as a way to meet this need. Many special education cooperatives began to employ specialists in the various categories of exceptionality to work with teachers. This system continues today except that in certain high-incidence categories districts are able to provide their own technical assistance supervisors.

In his review of special education and supervision, Finkenbinder concludes that:

> Although the administration of special education programs has been a growing field, the lack of literature about it persists. The need for action research is vital to the upgrading of the administrator's skills. Research is also important for the emerging supervisory personnel needed to implement programs on a nationwide

---

84 Frazee, "Telephone Conversation, 10 May 1983."

85 United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Education of Handicapped Children Public Law 94-142, 94th Congress, S. 6, Implementation of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, August 23, 1977, Federal Register 121 a. 380, p. 42492.

> basis in the forthcoming decade. Clinical (technical) supervision should become an integral part of any training program for special educators...86

The literature in the area of technical assistance supervisors seems to indicate that the functions of these positions are ill-defined and also difficult to separate from the administrative roles and positions. As noted by Finkenbinder:

> There was (1979) a growing realization that special education can and will have an important impact on education at the local level in the future, which will demand competent leadership. An increasing realization of the unique instructional needs of special education has led to some states certifying not only directors but also supervisors to serve as instructional change agents.87

There is an apparent evolutionary process from several differing viewpoints that has brought the technical assistance supervisor from the role of administrator to the brink of a separate identity. The present study will provide some clarification, thereby aiding this evolutionary process.

Summary

This chapter describes some of the more widely recognized theories of leadership and focuses primarily on the concept of leader behaviors. Within the study of leader behavior several instruments developed to measure leader behaviors were reviewed. The conclusion drawn is that, while these measures have provided usable data, like other personality measures, they suffer lack of an accurate definition of leadership and

---

86 Ronald L. Finkenbinder, "Special Education Administration and Supervision: The State of the Art," Journal of Special Education 15 (Winter 1981), p. 488.

87 Ibid., p. 493.

have probably segmented it such that the forest can't be seen through the trees.

Literature regarding the growing field of technical assistance was reviewed first from six contributory areas. Later, factors related to the establishment of technical assistance systems and agency/client interaction were presented.

Finally, the position of technical assistance supervisor was described. Long considered a function of administration, it has emerged as a position providing leadership and change for both special and regular education teachers.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Special education cooperatives have existed in Illinois for about thirty years. Originally most served as administrative or support agencies to local districts. In 1965, the Illinois legislature passed House Bill 1407 requiring school districts to serve handicapped children. Cooperatives grew in terms of personnel and services as the state increased mandates and funds. Programs for educable and trainable mentally handicapped, deaf, blind and orthopedically handicapped were among the first programs established.

Federal legislation, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142), provided additional mandates and some funds for more programs and services. Major service areas included diagnostics, learning disabilities, behavior disorders, early childhood and speech/language impaired, among others. At the present time twelve to fourteen percent of the school-aged children receive some type of special education service. Paralleling this growth in programming has been the increase in technical assistance supervision.

At this time, districts are assessing their needs with regard to special education services. Funding cutbacks necessitate districts utilize personnel effectively and efficiently. The subscales of the LBDQ-XII provide a description of the types of leadership skills deemed important by service providers as well as those who are served.

Instrumentation

A copy of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII) and its manual was obtained from the Bureau of Business Research, College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

The LBDQ-XII represents a revision of the original LBDQ. The latter, included only two subscales, Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Nevertheless, it has had a major impact on the study of leadership. Ralph Stogdill authored the LBDQ-XII in 1962, stating that, "It has not seemed reasonable to believe that two factors are sufficient to account for all the observable variance in leader behavior."[1]

The purpose of the LBDQ-XII as explained in the manual is as follows:

> It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had the opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group.[2]

In addition to the main purpose, Stogdill indicates that, with appropriate wording changes, the LBDQ-XII may be used by superiors or peers to describe a leader. Finally, the scale may be modified so that the leader may describe his/her own behavior. Such modifications were made in this study.

The LBDQ-XII consists of one-hundred (100) statements describing leadership characteristics or leader behaviors in twelve (12) categories called subscales (see definitions). The response format is a five-point

---

[1] Stogdill, "Manual for the LBDQ-XII," p. 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

frequency scale for each item: A = always, B = often, C = occasionally, D = seldom, E = never. When tabulating the results, A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, E = 1. It should be noted that twenty (20) statements are presented negatively and, therefore, are scored in reverse, i.e., A = 1, etc.

Comparing the leader behavior surveys cited in chapter 2, this researcher finds two major differences between them and the LBDQ-XII. First, it lacks a strong theoretical foundation. Second, rather than two or four factors, it contains twelve. Stogdill, by his own comment regarding the need for more than two variables to describe leadership, seems to want to deny the theoretical underpinning of the other scales. Rather, his attempt seems to be, literally, to describe a variety of leader behaviors. He has included twelve descriptive terms on which to base the determination, but he makes no claim that these twelve are exhaustive. At no time in reviewing the literature has this researcher found a leadership model based solely on all twelve of the LBDQ-XII subscales. Rather, it has been used to describe the characteristics of leaders.

The manual indicates that the reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The coefficient for each subscale was determined with the remainder of the items in its subscale rather than with the subscale including the items. According to the manual, "This procedure yields a conservative estimate of subscale reliability.[3]

---

[3] Ibid., p. 8.

The reliability coefficients provided are based on nine different studies cited in the manual. The range for each subscale using the studies in the manual are presented in table 1.

The manual for the instrument does little to assist one in establishing its validity, since no information is given relative to this issue. In fact, it is not until six years later that Stogdill presents information related to the validity of the scales.[4] In this study he used only six subscales, Consideration, Initiation of Structure, Production Emphasis, Tolerance of Freedom, Superior Orientation, and Representation. Actors are given scripts designed to portray the various characteristics in each of the subscales. Respondents watched the actors portray the leader behaviors and then completed the questionnaire. As a result of this study, he determined that:

> Since each role was designed to portray the behaviors described by the items in its respective subscale, it is agreed that the findings constitute evidence that the subscales of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire [sic] measure what they are purported to measure.[5]

In another study utilizing the LBDQ-XII, Ilgen and Fujii used two subscales, Consideration and Initiation of Structure, to provide information on the validity of the instrument. They determined that only when the items included on the subscales are averaged among a group of respondents was there some validity to the measure. In their view such a procedure takes into account the fact that supervisors react to individuals differently and they react differently depending on the situation. Therefore, they reject the use of the LBDQ-XII in the study

---

[4] Ralph M. Stogdill, "Validity," p. 153.

[5] Ibid., p. 157.

TABLE 1

LBDQ-XII Reliability Coefficients

	Subscale	High	Low
1.	Representation	.85	.54
2.	Demand Reconciliation	.81	.59
3.	Tolerance of Uncertainty	.85	.58
4.	Persuasiveness	.85	.69
5.	Initiation of Structure	.80	.70
6.	Tolerance of Freedom	.86	.58
7.	Role Assumption	.86	.57
8.	Consideration	.87	.76
9.	Production Emphasis	.79	.38
10.	Predictive Accuracy	.91	.62
11.	Integration	.79	.73
12.	Superior Orientation	.81	.60

of the dyadic relationship. Finally, they caution against the use of the term "actual behavior" in any reference to the instrument; rather, it is measuring perceived behaviors from the perspective of the respondent. They conclude that:

> Therefore, although leader behavior descriptions from subordinates in ongoing groups may be slightly more valid than in groups operating in a simulation, it is unlikely that the validity of the former would be very high.[6]

Schriesheim and Kerr have written two articles regarding The Ohio State Leadership Scales.[7] In the earlier article they conclude that the shortcomings of the LBDQ-XII are such that neither the studies utilizing it nor the questionnaire are worthless. In the later article they analyze the LBDQ-XII for construct, content, concurrent and predictive validity based on published reports using the instrument. They conclude that it has an acceptable level of concurrent validity, is marginally acceptable in content and predictive validity and is unacceptable regarding construct validity.[8] They give the LDBQ-XII better marks than the other Ohio Leadership Scales.[9] The problem, at least in part, seems to be in defining the term "leadership" in a way that can be meaningfully examined empirically.

As noted in table 1, the reliability coefficients of the LBDQ-XII are generally high, and these have been substantiated through numerous

---

6 Daniel R. Ilgen and Donald S. Fujii, "An Investigation," p. 650.

7 Schriesheim and Kerr, "Psychometric Properties," p. 756.
Schriesheim and Kerr, "Theories and Measures," p. 9.

8 Schriesheim and Kerr, "Theories and Measures," p. 33.

9 Ibid., p. 33.
Schriesheim and Kerr, "Psychometric Properties," p. 764.

studies.[10] It is, of course, possible to have an instrument that is reliable yet not valid.

A specific caution in interpreting the data is the skewed nature of the item responses.[11] This means that responses tend to be clustered around the items scored three and four, with some responses at the five level. However, there are usually very few two's and almost no one's. A possible reason for this is the overall relationship of the leader to subordinates. Assuming the leader is well liked, generally favorable responses in all subscales may be given. This is known as the "halo effect" and is a common problem with these types of scales. Another plausible explanation is that leaders cannot act independently regarding the various subscales.[12]

A second area of concern noted with the LBDQ-XII is the lack of reflected (reverse-scored) items.[13] Twenty items are reflected in this instrument (see table 2). However, they are not equally divided among the twelve subscales. Thus, one is uncertain as to whether the respondent is simply going down one side of the response column or has given ample consideration to the item. If one assumes the one side only response pattern, then certain subscales will be more skewed than

---

10 Schriesheim and Kerr, "Theories and Measures," pp. 21-22.

11 Ibid., p. 21.
Gary A. Yukl and Wayne F. Nemeroff, "Identification and Measurement of Specific Categories of Leadership Behavior: A Progress Report," in Crosscurrents In Leadership, ed. James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1979), p. 187.

12 Schriesheim and Kerr, "Psychometric Properties," p. 761.

13 Schreisheim and Kerr, "Theories and Measurement," p. 22.

TABLE 2

Reflected Items - LBDQ-XII

	Number of Items in Subscale	Number of Items Reflected	Percentage of Reflected Items
Representation	5	0	0
Reconciliation	5	3	60
Tolerance of Uncertainty	10	4	40
Persuasion	10	1	10
Initiation of Structure	10	0	0
Tolerance of Freedom	10	1	10
Role Assumption	10	7	70
Consideration	10	3	30
Production Emphasis	10	1	10
Predictive Accuracy	5	0	0
Integration	5	0	0
Superior Orientation	10	0	0

others. For example, Role Assumption will be more negatively skewed than Initiation of Structure.

This problem of skewness may be approached from a second perspective. The reflected items are not placed randomly throughout the instrument. Rather, they tend to be in clusters, which may allow the respondent to lapse into a habitual response (see table 3). This may be further explained if one analyzes the score sheet. Between items 56 and 71 (N=15) there are eight reflected items, but, between items 72 and 87 (N=15) there is only one (item 87). Clearly, this aspect of the instrument needs additional research, which is beyond the scope of the present study.

A third area of concern is the response categories (Always, Often, Occasionally, Seldom and Never) used in the LBDQ-XII. The extremes are measured in absolute terms, and it has been empirically shown that there is an unequal interval between the terms leading to possible erroneous conclusions.[14]

A fourth area of concern relates to the cognitive process that the respondent goes through in making the response. Rush, Thomas and Lord have developed a model which provides information related to this issue.[15] While their work concerns the use of all questionnaires of this type, their specific use of the LBDQ-XII makes it even more applicable in this study. They theorize that the responses to the

---

[14] Ibid., p. 22.
Yukl and Nemeroff, "Identification and Measurement," p. 165.

[15] Michael C. Rush, Jay C. Thomas, and Robert G. Lord, "Implicit Leadership Theory: A Potential Threat to the Internal Validity of Leader Behavior Questionnaires," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 20 (February 1978): 93.

TABLE 3

Reflected Items in Clusters of Ten

Item Number	Number of Reflected Items	Percentage of Reflected Items
1-10	1	10
11-20	1	10
21-30	1	10
31-40	1	10
41-50	2	20
51-60	3	30
61-70	5	50
71-80	1	10
81-90	1	10
91-100	3	30

questionnaire reflect both the behavior of the leader as well as the perceptual and memory processes of the subordinate/respondent. Utilizing the information processing model of learning theory, they believe that the respondent's process of observation and recording is thus:

1. Exposure to the stimulus behavior;
2. Selective attention to certain aspects of the behavior;
3. Encoding and storage of the behaviors attended to; and
4. Selective recall of the stored information when responding to a questionnaire.16

In this scenario the authors conclude that:

> It seems unreasonable to assume that raters attend to and store all the leader behavior displayed in a given situation and then are able to accurately access this information at a later time when filling out a behavioral questionnaire. What is more likely is that raters rely heavily on stereotypes and implicit theories to reduce the amount of information processing required in perceiving and understanding the behaviors of others.17

The authors conclude that due to these factors, the interpretation of leadership characteristics based on questionnaires is "at best problematic."

This review of the LBDQ-XII has now gone full circle--from its beginning as an attempt by a respected researcher in explaining an important personality trait to a situation with so many obstacles that results seemingly may not be worth the effort. The most appropriate warning seems to be that of the overinterpretation of data. Clearly analysis of these twelve subscales can go on as at least a partial definition of leadership since no one has proven that any or all of the subscales cannot be part of a definition of leadership. No claim is

---

16 Ibid., p. 105.

17 Ibid., p. 105.

made that there are not more subscales that could be added. Second, while there are many critiques of the questionnaire approach to studying leadership, other approaches such as observation and dyadic analyses have been both inconclusive and criticized in the literature as well. Thirdly, while statistical analysis is clearly a science, the final judgment as to whether a coefficient is high enough, based on the type of instrument being used, or not, is obviously a subject of debate. Schreisheim and Kerr have gone to great lengths to illustrate that point with their analysis of leadership questionnaires. Finally, it should be recalled that the purpose of the present study is to add to current knowledge about leader behaviors and not to negate previous works, as well as to describe the behaviors of a particular group of leaders in an educational setting.

Sample

Twenty-five (25) special education cooperatives from nine counties in northeastern Illinois were included in this study. For purposes of description, the cooperatives may be placed into four categories, including suburban, rural-suburban, county-wide and multi-county. The suburban cooperatives are located in the metropolitan Chicago area. They typically have relatively high student enrollments within small geographic areas in comparison to other types of special education cooperatives. They usually have ten to twenty member districts including elementary, high school and unit districts. The diversity of the population, educational philosophies of the local districts and needs of the districts make each cooperative unique unto itself.

Additionally, owing to proximity to Chicago with its hospitals, research universities and special facilities, these cooperatives tend to have more severe, profound and multiply handicapped children. Suburban cooperatives tend to have more technical assistance supervisors able to work in specific areas for which they are approved than the other types of cooperatives.[18]

The so-called rural-suburban cooperatives are located in the collar-county areas of the metropolitan area. They typically include rural areas with isolated cities of relatively high population. Usually there are three to four cooperatives in the county. While the population tends to be more homogeneous, problems exist in getting services to rural areas, getting children to special education centers within a reasonable amount of time and having sufficient numbers of students to justify certain classes. Therefore, children that have low-incidence handicaps or multiple handicaps present special problems. Fewer technical assistance supervisors are generally employed, and they tend to work in more areas of exceptionality or related services than they have approvals issued by the state.[19]

County-wide cooperatives are sometimes under the umbrella of the county school superintendent as opposed to a separate entity. These cooperatives tend to be located in rural areas and serve only a few districts with rather homogeneous populations. Many of the programs and

---

[18] Letter from Margaret Niederer, Program Approval Section, Department of Specialized Educational Services, Illinois State Board of Education, to Members of Ad Hoc Task Force to Study Special Education Supervision, December 5, 1980, p. 4.

[19] Ibid., p. 4.

services are itinerant owing to the low incidence rate. Technical assistance supervisors in this type of cooperative frequently have additional responsibilities for which they may not be approved.[20] Additionally, they may have other administrative responsibilities.

The multi-county cooperative is common in downstate rural areas and is usually a part of the educational service region. Due to its uncharacteristic administrative structure, namely the lack of administrative ties to local districts, this type of cooperative was not included in the present study.

Cooperatives, from the suburban, rural-suburban and county-wide categories, were included in this study from nine counties in northeastern Illinois, including Cook, DuPage, Grundy, Kankakee, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will. Thirteen cooperatives could be considered suburban, seven rural-suburban, and five county-wide.[21] Among those that provided usable data from the questionnaire sent to executive directors were ten suburban, four rural-suburban and two county-wide cooperatives (see table 4).

The issue of technical assistance supervision and the requirement for technical assistance supervisors was the subject of a detailed memo from the Illinois State Superintendent of Schools (see appendix B). The memo describes the basic definitions used in this project.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 5.

[21] The Special Education District of Lake County is unique in that it is neither county-wide nor typically rural-suburban (1). Its size and number of member districts significantly distorts the data presented in table 4. Therefore, as a subgroup to Rural-Suburban (2), a second list is shown without the data from the aforementioned cooperative.

TABLE 4

Participating Special Education Cooperatives

Type	Suburban	Rural/ Suburban (1)	Rural/ Suburban (2)	County	Total
Demographics					
Number Responding	10	4	(3)	2	16
Number of Member Districts	133	66	(25)	18	217
Average Districts/ Cooperative	13.3	16.5	(8.3)	9.0	13.6
Total Enrollment	338,700	99,700	(40,900)	22,300	460,700
Average Enrollment/ Cooperative	33,870	24,930	(13,660)	11,150	28,790
Number of Handicapped Students	44,040	13,250	(4,140)	2,290	59,580
Average Handicapped/ Cooperative	4,400	3,310	(1,380)	1,140	3,720
Number of Technical Assistance Supervisors	64	15	(10)	4	83
Average Technical Assistance Supervisors/ Cooperative	6.4	3.7	(3.3)	2.0	5.2

The technical assistance supervisors included in this study were employed by one of the twenty-five previously identified cooperatives and provided technical assistance to member districts. A total of ninety-eight surveys were mailed, and seventy-two were returned, which yields a seventy-three percent (73%) response rate. Among those responding were forty-two females (58%) and thirty males (42%). Only sixty-two surveys provided usable data for the accompanying demographic questionnaire. Among the latter group, an average of 3.8 teaching certificates or approvals per person was reported, with a range from one to seven. In response to a question regarding the number of supervisory approvals, the average was 2.9 approvals per supervisor and the range was one to six approvals. Fifty-two of the respondents, or 84%, indicated they had a General Administrative Certificate (Type 75), which means that, in accordance with State Superintendent's memo, they are "approved" in areas for which they have appropriate special education certificates or approvals. This method also does not require classroom experience and obviously increased their approved areas of supervision. For example, a person may have three Standard Special Certificates (Type 10) endorsed in learning disabilities, educable mentally handicapped and social/emotional disorders, respectively. In this example, the person may have only taught educable mentally handicapped students and would only be eligible for supervisory endorsement in that specific area. However, if this person completed a General Administrative Certificate (Type 75), approval would be granted for learning disabilities and social/emotional disorders areas as well. From the data gathered it is impossible to determine how each approval was attained. However, it

would seem that obtaining a General Administrative Certificate (Type 75) is a very common way of fulfilling these requirements.

When asked to identify in which areas of special education they provided technical assistance, respondents indicated the three high-incidence categories, namely learning disabilities, social/emotional disorders and educable mentally handicapped, most often. According to data presented in table 5, the technical assistance supervisors were responsible for a total of 257 areas, or an average of 4.1 areas per supervisor. When this is compared to the number of certificates per supervisor, 3.8, or the number of supervisory approvals, 2.9, it is apparent that as a group they see themselves as providing technical assistance in more areas than they are approved to render according to state guidelines.[22] This, in fact, corroborates a previous finding.

The technical assistance supervisors responding to the questionnaire have, in general, a Master's degree or higher (this is required for either supervisory approval or Type 75 certificate), certification/approval in several areas of special education, either administrative credentials or coursework in that area and provide technical assistance in more than one area, frequently in more areas than they are formally approved.

Executive directors are responsible for special education programs and services among the member districts. The term "executive director" is being used arbitrarily to identify the chief administrator of a cooperative, although several titles were found.

---

[22] Niederer, "Letter to Ad Hoc Task Force," p. 3.

TABLE 5

Areas of Technical Assistance Supervision,
According to Technical Assistance Supervisors

Category of Service	N	% of Respondents
Learning Disabilities	43	.84
Social/Emotional Disorders	39	.76
Educable Mentally Handicapped	31	.61
Early Childhood	23	.45
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	20	.39
Speech/Language Services	20	.39
Social Work	17	.33
Psychology	16	.31
Occupational/Physical Therapy	13	.25
Vocational Education	12	.24
Severe/Profound Mentally Handicapped	10	.20
Adaptive Physical Education	9	.18
Deaf	3	.05
Blind	1	.02
Total (62 Supervisors)	257	

One of the services an executive director may provide is technical assistance supervision. Usually the executive director has line supervision responsibility for technical assistance supervisors. As such, the director would know of the supervisor's general activities and receive feedback regarding him/her from the district personnel. Twenty-five executive directors were contacted, twenty returned usable LBDQ-XII questionnaires and sixteen returned usable surveys. Only one director returning a survey indicated that there were no technical assistance supervision services available in the cooperative.

In response to a question regarding what special education categories and related service areas had technical assistance supervisors, the directors indicated that the three most common areas were social/emotional disorders, learning disabilities and educable mentally handicapped. This is consistent with the technical assistance supervisors, although the rank order is slightly different (see table 6). A comparison of tables 5 and 6 indicates some discrepancy between the two groups. The technical assistance supervisors indicate considerably more services being available than do the executive directors. This may be explained by supervisors and directors from different cooperatives reporting, technical assistance supervisors having credentials in areas other than those needed to fulfill the responsibilities of their position or, as noted earlier, some supervisors working in areas where they are not formally approved.

Executive directors have been identified as the line supervisor to the technical assistance supervisors as well as the administrative

TABLE 6

Technical Assistance Supervisory Services,
According to Executive Directors

Category of Service	N
Social/Emotional Disorders	26
Learning Disabilities	19
Educable Mentally Handicapped	15
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	13
Early Childhood	9
Severe/Profound Mentally Handicapped	7
Vocational Programs	7
Speech and Language Services	5
Psychology	4
Social Work	4
Deaf	4
Physical/Occupational Therapy	3
Blind	3
Adaptive Physical Education	2
Total	121

head of special education programs and services, although their actual authority in local districts varies.

Two hundred, sixty-six district representatives were contacted as part of this study, with one-hundred and fifteen returning the LBDQ-XII survey, for a response rate of forty-three percent. Eighty-nine usable questionnaires were returned. The districts represent the same geographic area described above. They range in size from 155 to 14,850 with the average size about 2,260. All of the districts were members of one of the special education cooperatives included in the study. Single district special education programs and regional programs were excluded.

It was initially intended that only district directors of special education or the person assigned to act as a liaison between the district and the special education cooperative would be the respondent. These people would have accurate data regarding the activities of technical assistance supervisors throughout the district as well as demographic data about the district's programs and services. However, information included on the survey indicates that superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, directors of special education and other administrators participated in the study. These participants do not invalidate the use of the LBDQ-XII since the requirement that the respondents have had the opportunity to observe the technical assistance supervisor was met. Their responses to the questionnaire are subject to considerable question due to their lack of knowledge about district programs and services, enrollment data and other information requested on the survey. These data are not reported except as noted above. One common characteristic should be noted, namely, that after careful review

it appears all respondents were administrators as opposed to teachers. The inclusion of building level administrators could enhance the validity since they may have more first-hand knowledge of the technical assistance supervisor's activities than a central office administrator. This, of course, is conjecture.

Table 7 summarizes the sample in terms of the persons who received the LBDQ-XII surveys and questionnaires and those who responded.

Data Collection Procedures

The LBDQ-XII together with the manual including scoring key and record sheet, Statement of Policy (see appendix H) and other information regarding The Ohio State Leadership Studies were requested by telephone from The Ohio State University, College of Administrative Science, Bureau of Business Research.

After reviewing the materials together with information regarding other available measures, it was decided to use the LBDQ-XII. This decision was based on the following:

1. The twelve characteristics provide a more extensive measure of the technical assistance supervisor's leader behaviors than other measures such as the LBDQ, LOQ or Survey of Organizations.
2. One of the major aspects of this study was to describe leader behaviors not to relate to a theoretical model. The LBDQ-XII accomplishes this task.

The Statement of Policy allows for reproduction, adaptation and revision without formal approval. Such changes were made as part of this study. Three versions were written in order to make the format

TABLE 7

Project Sample

	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISORS		DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES		TOTAL
LBDQ-XII	Ideal	Ideal	Self	Ideal	Specific	
Sent	25	52	46	173	93	389
Returned	20	36	36	67	48	207
Percent Returned	80%	69%	78%	39%	52%	53%

appropriate to the situation. The revisions were entitled "LBDQ-XII Ideal," (see appendix C) which was sent to executive directors, one-half of the technical assistance supervisors (see appendix D) and approximately one-half of the district representatives (see appendix G); "LBDQ-XII Self" (see appendix E), which was sent to one-half of the technical assistance supervisors; and "LBDQ-XII Specific" (see appendix F), which was sent to approximately one-half of the district representatives.

The following changes in the instructions from the original LBDQ-XII were made in all revisions used in this study:

1. Substitution of the job title "Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor" for the word "supervisor."
2. Inclusion of the word "district" in describing "group."
3. Rewording the definition of "members" to be more illustrative of the situation, i.e., "supervised by" was changed to "may come in contact with while performing his/her duties."

An additional modification included in the LBDQ-XII Specific was the technical assistance supervisor's name. This was added at the beginning of the survey in such a way that name and descriptive phrase made a complete sentence. No other changes were made.

The LBDQ-XII Ideal had the following phrase added to the beginning of the survey: "The ideal technical assistance supervisor should," which was followed by the descriptive phrase making a complete sentence. Additionally, the verb beginning each item was changed to make it agree grammatically with the introductory phrase, for example:

LBDQ-XII:

Item 1. Acts as spokesman of the group.

Item 6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group.

LBDQ-XII Ideal:

The ideal Technical Assistance Supervisor should:

Item 1. Act as the spokesman of the group.

Item 6. Be hesitant about taking initiative in the group.

The LBDQ-XII Self had the following phrase added to the beginning of the survey: "As a special education technical assistance supervisor, I:" which was followed by the descriptive phrase making a complete sentence. The verb form was again changed to agree with the initial phrase. Where necessary, further changes were made to correct grammar. For example:

LBDQ-XII:

Item 6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group.

LBDQ-XII Self:

As a Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor, I:

Item 6. Am hesitant about taking initiative in the group.

No other changes were made in the wording of survey items.

The instrument was scored according to procedures outlined in the manual.

The LBDQ-XII Ideal was sent to all the special education cooperative executive directors in the nine-county area. Information regarding name, address, telephone number, etc., was obtained from the 1982-83 edition of Illinois Public School Districts and Schools. A follow-up telephone call was made to each director requesting permission

to contact technical assistance supervisors employed by their cooperative and their names. In most instances the respondents complied with the request. Two refused to participate or give out any names. Four indicated a willingness to participate but chose not to give out names, rather they indicated how many technical assistance supervisors they employed. In those instances, the requested number of surveys was sent to the director for dissemination.

Technical assistance supervisors were randomly placed into two groups. The first group received the LBDQ-XII Ideal. The second group received the LBDQ-XII Self. About one-half of the technical assistance supervisors from each cooperative received one survey and one-half received the other survey. Both forms were essentially the same; however, the LBDQ-XII Self had an additional page requesting the names and addresses of five district representatives who would be contacted and asked to complete the LBDQ-XII describing their leader behaviors.

All district representatives named by the technical assistance supervisors were sent a copy of the LBDQ-XII Specific with the name of the supervisor on the form. After these had been disseminated, the LBDQ-XII Ideal was sent to the remaining districts, addressed to the "Director of Special Education."

A log book was maintained by the researcher; each survey had a four- or five-digit code number to make certain the appropriate form was sent and to avoid duplication. The first two digits of the four-digit number identified the cooperative. The third digit identified the technical assistance supervisor. The last digit identified the district representative. For example:

1800 = Cooperative X

1810 = Technical assistance supervisor A employed by cooperative X

1811 = District representative M who has observed technical assistance supervisor A (1810) and the district is a member of cooperative X (1800)

The five-digit number was assigned to district representatives completing the LBDQ-XII Ideal. This included the two-digit cooperative number and allowed three digits to identify the district by its official number. For example: 18999 = District 999 (fictitious) is a member of Cooperative X (1800). This procedure avoided duplication of responses and maintained order in the mailing procedure.

Finally, to avoid misfiling completed surveys, each of the five groups of surveys was copied on different colored paper as follows:

Executive director, LBDQ-XII Ideal: Buff

Technical assistance supervisor, LBDQ-XII Self: Blue

Technical assistance supervisor, LBDQ-XII Ideal: Goldenrod

District representative, LBDQ-XII Specific: Green

District representative, LBDQ-XII Ideal: White

This procedure made filing and retrieving survey booklets easier and more accurate. All surveys included a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

The results were tabulated using the computer program entitled Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (hereafter SPSS). When all the data were entered, a random check of between thirty and forty percent of the data indicated less than one percent error rate. All errors detected in the data were corrected.

Data Analysis

The data for research question one were analyzed utilizing the subprogram of SPSS entitled FREQUENCIES-GENERAL. According to the manual, this program is designed to compute and present:

> ...one way frequency distribution tables for what are termed discrete or categorical variables (established by the user). FREQUENCIES also enables the user to calculate, along with distribution tables, any or all of the descriptive statistics...23

The mean response score was obtained for each subscale from which a rank order profile was derived. These data provided information regarding the first research question:

Question 1: What leader behaviors are perceived as relevant to the effectiveness of the position of special education technical assistance supervisor?

Three groups of data were analyzed in order to answer this research question including the LBDQ-XII Ideal completed by executive directors, technical assistance supervisors and district representatives.

The results from question one were then analyzed utilizing the SPSS subprogram CROSSTABS. This subprogram is used to compute two-way crosstabulation tables. The statistical procedure applied was chi-square. This procedure provides a statistical measure of discrepancy between expected and obtained frequencies. As such, it enables some analysis of significant differences between the perceived ideal

---

23 Norman H. Nie, et.al., SPSS-Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, second edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 194.

behaviors of the three groups. The level of significance used was $p \leq .05$.

Question 2: What perceived conflicts exist between the three groups consisting of executive directors, technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the ideal leader behaviors of the technical assistance supervisors?

The data for the third research question were obtained from the technical assistance supervisors. One group completed the LBDQ-XII Ideal, and the other completed the LBDQ-XII Self.

Question 3: What conflicts exist among the special education technical assistance supervisors, between their perceived ideal leader behaviors and their perceived specific leader behaviors?

The chi-square procedure was applied to determine significant differences between the perceived ideal and the perceived self leader behaviors.

The data for the fourth question were obtained from the technical assistance supervisors who completed the LBDQ-XII Self and the district representatives completing the LBDQ-XII Specific. The latter instrument included the name of a technical assistance supervisor, known to the respondent, who had completed an LBDQ-XII Self survey.

Question 4: What conflicts exist between special education technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the former group's perceived leader behaviors?

The chi-square procedure was applied to determine significant differences between the technical assistance supervisor perceived self

leader behaviors and the perceived leader behaviors as recorded by the district representatives.

Summary

The chapter described the participants, including special education executive directors, technical assistance supervisors and district representatives, included in the study as well as a description of the special education cooperatives in which they were employed. Information was given regarding how the LBDQ-XII was both obtained from The Ohio State University and modified into three different forms to meet the peculiar needs of the study. The various forms were mailed to participants. When returned, the data were entered into a computer utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, subprograms FREQUENCIES and CROSSTABS for analysis according to the research questions being examined. These two subprograms provided the statistical procedures necessary to analyze the data.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter data obtained as a result of this research project will be presented. This will be done in a manner consistent with the previously identified research questions and the data collection procedures discussed in chapter 3.

The response format of the LBDQ-XII includes a five-point Likert-type response scale (5 = always to 1 = never). These scores represent an absolute response pattern that is unrealistic in describing human behaviors. A more realistic criteria of "often" or a score of 4.0 has been arbitrarily selected as criterion for inclusion as an important leader behavior.

Research Question 1:

What leader behaviors are perceived as relevant to the effectiveness of the position of special education technical assistance supervisor?

The data included in table 8 shows the results of the LBDQ-XII Ideal completed by all of the executive directors as well as one-half of the technical assistance supervisors and the district representatives. Four subscales attain the 4.0 criterion across all three groups: Demand Reconciliation, Initiation of Structure, Integration and Consideration.

TABLE 8

LBDQ-XII Ideal Results
N=123

Subscale	Executive Directors N=20 Mean	Rank Order	S.D.	Technical Assistance Supervisors N=36 Mean	Rank Order	S.D.	District Representatives N=67 Mean	Rank Order	S.D.
Representation	3.650	11	0.546	3.634	11	0.673	3.567	11	0.655
Demand Reconciliation	4.560	1	0.287	4.411	1	0.442	4.418	1	0.513
Tolerance of Uncertainty	3.750	10	0.468	3.817	8	0.520	3.806	8	0.420
Persuasiveness	4.125	6	0.327	4.106	4	0.514	3.927	7	0.524
Initiation of Structure	4.345	2	0.332	4.111	2	0.414	4.064	4	0.575
Tolerance of Freedom	3.910	9	0.424	3.800	9	0.457	3.770	10	0.408
Role Assumption	4.080	7	0.406	4.006	6	0.541	3.961	6	0.555
Consideration	4.250	4	0.332	4.069	5	0.478	4.079	3	0.439
Production Emphasis	3.315	12	0.274	3.231	12	0.429	3.184	12	0.605
Predictive Accuracy	4.130	5	0.326	3.971	7	0.478	3.991	5	0.589
Integration	4.300	3	0.457	4.109	3	0.539	4.104	2	0.734
Superior Orientation	3.995	8	0.319	3.774	10	0.557	3.793	9	0.448

Range of Responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

A comparison of the means for the subscales that reached criterion reveals additional information about leader behaviors that are relevant to this position (see tables 9, 10, 11 and 12).[1]

Research Question 2:

What perceived conflicts exist between the three groups consisting of executive directors, technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the ideal leader behaviors of the technical assistance supervisors?

In order to examine this research question, the results from research question one were further analyzed using chi-square (χ^2). Table 13 provides a summary of the findings.

Research Question 3:

What conflicts exist among the special education technical assistance supervisors, between their perceived ideal leader behaviors and their perceived specific leader behaviors?

These leader behaviors were measured utilizing the LBDQ-XII Ideal and the LBDQ-XII Self, respectively.

In order to compile the necessary data, technical assistance supervisors from participating cooperatives were randomly divided into two groups. There were 52 LBDQ-XII Ideal forms sent to one group and 46 LBDQ-XII Self forms sent to the other group. Both groups had 36 usable forms returned. The results are shown in table 14.

---

[1] The reader is referred to Appendix I for information regarding the exact wording of each item in the respective subscale.

TABLE 9

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Ideal Demand Reconciliation Subscale (N=123)

Subcale Item	Executive Director (N=20)		Technical Assistance Supervisor (N=36)		District Representative (N=67)	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
51	4.500	0.513	4.486	0.612	4.343	0.592
61	4.550	0.605	4.257	0.701	4.343	0.664
71	5.000	0.000	4.743	0.443	4.924	0.267
81	4.350	0.671	4.286	0.750	4.227	0.719
91	4.400	0.754	4.286	0.750	4.227	0.612

Range of responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 10

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Ideal Initiation of Structure Subscale (N=123)

Subcale Item	Executive Director (N=20)		Technical Assistance Supervisor (N=36)		District Representative (N=67)	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
4	4.650	0.489	4.606	0.556	4.433	0.857
14	4.500	0.607	4.206	0.538	4.284	0.794
24	4.200	0.523	3.941	0.776	3.836	0.771
34	4.500	0.688	4.114	0.796	4.227	0.719
44	3.450	0.945	3.457	0.780	3.470	0.881
54	3.800	0.616	3.886	0.631	3.591	0.859
64	4.700	0.470	4.571	0.558	4.627	0.546
74	4.450	0.605	4.114	0.631	4.062	0.846
84	4.800	0.410	4.400	0.553	4.409	0.744
94	4.400	0.754	4.314	0.530	4.189	0.659

Range of responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 11

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Ideal Integration Subscale (N=123)

Subcale Item	Executive Director (N=20)		Technical Assistance Supervisor (N=36)		District Representative (N=67)	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
19	4.600	0.598	4.529	0.615	4.606	0.653
39	4.100	0.718	3.886	0.832	3.954	0.818
69	4.700	0.470	4.457	0.505	4.538	0.588
79	4.150	0.671	4.000	0.594	4.015	0.774
99	3.950	0.759	3.800	0.797	3.969	0.666

Range of responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 12

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Ideal Consideration Subscale (N=123)

Subcale Item	Executive Director (N=20)		Technical Assistance Supervisor (N=36)		District Representative (N=67)	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
7	4.850	0.366	4.706	0.462	4.806	0.500
17	4.000	0.918	4.265	0.666	4.000	0.937
27	3.950	0.510	3.914	0.658	3.923	0.645
37	4.150	1.040	3.800	1.079	3.910	1.011
47	4.750	0.444	4.486	0.612	4.409	0.656
57	4.250	0.910	3.943	0.938	4.104	0.104
67	3.800	0.696	3.771	1.043	3.923	0.853
77	4.550	0.605	4.200	0.719	4.318	0.636
87	4.450	0.686	4.229	0.731	4.303	0.859
97	3.750	0.851	3.629	0.731	3.631	0.671

Range of responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 13

Comparison of LBDQ-XII Ideal Results
Executive Directors - Technical Assistance Supervisors -
District Representatives (N=123)

LBDQ-XII Subscales	χ^2	d.f.
Representation	4.03	8
Demand Reconciliation	9.45	6
Tolerance of Uncertainty	4.49	6
Persuasion	6.52	8
Initiation of Structure	5.38	8
Tolerance of Freedom	4.07	6
Role Assumption	5.96	8
Consideration	7.02	6
Production Emphasis	12.43	8
Predictive Accuracy	4.75	6
Integration	3.91	8
Superior Orientation	6.65	8

*Denotes significant difference at $p \leq 0.05$ level

TABLE 14

Technical Assistance Supervisor's LBDQ-XII Ideal Compared to LBDQ-XII Self

LBDQ-XII Subscale	LBDQ-XII Ideal (N=36)		LBDQ-XII Self (N=36)		χ^2	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.		d.f.
Representation	3.634	0.673	3.850	0.472	7.61	4
Demand Reconciliation	4.411	0.442	3.822	0.681	11.56	3*
Tolerance of Uncertainty	3.817	0.520	3.519	0.444	8.63	3*
Persuasiveness	4.106	0.514	3.783	0.487	7.52	3
Initiation of Structure	4.111	0.414	4.031	0.397	1.41	3
Tolerance of Freedom	3.800	0.457	3.906	0.430	1.82	3
Role Assumption	4.006	0.541	3.739	0.581	4.36	3
Consideration	4.069	0.478	3.992	0.429	1.13	3
Production Emphasis	3.231	0.429	3.225	0.501	5.17	4
Predictive Accuracy	3.972	0.478	3.856	0.475	2.25	3
Integration	4.109	0.539	3.972	0.545	2.94	4
Superior Orientation	3.774	0.557	3.803	0.532	2.22	4

*Denotes significant difference at $p \leq 0.05$ level

Range of Responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

A comparison of the mean scores was completed for the three subscales, Demand Reconciliation, Tolerance of Uncertainty and Persuasiveness, that showed significant or nearly significant differences between the perceived ideal and perceived self scores (see tables 15, 16 and 17).[2]

Research Question 4:

What conflicts exist between special education technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the former group's perceived leader behaviors?

The last group consists of the technical assistance supervisors who were previously identified as having completed the LBDQ-XII Self survey and those district representatives who were named on the LBDQ-XII Self survey. That is, each technical assistance supervisor listed up to five district representatives who had an opportunity to observe them in their role as an instructional leader. There were 46 LBDQ-XII Self forms sent out and 36 returned. Of those returned, 23 respondents listed one or more district representatives who could be contacted. As a result, 93 LBDQ-XII Specific forms were mailed to district representatives and 48 were returned (see table 18).

A comparison of mean scores was completed for the two subscales, Demand Reconciliation and Tolerance of Uncertainty, that showed significant differences between the technical assistance supervisors and the district representatives (see tables 19 and 20).

---

[2] Persuasiveness was nearly significant at the $p \leq .05$ level at 0.057.

TABLE 15

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Ideal and LBDQ-XII Self Demand Reconciliation Subscale Completed by Technical Assistance Supervisors

Item	LBDQ-XII Ideal (N=36)		LBDQ-XII Self (N=36)	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
51	4.486	0.612	4.194	0.577
61	4.257	0.701	3.314	0.932
71	4.743	0.443	4.143	0.550
81	4.286	0.750	3.971	0.618
91	4.286	0.750	3.914	0.818

Range of Responses: 1 = Never to 5 = Always

TABLE 16

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Ideal and LBDQ-XII Self Tolerance of Uncertainty Subscale Completed by Technical Assistance Supervisors

Item	LBDQ-XII Ideal (N=36)		LBDQ-XII Self (N=36)	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
2	3.333	0.692	3.400	0.812
12	3.636	0.742	3.306	1.009
22	3.912	0.866	3.722	0.849
32	3.629	0.690	3.500	0.737
42	3.735	0.790	3.222	0.760
52	4.057	0.802	3.514	0.887
62	4.486	0.658	4.057	0.725
72	4.314	0.758	4.000	0.642
82	4.171	0.707	3.771	0.547
92	3.514	0.818	3.314	0.867

Range of Responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 17

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Ideal and LBDQ-XII Self Persuasiveness Subscale Completed by Technical Assistance Supervisors

Item	LBDQ-XII Ideal (N=36)		LBDQ-XII Self (N=36)	
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.
3	3.667	0.645	3.611	0.728
13	4.441	0.613	4.028	0.609
23	4.088	0.793	4.083	0.692
33	3.914	0.781	3.806	0.668
43	4.200	0.632	3.806	0.749
53	4.486	0.702	3.829	0.664
63	4.057	0.684	3.971	0.514
73	4.200	0.759	3.514	0.781
83	3.943	0.684	3.829	0.514
93	4.514	0.507	3.886	0.530

Range of Responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 18

Technical Assistance Supervisors (LBDQ-XII Self) Compared to District Representatives (LBDQ-XII Specific)

LBDQ-XII Subscale	LBDQ-CII Self (N=36) Mean	s.d.	LBDQ-XII Specific (N=48) Mean	s.d.	χ^2	d.f.
Representation	3.850	0.472	3.609	0.645	5.39	4
Demand Reconciliation	3.822	0.681	4.132	0.615	10.83	4*
Tolerance of Uncertainty	3.519	0.444	3.994	0.393	13.41	3*
Persuasiveness	3.783	0.487	3.909	0.595	5.96	4
Initiation of Structure	4.031	0.397	4.028	0.512	2.98	4
Tolerance of Freedom	3.906	0.430	3.957	0.559	3.24	4
Role Assumption	3.739	0.581	3.947	0.525	2.70	3
Consideration	3.992	0.429	4.164	0.375	2.14	3
Production Emphasis	3.225	0.501	3.121	0.583	3.52	4
Predictive Accuracy	3.856	0.475	3.868	0.557	1.79	4
Integration	3.972	0.545	3.957	0.647	1.59	4
Superior Orientation	3.803	0.532	3.783	0.490	1.71	3

*Denotes significant difference at $p \leq 0.05$ level

Range of Responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 19

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Self and LBDQ-XII Specific Demand Reconciliation Subscale

Item	Technical Assistance Supervisors LBDQ-XII Self (N=36) Mean	s.d.	District Representatives LBDQ-XII Specific (N=48) Mean	s.d.
51	4.194	0.577	4.217	0.544
61	3.314	0.932	3.957	0.698
71	4.143	0.550	4.617	0.534
81	3.971	0.618	3.889	0.611
91	3.914	0.818	4.413	0.580

Range of Responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

TABLE 20

Comparison of Mean Scores for LBDQ-XII Self and LBDQ-XII Specific Tolerance of Uncertainty Subscale

Item	Technical Assistance Supervisors LBDQ-XII Self (N=36) Mean	s.d.	District Representatives LBDQ-XII Specific (N=48) Mean	s.d.
2	3.400	0.812	4.234	0.758
12	3.306	1.009	3.957	0.833
22	3.722	0.849	3.956	0.706
32	3.500	0.737	3.957	0.588
42	3.222	0.760	3.809	0.770
52	3.514	0.887	3.957	0.595
62	4.057	0.725	4.574	0.542
72	4.000	0.642	4.255	0.488
82	3.771	0.547	4.000	0.558
92	3.314	0.867	3.652	0.795

Range of Responses: 1 = Never and 5 = Always

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study of the leader behaviors of special education technical assistance supervisors includes the responses of 207 participants from the northeast section of Illinois. The major purposes of the project were to delineate from the twelve subscales of the LBDQ-XII those leader behaviors which best describe the ideal technical assistance supervisor and those leader behaviors that indicate how the subjects are currently perceived. Using variations of the LBDQ-XII, the respondents were placed into five groups. Three groups responded to items which described ideal leader behaviors, while two groups described the leader behaviors as they perceived the technical assistance supervisors.

It was noted in chapter 2 that research in the general area of leadership has produced volumes of data, reports and instruments. However, as noted by Greene in 1976[1] and Sekaran, Hunt and Schriesheim as late as 1982, very little work has been done using all twelve subscales of the LBDQ-XII and apparently even less published.[2] This, in part, appears due to the strong emphasis in the literature to define and/or

---

[1] Greene, "Disenchantment with Leadership Research, p. 60.

[2] Uma Sekaran, James G. Hunt and Chester A Schriesheim, "Beyond Establishment Leadership Views: An Epilog," in Leadership Beyond Establishment Views, ed. James G. Hunt, Uma Sekaran and Chester A. Schriesheim (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), pp. 265-66.

determine a common theory of leadership rather than to describe the behaviors as they occur in a variety of settings.[3]

Analysis and Interpretation

Research Question 1:

What leader behaviors are perceived as relevant to the effectiveness of the position of special education technical assistance supervisor?

The seven subscales that achieve criterion appear to describe a desire by executive directors for technical assistance supervisors to provide continuity or focus to the system. The inclusion of Demand Reconciliation, Initiation of Structure, Integration and Predictive Accuracy indicate a desire for leader behaviors that tend to take divergent views, programs, methodologies, etc. and attempt to organize them with an external and unknown constant, i.e., law, budget, philosophy. If this premise is accepted, then Persuasiveness, Consideration and Role Assumption become important methods for dealing with the apparent variety of situations.

Conversely, Tolerance of Freedom and Tolerance of Uncertainty (see table 8) would be expected to have lower scores as these subscales tend to describe behaviors that do not bring the group together. Additionally, based on the cooperative organizational model where the technical assistance supervisor represents the cooperative and is in a staff relationship to district personnel, such leader behaviors as

---

[3] Fiedler, "Personality and Situational Determinants, pp. 49-50.

Representation and Production Emphasis would not be emphasized. These subscales are consistently at the bottom of the list (see table 8).

The technical assistance supervisors completing the LBDQ-XII Ideal appear to have a similar perspective in that their list of ideal behaviors includes six of the seven subscales listed as important by the executive directors. Only Predictive Accuracy fails to achieve criterion (see table 8).

These results describe the previously noted desire for the technical assistance supervisors to provide continuity and focus to the system with consideration of others as a prime methodology continues to be the important leader behaviors. The fact that Predictive Accuracy is not included among those subscales reaching criterion is not particularly important since the mean score is very close at 3.971. It does illustrate the fact that, while not significantly lower, eleven of the twelve subscales have mean scores lower than those of the executive directors (see table 8). The tendency is for the technical assistance supervisors to have the same ideal leader behaviors but perhaps not high an ideal.

The district representatives present a slightly different description of their ideal leader behavior. In addition to Predictive Accuracy, Role Assumption and Persuasiveness fail to achieve criterion. Table 8 shows that Predictive Accuracy is again extremely close to criterion and that Role Assumption and Persuasiveness have also not dropped too far from criterion. The fact that these latter two subscales have lower mean scores is interesting in that, of the original seven subscales seen as ideal, these have definitions that imply either

giving directions that subordinates must follow or being persuasive enough to attract followers to the technical assistance supervisors' position. These types of activities may detract from district representatives' line supervision role within the district. For example, if the technical assistance supervisor is particularly persuasive, could he/she not argue for a position which the district representative opposes? If the district representative is the line supervisor of the group, then he/she would not expect the technical assistance supervisor to assume such a role. Therefore, Role Assumption could be expected to be lower.

Further analysis of the individual survey items included in the four subscales, which each of the groups considered ideal, provides additional information relevant to this research question.

Demand Reconciliation (see table 9) has the highest mean for all three groups. It is defined as, "reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system." In each group this subscale also had a larger difference between it and the next subscale as compared to any other two subscales. All five items used to characterize this subscale scored above the 4.0 criterion. Item 71, "Gets things all tangled up," a reflected item, scored five on all twenty executive director surveys. Clearly, this becomes a key leader behavior for the technical assistance supervisor. Perhaps, too, this indicates there is considerable confusion about special education and that a person in this position must be capable of handling complex problems and multiple demands simultaneously, not to mention efficiently.

Initiation of Structure (see table 10) is defined as "clearly defines own role and lets followers know what is expected." Seven of the ten items were consistently above the criterion. Item 24, "Tries out his/her ideas on the group," fell below 4.0 on the technical assistance supervisors' and district representatives' results. Additionally, items 44 and 45 failed to reach criterion on any group's survey. These two items again imply that the technical assistance supervisor takes a specific action to direct the group, e.g. line supervision. This is not seen as their role in the organizational model used in the project. Across all items on this subscale there is a tendency for the district representatives to score lower than the other two groups. While the difference is not statistically significant, district representatives may be indicating that district personnel would be more likely to provide structure than someone from outside the district.

Integration is defined as "maintains a closely knit organization, resolves inter-member conflict" (see table 11). There appears to be general agreement that the skills in items 19, 69 and 79 are important. These items tend to encourage the type of leader behaviors that keep the group working together and settling their own conflicts. The mean scores are lower for items 39 and 99. The former item deals with settling arguments among group members. This could be viewed as a line supervisor's responsibility. The latter deals with maintaining a closely knit group, which in this organizational model would be inappropriate for technical assistance supervisors as he/she is not part of the district.

Consideration is defined as "regards the comfort, well being, status and contributions of the followers" (see table 12). Five items are consistently above criterion. These are related to being a nice person and sharing information. Clearly, these items are consistent with the view of the technical assistance supervisor presented herein. The four items that fall below the 4.0 criterion, while showing consideration of people, imply some action on the part of the technical assistance supervisor that could be considered inconsistent with the staff relationship to district personnel. For example, putting suggestions into action could be viewed as a function of a line supervisor.

An additional trend across all three groups is the apparent deemphasis of the Production Emphasis subscale (see table 8). It is defined as "applies pressure for productive output." This subscale is last by a fairly wide margin. Items included in this subscale tend to include competition among groups and measurable output results common to business and industry. Since such considerations are not currently a part of education, these results could be anticipated.

One last area of discussion concerns the issue of the high Consideration-high Initiation of Structure model of leadership frequently reported in the literature. Without reviewing the volumes written in support of it or those attacking it, the data included here would tend to support the concept that the technical assistance supervisor have high scores in both areas. This is evident in all three groups on the LBDQ-XII Ideal.

In general there appears to be agreement among the three groups that the technical assistance supervisor ideally should be one who

brings order to the system, can work well with groups of people and can assume a position of leadership without directing or taking control of the group.

Research Question 2:

What perceived conflicts exist between the three groups consisting of executive directors, technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the ideal leader behaviors of the technical assistance supervisors?

A comparison of the mean scores utilizing the chi-square procedure where $p \leq .05$, confirms that among the three groups there are no significant differences between the subscale scores (see table 13). This, of course, is good news for the technical assistance supervisors since, at least in terms of ideal leader behaviors, there is some consistency in expectations. Such consistency, of course, makes the job somewhat less anxiety producing.

Research Question 3:

What conflicts exist among the special education technical assistance supervisors, between their perceived ideal leader behaviors and their perceived specific leader behaviors?

When comparing the subscales that achieved the 4.0 criterion, it can be seen that only Initiation of Structure appears in both sets of results (see table 14). In fact, that is the only subscale of the LBDQ-XII Self that achieves criterion. Meanwhile, Demand Reconciliation, Integration, Persuasiveness, Consideration and Role Assumption exceed the criteria on the LBDQ-XII Ideal.

This finding is not totally unexpected since the ideal scores were generally close to the 4.0 criterion and since one would expect the perceived self scores to be less than the ideal, it follows that most scores would fall below 4.0. One point should be made with regard to Initiation of Structure, namely, that technical assistance supervisors are attempting to make certain that others are aware of their attitude and that they are making an effort to let others know what is expected of them.

However, when the mean scores are compared using chi-square, two subscales show significant differences between the groups Demand Reconciliation and Tolerance of Uncertainty. Persuasiveness is nearly significant at 0.057 (see table 14). It must be observed, therefore, that for the majority of leader behaviors as described by the subscales of the LBDQ-XII, technical assistance supervisors perceive themselves as performing in a manner consistent with their ideals.

The Demand Reconciliation subscale is defined as "reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system." This subscale was clearly of prime importance to all three groups on the LBDQ-XII Ideal. The technical assistance supervisors perceive themselves significantly lower than the ideal (see table 14).

The two items showing the greatest difference (see table 15) indicate considerable confusion among the supervisors themselves rather than within the system; item 61, "Gets swamped by details," and item 71, "Gets things all tangled up." However, what is more significant is the importance placed on these skills in the LBDQ-XII Ideal results and the frustration of the technical assistance supervisors find in executing

it. Looking at this from a slightly different approach, is the situation one where there is so much confusion to overcome that the technical assistance supervisors do not recognize their own skill in dealing with it? The options cannot be discerned from the data presented. However, it is clear their position is complex and at times confusing. Further, that additional skills are needed in this area or that successes must be identified to reduce the perceived conflict.

While Tolerance of Uncertainty (see table 16) ranked eighth on the LBDQ-XII Ideal, among technical assistance supervisors it fell significantly to eleventh on the LBDQ-XII Self. This subscale is defined as the ability "to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset." Items 42, 52, 62 and 82 indicate that technical assistance supervisors see themselves as unable to meet changes that take place in the system. There are many uncertainties related to the position, such as how to deal with districts, parents and other professionals, as well as the rapidly changing field of special education. Earlier when discussing Demand Reconciliation, it was noted that there were many complex problems. While not seen as one of the important ideal leader behaviors, the ability to handle stress as well as the significant difference between the ideal and self perception could become a major stress-causing situation.

Persuasiveness is defined as "uses persuasion and argument effectively, exhibiting strong conviction." On the LBDQ-XII Ideal, technical assistance supervisors ranked this subscale fourth, only .005 from second. The respondents to the LBDQ-XII Self ranked it ninth (see table

17). Persuasiveness is an important characteristic to technical assistance supervisors if they are to have their opinions accepted by district personnel. The most noticeable differences included items such as being a convincing talker or skillful in arguments. Without line supervision power to influence the activities of others, persuasion becomes a critical tool to getting things accomplished. If the technical assistance supervisor does not have his/her views accepted by district personnel, then apparently one of the areas where they see a need for additional skills is persuasion.

Research Question 4:

> What conflicts exist between special education technical assistance supervisors and district representatives regarding the former group's perceived leader behaviors?

Rather than compare the final sets of data with the so-called ideal, the technical assistance supervisors' perception of their own leader behaviors were compared with district representatives' perception of a specific technical assistance supervisor's leader behaviors. In the grouping, technical assistance supervisors identified district representatives who were asked to complete an LBDQ-XII Specific, thereby identifying the leader behaviors of a technical assistance supervisor known to the respondent (see table 18).

It should be noted that, not only do the district representatives have more subscales above the 4.0 criteria, they tended to rate supervisors higher in seven of the twelve subscales. Two other subscales differ by less than .01 points. The reason for this may be explained by the fact that the technical assistance supervisors were

allowed to name the district representatives who would complete the survey. While every attempt was made to indicate that this project did not involve an evaluation, the results would indicate that the technical assistance supervisors selected persons who were favorably disposed toward them.

Only two subscales showed any significant difference in mean score. As with the technical assistance supervisor sample, these were Demand Reconciliation and Tolerance of Uncertainty (see table 18). The remaining ten subscales showed that on the majority of leader behaviors included in the LBDQ-XII, there is agreement between the two groups. This, of course, reduces the potential for role conflict in these areas.

On the Demand Reconciliation subscale the district representatives rate the technical assistance supervisors signficantly higher (see table 18). This means that in the view of district representatives, technical assistance supervisors handle complex problems efficiently and can reduce complicated situations to order.

The differences (see table 19) may be accounted for by the fact that many district representatives are not familiar with special procedures. The inclusion of district representatives as opposed to district directors of special education was contrary to the original design of the project. Nevertheless, educators unfamiliar with special education procedures tend to see them as a confusing morass and marvel at anyone who can make sense of them. For this reason, district representatives may tend to perceive the technical assistance supervisor as able to handle complex problems.

Tolerance of Uncertainty was ranked eleventh by the technical assistance supervisors and came up to fourth among district representatives, barely .006 of a point from the 4.0 criteria of importance (see table 18).

As with Demand Reconciliation, many district representatives see special education as constantly changing. The technical assistance supervisor, as a special education specialist, is usually aware of these changes and is, perhaps, better prepared for the changes than the district representative. This could account for the view that the technical assistance supervisor can tolerate the uncertainty of shifts in special education (see table 20).

Another possible explanation has to do with uncertainty a technical assistance supervisor may experience while working with staff in a district. For example, the technical assistance supervisor is prepared to explain some recommended change in procedure. Following a presentation, the technical assistance supervisor may or may not have the recommendation accepted. Line supervisors, such as district representatives, in a similar situation may be able to predict the staff's response to the recommendation or simply order acceptance of the recommendation. Therefore, district representatives are more likely to see this uncertainty of acceptance or rejection as an important characteristic and, for this reason, may give higher scores in this area.

While reviewing the literature, several concerns were raised regarding the LBDQ-XII. The first of these is the skewed nature of the response pattern. This was clearly evident in these data. Most responses were in the three and four categories, with a few fives and

almost no ones and twos. The effect of this is to preclude adequate differentiation between the subscales or between groups on a particular subscale. Therefore, it is possible that, while it could not be shown statistically, more conflicts exist than were detected using the LBDQ-XII or that fewer groups may have met the 4.0 "important" criterion.

The use of reflected items in this type of questionnaire is a standard practice. However, as noted in chapter 3, the reflected items are not evenly spaced. It must be observed that all subscales where significant differences occurred contained reflected items. Conversely, subscales without reflected items did not show any significant differences. Therefore, one might assume that the discrepancies were due to reflected items (see tables 2 and 3).

Role Assumption, with 70 percent of its items reflected (see table 3), had consistent scores throughout the data, as did Consideration (30 percent reflected) and Tolerance of Freedom (ten percent reflected). Additionally, Production Emphasis (ten percent reflected) had one of the most consistent scores and a low score that required the respondent to shift sides of answer column. If one were assuming a one-sided response pattern, clearly this subscale would not have been so consistently low. Only Demand Reconciliation, Tolerance of Uncertainty and Persuasiveness showed significant differences. Additionally, with regard to response patterns on the LBDQ-XII Specific, it would appear that in order to obtain the significantly higher scores in Demand Reconciliation and Tolerance of Uncertainty, the response would have to have been two-sided since the higher scores were opposite the more normal left-side pattern of responses. It should also be noted that five subscales contain no

reflected items. None of these subscales showed any significant difference between the groups. The assumption is that the presence or absence of reflected items had little effect on the results.

The possibility of a halo effect, especially in the LBDQ-XII Specific results, has already been noted. Suffice it to say that the research has indicated that the halo effect is a distinct possibility with instruments of this type, and there is no evidence to refute it in this study.

The issue of the respondents' cognitive processes or why a certain response was selected is not addressed in this study. This is an area that will require considerable research before an adequate answer can be determined, if, in fact, it is possible.

Implications

This study has attempted to describe the position of the special education technical assistance supervisor in terms of the leader behaviors defined by the subscales of the LBDQ-XII. The results indicate that, in terms of ideal leader behaviors, there is general agreement among the three groups included, that the skills included in the Demand Reconciliation, Initiation of Structure, Consideration and Integration subscales are most important. Further, there are no significant differences in the relative importance of the remaining leader behaviors. Having identified these behaviors, it is important that executive directors, as leaders of the technical assistance agency, employ persons with (1) the ability to organize information from a variety of sources into a cohesive presentation, (2) skills in problem-solving techniques, (3) an

understanding of group dynamics and (4) the ability to accept and use effectively the staff supervisory role. Further, these skills need to be developed and/or refined as needed.

Technical assistance supervisors need to be aware of the general agreement among the three groups concerning leader behaviors. This consistency provides them with some direction with regard to expectations and skills. It also provides encouragement for the technical assistance model.

When comparing the technical assistance supervisor's ideal with self perception, it is apparent again that there is overall agreement (9 out of 12) on the subscales. Persons in this position tend to have good knowledge of their role expectations and generally work without role conflict. Nevertheless, everyone in education needs to be aware of the conflict areas and take steps to reduce conflict and resulting stress.

Lastly, it appears that some of the conflict may be within the technical assistance supervisors themselves since their clients, in districts, tend to perceive their leader behaviors higher than they did themselves. This would indicate a need for additional effort so as to improve their self-image.

Overall, the results indicate considerably more agreement among the three groups regarding the twelve leader behaviors than expected. These data support the technical assistance model in that agreement can be found in most areas.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Replicate this study with other interdistrict positions to determine if the leader behaviors remain consistent.
2. Use the LBDQ-XII with similar groups, but control the data such that a specific technical assistance supervisor may be examined in terms of ideal and perceived leader behaviors rather than only in groups.
3. Replicate this study in districts that are not members of a special education cooperative.
4. Complete a case-study type project that may provide some understanding of the differences through inferential analysis.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Books

Bennis, Warren G.; Benne, Kenneth D.; Chin, Robert; and Corey, Kenneth, ed. The Planning of Change, 3rd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Berman, Louise M. Supervision, Staff Development and Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Co., 1971.

Burrello, Leonard C. and Sage, Daniel D. Leadership and Change in Special Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.

Chin, Robert and Benne, Kenneth D. "General Strategies for Effecting Change in America." In The Planning of Change, pp. 71-96. Edited by Warren G. Bennis, et.al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Co., 1976.

Clifford, Richard M. and Trohanis, Pascal L., ed. Technical Assistance in Educational Settings. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1980.

Fiedler, Fred E. "Personality and Situational Determinants of Leader Behavior." In Current Developments in the Study of Leadership, pp. 41-59. Edited by Edwin A. Fleishman and James G. Hunt. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

_____, and Chemers, Martin M. Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1974.

Fleishman, Edwin A. "A Leader Behavior Description for Industry." In Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, pp. 103-19. Edited by Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957.

_____, Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1960.

_____, "The Leader Opinion Questionnaire." In Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, pp. 120-33. Edited by Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957.

_____, Manual for the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1969.

_____, "Twenty Years of Consideration and Structure." In Current Developments in the Study of Leadership, pp. 1-37. Edited by Edwin A. Fleishman and James G. Hunt. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

_____, and Hunt, James G. Current Developments in the Study of Leadership. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

Gross, Neal; Giaquinta, Joseph B.; and Bernstein, Marilyn. Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

Greene, Charles N. "Disenchantment with Leadership Research: Some Causes, Recommendations and Alternative Directions." In Leadership, the Cutting Edge, pp. 57-67. Edited by James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

Havelock, Ronald G. The Change Agents Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Hemphill, John K. and Coons, Alvin E., ed. "Development of Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire." In Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, pp. 6-38. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957.

Hunt, James G. and Larson, Lars L. Contingency Approaches to Leadership. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1974.

_____, and Larson, Lars L. Crosscurrents in Leadership. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1979.

_____, and Larson, Lars L. Leadership Frontiers. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1975.

_____, and Larson, Lars L. Leadership-The Cutting Edge. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

_____, Sekaran, Uma, and Schriesheim, Chester A. Leadership-Beyond Establishment Views. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.

Illinois State Board of Education, Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education. Springfield, Illinois: By the Author, 100 North First Street, 1976.

_____, Special Education Certification and Approval Requirements and Procedures. Springfield, Illinois: By the Author, 100 North First Street, 1982.

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals--Accreditation Council for Facilities for the Mentally Retarded. Standards for Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded. Chicago: By the Author, 875 North Michigan Avenue, 1975.

Knowles, Malcolm. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. 2nd ed. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1978.

Lipham, James M. and Hoeh, James A. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974.

Lippitt, Gordan and Lippitt, Ronald. The Consulting Process in Action. La Jolla, California: University Associates, Inc., 1978.

Nie, Normal H., et.al. SPSS-Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

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

Roethlisberger, Fritz J. The Elusive Phenomena. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Schriesheim, Chester A. and Kerr, Steven. "Theories and Measures of Leadership: A Critical Appraisal of Current and Future Directions." In Leadership: The Cutting Edge, pp. 1-45. Edited by James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

Sekaran, Uma; Hunt, James G.; and Schriesheim, Charles A. "Beyond Establishment Leadership Views: An Epilog." In Leadership-Beyond Establishment Views, pp. 260-77. Edited by James G. Hunt, Uma Sekaran and Chester A. Schriesheim. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Starratt, Robert J. Supervision Human Perspectives, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979.

Stedman, Donald J. "Some Technical Assistance Design Considerations." In Technical Assistance in Educational Settings, pp. 19-28. Edited by Richard M. Clifford and Pascal L. Trohanis. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1980.

Stogdill, Ralph M. Leadership Abstracts and Bibliography, 1904-1974. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1977.

_____, and Coons, Alvin E., ed. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1957.

Taylor, James C. Technology and Planned Organizational Change. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Braun-Brumfield, Inc., 1971.

Yukl, Gary A. Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1981.

_____, and Nemeroff, Wayne F. "Identification and Measurement of Specific Categories of Leadership Behavior: A Progress Report." In Crosscurrents of Leadership, pp.164-200. Edited by James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1979.

Periodicals

Ashour, Ahmed S. "The Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness--An Evaluation." Organizational Behavior and Human Development 9 (June 1973): 339-355.

_____, "A Framework of a Cognitive--Behavioral Theory of Leader Influence and Effectiveness." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 30 (December 1982): 407-30.

Bartol, Kathryn M. and Wortman, Max S. "Male Versus Female Leaders: Effects on Perceived Leader Behavior and Satisfaction in a Hospital." Personnel Psychology 28 (Fall 1975): 533-47.

Bowers, David G. and Seashore, Stanley E. "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership." Administrative Science Quarterly 11 (September 1966): 238-263.

Finkenbinder, Ronald L. "Special Education and Supervision: The State of the Art." Journal of Special Education 15 (Winter 1981): 485-495.

Frost, Dean E. "Role Perceptions and Behavior of the Immediate Superior: Moderating Effects of the Prediction of Leadership Effectiveness." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 31 (February 1983): 123-142.

Ilgen, Daniel R. and Fujii, Donald S. "An Investigation of the Validity of Leader Behavior Descriptions Obtained by Subordinates." Journal of Applied Psychology 61 (October 1976): 642-651.

Larson, James R., Jr. "Cognitive Mechanisms Mediating the Impact of Implicit Theories of Leader Behavior on Leader Behavior Ratings." Organizational Behavior and Human Development 29 (February 1982): 129-140.

Lillie, David L. and Black, Talbot. "Principles and Procedures in Technical Assistance: An Approach to Educational Change." Educational Technology 16 (October 1976): 33-36.

Lord, Robert G., et.al. "The Effect of Performance Cues and Leader Behavior on Questionnaire Ratings of Leadership Behavior." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 21 (February 1978): 27-39.

Mitchell, Terence R.; Larson, Jr., James R.; and Green, Stephen G. "Leader Behavior, Situational Moderators and Group Performance: An Attributional Analysis." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 18 (April 1977): 254-68.

Null, Eldon J. and Smead, William H. "Relationships Between the Political Orientation of Superintendents and Their Leader Behavior as Perceived by Subordinates.: The Journal of Educational Research 65 (November 1971): 102-106.

Rice, R. W. "Construct Validity of the Least Preferred Co-Worker Score." Psychological Bulletin 85 (November 1978): 1199-1237.

Rush, Michael C., Thomas, Jay C., and Lord, Robert G. "Implicit Leadership Theory: A Potential Threat to the Internal Validity of Leader Behavior Questionnaires." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 20 (October 1977): 93-110.

Schriesheim, Chester A. "The Great High Consideration-High Initiating Structure Leadership Myth: Evidence on Its Generalizability." The Journal of Social Psychology 116 (April 1982): 221-228.

_____, and Kerr, Steven "Psychometric Properties of The Ohio State Leadership Scales." Psychological Bulletin 81 (November 1974): 756-765.

_____, and Stogdill, Ralph M. "Differences in Factor Structure Across Three Versions of The Ohio State Leadership Scales." Personnel Psychology 28 (Summer 1975): 189-206.

_____, and Von Glinow, Mary Ann "The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis." Academy of Management Journal 20 (September 1977): 398-405.

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology 25 (January 1948): 35-71.

_____, "Validity of Leader Behavior Descriptions." Personnel Psychology 22 (Summer 1969): 153-158.

_____; Goode, Omar S.; and Day, David R. "New Leader Behavior Description Subscales." Journal of Psychology 54 (September 1952): 259-269.

Taylor, James C. "An Empirical Examination of a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership Using Smallest Space Analysis." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 6 (December 1971): 249-266.

Templer, Andrew J. "Self-Perceived and Others-Perceived Leadership Style Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire." Personnel Psychology 26 (Autumn 1973): 359-367.

Trohanis, Pascal L. "Developing Community Acceptance of Programs for Children." Child Welfare 59 (June 1980): 365-73.

_____, "Technical Assistance and the Improvement of Services to Exceptional Children." Theory Into Practice 21 (Spring 1982): 119-28.

_____, "Technical Assistance: An Innovative Approach to Building New Partnerships in Continuing and Inservice Education. Educational Technology 20 (August 1980): 30-36.

_____, and Jackson, Elouise. "The Technical Assistance Approach to Inservice." Educational Leadership 37 (February 1980): 386-89.

Reports

Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago. [1956.]

_____, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University. [1957.]

Stogdill, Ralph M. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII: An Experimental Revision. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University. [1963.]

Interviews

Frazee, Vernon, former Illinois State Director of Special Education. Telephone conversation, 10 May 1983.

Unpublished Materials

Gill, Donald G. to Regional and District Superintendents, Special Education Administrators, 6 August 1981. Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Illinois.

Niederer, Margaret to Joe Glassford, et.al, 30 October 1980. Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Illinois.

_____ to Members of Ad Hoc Task Force to Study Special Education Supervision, 5 December 1980. Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Illinois.

Microform Reproductions

Anastasio, Jean T. and Sage, Daniel D. Role Expectations for the Director of Special Education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 218 859. 1982.

Harris, Ben M., et.al. Professional Supervisory Competencies: Competency Specifications for Instructional Leadership Personnel. Austin, Texas: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 121 022. 1975.

Meyers, Richard K. Competencies of First Line Supervisors of Special Education. Slippery Rock State College: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 213 233. 1981.

Trohanis, Pascal L., ed. Strategies for Change. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 229 930. 1982.

_____, ed. TADS and Technical Assistance: Readings on System Design, Needs Assessment, Consultation and Evaluation. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 224 232. 1980.

Yearbooks

Gross, Bertram M. "The Scientific Approach to Administration." Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, in The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Edited by Daniel Griffiths. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Lipham, James M. "Leadership and Administration." Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, in The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Edited by Daniel Griffiths. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1964.

Public Documents

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Education of Handicapped Children PL 94-142, 94th Congress, S. 6, Implementation of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, Federal Register, 23 August 1977.

Wyatt v. Stickney 344 F. Supp. 387, 392 (M.D. Ala. 1972).

APPENDIX A

Originated by staff members of The Ohio State Leadership Studies and revised by the Bureau of Business Research

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "*group*," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

The term "*members*," refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

Published by

College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she (A) *always*, (B) *often*, (C) *occasionally*, (D) *seldom* or (E) *never* acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around *one* of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: Often acts as described ..... A (B) C D E

Example: Never acts as described ..... A B C D (E)

Example: Occasionally acts as described ..... A B (C) D E

---

1. Acts as the spokesperson of the group ..... A B C D E
2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision ..... A B C D E
3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group ..... A B C D E
4. Lets group members know what is expected of them ..... A B C D E
5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work ..... A B C D E
6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group ..... A B C D E
7. Is friendly and approachable ..... A B C D E
8. Encourages overtime work ..... A B C D E
9. Makes accurate decisions ..... A B C D E
10. Gets along well with the people above him/her ..... A B C D E
11. Publicizes the activities of the group ..... A B C D E
12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next .... A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

13. His/her arguments are convincing	A	B	C	D	E
14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures	A	B	C	D	E
15. Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems	A	B	C	D	E
16. Fails to take necessary action	A	B	C	D	E
17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	A	B	C	D	E
18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups	A	B	C	D	E
19. Keeps the group working together as a team	A	B	C	D	E
20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority	A	B	C	D	E
21. Speaks as the representative of the group	A	B	C	D	E
22. Accepts defeat in stride	A	B	C	D	E
23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view	A	B	C	D	E
24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group	A	B	C	D	E
25. Encourages initiative in the group members	A	B	C	D	E
26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group	A	B	C	D	E
27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation	A	B	C	D	E
28. Needles members for greater effort	A	B	C	D	E
29. Seems able to predict what is coming next	A	B	C	D	E
30. Is working hard for a promotion	A	B	C	D	E
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present	A	B	C	D	E
32. Accepts delays without becoming upset	A	B	C	D	E
33. Is a very persuasive talker	A	B	C	D	E
34. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group	A	B	C	D	E
35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best	A	B	C	D	E
36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her	A	B	C	D	E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

37. Treats all group members as his/her equals	A	B	C	D	E
38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace	A	B	C	D	E
39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group	A	B	C	D	E
40. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions	A	B	C	D	E
41. Represents the group at outside meetings	A	B	C	D	E
42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments	A	B	C	D	E
43. Is very skillful in an argument	A	B	C	D	E
44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done	A	B	C	D	E
45. Assigns a task, then lets the members handle it	A	B	C	D	E
46. Is the leader of the group in name only	A	B	C	D	E
47. Gives advance notice of changes	A	B	C	D	E
48. Pushes for increased production	A	B	C	D	E
49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts	A	B	C	D	E
50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position	A	B	C	D	E
51. Handles complex problems efficiently	A	B	C	D	E
52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty	A	B	C	D	E
53. Is not a very convincing talker	A	B	C	D	E
54. Assigns group members to particular tasks	A	B	C	D	E
55. Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it	A	B	C	D	E
56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm	A	B	C	D	E
57. Keeps to himself/herself	A	B	C	D	E
58. Asks the members to work harder	A	B	C	D	E
59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events	A	B	C	D	E
60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members	A	B	C	D	E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

61. Gets swamped by details	A	B	C	D	E
62. Can wait just so long, then blows up	A	B	C	D	E
63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction	A	B	C	D	E
64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members	A	B	C	D	E
65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action	A	B	C	D	E
66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep	A	B	C	D	E
67. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members	A	B	C	D	E
68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work	A	B	C	D	E
69. Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated	A	B	C	D	E
70. His/her word carries weight with superiors	A	B	C	D	E
71. Gets things all tangled up	A	B	C	D	E
72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events	A	B	C	D	E
73. Is an inspiring talker	A	B	C	D	E
74. Schedules the work to be done	A	B	C	D	E
75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative	A	B	C	D	E
76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise	A	B	C	D	E
77. Is willing to make changes	A	B	C	D	E
78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done	A	B	C	D	E
79. Helps group members settle their differences	A	B	C	D	E
80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors	A	B	C	D	E
81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order	A	B	C	D	E
82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs	A	B	C	D	E
83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage	A	B	C	D	E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

84. Maintains definite standards of performance	A	B	C	D	E
85. Trusts members to exercise good judgment	A	B	C	D	E
86. Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership	A	B	C	D	E
87. Refuses to explain his/her actions	A	B	C	D	E
88. Urges the group to beat its previous record	A	B	C	D	E
89. Anticipates problems and plans for them	A	B	C	D	E
90. Is working his/her way to the top	A	B	C	D	E
91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her	A	B	C	D	E
92. Worries about the outcome of any new procedure	A	B	C	D	E
93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project	A	B	C	D	E
94. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations	A	B	C	D	E
95. Permits the group to set its own pace	A	B	C	D	E
96. Is easily recognized as the leader of the group	A	B	C	D	E
97. Acts without consulting the group	A	B	C	D	E
98. Keeps the group working up to capacity	A	B	C	D	E
99. Maintains a closely knit group	A	B	C	D	E
100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX B

The memorandum as originally received was not suitable for photocopying. Therefore, it has been retyped exactly as received. The memorandum was written on Illinois State Board of Education letterhead under Dr. Donald Gill's signature.

'Date: August 6, 1981

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Regional and District Superintendents
Special Education Administrators

FROM: Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

SUBJECT: Administration and Supervision

Administration and supervision of special education staff and programs have posed some difficulty for school administrators. This memo is intended to clarify appropriate options from which you may choose.

Terms relating to administration and supervision of special education can be defined as follows:

> Administration refers to the overall full-time administration of special education programs and services. Each joint agreement and local district of sufficient size to offer comprehensive programming employ state approved Directors of Special Education. However, many LEAs also choose to designate a local employee to administer on a full-time basis special education programs maintained at the local level.
>
> Line Supervision refers to the on-site day to day supervision of teaching and support staff as they perform general functions of the classroom or support service. This can be a special educator but generally it would tend to be a building principal.
>
> Technical Assistant Supervision refers to the expert program advice and assistance given to teachers, administrators, and line supervisors. This type of supervision requires specialized knowledge and experience in particular areas of education, i.e., speech, retardation, vision, etc.

Each recognized special education entity must employ a state approved director of special education and many LEAs employ full-time special education administrators. Each special education teacher must have a line supervisor as well as access to a technical assistant supervisor.

The chart which is attached describes the responsibility by function and identifies the credentials which are applicable. A number of variables including administrative structure, size of program and certification will determine whether a single individual can satisfy the requirements of whether each function must be addressed by separate persons.

The relationship between the administration, line supervision, and technical assistant supervision regarding the authority and responsibility of each position varies. The existing articles of agreement, local board policies, or administrative procedures determine that relationship.

Attention is called to the fact that while line supervision may be provided by a person who is certificated in special education, most supervision will be provided by the building principal. Technical assistant supervision may be provided by a single district, by more than one district, by a joint agreement or by a special education region.

The chart which accompanies this memo should aid in determining how the administration and supervision requirements can best be handled in your special education entity.

Attachment'

SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

Function:	Applicable Credentials:
Line Supervision of Special Education	An Administrative Certificate endorsed endorsed for general super-vision or administration as specified in State Board of Education, Document #1. OR A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10), endorsed in a handicapping area plus the Administrative Certificate for general supervision or administration as specified in State Board of Education, Document #1. OR An Administrator of Special Education Approval.
Line Supervision of Pupil Personnel Services	An Administrative Certificate endorsed for general supervision or administration as specified in State Board of Education, Document #1. OR An Administrator of Special Education Approval. OR A School Service Personnel Certificate (Type 73 or 10) endorsed in a pupil personnel services area plus the Administrative Certificate endorsed for general supervision or administration as specified in State Board of Education, Document #1.
Technical Assistance Supervision of Special Education in a Handicapping Area	A Supervisor of Special Education Approval. This credential is valid only for supervision of the handicapping area for which the person holds the letter of approval in special education. OR A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) endorsed in a handicapping area plus the Administrative Certificate endorsed for general supervision or administration. These credential are valid for supervision of the handicapping area for which the Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) is endorsed. OR

	A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) endorsed for supervising in a handicapping area. This credential is valid only for supervision of the handicapping area for which the Standard Special Certificate is endorsed. OR A Standard Teaching Certificate (Type 03 or Type 09) and a letter of approval plus the Administrative Certificate endorsed for general supervision or administration as specified in State Board of Education, Document #1. These credentials are valid only for supervision of the handicapping area for which the person holds the letter of approval in special education and only for the grade level of the Standard Teaching Certificate.
Technical Assistance Supervision of Early Childhood Special Education	A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) or Early Childhood Certificate (Type 02), plus the Early Childhood Special Education approval plus the Administrative Certificate endorsed for general supervision administration. OR A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) endorsed for supervision plus the Early Childhood Special Education Approval. OR A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) or Early Childhood Certificate (Type 02), plus the Early Childhood Special Education Approval plus the Administrator of Special Education Approval.
Technical Assistance Supervision of Vocational Programs for Special Education	A Standard Secondary Certificate (Type 09) or Standard Special Certificate (Type 10), plus the Prevocational Coordinator Approval plus the Administrative Certificate for general supervision or administration. OR A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) in the exceptionality taught or a

	Standard Secondary Certificate (Type 09), plus the Teacher Coordinator Approval plus the Administrative Certificate for general supervision or administration. OR A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) endorsed for supervision in a handicapped area plus the Prevocational Coordinator Approval. OR A Standard Special Certificate (Type 10) endorsed for supervision in a handicapped area plus the Teacher Coordinator Approval.
Technical Assistance Supervision of Pupil Personnel Services	A School Service Personnel Certificate (Type 73 or Type 10) endorsed in a pupil personnel services area and the Administrative Certificate endorsed for general supervision or administration. These credentials are valid only for supervision of the pupil personnel service area for which the person holds the Type 73 certificate. OR A School Service Personnel Certificate (Type 73 or 10) endorsed for supervision of the pupil personnel service area for which the person holds the Type 73 certificate.
Special Education Administration	An Administrator of Special Education Approval.
Administration of a Special School	An Administrative Certificate endorsed for general administration as specified in State Board of Education, Document #1 plus an approval to teach in special education in at least one area of exceptionality served by the school.
School District Administration of Pupil Personnel Services	An Administrative Certificate endorsed for general administration as specified in State Board of Education, Document #1.
School District Administration of a Combination of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services	An Administrator of Special Education Approval.

APPENDIX C

Dear

RE: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISORS

Under the Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education districts are required to provide technical assistance supervisors. In this study a technical assistance supervisor is one who is employed by a cooperative to provide technical assistance in any special education category or related service to member districts. As part of my doctoral studies at Loyola University of Chicago, I have proposed to study some of the instructional leadership skills that might be called for in this rather unique position. Participants in the study will include executive directors, the supervisors, and district directors of special education.

Your cooperation in completing the enclosed survey and "Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire" (about ten to 15 minutes) will be appreciated. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Additionally, I will be contacting you by telephone to ask if the technical assistance supervisors in your cooperative may participate and, if so, their names. For purposes of this study some names and identification numbers are necessary to correctly tabulate the data. However, all information will be kept strictly confidential, and absolutely no identifying information will appear in the final text.

A final summary will be available when the study is complete. However, if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 474-1714 (days) or 481-3758 (evenings).

Thank you for your cooperation.

Cordially,

A. William Ton
Director of Special Education

Enclosure

No._____

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SURVEY

1. How many districts are included in this cooperative? _____

2. What is the total enrollment within the cooperative? _____

3. What was the last child count for handicapped children? _____

4. In general, how would you describe the overall organization of the cooperative?

   Centralized_____ Decentralized_____

5. Rank order the persons Technical Assistance Supervisors come in contact with most frequently.

   _____ District Director of Special Education

   _____ Regular Education Administrator(s)

   _____ Special Education Teachers

   _____ Regular Education Teachers

   _____ Cooperative Teachers

   _____ Parents

   _____ Students

   _____ Others (please specify) _____

6. Do you have a special title for Technical Assistance Supervisors?

   _____ Yes (please specify) _____

   _____ No

7. How many Technical Assistance Supervisors are available for each of the following special education categories in this cooperative?

_____ TMH	_____ Social Work
_____ EMH	_____ Adaptive Physical Education
_____ Severe/Profound M. H.	_____ PT/OT
_____ Vocational Programs	_____ Deaf
_____ Learning Disabilities	_____ Blind
_____ Social/Emotional Disorders	_____ Early Childhood
_____ Psychology	_____ Speech/Language

8. The total number of Technical Assistance Supervisors is _____.

9. Are Federal funds used to pay any part of the Technical Assistance Supervisors' salaries?

   _____ Yes

   _____ No

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
FORM XII - IDEAL

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe how a Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor should act. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the ideal behaviors of the Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor.

NOTE: The term "group" as employed in the following refers to a district, department, division, or other unit of organization that a Technical Assistance Supervisor may assist.

The term "members" refers to all the people in the unit of organization that the Technical Assistance Supervisor may come in contact with while performing his/her duties.

Directions

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the Technical Assistance Supervisor SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she SHOULD (a) always, (b) often, (c) occasionally, (d) seldom, or (e) never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected:

A = always
B = often
C = occasionally
D = seldom
E = never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example:	Often acts as described.	A	(B)	C	D	E
Example:	Never acts as described	A	B	C	D	(E)
Example:	Occasionally acts as described.	A	B	(C)	D	E

Adapted from: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII
Published by: College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

The IDEAL Technical Assistance Supervisor should:

1.	Act as a spokesperson of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
2.	Wait patiently for the results of a decision.	A	B	C	D	E
3.	Make pep talks to stimulate the group.	A	B	C	D	E
4.	Let group members know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E
5.	Allow the members complete freedom in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
6.	Be hesitant about taking initiative in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
7.	Be friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E
8.	Encourage overtime work.	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Make accurate decisions.	A	B	C	D	E
10.	Get along well with people above him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
11.	Publicize the activities of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Become anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
13.	Make his/her arguments convincing.	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Encourage the use of uniform procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Fail to take necessary action.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Stress being ahead of competing groups.	A	B	C	D	E
19.	Keep the group working together as a team.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	Keep the group in good standing with higher authority.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Speak as a representative of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Accept defeat in stride.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Argue persuasively for his/her point of view.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Try out his/her ideas on the group.	A	B	C	D	E

25.	Encourage initiative in group members.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Let other persons take away his/her leadership in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Put suggestions made by the group into operation.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Needle members for greater effort.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Seem able to predict what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Be working hard for a promotion.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Speak for the group when visitors are present.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Accept delays without becoming upset.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Be a very persuasive talker.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	Make his/her attitude clear to the group.	A	B	C	D	E
35.	Let the members do their work the way they think best.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	Let some members take advantage of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
37.	Treat all group members as his/her equals.	A	B	C	D	E
38.	Keep the work moving at a rapid pace.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	Settle conflicts when they occur in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	Have his/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	Represent the group at outside meetings.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	Become anxious when waiting for new developments.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	Be very skillful in an argument.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	Assign a task then let the members handle it.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	Be the leader of the group in name only.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	Give advance notice of changes.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	Push for increased production.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	Have things usually turn out as he/she predicts.	A	B	C	D	E

50.	Enjoy the privileges of his/her position.	A	B	C	D	E
51.	Handle complex problems efficiently.	A	B	C	D	E
52.	Be able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.	A	B	C	D	E
53.	Not be a very convincing talker.	A	B	C	D	E
54.	Assign group members to particular tasks.	A	B	C	D	E
55.	Turn the members loose on a job and let them do it.	A	B	C	D	E
56.	Back down when he/she ought to stand firm.	A	B	C	D	E
57.	Keep to him/herself.	A	B	C	D	E
58.	Ask members to work harder.	A	B	C	D	E
59.	Be accurate in predicting the trend of events.	A	B	C	D	E
60.	Get his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
61.	Get swamped by details.	A	B	C	D	E
62.	Wait just so long, then blow up.	A	B	C	D	E
63.	Speak from a strong inner conviction.	A	B	C	D	E
64.	Make sure that his/her part in the group is understood by group members.	A	B	C	D	E
65.	Be reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.	A	B	C	D	E
66.	Let some members have authority that he/she should keep.	A	B	C	D	E
67.	Look out for the personal welfare of group members.	A	B	C	D	E
68.	Permit the members to take it easy in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
69.	See to it that the work of the group is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E
70.	Have his/her word carry weight with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
71.	Get things all tangled up.	A	B	C	D	E
72.	Remain calm when uncertain about coming events.	A	B	C	D	E
73.	Be an inspiring talker.	A	B	C	D	E

74.	Schedule work to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
75.	Allow the group a high degree of initiative.	A	B	C	D	E
76.	Take full charge when emergencies arise.	A	B	C	D	E
77.	Be willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E
78.	Drive hard when there is a job to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
79.	Help group members settle their differences.	A	B	C	D	E
80.	Get what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
81.	Be able to reduce a madhouse to system and order.	A	B	C	D	E
82.	Be able to delay action until the proper time occurs.	A	B	C	D	E
83.	Persuade others that his/her ideas are to their advantage.	A	B	C	D	E
84.	Maintain definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
85.	Trust members to exercise good judgment.	A	B	C	D	E
86.	Overcome attempts made to challenge his/her leadership.	A	B	C	D	E
87.	Refuse to explain his/her actions.	A	B	C	D	E
88.	Urge group to beat its previous record.	A	B	C	D	E
89.	Anticipate problems and plan for them.	A	B	C	D	E
90.	Be working his/her way to the top.	A	B	C	D	E
91.	Get confused when too many demands are made of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
92.	Worry about the outcome of any new procedure.	A	B	C	D	E
93.	Be able to inspire enthusiasm for a project.	A	B	C	D	E
94.	Ask that group members follow standard rules and procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
95.	Permit the group to set its own pace.	A	B	C	D	E
96.	Be easily recognized as the leader of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
97.	Act without consulting the group.	A	B	C	D	E
98.	Keep the group working up to capacity.	A	B	C	D	E

99.	Maintain a closely knit group.	A	B	C	D	E
100.	Maintain cordial relations with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX D

Dear

RE: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISORS

You have been identified as a technical assistance supervisor in that you provide assistance to school personnel regarding programs in either special education categories or related services. As part of my doctoral studies at Loyola University of Chicago, I have proposed to study some of the leadership skills that might be required in this rather unique position. The study will include executive directors of special education cooperatives, district directors of special education, and other supervisors like yourself.

Your cooperation by completing the enclosed Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and survey by 1983, is appreciated. I realize this comes at a busy time of the year; however, it should take no longer than 10 to 15 minutes to complete. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is provided for your convenience.

For purposes of this study, some names and identification numbers are necessary to correctly tabulate the data. However, all information will be kept strictly confidential, and absolutely no identifying information will appear in the final text.

Should you have questions, please feel free to contact me at 474-1714 (days) or 481-3758 (evenings).

Thank you for your assistance.

Cordially,

A. William Ton

A. William Ton
Director of Special Education
Lansing School District 158

Enclosure

Number_____

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISOR SURVEY

1. List the I.S.B.E. certificates you currently possess (i.e., Type 10 LD, Type 10 S/ED, Type 73 Psychology, etc.).

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

2. In which area(s) above do you have supervisory approval?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

3. Do you have a Type 75 General Administrative certificate? Yes_____ No_____

4. In what area(s) of special education do you provide technical assistance supervision?

_____TMH
_____EMH
_____Severe/Profound MH
_____Vocational Programs
_____Learning Disabilities
_____Social/Emotional Disorders
_____Psychology
_____Social Work
_____Adaptive Physical Education
_____PT/OT
_____Deaf
_____Blind
_____Early Childhood
_____Speech/Language
_____Other (specify)
_____

5. How many districts do you serve?

_____Elementary _____High School _____Unit K-12

6. How many professionals do you provide supervisory assistance to?

_____Teachers
_____Speech/Language Therapists
_____Psychologists
_____Principals
_____Social Workers
_____Early Childhood
_____Other District Administrators
_____Other (specify)
_____

Does the cooperative have a policy on the number of staff you may supervise?

_____Yes _____No

If yes, what is the ratio? _____

7. List in order (on the average) the people you come in contact with most frequently during your work. (1 = highest percentage of time, and so on.)

_____District Special Education Teachers

_____District Regular Education Teachers

_____District Special Education Administrator(s)

_____District Regular Education Administrator(s)

_____Other (specify)

_____

_____Teachers in Cooperative Operated Programs

_____Other Administrators/Supervisors Employed in the Cooperative

_____Parents

_____Students

8. Indicate any "add on" responsibilities you have been assigned.

_____Teaching

_____Program Supervision

_____Principal

_____Assistant Executive Director

_____Other (specify) _____

9. List the three MOST common ways you contact the people whom you assist in the districts (1 = most common).

_____Individual Contact

_____Small Groups

_____Workshops/Large Groups

_____Other (specify)

_____

_____Faculty Meetings

_____MDS/IEP Meeting

_____Telephone

10. Do you at any time participate in the formal evaluation of district personnel?

_____Yes _____No

If yes, briefly describe who and how.

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
FORM XII - IDEAL

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe how a Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor should act. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the ideal behaviors of the Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor.

NOTE: The term "group" as employed in the following refers to a district, department, division, or other unit of organization that a Technical Assistance Supervisor may assist.

The term "members" refers to all the people in the unit of organization that the Technical Assistance Supervisor may come in contact with while performing his/her duties.

Directions

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the Technical Assistance Supervisor SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she SHOULD (a) always, (b) often, (c) occasionally, (d) seldom, or (e) never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected:

A = always
B = often
C = occasionally
D = seldom
E = never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example:	Often acts as described.	A	(B)	C	D	E
Example:	Never acts as described	A	B	C	D	(E)
Example:	Occasionally acts as described.	A	B	(C)	D	E

Adapted from: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII
Published by: College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

The IDEAL Technical Assistance Supervisor should:

1.	Act as a spokesperson of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
2.	Wait patiently for the results of a decision.	A	B	C	D	E
3.	Make pep talks to stimulate the group.	A	B	C	D	E
4.	Let group members know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E
5.	Allow the members complete freedom in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
6.	Be hesitant about taking initiative in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
7.	Be friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E
8.	Encourage overtime work.	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Make accurate decisions.	A	B	C	D	E
10.	Get along well with people above him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
11.	Publicize the activities of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Become anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
13.	Make his/her arguments convincing.	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Encourage the use of uniform procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Fail to take necessary action.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Stress being ahead of competing groups.	A	B	C	D	E
19.	Keep the group working together as a team.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	Keep the group in good standing with higher authority.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Speak as a representative of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Accept defeat in stride.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Argue persuasively for his/her point of view.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Try out his/her ideas on the group.	A	B	C	D	E

25.	Encourage initiative in group members.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Let other persons take away his/her leadership in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Put suggestions made by the group into operation.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Needle members for greater effort.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Seem able to predict what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Be working hard for a promotion.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Speak for the group when visitors are present.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Accept delays without becoming upset.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Be a very persuasive talker.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	Make his/her attitude clear to the group.	A	B	C	D	E
35.	Let the members do their work the way they think best.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	Let some members take advantage of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
37.	Treat all group members as his/her equals.	A	B	C	D	E
38.	Keep the work moving at a rapid pace.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	Settle conflicts when they occur in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	Have his/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	Represent the group at outside meetings.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	Become anxious when waiting for new developments.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	Be very skillful in an argument.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	Assign a task then let the members handle it.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	Be the leader of the group in name only.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	Give advance notice of changes.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	Push for increased production.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	Have things usually turn out as he/she predicts.	A	B	C	D	E

50.	Enjoy the privileges of his/her position.	A	B	C	D	E
51.	Handle complex problems efficiently.	A	B	C	D	E
52.	Be able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.	A	B	C	D	E
53.	Not be a very convincing talker.	A	B	C	D	E
54.	Assign group members to particular tasks.	A	B	C	D	E
55.	Turn the members loose on a job and let them do it.	A	B	C	D	E
56.	Back down when he/she ought to stand firm.	A	B	C	D	E
57.	Keep to him/herself.	A	B	C	D	E
58.	Ask members to work harder.	A	B	C	D	E
59.	Be accurate in predicting the trend of events.	A	B	C	D	E
60.	Get his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
61.	Get swamped by details.	A	B	C	D	E
62.	Wait just so long, then blow up.	A	B	C	D	E
63.	Speak from a strong inner conviction.	A	B	C	D	E
64.	Make sure that his/her part in the group is understood by group members.	A	B	C	D	E
65.	Be reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.	A	B	C	D	E
66.	Let some members have authority that he/she should keep.	A	B	C	D	E
67.	Look out for the personal welfare of group members.	A	B	C	D	E
68.	Permit the members to take it easy in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
69.	See to it that the work of the group is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E
70.	Have his/her word carry weight with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
71.	Get things all tangled up.	A	B	C	D	E
72.	Remain calm when uncertain about coming events.	A	B	C	D	E
73.	Be an inspiring talker.	A	B	C	D	E

74.	Schedule work to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
75.	Allow the group a high degree of initiative.	A	B	C	D	E
76.	Take full charge when emergencies arise.	A	B	C	D	E
77.	Be willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E
78.	Drive hard when there is a job to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
79.	Help group members settle their differences.	A	B	C	D	E
80.	Get what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
81.	Be able to reduce a madhouse to system and order.	A	B	C	D	E
82.	Be able to delay action until the proper time occurs.	A	B	C	D	E
83.	Persuade others that his/her ideas are to their advantage.	A	B	C	D	E
84.	Maintain definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
85.	Trust members to exercise good judgment.	A	B	C	D	E
86.	Overcome attempts made to challenge his/her leadership.	A	B	C	D	E
87.	Refuse to explain his/her actions.	A	B	C	D	E
88.	Urge group to beat its previous record.	A	B	C	D	E
89.	Anticipate problems and plan for them.	A	B	C	D	E
90.	Be working his/her way to the top.	A	B	C	D	E
91.	Get confused when too many demands are made of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
92.	Worry about the outcome of any new procedure.	A	B	C	D	E
93.	Be able to inspire enthusiasm for a project.	A	B	C	D	E
94.	Ask that group members follow standard rules and procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
95.	Permit the group to set its own pace.	A	B	C	D	E
96.	Be easily recognized as the leader of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
97.	Act without consulting the group.	A	B	C	D	E
98.	Keep the group working up to capacity.	A	B	C	D	E

99.	Maintain a closely knit group.	A	B	C	D	E
100.	Maintain cordial relations with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX E

Dear

RE: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISORS

You have been identified as a technical assistance supervisor in that you provide assistance to school personnel regarding programs in either special education categories or related services. As part of my doctoral studies at Loyola University of Chicago, I have proposed to study some of the leadership skills that might be required in this rather unique position. The study will include executive directors of special education cooperatives, district directors of special education, and other supervisors like yourself.

Your cooperation by completing the enclosed Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and survey by 1983, is appreciated. I realize this comes at a busy time of the year; however, it should take no longer than 10 to 15 minutes to complete. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is provided for your convenience.

For purposes of this study, some names and identification numbers are necessary to correctly tabulate the data. However, all information will be kept strictly confidential, and absolutely no identifying information will appear in the final text.

Should you have questions, please feel free to contact me at 474-1714 (days) or 481-3758 (evenings).

Thank you for your assistance.

Cordially,

A. William Ton

A. William Ton
Director of Special Education
Lansing School District 158

Enclosure

Number_____

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISOR SURVEY

1. List the I.S.B.E. certificates you currently possess (i.e., Type 10 LD, Type 10 S/ED, Type 73 Psychology, etc.).

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

2. In which area(s) above do you have supervisory approval?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

3. Do you have a Type 75 General Administrative certificate? Yes_____ No_____

4. In what area(s) of special education do you provide technical assistance supervision?

_____TMH
_____EMH
_____Severe/Profound MH
_____Vocational Programs
_____Learning Disabilities
_____Social/Emotional Disorders
_____Psychology
_____Social Work
_____Adaptive Physical Education
_____PT/OT
_____Deaf
_____Blind
_____Early Childhood
_____Speech/Language
_____Other (specify)
_____

5. How many districts do you serve?

_____Elementary _____High School _____Unit K-12

6. How many professionals do you provide supervisory assistance to?

_____Teachers
_____Speech/Language Therapists
_____Psychologists
_____Principals
_____Social Workers
_____Early Childhood
_____Other District Administrators
_____Other (specify)
_____

Does the cooperative have a policy on the number of staff you may supervise?

_____Yes _____No

If yes, what is the ratio? _____

7. List in order (on the average) the people you come in contact with most frequently during your work. (1 = highest percentage of time, and so on.)

_____District Special Education Teachers

_____District Regular Education Teachers

_____District Special Education Administrator(s)

_____District Regular Education Administrator(s)

_____Other (specify)

_____

_____Teachers in Cooperative Operated Programs

_____Other Administrators/Supervisors Employed in the Cooperative

_____Parents

_____Students

8. Indicate any "add-on" responsibilities you have been assigned.

_____Teaching

_____Program Supervision

_____Principal

_____Assistant Executive Director

_____Other (specify) _____

9. List the three MOST common ways you contact the people whom you assist in the districts (1 = most common).

_____Individual Contact

_____Small Groups

_____Workshops/Large Groups

_____Other (specify)

_____

_____Faculty Meetings

_____MDS/IEP Meeting

_____Telephone

10. Do you at any time participate in the formal evaluation of district personnel?

_____Yes _____No

If yes, briefly describe who and how.

11. In order to adequately define the leader behaviors of the Technical Assistance Supervisor, I would like you to identify five district administrators/directors of special education who are knowledgeable of your activities. They will be asked to describe your activities just as you are being asked to describe them. No evaluation of your performance will be made. All information will be strictly confidential, and no names or other identification will be made in the text of the dissertation. If you do not wish to participate in this aspect of the study, please omit this question, but please complete the remaining sections and return the questionnaire to me. Thank you.

	Name and District	Address (if available)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Return to: A. William Ton, 5105 Imperial Drive, Richton Park, IL 60471

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe your behavior as a Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, your own behavior as a Technical Assistance Supervisor.

NOTE: The term "group" as employed in the following refers to a district, department, division, or other unit of organization that a Technical Assistance Supervisor may assist.

The term "members" refers to all the people in the unit of organization that you may come in contact with while performing your duties.

Directions:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently YOU engage in the behavior described.

c. DECIDE whether you (a) always, (b) often, (c) occasionally, (d) seldom, or (e) never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = always
B = often
C = occasionally
D = seldom
E = never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example:	Often acts as described.	A	(B)	C	D	E
Example:	Never acts as described.	A	B	C	D	(E)
Example:	Occasionally acts as described.	A	B	(C)	D	E

Adapted from: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII
Published by: College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

As a Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor, I:

1.	Act as spokesperson for the group.	A	B	C	D	E
2.	Wait patiently for the results of a decision.	A	B	C	D	E
3.	Make pep talks to stimulate the group.	A	B	C	D	E
4.	Let group members know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E
5.	Allow the members complete freedom in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
6.	Am hesitant about taking initiative in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
7.	Am friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E
8.	Encourage overtime work.	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Make accurate decisions.	A	B	C	D	E
10.	Get along well with people above me.	A	B	C	D	E
11.	Publicize the activities of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Become anxious when I cannot find out what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
13.	Give arguments that are convincing.	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Encourage the use of uniform procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Fail to take necessary action.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Stress being ahead of competing groups.	A	B	C	D	E
19.	Keep the group working as a team.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	Keep the group in good standing with higher authority.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Speak as representative of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Accept defeat in stride.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Argue persuasively for my point of view.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Try out my ideas in the group.	A	B	C	D	E

25.	Encourage initiative in the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Let other persons take away my leadership in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Put suggestions made by the group into operation.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Needle members for greater effort.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Seem able to predict what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Am working hard for a promotion.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Speak for the group when visitors are present.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Accept delays without becoming upset.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Am a very persuasive talker.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	Make my attitudes clear to the group.	A	B	C	D	E
35.	Let members do their work the way they think best.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	Let some members take advantage of me.	A	B	C	D	E
37.	Treat all group members as my equals.	A	B	C	D	E
38.	Keep the work moving at a rapid pace.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	Settle conflicts when they occur in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	My superiors act favorably on most of my suggestions.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	Represent the group at outside meetings.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	Become anxious when waiting for new developments.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	Am very skillful in an argument.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	Assign a task then let the members handle it.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	Am a leader of the group in name only.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	Give advance notice of changes.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	Push for increased production.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	Have things usually turn out as I predicted.	A	B	C	D	E
50.	Enjoy the privileges of my position.	A	B	C	D	E
51.	Handle complex problems efficiently.	A	B	C	D	E

52.	Am able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.	A	B	C	D	E
53.	Am not a very convincing talker.	A	B	C	D	E
54.	Assign group members to particular tasks.	A	B	C	D	E
55.	Turn members loose on a job and let them go to it.	A	B	C	D	E
56.	Back down when I ought to stand firm.	A	B	C	D	E
57.	Keep to myself.	A	B	C	D	E
58.	Ask the members to work harder.	A	B	C	D	E
59.	Am accurate in predicting the trend of events.	A	B	C	D	E
60.	Get my superiors to act for the welfare of group members.	A	B	C	D	E
61.	Get swamped by details.	A	B	C	D	E
62.	Can wait just so long, and then blow up.	A	B	C	D	E
63.	Speak with a strong inner conviction.	A	B	C	D	E
64.	Make sure that my part in the group is understood by the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
65.	Am reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.	A	B	C	D	E
66.	Let some members have authority I should keep.	A	B	C	D	E
67.	Look out for the personal welfare of group members.	A	B	C	D	E
68.	Permit the members to take it easy in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
69.	See to it that the work of the group is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E
70.	My word carries weight with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
71.	Get things all tangled up.	A	B	C	D	E
72.	Remain calm when uncertain about coming events.	A	B	C	D	E
73.	Am an inspiring talker.	A	B	C	D	E
74.	Schedule the work to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
75.	Allow the group a high degree of initiative.	A	B	C	D	E
76.	Take full charge when emergencies arise.	A	B	C	D	E

77.	Am willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E
78.	Drive hard when there is a job to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
79.	Help group members settle their differences.	A	B	C	D	E
80.	Get what I ask for from my superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
81.	Can reduce a madhouse to system and order.	A	B	C	D	E
82.	Am able to delay action until the proper time occurs.	A	B	C	D	E
83.	Persuade others that my ideas are to their advantage.	A	B	C	D	E
84.	Maintain definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
85.	Trust members to exercise good judgment.	A	B	C	D	E
86.	Overcome attempts made to challenge my leadership.	A	B	C	D	E
87.	Refuse to explain my actions.	A	B	C	D	E
88.	Urge the group to beat the previous record.	A	B	C	D	E
89.	Anticipate problems and plan for them.	A	B	C	D	E
90.	Am working my way to the top.	A	B	C	D	E
91.	Get confused when too many demands are made of me.	A	B	C	D	E
92.	Worry about the outcome of any new procedure.	A	B	C	D	E
93.	Can inspire enthusiasm for a project.	A	B	C	D	E
94.	Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.	A	B	C	D	E
95.	Permit the group to set its own pace.	A	B	C	D	E
96.	Am easily recognized as the leader of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
97.	Act without consulting the group.	A	B	C	D	E
98.	Keep the group working up to capacity.	A	B	C	D	E
99.	Maintain a closely knit group.	A	B	C	D	E
100.	Maintain cordial relations with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX F

Dear

RE: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SUPERVISORS

Special education joint agreements provide technical assistance in a variety of ways. One way is to have a person from the joint agreement who is certified and approved in a specific area(s) provide the needed assistance to either you or your staff. While there are differing titles for these people (such as assistant director, supervisor, resource services supervisor, teacher consultant, etc.), the common name is technical assistance supervisor.

As part of my doctoral program at Loyola University of Chicago, I am studying the leadership skills that might be required in this rather unique position. The study includes executive directors, the supervisors, and district directors of special education like yourself.

The person named on the enclosed questionnaire is participating in the study and has identified you as a person familiar with his/her activities as a technical assistance supervisor. While completing the survey, consider each of the descriptors as it relates to the person named. You are only describing the person's behavior. You are NOT evaluating the person's performance nor whether you think the behaviors listed are important or unimportant, good or bad, necessary or unnecessary. Identification is required in order to correctly tabulate the data, and all individual results will be kept strictly confidential. Absolutely no identifying information will appear in the text. This is an important aspect of the study, and your cooperation is appreciated.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 474-1714 (days) or 481-3758 (evenings).

Sincerely yours,

A. William Ton

A. William Ton
District Director of Special Education
Lansing District 158

Enclosure

Please return the enclosed questionnaire by

Number_____

DISTRICT DIRECTOR SURVEY

1. District enrollment is _____.

2. District Special Education child count is _____.

3. During the year the following Technical Assistance Supervisory services are used in this district:

_____ LD	_____ S/L	_____ PT/OT
_____ BD	_____ Psych	_____ Deaf
_____ EMH	_____ Social Work	_____ Blind
_____ TMH	_____ PE	_____ Early Childhood
_____ Vocational		

4. List in order the people the Technical Assistance Supervisor most frequently comes in contact with in your district.

_____ District Director of Special Education

_____ Other Special Education Administrator(s)

_____ Special Education Teachers

_____ Regular Education Teachers

_____ Regular Education Administrator (Principal)

_____ Parents

_____ Students

_____ Other (specify)_____

5. List in order from most frequent to least frequent the types of contacts made between the Technical Assistance Supervisor and those listed in number 4 above.

_____ Individual 1-to-1	_____ MDS/IEP Meetings
_____ Small Group	_____ Telephone
_____ Faculty Meeting	_____ Workshops
_____ Other (specify)_____	

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of a Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behaviors of the Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor.

NOTE: The term "group" as employed in the following refers to a district, department, division, or other unit of organization that a Technical Assistance Supervisor may assist.

The term "members" refers to all the people in the unit or organization that the Technical Assistance Supervisor may come in contact with while performing his/her duties.

Directions:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the Technical Assistance Supervisor engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she (a) always, (b) often, (c) occasionally, (d) seldom, or (e) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = always
B = often
C = occasionally
D = seldom
E = never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example:	Often acts as described.	A	(B)	C	D	E
Example:	Never acts as described.	A	B	C	D	(E)
Example:	Occasionally acts as described.	A	B	(C)	D	E

Adapted from: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII
Published by: College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Name of Technical Assistance Supervisor_____

1.	Acts as the spokesperson of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
2.	Waits patiently for the results of a decision.	A	B	C	D	E
3.	Makes pep talks to stimulate the group.	A	B	C	D	E
4.	Lets group members know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E
5.	Allows the members complete freedom in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
6.	Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
7.	Is friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E
8.	Encourages overtime work.	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Makes accurate decisions.	A	B	C	D	E
10.	Gets along well with the people above him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
11.	Publicizes the activities of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
13.	His/her arguments are convincing.	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Encourages the use of uniform procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Fails to take necessary action.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Stresses being ahead of competing groups.	A	B	C	D	E
19.	Keeps the group working together as a team.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Speaks as the representative of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Accepts defeat in stride.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Argues persuasively for his/her point of view.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Tries out his/her ideas in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
25.	Encourages initiative in the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Needles members for greater effort.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Seems able to predict what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Is working hard for a promotion.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Speaks for the group when visitors are present.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Accepts delays without becoming upset.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Is a very persuasive talker.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group.	A	B	C	D	E

35.	Lets the members do their work the way they think best.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	Lets some members take advantage of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
37.	Treats all group members as his/her equals.	A	B	C	D	E
38.	Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	Settles conflicts when they occur in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	Represents the group at outside meetings.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	Is very skillful in an argument.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	Assigns a task then lets the members handle it.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	Is the leader of the group in name only.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	Gives advance notice of changes.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	Pushes for increased production.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	Things usually turn out as he/she predicts.	A	B	C	D	E
50.	Enjoys the privileges of his/her position.	A	B	C	D	E
51.	Handles complex problems efficiently.	A	B	C	D	E
52.	Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.	A	B	C	D	E
53.	Is not a very convincing talker.	A	B	C	D	E
54.	Assigns group members to particular tasks.	A	B	C	D	E
55.	Turns the members loose on a job and lets them go to it.	A	B	C	D	E
56.	Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm.	A	B	C	D	E
57.	Keeps to him/herself.	A	B	C	D	E
58.	Asks the members to work harder.	A	B	C	D	E
59.	Is accurate in predicting the trend of events.	A	B	C	D	E
60.	Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
61.	Gets swamped by details.	A	B	C	D	E
62.	Can wait just so long, then blows up.	A	B	C	D	E
63.	Speaks from a strong inner conviction.	A	B	C	D	E
64.	Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
65.	Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.	A	B	C	D	E
66.	Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep.	A	B	C	D	E
67.	Looks out for the personal welfare of group members.	A	B	C	D	E

68.	Permits the members to take it easy in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
69.	Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E
70.	His/her word carries weight with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
71.	Gets things all tangled up.	A	B	C	D	E
72.	Remains calm when uncertain about coming events.	A	B	C	D	E
73.	Is an inspiring talker.	A	B	C	D	E
74.	Schedules the work to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
75.	Allows the group a high degree of initiative.	A	B	C	D	E
76.	Takes full charge when emergencies arise.	A	B	C	D	E
77.	Is willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E
78.	Drives hard when there is a job to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
79.	Helps group members settle their differences.	A	B	C	D	E
80.	Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
81.	Can reduce a madhouse to system and order.	A	B	C	D	E
82.	Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs.	A	B	C	D	E
83.	Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage.	A	B	C	D	E
84.	Maintains definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
85.	Trusts members to exercise good judgment.	A	B	C	D	E
86.	Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership.	A	B	C	D	E
87.	Refuses to explain his/her actions.	A	B	C	D	E
88.	Urges the group to beat its previous record.	A	B	C	D	E
89.	Anticipates problems and plans for them.	A	B	C	D	E
90.	Is working his/her way to the top.	A	B	C	D	E
91.	Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
92.	Worries about the outcome of any new procedure.	A	B	C	D	E
93.	Can inspire enthusiasm for a project.	A	B	C	D	E
94.	Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.	A	B	C	D	E
95.	Permits the group to set its own pace.	A	B	C	D	E
96.	Is easily recognized as the leader of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
97.	Acts without consulting the group.	A	B	C	D	E
98.	Keeps the group working up to capacity.	A	B	C	D	E
99.	Maintains a closely knit group.	A	B	C	D	E
100.	Maintains cordial relations with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX G

Dear District Director of Special Education:

RE: Technical Assistance Supervisors

From time to time each of us or members of our staff have had a need for advice or assistance in one or more of the complex areas of special education. When that need occurs, one source of information is the special education cooperative or joint agreement. While all joint agreements have an executive director, many have other persons available to assist us. These people have varying titles, including assistance director, supervisor, resource services supervisor, coordinator, teacher consultant, etc. The common name for this position is technical assistance supervisor.

As part of my doctoral program at Loyola University of Chicago, I am studying the leadership skills of people in the technical assistance supervisor position. This study will include executive directors, technical assistance supervisors, and district directors like yourself.

The enclosed questionnaire will take about ten minutes of your time (I know it is a busy time of year), and your cooperation is greatly appreciated in completing it. This particular form is not designed to identify any specific person. However, it may be helpful to think of the kinds of leadership skills that have been most effective with your staff and that have helped you when technical assistance has been rendered through your joint agreement.

The identification numbers are being used to tabulate data and to reduce the possibility of you receiving the same questionnaire twice. All information will be kept strictly confidential.

Sincerely yours,

A. William Ton

A. William Ton
District Director of Special Education
Lansing District 158

Enclosure

Please return the enclosed questionnaire by

DISTRICT DIRECTOR SURVEY

1. District enrollment is _____.

2. District Special Education child count is _____.

3. During the year the following Technical Assistance Supervisory services are used in this district:

_____ LD	_____ S/L	_____ PT/OT
_____ BD	_____ Psych	_____ Deaf
_____ EMH	_____ Social Work	_____ Blind
_____ TMH	_____ PE	_____ Early Childhood
_____ Vocational		

4. List in order the people the Technical Assistance Supervisor most frequently comes in contact with in your district.

_____ District Director of Special Education

_____ Other Special Education Administrator(s)

_____ Special Education Teachers

_____ Regular Education Teachers

_____ Regular Education Administrator (Principal)

_____ Parents

_____ Students

_____ Other (specify) _____

5. List in order from most frequent to least frequent the types of contacts made between the Technical Assistance Supervisor and those listed in number 4 above.

_____ Individual 1-to-1	_____ MDS/IEP Meetings
_____ Small Group	_____ Telephone
_____ Faculty Meeting	_____ Workshops

_____ Other (specify) _____

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
FORM XII - IDEAL

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe how a Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor should act. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the ideal behaviors of the Special Education Technical Assistance Supervisor.

NOTE: The term "group" as employed in the following refers to a district, department, division, or other unit of organization that a Technical Assistance Supervisor may assist.

The term "members" refers to all the people in the unit of organization that the Technical Assistance Supervisor may come in contact with while performing his/her duties.

Directions

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the Technical Assistance Supervisor SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she SHOULD (a) always, (b) often, (c) occasionally, (d) seldom, or (e) never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected:

A = always
B = often
C = occasionally
D = seldom
E = never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example:	Often acts as described.	A	(B)	C	D	E
Example:	Never acts as described	A	B	C	D	(E)
Example:	Occasionally acts as described.	A	B	(C)	D	E

Adapted from: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII
Published by: College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

The IDEAL Technical Assistance Supervisor should:

1.	Act as a spokesperson of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
2.	Wait patiently for the results of a decision.	A	B	C	D	E
3.	Make pep talks to stimulate the group.	A	B	C	D	E
4.	Let group members know what is expected of them.	A	B	C	D	E
5.	Allow the members complete freedom in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
6.	Be hesitant about taking initiative in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
7.	Be friendly and approachable.	A	B	C	D	E
8.	Encourage overtime work.	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Make accurate decisions.	A	B	C	D	E
10.	Get along well with people above him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
11.	Publicize the activities of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Become anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
13.	Make his/her arguments convincing.	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Encourage the use of uniform procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Fail to take necessary action.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Stress being ahead of competing groups.	A	B	C	D	E
19.	Keep the group working together as a team.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	Keep the group in good standing with higher authority.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Speak as a representative of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Accept defeat in stride.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Argue persuasively for his/her point of view.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Try out his/her ideas on the group.	A	B	C	D	E

25.	Encourage initiative in group members.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Let other persons take away his/her leadership in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Put suggestions made by the group into operation.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Needle members for greater effort.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Seem able to predict what is coming next.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Be working hard for a promotion.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Speak for the group when visitors are present.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Accept delays without becoming upset.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Be a very persuasive talker.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	Make his/her attitude clear to the group.	A	B	C	D	E
35.	Let the members do their work the way they think best.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	Let some members take advantage of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
37.	Treat all group members as his/her equals.	A	B	C	D	E
38.	Keep the work moving at a rapid pace.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	Settle conflicts when they occur in the group.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	Have his/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	Represent the group at outside meetings.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	Become anxious when waiting for new developments.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	Be very skillful in an argument.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	Assign a task then let the members handle it.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	Be the leader of the group in name only.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	Give advance notice of changes.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	Push for increased production.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	Have things usually turn out as he/she predicts.	A	B	C	D	E

50.	Enjoy the privileges of his/her position.	A	B	C	D	E
51.	Handle complex problems efficiently.	A	B	C	D	E
52.	Be able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.	A	B	C	D	E
53.	Not be a very convincing talker.	A	B	C	D	E
54.	Assign group members to particular tasks.	A	B	C	D	E
55.	Turn the members loose on a job and let them do it.	A	B	C	D	E
56.	Back down when he/she ought to stand firm.	A	B	C	D	E
57.	Keep to him/herself.	A	B	C	D	E
58.	Ask members to work harder.	A	B	C	D	E
59.	Be accurate in predicting the trend of events.	A	B	C	D	E
60.	Get his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.	A	B	C	D	E
61.	Get swamped by details.	A	B	C	D	E
62.	Wait just so long, then blow up.	A	B	C	D	E
63.	Speak from a strong inner conviction.	A	B	C	D	E
64.	Make sure that his/her part in the group is understood by group members.	A	B	C	D	E
65.	Be reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.	A	B	C	D	E
66.	Let some members have authority that he/she should keep.	A	B	C	D	E
67.	Look out for the personal welfare of group members.	A	B	C	D	E
68.	Permit the members to take it easy in their work.	A	B	C	D	E
69.	See to it that the work of the group is coordinated.	A	B	C	D	E
70.	Have his/her word carry weight with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
71.	Get things all tangled up.	A	B	C	D	E
72.	Remain calm when uncertain about coming events.	A	B	C	D	E
73.	Be an inspiring talker.	A	B	C	D	E

74.	Schedule work to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
75.	Allow the group a high degree of initiative.	A	B	C	D	E
76.	Take full charge when emergencies arise.	A	B	C	D	E
77.	Be willing to make changes.	A	B	C	D	E
78.	Drive hard when there is a job to be done.	A	B	C	D	E
79.	Help group members settle their differences.	A	B	C	D	E
80.	Get what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
81.	Be able to reduce a madhouse to system and order.	A	B	C	D	E
82.	Be able to delay action until the proper time occurs.	A	B	C	D	E
83.	Persuade others that his/her ideas are to their advantage.	A	B	C	D	E
84.	Maintain definite standards of performance.	A	B	C	D	E
85.	Trust members to exercise good judgment.	A	B	C	D	E
86.	Overcome attempts made to challenge his/her leadership.	A	B	C	D	E
87.	Refuse to explain his/her actions.	A	B	C	D	E
88.	Urge group to beat its previous record.	A	B	C	D	E
89.	Anticipate problems and plan for them.	A	B	C	D	E
90.	Be working his/her way to the top.	A	B	C	D	E
91.	Get confused when too many demands are made of him/her.	A	B	C	D	E
92.	Worry about the outcome of any new procedure.	A	B	C	D	E
93.	Be able to inspire enthusiasm for a project.	A	B	C	D	E
94.	Ask that group members follow standard rules and procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
95.	Permit the group to set its own pace.	A	B	C	D	E
96.	Be easily recognized as the leader of the group.	A	B	C	D	E
97.	Act without consulting the group.	A	B	C	D	E
98.	Keep the group working up to capacity.	A	B	C	D	E

99.	Maintain a closely knit group.	A	B	C	D	E
100.	Maintain cordial relations with superiors.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX H

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Concerning the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. Use: The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organizations other than The Ohio State University.

2. Adaptation and Revision: The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific situations when such steps are considered desirable.

3. Duplication: Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.

4. Inclusion in dissertations: Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

5. Copyright: In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19--, by The Ohio State University."

6. Inquiries: Communications should be addressed to:

Center for Business and Economic Research
The Ohio State University
1775 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210 U.S.A.

1979

APPENDIX I

SUBSCALE ITEMS LBDQ-XII

*Indicates reflected (negatively scored) item

Representation

1. Acts as the spokesman of the group.
11. Publicizes the activities of the group.
21. Speaks as the representative of the group.
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present.
41. Represents the group at outside meetings.

Demand Reconciliation

51. Handles complex problems efficiently.
*61. Gets swamped by details.
*71. Gets things all tangled up.
81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order.
*91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her.

Tolerance of Uncertainty

2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision.
*12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next.
22. Accepts defeat in stride.
32. Accepts delays without becoming upset.
*42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments.
52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty.
*62. Can wait just so long, then blows up.
72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events.

82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs.

*92. Worries about the outcome of any new procedure.

Persuasion

3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group.

13. His/her arguments are convincing.

23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view.

33. Is a very persuasive talker.

43. Is very skillful in an argument.

*53. Is not a very convincing talker.

63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction.

73. Is an inspiring talker.

83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage.

93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project.

Initiation of Structure

4. Lets group members know what is expected of them.

14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures.

24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group.

34. Makes his/her attitude clear to the group.

44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.

54. Assigns group members to particular tasks.

64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members.

74. Schedules work to be done.

84. Maintains definite standards of performance.

94. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

Tolerance of Freedom

5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work.

15. Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.

25. Encourages initiative in the group members.

35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best.

45. Assigns a task, then lets the member handle it.

55. Turns the members loose on a job and lets them go to it.

*65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.

75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative.

85. Trusts members to exercise good judgment.

95. Permits the group to set its own pace.

Role Assumption

* 6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group.

*16. Fails to take necessary action.

*26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group.

*36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her.

*46. Is the leader of the group in name only.

*56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm.

*66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep.

76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise.

86. Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership.

96. Is easily recognized as the leader of the group.

Consideration

7. Is friendly and approachable.

17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

37. Treats all group members as his/her equals.

47. Gives advance notice of changes.

*57. Keeps to him/herself.

67. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members.

77. Is willing to make changes.

*87. Refuses to explain his/her actions.

*97. Acts without consulting the group.

Production Emphasis

8. Encourages overtime work.

18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups.

28. Needles members for greater effort.

38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace.

48. Pushes for increased production.

58. Asks the members to work harder.

*68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work.

78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done.

88. Urges the group to beat its previous record.

98. Keeps the group working up to capacity.

Predictive Accuracy

9. Makes accurate decisions.

29. Seems able to predict what is coming next.

49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts.

59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events.

89. Anticipates problems and plans for them.

Integration

19. Keeps the group working together as a team.

39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group.

69. Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated.

79. Helps group members settle their differences.

99. Maintains a closely knit group.

Superior Orientation

10. Gets along well with people above him/her.

20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority.

30. Is working hard for a promotion.

40. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions.

50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position.

60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.

70. His/her word carries weight with superiors.

80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.

90. Is working his/her way to the top.

100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Adrian William Ton, Jr. has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Philip M. Carlin, Director
Associate Professor, Chairperson, Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Max A. Bailey
Associate Professor, Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Karen S. Gallagher
Assistant Professor, Administration and Supervision, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December 12, 1984 — Date

Phil G. M. Carlin — Director's Signature