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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Cooperative Extension Service, for many decades, has depended upon community leaders in the furtherance of its own objectives and has recognized the value of leadership in the wider process of community development.

The Extension Service was founded on principles dedicated to serving people in their indigenous and predominantly rural communities. Created by the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, Extension was oriented to being an outreach effort designed to disseminate university-based research findings. Expanding agricultural production through scientific methods was the intent, especially in the formative years. According to Warner and Christenson (1984, pp. 6-7):

Extension was created by the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 as a third arm of the land-grant system, in order to transmit information from colleges and the Department of Agriculture to local people. According to the purposes specified in the original legislation, Extension is to disseminate and encourage the application of useful and practical information relating to agriculture, home economics, and related subjects among the people of the United States not enrolled in land-grant colleges.

In spite of the fact that the founding rationale for the Service was to bring scientific methods to agriculture and thus expand the urban/industrial society, Extension has been an exponent of a wide variety of independent research findings among a variety of audiences (Jenkins, 1980, p. 7). Although various authors, notably Hightower, have pointed to the
Service as catering to the agribusiness community, in reality the clientele has expanded significantly in response to changes of population, legislation, and felt needs in general. The audience includes a diversity of individuals, ranging from subsistence farmers to those in urban areas.

Although an arm of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Extension is based in a university environment with agents themselves resident in client communities. While having this federal component, Extension is not a centralized bureaucracy, but bases its mission in response to state and local needs. Flexibility in dealing with varied audiences is both a strength and a challenge in that needs are both widely divergent but must also be differentially conceptualized and recognized by agents. Thomason (1969, p. 113) relates that "... it is the social context which gives (human traits) relevance to the leadership role."

The history of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service largely paralleled national trends. The first county agents worked under the auspices of the state Experiment Station, prior to the Smith-Lever Act, and did not always operate with the cooperation and approval of county residents (Christian, 1959, p. 16). After the passage of the Act, with the government impetus, the number of agents expanded into the 1920's. Of main interest, here, is the early recognition of the importance of cooperative working relationships with local people in Extension programs (Christian, p. 21):

In the early days of Extension in Ohio, a wise member of the state staff observed: "The best county agent is not the one who makes the most farm calls; it is the man who gets the most people to work with him." This is another way of saying what Extension workers recognized from the beginning: that Extension needs organized people helping to decide what is important and what needs doing first in an educational program.
Early evaluation efforts of Extension programs, especially by Director Ramsower (1920-1949), again pointed up the value of leadership, insight, and social skills as being of greater relative value than technical expertise in agent success.

Community development efforts have always played a role in Extension work. Any effort to increase agricultural production, organize group efforts, or improve living standards will generally result in community improvement. According to the Ohio Extension Handbook (1983, p. 5.04.00), beginning identifiable work in the area was with the Ohio Federation of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Agents were hired in 1956, with expansions seen in 1960 and 1963. The 1960's saw community development delineated as a separate program area, with funds earmarked by the 1972 Rural Development Act, according to the same reference. The first state leader was employed in 1962, and "further area expansion came in 1963 in the Appalachian Plateau Region of Ohio; community resource development became a part of each area center program throughout Ohio with the establishment of the area center structure" (Handbook, p. 5.04.00).

In recent times, much emphasis seems to have been placed on economic and resource development, such as "industrialization and employment. . ., public finance. . ., land use planning" (p. 5.04.00), and similar efforts. Social development was reflected in such endeavors as safety and community leadership development and organizational structure.

Extension outreach philosophy is seen in a variety of works, including Rogers and Shoemaker (1971), Havelock (1973), and Argyris (1974). The basic approach can be found in Rogers and Shoemaker, in their delineation of seven roles by which the change agent introduces innovations:

While having a formal organizational goal to disseminate information, help increase production, and coordinate group efforts in development, Extension ideally attempts to achieve a balance with process concerns. It is recognized that the process of having people involved as fully as possible in the identification and solution of community problems effects the greatest long-term benefits, in contrast to the imposition of "solutions," or "assistance" from outside the community.

Community leadership has been an area of great importance to Extension and other development agencies for some time. Early recognition and examples of leader usage are widespread. For example, Smith, in his history of the Extension Service (1930), refers to "local leaders" or "project leaders" as being those individuals who assist and extend the work of the agent. This was and is considered to be a highly valuable function in the diffusion of innovations generally: "The work of the local leaders is infinite. They are carriers of instruction from the county agents and Extension specialists to the group they represent" (p. 122). In the same light, Sanders (1966, p. 315) has identified that lay leaders contribute to Extension efforts in three major ways: "a) they add local strength, b) they increase volume of teaching done, and c) they increase ability of rural people to cope with new problems." Leaders are further utilized in their contribution to the all-important
advisory and project committees that help make needs known, and that help plan, conduct, and evaluate projects.

Further, community development is ultimately a process of linkage, both "horizontally," to intra-community groups and organizations, and "vertically," to organizations formally extrinsic but having strong ties to the local community, to borrow terms from Roland Warren (1963). Skills are needed to interact in both spheres, especially considering the strong extra-local ties that have developed in the past 50 years. Resources, both material and non-material, are essential to most development efforts, and local leadership is one of the key elements needed to coordinate community needs and potentials with governmental and other external assistance. It is appropriate to quote at length from Zealey (1959, p. 117) regarding these issues:

To be successful, a development program necessitates mutual cooperation between government and rural people at various levels. It also calls for coordination of effort between various agencies of government and, one might add, between differing elements in the rural community. It calls for the investment of capital, technical knowledge and skills, and often supplies, by the government and, above all, it calls for a capacity in the community to utilize their own resources and the additional investment to the best advantage. It is at this point that the importance of training local leaders becomes apparent.

In addition, in the face of strong external influence, local leadership can serve to bolster community pride and autonomy.

Voluntary associations are another area where local leadership for community development can be manifested. These organizations, according to Warren (1963), have increased in importance as socializing agencies and have supplanted many of the informal primary groupings in this respect as well as proliferating greatly in recent decades (Hyman
& Wright, 1971). While a wide body of literature exists relative to social class and participation, the concern here is for the role of such associations in the development process. After Bloomberg (1969, in Kramer), most voluntary organizations seldom deal with basic community problems and seldom allocate substantial resources. However, "voluntary associations can have an important impact on community affairs if they are persistently involved on behalf of a few goals to which they devote substantial resources" (p. 122). In Extension, Lancaster (1966, in Sanders) claims that agents can establish linkages with other leaders in civic organizations to help further the county program. Further, these organizations "frequently act as sponsors for Extension projects and activities" (p. 282). Effective leadership can help to foster and further community problem solving in these voluntary groups in all mentioned capacities.

Leadership has been assigned a variety of definitions in the literature. These definitions have fallen into a number of generic categories, including, for example (from Stodgill, 1974), leadership: as personality, as the art of inducing compliance, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, as an instrument of goal achievement, as an effect of interaction, and numerous others. However, many investigators have concluded that what supersedes all previous definitions of leader behavior are the situational exigencies on hand. Varying situational demands are held to largely accommodate and encompass (not invalidate) other theories. "Instead of a general trait applicable to all situations, leadership might be expressed as a set of highly specific traits each of which would be applicable to clearly defined situations"
The situational approach is, or should be, at the heart of community development efforts in Extension and other agencies, both in regard to leader training and other phenomena.

Community leaders can span a broad spectrum of roles and functions and are not limited to the Extension project assistants envisaged by Smith and other early writers, although these assistants perform an important function. Rudramoorthy, in "Extension In Planned Social Change" (1964) discusses "formal (leaders) representing institutions and organizations...and informal, not representing any formal organization, but exercising leadership by their very functions" (p. 122), with the stated necessity of working with both in Extension work. This same general categorical differentiation is found in Bradfield (1966). Here, albeit discussed in a foreign context, both formal and informal leaders are again considered valuable in disseminating innovative ideas in conjunction with the agent.

Both formal and informal leaders, as well as those individuals not resident in the community but having some particular expertise, can contribute to the development process. In an ideal sense, broad participation or representation is conducive to motivation and effort in seeing projects through to completion. Formal leaders, usually elected officers, have the mandate of their organization or constituent population, and therefore represent a more structured position than others. Informal leaders are usually those individuals having extensive influence in the community and while often not occupying elective office may be even more important than their counterparts in local decision-making. Both types, especially the informal, play an important role at the
"legitimation" stage or the giving of approval or authority in the "social-action process" in development.

Legitimation is also important because it is at this point that many people are initially contacted with the basic ideas of the new program and with what the initiating group is trying to accomplish. Important expectations of and attitudes toward the initiating group are grounded in this contact. (Copp, 1964, p. 252)

With the importance of leadership in Extension, what is the need for training in leadership? Can it be assumed that all leaders have an innate talent that transcends daily circumstances and interaction, or can leadership skills be improved to be more readily valuable in development work?

Many early writers in the Extension/development fields have dealt with what they consider the human resources available for leadership efforts. Much talent is assumed to be latent or in a state of potentiality, awaiting only the catalyst. For example, a noted development scientist notes that "we would conclude that potential leaders are almost everywhere, that they will appear with patience and encouragement, that their ability can be trained remarkably in experience" (Biddle, 1953, p. 11). Further, in the same vein, Wileden (1970, p. 212) relates that "... leadership is a relative thing and that given the proper circumstances, everyone can be a leader. ... Wherever we find groups, we have leaders, and the only possible situation where there are no leaders is where there is no group life as such."

One obvious indication of the need for training leaders, at least in Extension activities, is the sheer number of individuals assisting in meetings and other events. For example, as early as 1930, Smith (p. 119) estimated the existence of nearly 250,000 voluntary leaders,
contributing approximately 2,000,000 days per year. More recently, Trent (1966, p. 315), in Sanders, quoted a figure (for 1961) of some 1½ million local leaders actively engaged in Extension work, equalling approximately "... 52,000 persons employed for a full year of 260 days, or five times the total paid county Extension personnel."

Current figures from Vines and Anderson (1976, p. 108), in "Heritage Horizons," quote an estimated 2,000,000 volunteers per year assisting Extension staff, which demonstrates one current need for volunteer leaders in this area.

The treatment of leadership, in this research, is in reference to the socio-economic and technical development of the community and its members, as opposed to isolated skills training. Consequently, leadership training is seen as a catalytic method to aid in the total development of the community. This is accomplished, again, in a generic sense, by enabling leaders to understand the relationship between the local community and the wider society, and their individual and collective roles in facilitating a positive relationship. In the process, and as an important objective in itself, community autonomy is promoted—autonomy to the extent possible—, which can lead to a stronger sense of local identity, and feelings that efforts made toward development are the people's efforts, rather than merely satisfying red tape demands of governmental agencies or parent companies. According to Griffiths (1971, p. 83):

Before embarking on any programme of leadership training, we have to ask ourselves why it is that we wish to provide training. We perceive that some of the leaders in the community are not well equipped to deal with the problems which they encounter, and we surmise that they need training in order to do their jobs properly.
properly. But the existence of need in itself is not the main-spring of the action which we contemplate taking. We consider offering training to leaders in the community because we are interested in the total development of the community.

This same author, Griffiths (p. 84), has offered four propositions which summarize a majority of the social-psychological literature in the field, especially the symbolic-interactionist, regarding the role of leadership training in community development. The propositions will serve as a conceptual framework and as generic evaluative criteria, in assessing Extension's leader training workshops:

1. Leadership training should aim to improve the technical skills and knowledge required by the participants to perform their roles and functions in the community.

2. Leadership training should aim to increase the understanding of the participants with regard to the individual and social forces which operate within the community and which affect the community from outside.

3. Leadership training should aim to improve the morale and self-confidence of the participants, so that they are encouraged to think of times of change and development as times of opportunity, and not as times which threaten their personal positions.

4. Leadership training should aim to be concise, particular, and relevant. To this end, it must be conceived of as an on-going programme of training experiences related to events and to life, rather than as a series of infrequent and unrelated courses.

The early recognition and value of leadership in Extension work has been referred to. While there is a reasonable body of literature referencing leadership training in other fields, there is a distinct paucity of published material dealing with rural community leadership. As elaborated in the second chapter, most of the authoritative work has been performed under the auspices of private organizations.
The Extension Service has recently (June 1984) compiled a definitive list of on-going leadership training programs nationally. According to this document, "Extension Community Leadership Programs in the United States," some 93 leadership programs were on-going at the time of the survey. "Over half (55%) dealt with community development (CD) process skill subject matter - helping participants understand how their communities worked, and how they could be improved" (North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, p. 7). The nature and extent of these programs indicate the priority being given to leadership training. Nevertheless, the document also points up the general lack of systematic evaluative efforts, indicating that less than half of the programs had any kind of incorporated assessment at all, with "the most common kind of evaluation reported (being) that which elicited testimonials from participants" (NCRCRD, p. 9). The need for such impact assessments is thus made clear, considering the recency and comprehensiveness of the aforementioned document.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF EXTENSION LEADER TRAINING

Extension history affords a number of examples of leader training, again demonstrating the importance of the concept. Home economics and 4-H club work, especially, have long made use of volunteer leaders and leader training in their programs. In a general sense, Smith relates that:

In the evolution of the local leader, it is to be remembered that they generally need to be told clearly the task before them and given some specific training for the particular work to be done. To this end, there were held in 1927 over 38,000 training schools of one to three days each for local leaders by Extension agents, with an attendance totaling approximately 350,000 people. (1930, p. 126)
The same author further delineates the use of leader training in club work, of one or more days duration, "... in 1925 show(ing) an average of 8.8 meetings per agent during the year, with an average of eight local leaders in attendance" (p. 129). And advanced training was also given to older club members and leaders on a state or regional basis to sharpen skills for club camp use. Heywood (1966, in Sanders) reports on the training of volunteer leaders to augment Extension teaching efforts under the impetus of the war (first) (p. 253).

Christian, in his history of Ohio Extension (1959), again corroborates the volume of training of volunteer leaders to assist the Home Economics agent in teaching (p. 4). And in 4-H club work, there is also advanced training having early-on (1925) been offered officers and advisors (p. 51). While specific information spanning the 1960's was unavailable, it can be assumed that some type of leader training was an on-going priority. The Ohio Extension Annual Report of 1978-79 lists leadership development as a major topical area, claiming that:

"Leadership Development" was listed as one of the greatest needs in communities by 2,000 Ohio leaders who participated in a series of Community Development seminars conducted by Extension in the early 1970's. In the past five years, concentrated leadership workshops have been sponsored by the Cooperative Extension Service in 26 Ohio counties. (p. 29)

Subsequent annual reports continue documenting the priority, conduct, and expansion of the workshops to embrace more counties, and, in one year at least (1979), to indicate the carrying out of an advanced workshop for former participants. The Handbook of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (1983) lists leadership and organizational
development as a program priority area, with major effort being devoted to non-metropolitan communities (p. 103.00).

The Ohio Extension Service has conducted 2-3 day (2-4 hrs./day) leadership workshops, for the past 10+ years (since the early 1970's), taught largely by the current CNRD specialist, with occasional assistance from county/area agents and other state specialists. These workshops expanded into a state-wide effort after a successful series was conducted in one county. However, evaluative efforts have not been systematic or comprehensive, being limited to brief informal attitude questionnaires administered following the workshops.

If leadership training in Extension is to maintain a high degree of effectiveness in conjunction with creativity, then programs must be proactive, rather than reactive or responsive to just external demands. Systematic program evaluation in Extension was not often conducted until the 1970's, at which point and especially into the 1980's, a considerable emphasis was given to this topic. Evaluation is seen to be essential to the organization. This is the case partially because the multiple funding sources (federal, state, county) require some type of accountability to justify their support. More important, ideally, is that Extension is a helping institution providing services to the society that created it. The goals of the institution have been seen to be that of assisting (predominantly rural) community residents not having access to land-grant universities, with research findings designed to improve their overall quality of life. With changing social needs, demographics, and resources, Extension must be able to assume responsibility for adapting to differing requirements,
especially those relating to needs of people.

Most evaluations of community development programs are not only ex-post-facto, but usually based upon single-instrument studies (Thomas, 1970). And, again, "the evaluation of community development programs is often neglected or purposely avoided by agencies which fear the consequences of objective analysis of attempts to put project goals into action" (p. 77). Given the need, desire, or mandate for assessment, multiple-instrument evaluation can overcome problems inherent in single instrumentation. This is accomplished by combining qualitative and quantitative methods, by exploring ramifications and contexts of problems, and by helping to increase response rates etc., all leading to greater validity. Multiple-instrument evaluation has been utilized in this study.

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose in the study was to evaluate the leadership workshops conducted by the Community and Natural Resources Development program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, that have been taking place for the past 10+ years.

Evaluation of the workshops, when conducted, has been confined to informal attitude questionnaires administered following the workshops. A more comprehensive impact assessment was deemed advisable, to ascertain the effectiveness of the training in bringing about positive socio-economic changes in the community, and improve the workshops as a consequence.
Specific objectives for the study are as follows:

1. Identify workshop effects on organizational and committee memberships of participants.

2. Assess workshop effects on participants in the following areas:
   a) participant involvement in community activities, b) perceptions of individuals as leaders in their community, and c) orientation toward community issues and effectiveness as leaders.

3. Qualitatively seek participants' perceptions of: a) program strengths, b) empirical community influence of individuals as a result of the program, and c) workshop recommendations.

4. Identify selected occupational and personal characteristics of participants.

5. Qualitatively seek county agents' perceptions of: a) how the need for a workshop is determined, b) tailoring of program to local community needs, c) selection of participants, d) workshop effects, and e) improvement recommendations.

6. Seek ramifications and further understanding of the leadership program by means of a comprehensive survey of the Extension program manager.

7. Make recommendations for improvement.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND THEORY

SITUATIONAL RELEVANCE OF MEANING

Background

As the Symbolic-Interactionists and a host of writer/researchers (Winch, Whorf, Sapir, Batten etc.) have demonstrated, meaning is inherent in a particular culture, life-style, or group way. From this perspective, symbols, which are the basis of meaning, are those ideas or objects which indicate a future-completed act or full behavioral pattern. The symbol, as a human construct, differs from the "natural sign," this latter being based in animal behavior, and calling out an instinctive response (Mead, 1934). Mead also refers to the "significant symbol" as a human phenomenon on a conscious level, or a sharing of meaning or signification common to an identifiable social nexus. Similarly,

The relation between idea and context is an internal one. The idea gets it's sense from the role it plays in the system. It is non-sensical to take several systems of ideas, find an element in each which can be expressed in the same verbal form, and claim to have discovered an idea which is common to all the systems. (Winch, 1958, p. 107)

The importance of these considerations from the standpoint of community development is that local groups should not be presumed to be uniform in values or beliefs. Working with these groups should entail variable behavior from agents and other specialists, according to indigenous priorities, as there can be expected to be variable reactions from participants.
"Subjective reality," or the defined beliefs of the person and group, are real in their consequences, even though, objectively they may not be so, to another observer. Furthermore, if these beliefs incorporate a large number of non-empirical referents, any independent verification is ruled out. Therefore, the development agent cannot hope to change behavior until his actions are geared into the "real-life world" of the cultural group dealt with, and he avoids the "generic fallacy" (assumptions as to the universal validity of meaning and data). (Long, 1976, p. 48)

Again, although meaning and the significance of symbols and events can be expected to be relatively uniform within a particular culture, there are situational/community differences. These differences are also both handicaps and opportunities, in the sense that conceptualization and definition must be exercised for full awareness of local community problems, yet this awareness can lead to more effectual working relationships and development. In leader training considerations, the situational relevance of meaning assumes highest significance when dealing with selection of leaders and devising training sessions around issues of community importance. In reference to the use of local leaders in development work, Thomason (1969, p. 113) relates that:

It may be important to see leadership as something which can only be exercised in the context of a group (which may in certain circumstances be synonymous with a local culture) and of an overall situation and task. These provide a necessary framework for leadership which whilst it must always be acted out by a person, is nevertheless the personal conjunction with the environment.

This theme of development being pervaded by considerations of indigenous meaning has ramifications at many different levels. Differing community lifestyles of importance and agent-working implications have been touched upon. However, it is important to stress that community development agents are almost always representatives of agencies, and these agencies exercise a wide swath of influence over their employees (Pitt, 1976).
Fortunately, the Extension Service has embodied the respect for community lifestyles in official policy, which therefore receives at least this degree of recognition (Handbook, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, 1983, p. 1.01):

The basic objective of the Cooperative Extension Service is to help people utilize scientific data so they are better able to solve problems and attain an improved level of living. . . . In determining program direction, priorities are established in terms of major needs of the people, then programs are provided within the limits of available financial and professional resources.

Nevertheless, what is embodied in policy and what is conceptualized and practiced are often different phenomena, especially with agencies which are centralized bureaucracies with agenda that emphasize production or their own criteria. David C. Pitt, in "The Social Dynamics of Development" (1976) deals at length with these considerations, and while primarily applicable to international organizations, claims that frequently these centralized agencies pay little attention to events in local countries or communities. " . . . Quite often development plans for country after country read very similarly, when the reality is very different. Jobs are measured not in terms of any performance criteria, but some unrelated quantitative index" (p. 37). Considering that the Extension Service is not officially a direct-line agency, with the exception of policy recommendations, theoretically agents are relatively free to adapt educational programs to felt needs. With program responsibility thereby shifted to the county and supervisory state levels, it is incumbent that: a) agents study and know the communities they deal with as unique, at least in some respects, planning accordingly; and b) state specialists, supervisors, and administrators, while
offering guidance, must not frustrate agents with autonomy-limiting plans or unrelated quantitative performance criteria.

... There are many different meanings of development. The academic or administrator in the West has certain well-established criteria, usually focusing on increased production or consumption, but other people in the outside world, and not only in the Third World, have very different ideas, in different time and space contexts, about how many and what kinds of goods and services constitute an ideal pattern. (Pitt, p. 8)

**Community Needs for Workshop**

Much of the theoretical material relating to community need for workshops has been covered in the preceding section. Nevertheless, it is important to stress the necessity for agents and other developers to ascertain specific needs facing specific communities they are dealing with. From another perspective, perceived or legislated generic needs must be tailored to fit situational requirements.

It is easy to forget that all situations are different. There are differences in the physical situation; there are differences in people - in their attitudes and in their experiences, and there is always the matter of timing. What may be highly successful in one situation may be a complete failure in another situation, or at another time. ... Community development programs must be tailor-made rather than ready-made. The action must meet the needs. (Wileden, p. 259)

The thesis that satisfaction of needs is a major thrust of community development, and consequently leadership workshops is, of course, valid primarily in a democratic environment where freedom of choice is possible and self-help can lead to a positive process of self-renewal. Development agencies, especially in past decades, have frequently sought to impose solutions or decisions on communities presuming the validity of their innovation. Of four theoretical ways of viewing C.D. (Sanders, in Cary, 1970): as a process, a method,
a program, and a movement, the imposition of solutions is seen to correspond with the definition of "method": "Central planners, economic developers, and those representing some one professional field may look upon community development in terms of whether it will or will not help them achieve the concrete, material goals they have in mind" (Sanders, p. 19).

This above tactic was also termed the "directive" approach by T.R. Batten in a number of social development works originating from international experience. The directive approach, while conceded to have wrought some good, due to provision of basic services (which were wanted), was considered short-term and not conducive to long-term problem-solution. This was concluded since there did not exist: a) a cultural/value system compatibility, and b) people were largely excluded from the decision-making or need-ascertaining process, which could have led to long-term self-help capability. Much development literature has attested to the deleterious effects of external service provision in creating dependency. In contrast, Batten (1967) has recommended the "non-directive approach," because ". . . (an agency) feels the people's greatest need is to acquire more confidence and competence in thinking, deciding, and implementing their own decisions for themselves, and that a directive approach would tend to have just the opposite effect" (p. 27).

Other sociologists employed by development agencies internationally and domestically have early-on commented on the necessity of determining needs and indigenous meaning patterns before planning could hope to have a lasting effect. For example, Sutti Ortiz, in "The 'Human Factor'
in Social Planning in Latin America" (1970) states that:

Perhaps social planning should be less concerned to direct action and development than to advise, on the one hand, on the evaluation of needs which have to be satisfied, and on the other hand to recommend corrective devices for maintaining certain well-recognized moral values. . . . Responsibility for change should as far as possible rest on the actors themselves. The planners should advertise opportunities, make them more easily available and adduce comparative information on how they could be introduced in a way that could be locally understood and used. (p. 161)

David C. Pitt, another development sociologist referred to earlier, terms grass-root efforts "development from below," or that which is indigenous and internally generated, as opposed to "development from above," which again is agency imposition on a community. Included within the development from below thesis are ideas such as group identity and status, symbolic interactionism and the relativity of development, and the motivating rather than static function of tradition. The central thesis of the work revolves around "interdisciplinary approaches. . . (and) situational explanations of the dynamics of development complexity . . . at the grass roots level. . . where it has been internally generated rather than externally imposed" (1976, p. 1).

The field of community organization is a predecessor, but also nearly a conceptual twin of community development, although having a social work orientation. Many of the key ideas from community organization have been pervasive to the present. Roland Warren (1963) considers Murray Ross' "Community Organization" (1955) as the most important work in the field. Ross, writing with a domestic perspective, defines the objective of the field as (summarized) the identification, ranking, and solving of needs or objectives in the community (p. 40). Again, the central concept of need is predominant, whether the need is
consciously articulated or represents the force of tradition. And, "the task of the professional worker in community organization is to help imitate, nourish, and develop this process" (p. 41), one of integrated community functioning.

Warren points out that the tendency until lately has been to ascribe a unitary public interest to community change theory, as if undifferentiated goals were held by all community groups. Idealistically, this has probably been true to some extent. However, even Ross strongly emphasized the necessity of distinguishing between "functional" and "geographic" communities.

Those whose primary concern is that the geographic community develop sufficient cohesion and capacity to deal with its own problems have a focus for their work in the geographic community which is distinct from the work of the adult education or welfare council in the same geographic community. These latter councils may wish to see greater community integration and may cooperate to that end, but their primary effort is directed at advancement of their own program of welfare or adult education in the geographic community. This leads to quite different methods of work in the geographic community. (Ross, p. 43)

Warren goes on to emphasize what he considers to be the fallacy of a unitary public interest, even though most development theory is based on it. Instead, the reader is enjoined to "consider the action episode as a type of 'opposition' and 'negotiation'... (by various community groups)" (p. 377). This latter position has often been identified with the "conflict" school of thought, and much has been written about it. However, from the perspective of this thesis, it is sufficient that the existence of groups having varying degrees of autonomy, community integration, external linkages, and consequently needs, be recognized.
Rogers and Shoemaker (1971), in a major work on communication of innovations and in many published articles, have dealt with the concept of need as fundamentally representative of a democratic group's varying states of growth, and, in their words, "modernization." While issue may be taken with the authors' conception of a consensual progression of societies from traditional to modern, the significance of their viewpoints is seen in the context of innovation. Individuals and groups are postulated to adopt innovations partially due to the new item's compatibility with clients' felt needs. "When felt needs are met, a faster rate of adoption should occur" (p. 148). Rogers and Shoemaker further relate:

Many change programs fail because they seek to swim against the tide of clients' cultural values, without steering toward clients' perceived needs. Change agents must have knowledge of their clients' perceived needs, attitudes, and beliefs, their social norms and leadership structure, if programs of change are to be tailored to fit the clients. Mead (1955, p. 258) stated: "Experience has taught us that change can best be introduced not through centralized planning, but after a study of local needs." (p. 239)

The recognition of community needs is again given priority in Ohio Extension policy, as reflected in the "Handbook" (p. 3.01):

Extension programs, to be significant, must meet the needs of people. To be effective, the programs must also satisfy the interests of those who most need the assistance. Key local leaders, working with professional educators in developing programs, assure that both the needs and interests of people will be considered. Through this process, new horizons unfold for many thousands of people.

**Tailoring Workshop to Community Situation and Needs**

An easily deduced corollary of identifying problem sets and needs as a basis for development programs is the advisability of tailoring leadership (and all other) workshops to this unique situation. Even though it is a logical consequence that growth prospects revolve around
group action (in a variety of forms) as the basic mode of community problem-solving, it still can be observed that much teaching in workshops or groups still makes use of generalized content, and not that which is endemic to the locale.

Underpinnings for the need to present situationally relevant workshop content will be briefly examined in symbolic-interaction and diffusion theory. Symbolic-interactionism, as referred to earlier, is a mode of interaction that is contingent upon a commonly shared set of symbols and referents. "Significant symbols," which indicate the same or similar behavioral modes on a consciously understood level, are formed not only within a culture, but also in the context of particular residential locales, where individuals participate in similar activities and develop local meanings. Hence, the meaning of an event, an innovation, or any idea is dependent upon selective perception, or the "definition of the situation." In concrete terms, this means that individuals are going to value what they have learned to perceive as relevant and important in their personal and group lives. Issues that affect them directly are of much greater significance to a majority of community residents than abstract or cosmopolitan happenings.

The implication of a wide variety of research: Vidich and Bensman (1968), Warren (1963), and Bradshaw and Blakely (1979), is that small towns and rural areas have, for several decades, lost a great deal of autonomy and have increasingly become tied to extra-local institutions. This one aspect of the "great change" of Warren means
that:

Not only do many and varied community units have strong ties with extra-community organizations, but the ties appear to be getting stronger as time goes on. Less and less of their activity is determined by local people. More and more of it comes from outside the community. They are, in many cases, much more closely integrated with their respective extra-community systems than they are with each other, locally. A result of this is that if some degree of concerted action among such diverse units at the local level is to take place, it must be brought about through deliberate efforts. (Warren, in Kimball, 1978, p. 6)

The importance of contemporary social organizational factors and other aspects of Warren's "great change," but especially the extra-local tie phenomenon, is that community leadership training should deal with issues in the wider society that affect the local community. In other words, the particular leadership group or community concern should be able to contextualize itself in reference to institutional, financial, and informational sources that are, to a large degree, determining its destiny, and consider way to bring about what autonomy and integration are possible under the circumstances.

Leader training oriented to the foregoing issues has been conducted in several significant workshop series. The most important of these was sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation (expounded later) in four major leader development programs in Michigan, Montana, California, and Pennsylvania, between 1965 and 1976. During the course of the programs, which lasted from one to three years, a variety of training methods was used, which included "travel seminars... aimed at providing participants with an understanding of the social, economic, cultural, and political dimensions of public problems, and the ways in which public policy is developed and group action is initiated" (Howell, 1979, p. 2).
As further related in the document (p. 167), instruction was given "not only (in) economics and broad agricultural policies, but also (in) the social sciences in general and the humanities." Other broad impact training programs have deemed it appropriate to include in the curriculum economic and social factors that impact on the community and group.

Another perspective can be seen in the work of Rogers and Shoemaker (1971), again, in the discussion of compatibility as one significant factor in the rate of innovation spread; these ideas have an immediate relevance to content concerns in leadership or any community development workshops:

Compatibility is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the existing values, past experiences, and needs of the receivers. An idea that is not compatible with the salient characteristics of a social system will not be adopted so rapidly as an idea that is compatible. Compatibility ensures greater security and less risk to the receiver and makes the new idea more meaningful to him. An innovation may be compatible 1) with sociocultural values and beliefs, 2) with previously introduced ideas, or 3) with client needs for innovations. (p. 145)

The compatibility concern is especially important in leadership workshops, because much of the educational presentation will consist of non-material context information, such as socio-economic theories and explanations. It is important that the referents, or the concrete implications of theories, and more importantly, the direct tie-in or significance on the local level, be made manifest during presentations. This is exemplified in Tarcher's (1966) discussion of a leadership training program for supervisors in the California State Department of Employment:

Social change was defined, explained, and discussed in terms of the real changes taking place in Corwall as a consequence of technological innovation, economic dislocation, and Corwall's attempt
to control them both. Social mobility, role, stratification - all gave meaning to and derived meaning from the events and realities of Cornwall. (p. 127)

The Cooperative Extension Service, in addition to orienting itself to community help by means of need identification, relies upon teaching methods that concretize, or make locally relevant, problems and solutions. Demonstration methods and meetings were partially responsible for the establishment of the Service, and rely upon local residents demonstrating innovative practices to others. These meetings can have as subject matter both concrete results and methods. Extension also relies upon planning meetings with participant input, workshops, schools, and tours and field days (Sanders, 1966). The latter, especially, have been utilized in a number of high-quality leader training programs, with a value predicated upon Roger's "observability" and "compatability" theses. This is further elaborated in Poorbaugh (in Sanders, p. 154): "Lessons to be learned are applied to real-life settings in which he can observe both the advantages and disadvantages. . . . This technique provides a strong point of reference to the person as he goes on to greater understanding and application."

Clientele Participation

The concept of clientele participation in development has a long history and is almost synonymous with the growth of the fields of community organization and development. Client involvement in efforts to improve the socio-economic standing of their locale, as dealt with earlier, is fundamental in a democratic society. Granted that much autonomy has been lost in the transference of many local institutional/financial and other social functions to external organizations, citizen
involvement in planning, advising, and evaluating still remains a fundamental premise.

Different types of development are still practiced. Often the social factor is given secondary (or no) consideration, especially when technical "improvements" are what is being propounded. Along these lines, Sanders (in Cary, 1970, pp. 14-31) discusses several approaches to social betterment, including economic, agricultural, and industrial development, each with its respective programmatic emphases. Social development, according to this author, entails such phenomena as literacy, welfare, and "the developmental approach (which) would necessitate economists and welfare specialists working together to anticipate social consequences of planned economic programs" (p. 18). The latter represents a wide social-oriented consensus and the view of this paper, that only an interdisciplinary approach can solve human problems, but an interdisciplinary approach that respects indigenous decision-making through symbolic mediation.

Participation in community organization/development has not been satisfactorily defined in the literature, and has included nearly every type of activity, as well as attitudinal phenomena. Fundamental work in this area has been performed by Cohen and Uphoff ("Rural Development Participation," 1977), however, in which they offer the following meaning:

With regard to rural development, we saw "participation" including people's involvement in decision-making processes about what would be done and how; their involvement in implementing programs and decisions by contributing various resources or cooperating in specific organizations or activities; their sharing in the benefits of development programs; and/or their involvement in efforts to evaluate such programs. (p. 6)
While the concept of participation and inclusive involvement in decision-making is almost unequivocally an ideal, certain qualifications and realizations from the literature have been adduced. Groups coalesce and persist in time primarily to satisfy needs of members. These needs and objectives are changeable, with community betterment therefore often a sometime thing, dependent upon working relationships of community groups and synonymity of goals. In addition, there is the matter of representation, and what Cary (1970, Ch. 6) differentiates as "inclusive organizations," with small locality involvement, the "representative organization," and the "nonrepresentative organization," with the latter being "perhaps the most frequently employed participation model... (with advantages being) its simplicity of structure and procedures, openness to additional participants, and ability to act quickly" (p. 163).

Relatively few people are normally involved in local decision-making, and these are largely made up of the above-average in education, income, and employment. And, according to Thullen (1978, p. 43), some communities want participation while others don't, some federal and state programs mandate "broad citizen involvement," and some groups and organizations seek greater involvement and request assistance from development agents. Others, including Bender (1972, p. 73), relate that collective participation slows the rate of decision-making, may simply pool ignorance, and can result in anti-intellectualism. Nevertheless, advantages seem to outweigh disadvantages, according to most authors in the field.
As Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) conclude:

1. Through participation in the decision-making process, individual members learn that most others in the system are also willing to go along with the decision.

2. The decision to accept or to reject is more appropriate to the needs of the system's members if they take part in reaching such a decision.

3. Widespread participation allows the opinion leaders in the system to assume a major part in making the decision. Hence, the opinion leader's position is reinforced, and the members are induced to abide by the decision and be more satisfied with it. (p. 287)

The position of the Extension Service has been quite clear on the value of participation from early years. However, there seems to have been an historical progression from elementary personal interviews and emphasis on meeting attendance, to an awareness of the value of broad-scale clientele involvement in planning, carrying-out, and evaluating programs. For example, Smith (1930, p. 345) reports on improved diffusion of new ideas with meeting participation, agent contact, and other formal and informal activities. Brunner and Yang (1949) claim that "In either case, the people must share in the development of the program. Indeed, this essentially democratic procedure is a major principle. Sharing in program-building makes the program belong to the people. They have accepted it" (pp. 180-181). And, Warner and Christenson (1984) say:

Extension encourages direct involvement of clientele in the process of planning and carrying out programs. Citizen's advisory councils and committees are active in the formulation of Extension programs at the local, state, and federal levels. Through this process of participation, people come to know the organization. (p. 87)
While certainly placing a high priority on citizen involvement, Extension and similar agencies with line responsibilities and accountability requirements must attempt to balance clientele input with programming functions, without negating the former or countermanding the latter. Extension achieves this, in a majority of cases, and again, in cooperative working relationships with local residents, in which the problem is identified and facts collected, objectives and work plans established, a plan of work is implemented, and results evaluated, according to Pesson (in Sanders, 1966, p. 95). In a generic sense, and after Batten (1967) the "non-directive" approach generally used by Extension and other agencies, is that of avoiding the implementation of "solutions," but instead "stimulate(ng) people to think about their needs, feed in information about possible ways of meeting them, and encourag(ing) them to decide for themselves what they will do to meet them" (p. v). Planning and programming is a high priority in Extension, and is most effective with clientele participation.

Advisory committees are one of the chief mechanisms through which community individuals have input into the development process (Cole & Cole, 1983; Bible, 1963; Cochran, 1980; and others). "Probably no other government agency has as extensive an involvement of local citizens in the program development process as does Extension" (Warner & Christenson, 1984, p. 38). Advisory committees have important functions in both the county and state. According to Cole and Cole (1983, p. 40):

One of the basic purposes of the county Extension Advisory Council is to work with the Extension Service through the county and state staffs, in order to help plan and carry out an educational program
both annual and long-range, dealing with the improvement of agriculture, home economics, and rural as well as urban living in the county. Councils have roles to play in helping to identify and prioritize needs, activate resources, legitimize programs, communicate with clientele, and aid in accountability.

These advisory committees can exist at a variety of levels in Extension, including (after Cole & Cole, 1983): a) an overall advisory council, responsible for analysis and advice to Extension relative to county trends and developments; b) program area councils, which assist in development of specific plans for a target development effort. "Specifically, they should provide support as legitimizers, advisors, interpreters, communicators, and advocates for Extension efforts" (p. 42); and c) program area subcommittees, which extend and widen the efforts of the program councils, by exploring more specific issues. Some councils are mandated by law, while others, no less importantly, are voluntarily formed or ad-hoc. Councils representing broader geographic areas within the state are also possible.

In Ohio Extension, in addition to a variety of councils at the county level, there are also district (multi-county) committees, which advise district specialists, and state committees (general, 4-H, homemakers etc.). County committees here, also, have advisory and program development functions, and, in addition, there are "support committees," which "develop a committee system, on a continuing basis, for acquainting appropriate elected county, state, and federal officials, as well as opinion leaders, about the nature and importance of Extension education programs. . ." (Handbook, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, p. 3.07).
Needs assessment is a logical adjunct to basing Extension programming on community needs and conditions. Needs assessment has progressed significantly from early Extension history, when the government and service agents assumed that their knowledge of local requirements was necessary and sufficient, or in other words, that they knew best. "The program was predetermined and taken to the farmer, who had nothing to say about it" (Brunner & Yang, 1949, p. 103). Smith (1930, p. 132) relates that program planning progressed from this state to that of relative laissez-faire in letting people plan programs, to that of coordination between the people and agents, using various resources.

Early assessment efforts appear not to have been systematic or scientific. For example, systematic surveys seem not to have been used, even though individual and group interviews were conducted. And even in later decades Neuber (1980) says that "in most cases, needs assessments were developed to address the pragmatic concerns of accrediting and funding bodies" (p. 14). Combined with the recent decade's stress on quantitative research (and later qualitative methodology), along with consumerism, community accountability, and human services, needs assessment has assumed a more organized form.

It would seem that an agency has a greater likelihood of achieving identified goals by developing a conceptual and operational framework for providing human services based on the perceived goals, needs, and characteristics of the community which the agency serves. This concern for developing a community-oriented framework for providing human services has escalated the demand for accurate, usable information which reflects the needs and characteristics of a specific population. (Neuber, p. 15)
Needs assessment has been a topic of increasing interest in recent years, as seen in, for example, Cochran et. al. (1980) in education, Neuber in mental health and social agency work, and Caffarella (1982), Robinson (1984), and Cole and Cole (1983) in Extension. Most work has centered around assessment as taking place in the context of advisory committees, reflecting the emphasis on participatory planning.

Detailed methodological procedures are incorporated in most works on the subject. References emphasize the advisability of gathering background information dealing with factors influencing the county/community, such as demographic statistics, economic trends, and advice of resource individuals. "The purpose of analyzing the county situation is to enable the council to identify existing trends and conditions and compare these with those that could and should exist" (Cole & Cole, p. 67). Formal need determination is best accomplished by triangulation, or the use of a variety of methods. Little (in Cole & Cole, 1983) refers to the following approaches: a) key informant interviews, b) community public forums, c) social indicators (statistics), and d) surveys based on interviews or questionnaires. Neuber emphasizes key informant interviews and personal resident interviews, along with the prior pre-assessment background information. Advisory committees with subcommittees and study groups can effectively appraise the county situation, especially in regard to background data.

Additional techniques in needs assessment could center around unobtrusive or qualitative methods, such as participant observation, if time and resources permitted. Participant observation would allow a more precise determination of needs that often remain unexpressed.
The value of needs assessment is considerable, but must always be balanced against Extension programming and priority requirements and available or expected resources.

PARTICIPANT SELECTION

As referred to earlier, Biddle (1953) and others have commented that potential leaders can be found everywhere. However, this does not mean that everyone has leadership potential. While not espousing the trait approach to leadership abilities, still a broad spectrum of talents already latent will more effectively pre-condition the individual to benefit from the training course, and benefit the community in turn. "... Training cannot create an ability in the absence of capability; ... it cannot create skill where aptitude does not exist. It can only develop the potential that is already latently there" (Taylor, 1962, p. 49). Along these lines, Cole & Rossmiller (1970, p. 2), in discussing university obligations in training adults for public decision-making relate that:

To provide adult education for all those who need and want it would be an extremely costly process. Perhaps, it would be wise to concentrate on those individuals with the most leadership potential, because of limited resources. The objective is not to develop an entire society of leaders, but to expand the level of awareness of the needs and problems within the community whether it be local, state, national, or world-wide.

The situational perspective in leadership, seen earlier, espouses the viewpoint that differing situational requirements call for varying personal traits (Vroom, 1976; Stodgill, 1974; Wileden, 1970). Ideally, leader training would recruit similar individuals who would expect to face similar contextual circumstances. However, in Extension and most other leader training, programs are usually designed for the general
public. More to the point, participants will return to a broad spectrum of leadership positions in the community. While selection by traits or situational expectations is thereby inappropriate, it is appropriate to exercise a modicum of selectivity for programs in order to capitalize on the value of the training. "Until more efficient methods of personality measurement have been devised and validated for different cultural situations, it might well prove to be more sensible to rely simply upon the factors of trainability in the individual, and acceptability within the . . . group" (Thomason, p. 115).

Selection criteria for leaders have been utilized for a considerable period of time, and in virtually all occupations and professions. For example, Cunningham (1973), in discussing criteria for educational administrators relates that a state of the art research summary in the field concludes that there still is not a simple test to differentiate the "fit from the unfit" (p. 278). Traditional rating methods, while not all bad, such as letters of reference, rating scales, interviews, and grades, still have been widely criticized. Better alternatives proposed include intelligence measures, personality inventories, situation performance tests, judgmental vs. actuarial prediction, and others (Cunningham, pp. 279-283).

In the field of rural community development, the topic at hand, relatively few leadership development studies have been evaluated and published. Most of these studies employed formal selection criteria, which will be briefly examined. Under the auspices of the Kellogg Foundation, four leadership development programs were conducted in Michigan, Pennsylvania, California, and Montana, between 1965 and
1975 (as summarized in Howell, 1982). Training programs varied in length from one week to three years. The Pennsylvania program required: 1) age of 25-42 yrs., 2) leadership potential, and 3) desire to be active in solving rural problems (p. 13). In California, specifically an agricultural program, criteria were: 1) an agricultural occupation, 2) 25-40 yr. age range, and 3) potential or demonstrated leadership qualities in the community (p. 26). The Michigan farmer's program required 1) successful farming occupation, 2) 25-35 yr. age range, and 3) demonstrated leadership ability and further potential (p. 35). Lastly, the Montana leadership program's criteria were: "1) likely tenure in the community, 2) personality and potential for leadership, 3) academic competence, 4) potential for making a contribution to the growth and development of other study/travel group participants, 5) potential for personal growth, and 6) the ability to define problems, as opposed to presenting dogmatic solutions" (p. 44).

All Kellogg leadership program selection efforts included nomination of prospective applicants, completion of extensive applications, and personal interviews by screening committees. In most or all cases, applicants were asked to indicate potential or accomplishments in contributing to community problem solution, and who were likely to remain in the community, thereby helping to insure continued opinion (and formal) leadership. In Montana, one-week workshops were held at the university campus. These were followed (for some participants) by more advanced training consisting of a second and third one-week workshop. "Applicants to the Freshman Workshops (one-week) completed a simple two-page application form which elicited information on their
community activities and reasons for applying. Persons interested in the more intensive study/travel programs completed a lengthy, multi-page form..." (Williams, 1983, p. 4). In other words, the degree or extent of selectivity was less with the shorter workshops, but was still exercised, and selection procedures were also followed by personal interviews.

A further example of selection being employed in rural leadership training is seen in a publication ("Citizen Involvement in Rural Community Development"), by the Sigurd Olson Institute (1979). Methods utilized to recruit potential applicants were similar, in some respects, to the Kellogg efforts, in that prospective individuals were suggested by local committees, residents, and other decision-makers. Broad representation was sought, along with those identified as active community leaders. Individuals were contacted by mail, and even though there was no written application, extensive personal interviews were conducted to probe suitability for the three-year (monthly seminar) program.

EVALUATION

Extension is called upon, at frequent intervals, to justify to various funding sources and clientele the worth and efficacy of it's programs. In the community development area, as with most social development activities, effects of programs are often slow to mature, and therefore to be seen. Furthermore, social organizational and social-psychological changes fostered as a result of agency efforts may not be observable at all, and only manifest in the context of ongoing planning efforts and community activities. Nevertheless, funding bodies often
wish to see "hard" (quantitative) documented results and make continued support contingent upon such data. According to Bennett (1982, p. 2),

Public and private funding for Extension programs can be justified in several ways. First, Extension, like other organizations, makes promises to people who finance its programs. These promises generally are statements of need and associated goals that are included in extension program(s). . . In areas where legislators and policymakers are unfamiliar with extension, or for some reason question its effectiveness, a third way to justify budgets is rapidly growing in importance: documented studies of the results of extension programs.

In spite of the fact that most valid community development evaluation results from longitudinal and qualitative analyses (Warner & Christenson, 1984), there has been mounting pressure in recent years for accountability. Social programs like development where "hard data" is harder to elicit, or where its elicitation may violate the meaning of community events, are often suspect by policy makers. Furthermore, according to Voth (in Christenson & Robinson, 1980, p. 187), "the accountability movement, which has led to the current emphasis on evaluation, includes a strong and justified criticism about social programs with 'vague goals, strong promises, and weak effects.'" The same author continues by characterizing community development as particularly susceptible to these thrusts, "because of the ambiguity of its targets (groups, institutions), and the developmental nature of its goals" (p. 187). The implication is to confront the accountability demands with a clear definition of the field, and a justification of the (often divergent) evaluation methods utilized.

Reflection on, and evaluation of Extension programs generally takes place as a continuing process, albeit usually not in a systematic
fashion. For example, Summers (1981), in a comprehensive study of Extension program evaluation, found that most assessment efforts were informal (75%), among both county agents as well as among state leaders and state specialists. In a similar vein, Bennett (1982, p. 4) relates that "compared with the expectations of Extension administrators and their own expectations, county staff seem to obtain too little systematic evidence on program results..." Summers goes on to say that when formal evaluations are conducted (2/yr. for county agents, 3/yr. for state leaders), the county focus is on individual projects (i.e. workshops), with the state's being on specially funded projects. Methods used vary from "informal observation and discussion with clients to quasi-experimental studies of program effects" (p. 13).

Many purposes can characterize evaluative efforts. In Extension, again according to Summers, formal evaluation is conducted for the following four purposes by both agents and state staffs (p. 16):

1. Revising and improving existing or continuing programs,
2. Assessing new programs,
3. Accountability reporting inside the Extension organization, and
4. Assisting in administrative decision-making.

In the Summers comprehensive survey, informal evaluations were most frequently conducted to revise and improve programs, again primarily by county staff, who utilized mainly non-systematic qualitative methods, such as appraisals of client opinions and local advisory council recommendations; formal surveys and systematic observation did play a role, although experimental and even quasi-experimental
methods were used least frequently. In reference to methodologies that agents and leaders thought would yield valuable information, "both groups rated 'formal surveys of clients' opinions and reactions' highest on a scale of usefulness" (p. 28). This appears to reflect on Extension staff's perceptions of the efficacy of qualitative assessment techniques that permit the researcher to ascertain indigenous meaning. This observation is reinforced when it is seen (p. 31) that choices 2, 3, and 4 are: judgments obtained from advisory councils, systematic observation by staff, and informal checks of client opinion. To capitalize on these staff opinions is an appropriate mix of quantitative and qualitative methods ("triangulation"), to be utilized, with systematic data analysis processes.

While many similarities are found between research and evaluation, the former is generally considered a knowledge-generating process, with the latter having the intention of using the knowledge in a practical sense to establish, validate, and improve programs.

A variety of styles and typologies are found in the evaluation literature, with most of these found under the conceptual umbrella of either the qualitative or quantitative paradigm. For example, Campbell and Stanley (1963) represent the classic and much referenced natural science paradigm, widely used even in the social sciences:

Evaluation research is dominated by the largely unquestioned natural science paradigm of hypothetico-deductive methodology. This dominant paradigm assumes quantitative measurement, experimental design, and multivariate, parametric statistical analysis to be the epitome of "good" science. This basic model for conducting evaluation research comes from the tradition of experimentation in agriculture. (Patton, 1978, p. 203)
In contrast, Patton summarizes the alternative paradigm, which has philosophical and conceptual origins in pragmatism, symbolic-interactionism, and gestalt psychology:

. . . The alternative to the dominant hypothetico-deductive paradigm is derived from the tradition of anthropological field studies. Using the techniques of in-depth, open-ended interviewing and personal observation, the alternative paradigm relies on qualitative data, holistic analysis, and detailed description derived from close contact with the targets of study (p. 204). . . In short, (this) approach assumes that the social sciences need methods different from those used in agricultural experimentation and natural science because human beings are different from plants. The alternative paradigm stresses understanding that focuses on the meaning of human behavior (and) the context of social interaction. (1978, p. 208)

Brief examples of evaluation models found in the literature include the following comprehensive list developed by House, as referenced in Patton (1980, p. 50): "1) systems analysis, 2) behavioral objectives, 3) decision-making, 4) goal-free, 5) art criticism, 6) accreditation, 7) adversary, and 8) transaction, . . . (with the first two being) the traditional and dominant evaluation models concerned with . . . quantitative change." Warner and Christenson (1984), in an Extension context, discuss two main organizational effectiveness models, the systems, and the goals approach. The systems approach deals with the capacity of the organization to function in an environment; the goals approach assesses an organization's attainment of specified objectives. Voth (in Christenson & Robinson, 1980, p. 193) says that all models vary along a continuum, ranging from "hard quantitative classical designs, to soft intuitive descriptive designs. The continuum has at least two distinct thresholds - the first as one moves from comparative to non-comparative designs, and the second as one moves from goal-based to non goal-based designs."
Another important distinction in the literature is that between "formative" and "summative" evaluation, terms coined by Michael Scriven, 1967, (in Weiss, 1972). Formative evaluation refers to program improvement through feedback data in process. Summative evaluation is that performed after program completion.

All above approaches have been found more readily applicable to some research/evaluative contexts than to others, depending upon one's philosophical/theoretical orientation. This study leans toward the qualitative and noncomparative, non goal-based designs, but recognizes the legitimacy and advisability of eclectic/holistic approaches, or triangulation (mixed methods) in evaluation and research. The logic of triangulation revolves around the fact that no single method can ever account for all explanatory factors in research. Designs utilizing combinations of "hard" and "soft" approaches yield quantitative and qualitative data that can greatly extend the range of understanding and validity of the phenomenon under investigation (Webb, 1966; Denzin, 1970; Patton, 1980; Cook & Reichardt, 1979).

A variety of qualitative/quantitative strategies is possible. Patton (1980) lists the following combined alternatives (pp. 112-114): "a) experimental design, qualitative measurement, and content analysis; b) experimental design, qualitative measurement, and statistical analysis; c) naturalistic inquiry, qualitative measurement, and statistical analysis; and d) naturalistic inquiry, quantitative measurement, statistical analysis." Many other designs can be constructed, depending upon the purpose of the study, information to be sought, and other program contingencies. This study utilizes an eclectic research
research and evaluative studies of rural leadership development programs are rather limited. In fact, in spite of the vast number of leadership training programs in business, industry, the military, and in the Extension service, few are ever documented in the literature. "It is certain that the published literature is not representative of current leadership training. . . The field is much more active, viable, and varied than might be concluded from perusal of the literature" (Olmstead, 1980, p. 11). In Extension, a current (1984) document reveals that leadership training programs are being conducted in 34 states, with proposed programs being developed in 23 states, an indication of the viability in the field.

The published literature reveals a diversity of leadership training, ranging from the classic and intensive efforts in the military, to that conducted in educational administration. Again, a wide variety of training styles characterizes the programs, although very few were systematically evaluated.

Kellogg Rural Leadership Training Studies

The most significant and applicable rural leadership training programs were conducted by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan. With a history of involvement in rural affairs, the foundation partially funded four statewide programs, between 1965 and 1975, in Pennsylvania, California, Michigan, and Montana, during which more than 700 leaders participated. The objectives of the programs were to: "increase participation in public affairs by men and women from rural
areas, improve problem-solving and leadership skills of participants, and encourage sponsoring educational institutions to expand their extension programs in the areas of public affairs education and rural leadership development" (Howell, 1982, intro.).

The following, from Howell (1982), is a brief overview of each program. The Michigan (Kellogg Farmers' Study) program was begun in 1965, in coordination with Michigan State University to develop farmers' leadership abilities and capacity to deal with contemporary social problems. Five groups of 30 persons each completed 123 days of classroom participation and travel over a three-year period of time. The Pennsylvania (Public Affairs Leadership) program started in 1970 at Pennsylvania State University, and had the purpose of educating rural citizens in public affairs issues, in order to guide future developments in rural and agricultural development. Several groups participated in a beginning one-year program, with the possibility of a separate two-year advanced series. The California (Agricultural Leadership) program was oriented around a very similar provision of educational material, to farmers and others in agricultural occupations, for the same purposes. The program was a joint effort between a branch of the Council of California Growers, and four California universities. The first three groups participated in a three-year program (of 100 days), with subsequent groups receiving two years of 80 days. The Montana leadership program (Kellogg Extension Education Project), begun in 1971, was carried out by specialists in the Montana State University Extension Service, to further the education of public affairs leaders. Six groups of 30 participants each attended three
sequential one-year programs comprised of state and local issues, national issues, and international issues.

Although the programs were established separately, they shared several common elements. For example, each program consisted of workshops and travel seminars aimed at providing participants with an understanding of the social, economic, cultural, and political dimensions of public problems and the ways in which public policy is developed and group action is initiated. The two- and three-year programs focused on the national and international aspects of public problems. Specific workshops and seminars were designed to develop individual and group communication skills, sharpen problem-solving skills, and increase knowledge of governmental processes. Increased motivation for future learning was stressed. (Howell, 1982, p. 1)

One of the earliest assessments of the Kellogg leadership programs was a doctoral dissertation by Rothert (1969). Rothert investigated the effects of the early Michigan program on critical thinking ability and open-mindedness, "as measured by the Inventory of Beliefs, their intellectual abilities. . . , and their capacity to make judgments, as measured by the Farm Policy Scale" (p. 9). The study made use of a non-equivalent control group design with pre- and post-tests. Rothert found that the Kellogg program had only a limited effect on critical thinking ability, with a greater impact occurring with those having had fewer years of education. Participants improved in capacities relative to dealing with farm problems, and improved in reading comprehension. No age differences were discovered. Participants, in general, "... became more willing to use the tactics of organized labor to obtain higher farm prices" (i). Significantly, the author concluded that the program could be improved by more actively involving participants in the learning process.

Howard Miller (1976) also assessed the effectiveness of the Michigan Kellogg program, under the auspices of the Kellogg Foundation.
Miller primarily summarized the entire course of the leadership program. His appraisal of program impact revolved around non-systematic qualitative queries of lifestyle change, individual evaluations, leadership skills, self-image changes, new community roles, and improved decision-making. Also assessed were communication skills changes, commitment to agriculture and lifelong education, and family impact. Miller relied upon a combination of reports and oral comments, and concluded that the goals of the program had been achieved, in the sense of having infused "Michigan agriculture... with a group of rural professionals dedicated to the industry... and with a firm determination to contribute to it's betterment" (p. 49). Among others, the author recommended "increased participant input in the planning and conduct" of the program, "a mix of educational approaches," and again the belief that "participants need to be provided maximum opportunities for interaction and for bringing their own experience to bear on problems" (p. 51).

Robert Howell and several other investigators (Williams, Weir etc.) have written a series of articles and one major report presenting research findings relative to the four Kellogg programs. These reports have dealt with the following topics: a) "Improving Rural Leadership Potential in Public Affairs" (1974), b) "Changing Patterns of Participation..." (1977), c) "... Impacts... on Male and Female Participants" (1978), d) "... Changes in Affiliations in Public Affairs Organizations..." (1978), e) "Educational Strategies for Rural Development..." (1980), f) "Training Rural Citizens..." (Williams, 1981), two Extension Service bulletins by Williams (1979, 1983), and a comprehensive
report by Howell, Weir, and Cook (1979). Several other related documents are extant but were unavailable. All Howell research reports have made use of quantitative (quasi-experimental) methods, and measures of central tendency to assess program effects. Results generally indicated positive program results, such as increased organizational memberships (primarily instrumental organizations), interest in public affairs, and self-confidence etc.

The Williams' studies also quantitatively assessed (Montana) program effects, although utilizing a variety of social-psychological indicators of leadership, such as self-image, self-consciousness, life-impact, advancement in public affairs, and others (1979). Williams concluded with a positive assessment of the Montana program, with an important (to this study) finding that "the participants in the most intensive study/travel programs appeared to benefit the most from their involvement. In general, participants in the freshman workshops seemed to gain the least on these indicators of leadership" (p. 34). In addition, graduates improved their extra-community leadership activities and interests.

Other Rural Leader Studies

In 1975, Dawson conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of a leader training program for rural lay leaders in Alabama. The leader program comprised twelve discussion units (30 hours), during a two-month period, with 24 months of follow-up activities. Sixteen lay leaders participated in the training, and 60 were involved in the follow-up activities. Assessment was performed by means of "a questionnaire, a community attitude scale, and a community
solidarity index schedule before and after the leadership program and follow-up activities were conducted" (p. 15). All data, including attitude surveys, were in quantitative form, and analyzed to indicate the mean, standard deviation, and significance where appropriate. Dawson found a positive program effect on the leader participants only in the area of attitude change toward public school officials and the school program. Two of Dawson's more important recommendations were that: "(a) rural lay leaders be trained and involved in the total community development process to maximize community improvement. . . , and (b) only rural lay leaders who the community citizens have identified be trained and involved to help spearhead the total community development program" (p. viii).

Thaxton (1979) reports evaluative results of a three-day workshop presented by the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service of the University of Maryland in 1977. This workshop was conducted by 1890 Extension faculty for lay leaders of "the hard-to-reach, the unreached, and limited resource persons, in an effort to improve their leadership skills" (p. iii). Instructional topics included lay leader identification, group motivation, and group dynamics, all revolving around leadership in community development. Assessment involved weighted attitude surveys referencing the overall workshop, as well as each seminar and laboratory session. Participants rated the overall workshop as "good," indicating that the three objectives were met. Group seminars and sessions were correspondingly rated.
Current and Proposed Programs

As seen before, a 1984 Extension document ("Extension Community Leadership Programs in the United States") references the existence of 93 ongoing leadership programs in 34 states. As stated in the document's key findings section (p. 7),

The content of these ongoing programs was grouped into four general topic areas. Over half (55 percent) dealt with community development (CD) process skill subject matter - helping participants understand how their communities worked and how they could be improved. About a third of the ongoing programs focused on organizational skills and knowledge, which would help participants understand how organizations worked and how leaders could work within organizations. About a quarter (26 percent) dealt with personal leadership skills and knowledge, which would help participants understand leadership roles, communicate better, and develop self-confidence. Only about a tenth (9 percent) of the programs dealt with understanding specific issues facing communities. (NCRCRD)

A comprehensive leader training program, LEAD (Leadership Education and Development) is currently being held in Ohio, based at Ohio State University. LEAD began in February 1985, and is closely patterned after the Kellogg and similar programs in California, Michigan, and Washington etc., with a two-year duration built around a combination of intensive lecture/discussion classes, and travel/observation. As with the Kellogg, an application and interview selection process is required, with the 30 participants finally chosen having to demonstrate leadership potential, along with other criteria. Lecture and travel subject matter do not deal with production agriculture, but rather are oriented around wider societal forces shaping it, such as economic policy, international trade, developing countries, and cultural awareness etc. "In addition, educational experiences aimed at increasing skills in creative thinking, decision-making,
organization and communication are emphasized" (College of Agriculture, O.S.U., 1984). The purpose of the LEAD program is to develop a corps of trained agricultural individuals to assume leadership roles and act as spokespersons for Ohio agriculture.

In regard to proposed leadership training programs, the 1984 document ("Extension Community Leadership. . .") reports that 23 states have a total of 30 new Extension programs being planned. These programs will be similar in content to the current efforts, with 80% dealing with CD process skills, followed by organization leadership skills, personal leadership skills, and specific community issues (NCRCED, p. 7). However, in spite of a considerable emphasis in Extension journals on the need for and merits of systematic evaluation, the same aforementioned source reports that fewer than half of the programs indicated an evaluative component, especially that of a formal nature. Corresponding with the "Program Evaluation in Extension" document (1981), by Summers, these ongoing programs demonstrated that "the most common kind of evaluation reported was that which elicited 'testimonials' from participants. The only programs that indicated a measure of impact evaluation were those that were large, funded, and were being implemented on a multi-state basis" (p. 9), again demonstrating the need for systematic and holistic evaluation of mid-level Extension programs.
CHAPTER III
METHOD

The methodology for this study was formulated in order to evaluate the leadership workshops conducted by the Community and Natural Resource Division of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, during the past 10 years. The triangulated methods utilized sought both perceptual as well as substantive data relative to program impact, from participants, as well as county agents and the program manager. Specific hypotheses were not tested, since an inductive approach utilizing quantitative and qualitative instruments was deemed most appropriate to ascertain relevant data. Findings were compared with theoretically expected relationships from other studies and principles.

Major components of the methodological plan presented in the following sections include: 1) the sample, 2) the research design, 3) instrumentation, 4) data collection, and 5) data analysis.

SAMPLE

The target participant population of this study included all individuals from cooperating counties where the workshop had been conducted from the point of instigation of the program - 1975-1984. In addition, all county agents in each respective county were interviewed, as well as the overall program manager.

Workshop Participants

Counties involved in the study included the following: Mercer,
Richland, Morrow, Van Wert, Putnam, Ashland, Morgan, Delaware, Washington, and Wayne. One additional county (Coshocton) had sponsored a workshop, but failed to respond to a letter request, and a second (Wayne) had no current agent, with the previous agent having retired. Nevertheless, workshop participants were surveyed from Wayne County, since lists were available. In contrast, the agent responsible for current workshops in Marion County was interviewed, but no previous workshop lists were available, so participants were not surveyed. Letters from the CNRD program manager/Extension specialist were sent to the current agents in each county explaining the study and requesting cooperation in furnishing a list of workshop participants from records maintained. These requests yielded a population total of 311 individuals. The decision was made to utilize the available population rather than a sample, due to the limited numbers involved, and the need to maximize survey return to increase findings validity. In addition, previous research has pointed out that social program effects frequently take an extended period of time to manifest, and since changes in organizational memberships was a criterion, it was decided to make use of the full time period. An available population survey did allow for maximum numbers, but still did not access the two mentioned counties. Additionally, participants had not been randomly selected for the original workshops.

County Agents

Each county agent resident in the aforementioned counties was personally interviewed, as detailed above. This agent was not always resident for all workshops conducted, but was responsible for and involved with more than one during the survey period. Agents were apprised
of the study through the program manager's letter, which primarily advised of the study's utility for Extension program evaluation. Each agent was also personally contacted with an interview request. In the case of Morrow County, the agent responsibilities were being assumed by the current area agent (district specialist), who happened to be in the county at the time of the workshops; this individual was interviewed in lieu of the usual county agent. And, as indicated, the Marion County agent was interviewed in spite of no participant survey. Consequently, there were 10 agents interviewed.

Program Manager

The current leadership workshop program manager was also surveyed. This individual is also the key workshop instructor, as well as being one of the Extension CNRD State Specialists. While not being the workshop originator, the current manager has been responsible for the program for approximately 10 years, which encompasses virtually all survey participants.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design selected for use in this study capitalizes on the aforementioned value of mixed or eclectic approaches, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative strategies, while leaning toward the former. Previous leadership training evaluations have used a number of instruments. However, by far the most prevalent have been those in the quantitative paradigm, with qualitative strategies generally being unsophisticated and assuming a subordinate role. This is seen especially in the numerous Kellogg Foundation evaluations by Howell, where the experimental method, while not used because of design limitations, is
epitomized as the ideal, in the tradition of Campbell and Stanley.

As discussed earlier, "... no single method will ever permit an investigator to develop causal propositions free of rival interpretations. ... Because each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality, multiple methods of observation must be employed. This is termed triangulation. ..." (Denzin, 1970, p. 26), which many writers have espoused. This methodology can encompass a wide variety of techniques, all with value depending upon the particular circumstances of the investigation.

Because of the variety of control and interaction aspects involved in the Ohio workshops, it was determined that assessment could be most validly accomplished by surveying participants with both open and closed-ended questions, and by interviewing county agents, with a separate survey being administered to the overall program manager.

Limitations of the design methodology could be (by some) considered to be the fact that no pre-tests were administered to workshop participants, so therefore no data were available to be used in comparative fashion with post-test information, in the tradition of experimental and quasi-experimental designs. Campbell and Stanley (1966) would likely refer to the present design as a "one-shot case study" (p. 6). However, the absolute validity of experimental design, and the natural scientific paradigm that it represents, is not assumed to have prevalence here. Instead, qualitative research takes relative priority, in the attempt to ascertain real-life or indigenous meaning of phenomena under investigation, with a primarily inductive design. Pre- and post-tests have little meaning here, since the interactionist (qualitative)
tradition does not accept standardized (or nearly so) treatment effects on "responsive organisms" (as with the behaviorists), but rather an interpretive and meaning-conveying act on the part of participants that contextualizes and concretizes workshop effects in terms of an individual's or group's lifeway. However, quantitative data has been sought as a readily-compared means of ascertaining workshop effects, this in the form of attitude questions, to be used in conjunction with open-ended items. Further, the investigator had no control over design of the past 10 years—workshops, or recruitment of participants; workshop conduct was a "fait accompli" to be investigated in the most expeditious and efficacious manner.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Participant Survey

Workshop participants were administered a self-report survey questionnaire. This instrument is partially a modification of one utilized by Howell and Wilkinson (1977) in one of their own analyses of the Pennsylvania Kellogg leadership program, itself based upon a survey used in Montana. Adaptations of other Howell/Kellogg surveys complemented other sections here, as well.

The instrument used in the present study was composed of four sections as follows: 1) a listing of organizational memberships, with inclusive dates and offices held; 2) a 23-item questionnaire, based on a three-part breakdown: a) participant involvement in community activities, b) perceptions of individuals as leaders in their community, c) orientation toward community issues, and effectiveness as leaders, along with two questions relating to desire to serve the common good, and personal
effects relating to the workshop; 3) three open-ended questions querying participants about program strengths, concrete effects, and improvement recommendations (not found in the Howell material); and 4) 12 demographic questions intended to afford a generalized personal profile and help to contextualize the study.

The organizational membership question asked respondents to list all memberships in any type of organization from five years prior to the workshop to the present (survey), with a specification of memberships. The rationale for inclusion of this question is that previous research (Griffiths, 1971; Schler, 1970; Williams, 1981; Howell, 1978, 1982) had pointed out that the effects of leadership training often manifested in organizations where leadership could be expressed, usually of the instrumental type. A determination of the relative change in memberships gave a general indication of the efficacy of the workshops. Limitations extant are that there was no comparison group; also, in some cases (in the results), it could not be determined whether prior memberships continued past the workshop date. A further assumption in leadership training is that in enhancing problem-solving skills, speaking ability, self-confidence, and other skills, individuals will seek offices and similar positions.

The 23-item questionnaire in the participant survey asked for a respondent's perception of the workshop's effect in the aforementioned three areas, to indicate a degree, from (1) strong decreased, to (5) strong increased. Two sample items are as follows:

Item 2: Knowledge of resources to use in the solution of public problems.
Item 17: The priority you place on participation in economic development activities.

Again, this part of the overall instrument was considered valuable, in that it was expected (and found) that there would be a relatively high response rate, due to the fixed alternative choices. In addition, the questionnaire results could be generally compared with the Kellogg findings, even though these workshops ranged from one week to three years, and were more extensive and intensive. And lastly, the questionnaire was used in conjunction with other parts of the instrument to effect the desired triangulated (eclectic) evaluative strategy.

The three open-ended questions used were:

1. What were the strengths of the program?

2. How have the workshops helped you make a positive contribution in your community, if at all? Please list specific accomplishments.

3. How could the workshops be improved?

The rationale for the inclusion of the above items, as with most open-ended analyses, was to allow for a free expression of respondent ideas, opinions, and attitudes, and to acquire much information without any restraints. Questions ask for participant evaluation of the workshops, as seen from the perspective of their own life-station. Question #2 (specific accomplishments) was included to further substantiate workshop effects, as previous evaluations of leadership workshops (e.g. Rothert, 1969) have not addressed the issue. The Howell material approached it indirectly through organizational membership/officership queries, while Miller (1976) asked only for general perceptions. Qualitative content analysis - abstracting predominant categories, along with quantitative tabulations, was used in data analysis, as seen later.
The number of open-ended questions was limited to three, as it was felt that the expected educational background of the respondents might preclude extensive answers and also be intimidating. These expectations were borne out in the findings.

As indicated, 12 demographic items on the participant survey sought educational, residential, and occupational etc. information, to assist in characterizing the respondent group and to help contextualize the findings. The variables were treated as categorical data.

Pre-testing the instrument was considered unnecessary, as the quantitative components (organizational, 23-item and demographic components) had previously been used and refined by Howell in other major evaluations, as well as in Montana studies. The three open-ended items were thought to be simple and straightforward, and proved to be such, in that there were no adverse respondent statements.

County Agent Interviews

County agents were included as part of the triangulated evaluation strategy due to their important responsibility for the planning and conduct of the workshops, as well as the follow-up. According to the Ohio Extension Handbook (1983), the county Extension agent (p. 2.26.00):

2. Is responsible to the area supervisor for the conduct of the county Extension educational program in the assigned program area(s).

8. Plans for and uses appropriate teaching methods in conducting the Extension educational program. Evaluates teaching efforts and results in those phases of the program for which responsibility is assigned.

Even though the agent relies heavily upon advisory committees, and all levels of the Extension staff in program development, the primacy in
need determination and workshop establishment is his, this being further corroborated by the program manager in discussions.

Personal interviews were selected as the data gathering strategy because of their capacity to allow for divergent and exploratory inquiry, and, again, the qualitative advantage of getting close to the data, and eliciting meanings inherent only in personal and collective conceptions. "Interview data for program evaluation purposes allow the evaluator to capture the perspectives of program participants, staff, and others associated with the program. What does the program look like and feel like to the people involved?" (Patton, 1980, p. 196).

In Patton's major summative work on qualitative methodology, three approaches to interviewing are detailed (pp. 197-198): a) the informal conversational, which "relies entirely on the spontaneous generation of questions in the natural flow of an interaction"; b) the general interview guide approach, which "involves outlining a set of issues that are to be explored with each respondent before interviewing begins"; and c) the standardized open-ended interview "consist(ing) of a set of questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence and asking each respondent the same questions. . .".

This study relied upon a modification of the general interview procedure with county agents, in that a list of questions was asked of each respondent. However, flexibility in the order and wording was employed, with much probing being conducted, with the interviewer careful not to impose preconceived ideas or answers. Therefore, while somewhat more bias may have been introduced compared to the standardized approach, the prime objective was the gathering of perceptual data relative to certain im-
important issues, summarized in a question list explored with each agent, presented below:

1. How do you determine the need for a leadership workshop?

2. What attempt is made to tailor the workshop to local community needs?

3. How are participants selected?

4. Assess the effects of the workshops. Have you seen tangible as well as intangible results?

5. How could leadership training be improved?

The theoretical rationale which determined the selected agent list was extensively explored in Chapter 2, especially in regard to the first three. In sum, a) community needs must be (and are legislated in policy) the basis for all community planning, as requirements for social and economic improvement will vary from one community to another; b) program content of any nature achieves the greatest significance, and effects greater changes, when it is designed around issues, or makes use of illustrative material having local importance; and c) participant selection has been shown to be of import, in that individuals with existing talent or capacity benefit more from a leadership training program, and are better able to infuse these benefits into the community. And, again, referencing #4, it has been outlined how previous research has pointed out the relative absence of tangible findings of workshop effects.

Agent interviews were compared with participant and program manager reports.

Program Manager's Report

The third data source used in assessing the leadership workshops was a special questionnaire designed for administration to the overall
manager/instructor. As indicated, this individual, while not the origi-
nator of the program, has been responsible for its conduct and operation
during the period of the participant survey.

The instrument used for this aspect of the evaluation is also a mo-
dification of one administered by Howell, Weir, and Cook (1979), in
their appraisal of the four Kellogg Foundation leadership programs:

The Program Manager's Report is intended to fulfill three purposes: 1) to provide information that will be useful in assessing the
success or failure of the leadership development program in
achieving its goals and educational objectives; 2) to provide inform-
ation about the program's operation, its financial support, and
content, which can help other educators who may be interested in
developing a similar program; and 3) to provide documentation per-
taining to the environmental setting in which the program operated.
The Program Manager's Report is a critical part of the overall
evaluative evidence-gathering process, because it will provide
qualitative documentation from program files, and commentary
about the program and its impact from (the person) ... closest
to its operation. (p. 435)

Three evaluative areas within the extended questionnaire are:
a) the environmental setting, which deals with the sponsoring organiza-
tion and it's goals, and relationships between the sponsoring organiza-
tion and other organizations; b) the program's operation, financial
support, and structure, dealing with budget, design and content, and
program structure; and c) indications of program success or failure in
achieving goals, including program impact upon participants and the uni-
versity. A number of new questions were added to the original instru-
ment, with many original items eliminated, all dependent upon contextual
relevance to the Ohio study. A copy of the final questionnaire used
is reproduced in Appendix B.
DATA COLLECTION

Participant Survey

Data collection was preceded by the acquisition of workshop participant lists from county agents, upon request of the program manager and author, as indicated earlier. This request was in the form of a formal letter, which was followed up by personal telephone calls to agents.

The participant survey was preceded by a post card mailed the first week of November 1984, reminding respondents of their participation in the workshop, informing them of the survey mailing within several days, and requesting their cooperation.

The questionnaire, a four page (back to back) yellow form, was mailed with a cover letter and a self-addressed, stamped envelope, during the first and second weeks of November. Each instrument had a coded number to facilitate any required follow-up mailing. The cover letter (Appendix C) explained the purpose of the evaluation, assured confidentiality, and again requested cooperation. To further assure anonymity, the return envelope had the author's home address, with all instruments also being retained at this location.

Approximately two weeks following the initial mailing, all individuals who had not responded received a separate complete survey package, with a modified cover letter, emphasizing the importance of the study, for validity, and for workshop improvement. As a final inducement, all remaining non-respondents were sent a post card a week after the second survey mailing.
County Agent Interviews

As seen earlier, county agents had been advised of the workshop evaluation process for some period of time, having received participant request letters, and having been spoken to in meetings.

All agents were contacted telephonically, with an interview request, which, in all cases but one, were subsequently conducted in the individual's county office.

Each interview, in addition to utilizing the exploratory method structured around the five-question list, was also tape-recorded. Tape-recording was employed to not only enable a full capturing of responses and questions, but also to allow for analysis of nuances and idiosyncrasies endemic to the respondent and context (Dexter, 1970). Permission to tape was requested of each respondent, and combined with confidentiality assurances, a non-threatening atmosphere was established. Interviews were transcribed and typed prior to analysis.

Program Manager

The program manager/Extension specialist was, from the beginning, part of the evaluation planning and development process, and so fully aware of needs and requirements relative to assessment. This individual was given the modified Howell instrument (Appendix B) in December, and was asked to return the open-ended written questionnaire expeditiously, as all data were pre-analyzed for a brief Extension Service report in January.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis procedures were selected for this study that would maximize assessment of the Ohio Extension leadership workshops from a
variety of data bases. A triangulated research design yielded both quantitative and qualitative information, including organizational, demographic, scaled attitudinal, oral interview, and open-ended written types. The data were used to describe participants, and to evaluate program success through an exploration of relationships in both sets, and a coordination of meaning between the types.

**Descriptive Procedures**

Organizational membership and officership changes were calculated on the basis of a pattern of gain following the workshop, compared to that before, based on the stated length of membership. The study is somewhat restricted by not having pre-test (or comparison groups) information on memberships, and therefore relies upon respondent accuracy—possible sources of bias. Findings showed totals, mean scores, percentages, and standard deviations, or descriptive statistics; this avenue was chosen, since even though all respondents from available groups were surveyed, information (again) was not available from two counties where workshops had been conducted, and a since a population random sample was not being worked with, tests of significance were ruled out. Data were compared, however, with that from the Kellogg programs (which used comparative descriptive statistics) to ascertain the existence of a pattern of gain.

The 23 attitudinal survey questions on the participant survey, as with all quantitative findings, including demographic data, were computer analyzed. Quantitative data served primarily as a cross-validating adjunct to the qualitative.
Qualitative Analysis

A diversity of means exists for the analysis of this type of data, with challenges being inherent in its non-numeric nature. Miles and Huberman (1984, p. 21) detail analysis as being comprised of a) data reduction - "selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting..."; b) data display - "an organized assembly of information that permits conclusion-drawing and action-taking"; and c) conclusion drawing/verification.

This study generally followed the above methods, but especially the "constant comparative" process of Glaser and Strauss (1967, pp. 105-115), in dealing with all participant and agent information. The intent of this process is to discover "grounded theory" - that which is inductively arrived at, with conceptual categories that "fit," or correspond to the real-life perceptual world of the respondents. This contrasts with most naturalistic research that constructs a-priori hypotheses and seeks to test them. Here, even though variation is possible, categories are derived from coded or significant themes or patterns in the responses. Content analysis has been described as the analytic method involved. "This kind of approach requires an analysis of the verbal categories used by participants and/or staff in a program to break up the complexity of reality into parts" (Patton, 1980, p. 307).

The constant-comparative method, herein used, in a more specific sense, 1) codes data into applicable categories, 2) integrates the categories and their properties, and 3) delimits the theory, followed by writing. The keys to the process are that at each subsequent stage earlier stages can be co-existing, and that "with reduction of terminology and consequent generalizing, forced by constant comparisons..."
the analyst starts to achieve two major requirements of theory: 1) parsimony... and 2) scope in the applicability of the theory to a wide range of situations, while keeping a close correspondence of theory and data" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, pp. 110-111). Significant categories in the data analysis were coded according to their frequency of mention and meaning, and revised and integrated as mentioned above. Qualitative findings were also displayed in tables indicating frequencies and key concepts, to supplement the narrative, and to assist in drawing conclusions. The program manager's report, coming from a single individual, was used as a supplementary and partially explanatory adjunct to the main data sources.

A follow-up survey (telephonic) of 25 randomly selected non-respondents was performed. Selected survey questions were analyzed and demonstrated no significant differences when compared with returned survey data.

Again, being a mixed-methods study, results from each data source were compared with relevant others, to increase validity, and contribute to overall program evaluation.

Generalizability concerns are reflected in certain considerations. The study was largely qualitative, with data being sought within relatively uniform sites (in-state, rural/small town, similar living/working contexts). Sampling does not assume the importance in this type of evaluative research as it does in quantitative inferential statistics, as meaningful interactive phenomena occur within certain common environments; sampling a large population breaks these interactive networks or associations. Therefore, even though statistical representativeness is
not demonstrated, results should be able to be generalized to relatively similar contexts of behavior, especially within the state, but possibly also to Midwestern or similar areas.

As a synopsis, the study methodology was intended to generate data from a variety of sources that impact on workshop effectiveness evaluation. Quantitative data, in the form of organizational and committee membership changes, as well as self-assessment scalar information, was compared and contrasted with that from identical or similar surveys used to assess Kellogg leadership programs. Qualitative survey questions acquired largely free-response information from both participants and agents, that was intended both to assess a variety of factors related to workshop success, and to be used in conjunction with quantitative data for an overall program appraisal with improvement recommendations.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION

Data analysis results are presented in this chapter. Following survey return information and a description of the respondent group, the findings and discussion are organized into three sections. The first section includes workshop participant analyses according to procedures identified in the design chapter. The second section contains an assessment of the county agent interview data relative to conceptualization, design, and evaluation of the workshops. Information from the program manager's report comprises a third component, but is also interwoven as explanatory material throughout the body of text. In similar fashion, and also in the conclusions, all three sections are considered together as a multiple-perspective analysis of the leadership program.

RESPONDENT GROUP DESCRIPTION

Response Rate

During the specified 10 year period of the Extension workshop survey, 311 participants were identified and surveyed from the (10 of 12 counties) available pool. As seen in the collection section, four mailings were made, with two being complete survey packages. No formal data collection cut-off date was established, to allow for maximum survey return, and it was found that they continued to be received into January 1985. Of the surveyed participants, 15 were returned undeliverable, with
156 returned completed, for a response rate of 50%. This response rate, while seemingly low, and even with Extension letterhead (and specialist-signed) cover letters, could likely be seen as a combination of factors. These would possibly include length of time between the workshop and survey (engendering memory loss), low mean educational levels, and perceptions of privacy invasion etc. Nevertheless, all returned surveys evidenced completion of the majority of items.

Demographic Variables

Description of the respondent group is provided initially in the report not only as illustrative material, but as information that can help to establish a contextually-relevant group to aid in the understanding and interpretation of the data. Descriptions are provided in terms of educational attainment, marital status, age, gender, length of residence in Ohio and at present address, locale of residence, re-location since workshop, former residence, present occupation and that at time of workshop, and household income. This part of the participant survey was adapted from Howell, Weir, and Cook (1979, p. 424). Summary data on the aforementioned variables is provided in Table 1, with occupational breakdowns in Table 2.

As seen in the table, from those answering, the respondent population was divided equally among males and females, with the mean age being 46.8 years (ranging from 18 to 73). Eighty five percent of all participants were married at the time of the survey.

教育ally, the vast majority of workshop participants had completed high school or above. Only seven individuals had not completed high school in this study. The mean attainment (4.8), and mode (5.0)
Table 1
Selected Demographic Variables on Workshop Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>137 (Mean = 46.8 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1. No High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Some H.S.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. H.S. Graduate + Short</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Some College</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. College Graduate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. College Graduate + Short</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Advanced Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1. Single</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Married</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Residence</td>
<td>1. Farm</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rural Non-Farm</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Town/Village less than 2,500</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Town of 2,500 - 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. City of 10,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. City over 100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time at Current Address</td>
<td>151 (Mean = 17 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence in Ohio</td>
<td>148 (Mean = 40.5 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence before Workshop</td>
<td>1. Farm</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rural Non-Farm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Town/Village less than 2,500</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Town of 2,500 - 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. City of 10,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. City over 100,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>1. Less than $20,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. $20,000 - $40,000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. More than $40,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 156
Table 2
Participant Occupational Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education, Ministry, Engineering, Accounting, Librarian, Banking, Nursing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales/Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Social Agency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Fire Depts.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Co.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Employed/Private Co.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 156
were virtually synonymous, with approximately 102 individuals or 66.6% having completed high school or having taken some college work. College graduates and those with advanced degrees comprised 28.7% of the respondent population, with there being 12 advanced degree holders. These college completion levels, when compared with the Kellogg program participants, range from the same (Michigan) to 10-50 percentage points below those in California, Montana, and Pennsylvania.

Residentially, it is seen that the modal locale is that of rural farm, with a sizeable 68.4% indicating residence in a rural area (farm, non-farm, or small town). Approximately 32% reside in medium-sized towns or cities, while no individual specified that in a large city, all generally synonymous with Extension's traditional and current clientele. Participants specified means of 17 years for time at current address, and 40.5 years for length of residence in Ohio. Other data demonstrated that the vast majority (91%) had not moved since the time of the workshops, reflecting on a relatively stable survey population. Those who had moved at some point in their lives indicated somewhat more of an urban/larger town point of origin, with 40% having come from these areas.

In reference to occupations (Table 2), survey data found that the largest category of participants (20.3%) was in the professional area, including those listed in the table. In contrast, most other states in the Howell/Kellogg studies found farming to be the predominant occupation. Here, farming was third at 12.4%, homemakers second at 17.6%, and retail sales/management fourth at 7.8%. No occupational group was overwhelming in frequency of attendance; minor gradations
characterized category separations. In essence, a wide-spectrum representation may be considered advantageous in community development efforts, in that leadership in broad segments of the community facilitates collaboration on self-help projects. Household income survey results are shown in Table 1. Of the three ranges indicated, category 2 (\$20,000 - 40,000) garnered 52.6% of the choices, more than double either of the other categories, which may be expected due to the frequency of individuals in professional and farming occupations.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND CHANGES

Organizations

As indicated earlier, and as seen in the sample questionnaire in the Appendix, workshop participants were asked to list all organizational and committee memberships from five years prior to the workshop, to the current time. While possibly not as accurate a survey indicator of changes compared with pre- and post-test information, it was found, nevertheless, that most respondents did indicate inclusive dates of membership, enabling a degree of workshop effect determination.

To assess organizational and committee membership changes, participant listings were categorized into five types: 1) government/quasi-government public service, 2) voluntary public service, 3) political, 4) economic associations, and 5) expressive/social. The first four had been conceptualized by Howell, Weir, and Cook (1979, p. 51) as four of eight general categories. The fifth type (expressive/social) used in the present study combines the remaining four general Howell categories into one. A further important distinction seen in the literature, and here in Table 5, is that between instrumental and expressive organiza-
Table 3
Organizational Membership and Committee Changes
Summed Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Types</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Org's Before</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = .15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Org's After</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = .20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% gain (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>71% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td>4% gain</td>
<td>11% gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. Before</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = .13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. After</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = .10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% loss (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td>3% gain</td>
<td>10% gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  2. Voluntary Public Service (professional, civic-social, health)  
  3. Political  
  4. Economic Associations (financial, business, advocacy)  
  5. Expressive/Social (fraternal, sports, veteran, religious) |
tions; in the current study, the first four types represent the instrumental, with number five the expressive. It is recognized that there is a degree of ambiguity in the latter classification, since the listed organizational types can perform instrumental activities in the course of their lives.

An examination of the change patterns from pre- to post-workshop listings is seen in Tables 3 through 8. The summed data (Table 3) demonstrate a consistent pattern of organizational gain, albeit relatively small, in only three categories: government, voluntary, and economic associations. In contrast, political and expressive organizations evidenced only slight summed gains of two and one, respectively, generally insignificant by most criterion measures, especially the expressive.

Voluntary public service organizations, which included professional, civic-social, health, and educational affiliations, evidenced the largest membership numbers in pre- and post-workshop determinations, and the greatest numerical gain of 40 memberships, or from a mean of 1.49 to 1.75. Again, the expressive/social category demonstrated a minor change of one affiliation, from 222 to 223. In spite of small relative numbers, gains occurred among the economic associations (11% proportionate), and the government/quasi-government organizations (13%), with respective means of .11 and .20 following the workshops. It is apparent that the voluntary public service organizations represent the major modality for group-oriented leadership expression for workshop participants, witnessing the largest proportion of change at 71% (Tables 3 & 4).
As seen in Table 4, overall there resulted an increase in organizational affiliations for program members, from totals of 504 to 560 (11.1% increase). While memberships positively increased, the gains were comparatively small in relation to four major Kellogg programs, as reported by Howell and Weir (1978). In these latter (primarily 2-3 year) programs, in contrast, affiliations increased 57.6%, from 1065 to 1678, with "components of change" ranging from 4.63 to 33.80, for a total of 57.58. The present study's components of change varied from .002 to .079, for a .111 total. As discussed later, program length and consequent intensity may be responsible for the reported differences.

To reiterate, an important contrast seen in the literature referencing leadership workshop effects is that of membership changes in instrumental versus expressive organizations, with the former generally demonstrating the greater proportionate gains. That trend is mirrored in the present study, where, in Table 5, it is seen that instrumental organizations represented 98.2% of all affiliation change, and comprised 55 of the 56 new organizations. Expressive organizations increased by but one, essentially remaining static when comparing both genders.

When examining male versus female organizational changes - Tables 6 and 7, only minor differences are evident (compared with committee changes). Males had larger membership numbers in government, economic, and (surprisingly) social organizations, but showed greater relative gains (compared with females) only in the expressive/social category. In contrast, females, while having greater pre-workshop numbers in voluntary public service and political organizations, only, had larger
Table 4

Components of Change in Organizational Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Preprogram Affiliations</th>
<th>Postprogram Affiliations</th>
<th>Components of Change&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Proportion of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Government/Quasi-Government</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voluntary Public Service</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Economic Associations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expressive/Social</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 156

<sup>a</sup> Components of Change = \[ \frac{\text{Postprogram Category Score} - \text{Preprogram Category Score}}{\text{Sum of Preprogram Category Scores}} \]
gains in all instrumental categories, with economic association gains being equal between the sexes. This data, unexpectedly, considering the program length differences, nearly parallels the Kellogg findings, where women (especially in Pennsylvania and Montana) a) had lower initial participation rates, and b) made greater relative gains in voluntary public and government organizations, with men showing slightly greater gains in expressive/social and economic organizations; in the current study, the economic gain was identical, even though males had higher rates of participation.

**Committees**

Committee membership and officership changes can be an even more efficacious manifestation of leadership than organizational membership. What were seen as trends in organizational changes become even more pronounced in committee changes as seen in the relevant tables. Table 5 delineates that while the total number of committee memberships actually decreased from 344 to 292, the net decrease was entirely comprised of those in expressive/social affiliations. In sum, expressive committees dropped from 179 to 90, while instrumental committees increased from 165 to 202.

Important differences characterize male and female data, which is even more noteworthy considering the equal numbers of respondents in each group. Tables 6 and 7 demonstrate that male participants had losses in three of the four instrumental organization types, showing a gain only in economic associations; males also declined (from 87 to 43) in expressive affiliations. In contrast, females increased memberships in all instrumental organizations, and correspondingly declined
Table 5

Instrumental versus Expressive Changes in Organizations and Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Preprogram Affiliations</th>
<th>Postprogram Affiliations</th>
<th>Components of Change&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Proportion of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Organizations</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Organizations</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Committees</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Committees</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 156  

<sup>a</sup> Components of Change = \( \frac{\text{Postprogram Category Score} - \text{Preprogram Category Score}}{\text{Sum of Preprogram Category Scores}} \)
Table 6
Organizational Membership and Committee Changes
Male Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org's Before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = .27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X = 1.44$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org's After</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X = .30$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% gain (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X = 1.69$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% gain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X = .25$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. After</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X = .10$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% loss (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X = .69$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 77

2. Voluntary Public Service (professional, civic-social, health)
3. Political
4. Economic Associations (financial, business, advocacy)
5. Expressive/Social (fraternal, sports, veteran, religious)
Table 7
Organizational Membership and Committee Changes
Female Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Types</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Org's Before</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = .04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org' s 8</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org' s 8</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% gain (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Org's After</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = .10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org' s 8</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% gain (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. Before</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. 7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% gain (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm. After</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. 7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% gain (proport.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49% loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Voluntary Public Service (professional, civic-social, health)
3. Political
4. Economic Associations (financial, business, advocacy)
5. Expressive/Social (fraternal, sports, veteran, religious)
(from 92 to 47) in the expressive/social category. The net increase in postprogram instrumental affiliations was accounted for by the small male decline countered by the female increases.

Results from this study largely parallel findings from the Kellogg programs in Montana and Pennsylvania where male/female differences were explored. Both studies found greater gains by women in public service participation, larger numbers of men in economic associations, and small numbers from both groups in political groups, although the present research found women with even smaller numbers in the government and economic categories. An explanation for the gender-related differences is not readily apparent, but may reflect (married) women's greater opportunities for non-work related pursuits.

Committee membership changes, in the present study, are again congruent with past leadership program research, in that respondents are seen to re-orient the focus of their organizational participation and leadership efforts away from expressive/social concerns to those of an instrumental nature, dealing with community problem-solving. Table 8 reflects the predominance of voluntary public service work among those affiliations indicating positive committee changes.

In sum, more of a "community-minded spirit" seems to have been engendered in program participants, where a desire to serve the common good has taken precedence over purely social affiliation.
Table 8
Components of Change in Committee Memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Preprogram Affiliations</th>
<th>Postprogram Affiliations</th>
<th>Components of Change&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Proportion of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Government/Quasi-Government</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voluntary Public Service</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Economic Associations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expressive/Social</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 156 \]

<sup>a</sup> Components of Change = \( \frac{\text{Postprogram Category Score} - \text{Preprogram Category Score}}{\text{Sum of Preprogram Category Scores}} \)
RESPONDENTS' SELF-ASSESSMENTS OF PROGRAM EFFECTS

As a further means of evaluating workshop effect, a 23-item self-assessment statement list was included in the participant instrument. This list, as described earlier, was composed of three life-impact areas of inquiry, of seven questions each, evaluating: a) participant involvement in community activities, b) perceptions of individuals as leaders in their community, and c) orientation toward community issues, and effectiveness as leaders. Two additional questions were included. Respondents were asked to indicate their perception of the degree of workshop effect with a numerical designation from (1) strong decreased, to (5) strong increased.

This self-assessment statement list utilized had, with the exception of six items, been administered in identical fashion, in early evaluation of the Pennsylvania Kellogg leadership program (Howell and Wilkinson, 1977), and was based on a similar list used in Montana. The general synonymity of professed program objectives would theoretically allow for comparative assessment of the two programs, examining the efficacy of the Ohio workshops relative to the longer Kellogg undertakings, and helping to point out possible revisions of objectives, and/or program improvements. Comparative assessment is further provided (in Table 11) in the abstraction and mean interpolation of the same 23 statements used in the present study, from revised surveys employed in all four Kellogg programs.

Analysis results are presented in Tables 9 and 10. Table 9 gives a complete data tabulation for each question, although in the form of percentages, with means and standard deviations. It can be seen that the first conceptual set, involvement in community activities and interper-
Table 9
Summary of Respondents' Self-Assessments of Program Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Area Items</th>
<th>Strong Decreased</th>
<th>Moderate Decreased</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Increased</th>
<th>Strong Increased</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set A: Participant Involvement in Community Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Your interest in public affairs.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of resources to use in the solution of public problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your willingness to listen to others and consider alternative points of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your feeling of confidence in openly promoting causes about which you feel strongly.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perseverance in working toward the accomplishment of what you feel is right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. An appreciation of the importance of fact gathering, thorough study, and planning in dealing with public issues.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your feelings of independence, growth, and self-worth as a person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Means):</td>
<td>(.2%)</td>
<td>(.9%)</td>
<td>(31.5%)</td>
<td>(49.5%)</td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set B: Perceptions of Individuals as Leaders in Their Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Your confidence in your long-range future as a public affairs participant.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Your awareness of connections among problems and the ability to take a comprehensive view of the needs of a community.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Area Items</th>
<th>Program Effect Self-Assessments</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Decreased 1</td>
<td>Moderate Decreased 2</td>
<td>No Effect 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Your knowledge of your limits and strengths as a participant in public affairs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Your feeling that you can motivate and inspire people to work together.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Recognition of your own biases and prejudices.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Your feelings about your ability to influence community affairs.</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Your ability to involve others in public affairs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Means): (.3%) (2.0%) (38.1%) (47.2%) (12.4%) (3.7) (.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Set C: Orientation Toward Community Issues, and Effectiveness as Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Area Items</th>
<th>Program Effect Self-Assessments</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Decreased 1</td>
<td>Moderate Decreased 2</td>
<td>No Effect 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The breadth of your interest in a variety of community problems and issues.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Your feeling that you should concentrate on selected issues rather than getting involved in many.</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The priority you place on participation in economic development activities.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Your desire to serve the common good.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Your feeling that others accept you as a leader and look to you for advice in public affairs.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The priority you place on participation in environmental improvement programs.</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Your use of group skills in community life.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Means): (.4%) (2.6%) (46.9%) (39.9%) (10.2%) (3.6) (.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Area Items</td>
<td>Program Effect Self-Assessments</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Decreased 1</td>
<td>Moderate Decreased 2</td>
<td>No Effect 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Questions

22. The priority you place on participation in social service programs.
23. Strain and tension between you and older community leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Questions</th>
<th>Strong Decreased 1</th>
<th>Moderate Decreased 2</th>
<th>No Effect 3</th>
<th>Moderate Increased 4</th>
<th>Strong Increased 5</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Program Means: (4%) (2.5%) (40.8%) (43.5%) (13.2%) (3.7) (0.72)

n = 156
personal growth relative to this, elicited higher mean scores than the other two sets. Three items in this set had three of the four highest means in the list: a) willingness to listen to others (#3), b) working perseverance (#5), and c) feelings of independence, growth, and self-worth (#7). Approximately 68% of all respondents felt that the workshop had had a moderately or strongly increased effect on first set items, but primarily due to the 31.5% "no effect" indications, the overall set mean was reduced to 3.8, or somewhat less than "moderate increased." Again, however, responses in one of the "increased" scalar values demonstrated higher percentages (and consequent means) than the other conceptual sets, especially in reference to interpersonal skills improvement, which will later be seen as significant in relation with qualitative findings.

Set B, "perceptions of individuals as leaders in their community," evidenced a proportionate but reduced level of support (compared with Set A) referencing program impact. Here, 59.6% of residents indicated that the workshops had been responsible for an increase in effect. Means were uniform, ranging from 3.6 to 3.8, with an overall score of 3.7. In sum, a majority of participants rated the program as having a near moderately increased impact upon personal confidence in leadership skills. Of notable interest is that the statement rated highest in this set (69.1% positive responses) was "your feeling that you can motivate and inspire people to work together."

Referencing Set C, "orientation toward community issues and effectiveness as leaders," data tabulations show the least support among the three sets. As seen later in the qualitative examinations, workshop content was oriented largely around broad generic topical concerns, with
only modest or no reference to local community events that might help "ground" or contextualize the broad content. In consequence, a local orientation or frame of reference seems not to have been inculcated to any great degree, with 46.9% of participants indicating "no effect," although 50.1% did check "moderate" or "strong" increased. The set mean was 3.6, elevated largely due to the 3.9 mean of statement #18: "your desire to serve the common good."

Participants gave a relatively (compared with set means) low rating to question #22 - "the priority you place on participation in social service programs," with 53.6% indicating no effect, and 43.1% rating a positive effect, with a 3.5 mean. In question #23, querying about "strain and tension between you and older community leaders," where a low score is desirable, it is seen that a majority of respondents consider the program to have had no effect; slightly more respondents felt that tension was reduced, compared to heightened.

Respondent self-assessments demonstrate a surprising correspondence with the listed 1977 Kellogg one and three-year studies, although at a reduced level of effect, demonstrated in Table 10. With each subsequent set, from A to C, means decreased, with the three-year program evidencing the greatest effect in each case.

As reported in Table 11, data were taken from the results of extensive evaluations of the four-state Kellogg leadership programs. The same 23 statements used in the current study on respondent self-assessments were abstracted from somewhat longer but similar instruments employed in the four states. Means from the Kellogg data were based on a nine point rating scale, and had to be interpolated to be reasonably compatible with
Table 10
Respondent Self-Assessment Comparisons:
Ohio and Kellogg Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Area Items</th>
<th>Program Effect Self-Assessments</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Decreased 1</td>
<td>Moderate Decreased 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set A:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ohio Extension</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kellogg 1 Year</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kellogg 3 Year</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set B:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Leaders in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ohio Extension</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kellogg 1 Year</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kellogg 3 Year</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set C:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ohio Extension</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kellogg 1 Year</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kellogg 3 Year</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n: Ohio (156); Pa. 1-yr. (113); Pa. 3-yr. (101).

Kellogg data from Pennsylvania leadership program,
abstracted from Howell & Wilkinson (1977, pp. 8-9).
the initial Pennsylvania and present Ohio studies (in Table 10).

Table 11 points to the fact that participant program assessments generally increase with program length. This finding is readily apparent with the 1979 Pennsylvania data, where each yearly increment in program length resulted in a mean increase in two or more area sets. One year programs were not reported for California, Montana, or Michigan, and California two year data were aggregated with the three year for assessment purposes, so that comparative evaluations are not possible for these states. Therefore, the relatively low California ratings could possibly be seen as a result of program idiosyncrasies. Michigan data evidenced little variation from that in shorter programs, but Montana means were generally higher. Since the mean ratings in Table 11 were interpolated from a nine-point scale, inaccuracies may result from comparison with the two surveyed five-point scales. Nevertheless, the self-assessed program effect trends can be readily deduced.

Preliminary assessment, at least from this data base, points to the Ohio program's primary impact as being upon enhancement of interpersonal group working skills, and instrumental organizational gains, with (Kellogg and Ohio comparative) program length being directly related to degree of impact in all areas. Since means for the Ohio data varied by only .2 of a point per impact area (with Kellogg data varying .3), it is also believed that important differences between the three conceptual sets are probably not present.

The social-psychological theory of cognitive dissonance postulates the resolution of opposing cognitions in favor of consistency. It is conceivable that self-assessment data results could be seen as participants'
desires to attribute useful results to a program deemed important by Extension Agents and themselves. However, as investigators in the 1977 Pennsylvania Kellogg program have pointed out, a large body of time has elapsed from the time of the workshop to the survey, with the likelihood that professed changes are those actually having taken place and able to be conceptualized. Relatively proportionate correspondence in data among the states, which varies mainly with program length, further suggests the validity of attributing behavioral and conceptual changes to the workshops.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Impact Area Sets&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Yr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3 Yr.</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>n</sup>: Pa.: 1-yr.(112); 2-yr.(99); 3-yr.(84)
California(143); Montana(72); Michigan(124)

<sup>a</sup>Sets: A: Participant Involvement in Community Activities
B: Perceptions of Individuals as Leaders in Their Community
C: Orientation Toward Community Issues, and Effectiveness as Leaders

<sup>b</sup>Means interpolated to 5-pt. rating scale from 9-pt. scales abstracted from Howell, Weir, and Cook (1979). Impact area sets correspond to Tables 9 & 10 in current study, and are based on 23-item survey.
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS: PARTICIPANT FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The series of analyses performed to this point have demonstrated important but incomplete information relative to the role of the workshops in effecting leadership change. Findings have been adduced that participants in the study moved from social/expressive to instrumental organizational memberships, and showed modest gains overall. Additionally, participants self-rated program impact as having had a near moderately increased impact upon community involvement, leadership self-conception, and orientation toward community issues.

The foregoing quantitative instrumentation queries elicited high response rates and made available data that can be compared with other leadership studies. However, response categories were relatively structured, with the previously shown implication that free-response (qualitative) questions in the survey could tap participants' meanings about program worth. Open-ended answers were sought to three questions: 1) "What were the strengths of the program?," 2) "How have the workshops helped you make a positive contribution in your community, if at all? Please list specific accomplishments," and 3) "How could the workshops be improved?"

As seen in the related tables, there was a moderately large non-response rate, ranging from 21.5% to 43.8%. Reasons for this remain unexplained, although the possibility exists that in the physical absence of an interviewer, the creative effort required in answering would preclude a high response rate. Nevertheless, response patterns were sufficiently clear to enable coding into conceptual categories, even though a certain
degree of overlap is always present. Coding was performed according to procedures detailed in Miles and Huberman (1984), and Glaser and Strauss (1967), with the intention of abstracting significant themes that could serve as the basis for grounded theory. Responses to each question varied from single phrases to typed pages, although most were contained within the space bounds of the questionnaire. Abstracted categories were formed into frequency tables for ease of presentation, with discussion revolving around the most significant themes. While it is possible that personal interviews would have resulted in more extensive responses, it is also likely that the absence of compulsion with the questionnaire afforded answers that were freely given and valid to the participants.

Program Strengths

Workshop attendees offered a diversity of concepts in response to this question. As would be expected, responses to this and the additional two questions often reflected the participants' conceptual framework relative to the program's personal impact, rather than upon its general or ideal impact. For example, a number of subjects discussed specific class presentation topics, including (e.g.) "stress," "time management," and "values," especially those having job-related relevance. Others mentioned issues dealing with community development dynamics, such as community problem-solving, setting up new programs, and the training of new leaders. In all, single- and double-response answers totaled 24, which, although not listed in Table 12, are indicative of answer variability.

Important themes relating to participant-seen program strengths revolve around the topics codified in the table. In fact, the first three topics comprise 60% of all responses, and are: 1. group involvement and interac-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Group Involvement and Interaction</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;The opportunity it afforded to become better acquainted with other community members.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Group involvement helped put into practice skills needed for capable leadership.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workshop Leaders and Presentation Methods</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&quot;The material and the manner in which it was presented were very good. The people involved in the presentations were very well prepared.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Building Self-Confidence and Evaluation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot;Build(ing) self-concept and confidence, and develop(ing an) awareness of strengths and how we need to perceive others as we work with them.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication, Speaking, and Self-Expression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;The main thing I got out of it was poise and ability to communicate with other people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>(N^a)</td>
<td>(%^b)</td>
<td>Illustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Topic of &quot;Parliamentary Procedure&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;The sections on running meetings and rules of order were helpful.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Introductory Leadership Concepts/Techniques</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Good beginning leadership courses - a much needed educational avenue in our community.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Presentation Materials and Handouts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Quality of the take-home material.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Provided many handouts for future. . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. &quot;Helpful Suggestions&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;They were very interesting and I think I did pick up helpful suggestions.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Not Indicated</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N\) represents total number of indications in category, with more than one possible per participant.

\(\%\) Cited figures represent percentages of those who responded, except for \#10, which is a percentage of total responses and non-responses.
tion, 2. workshop leaders and presentation methods, and 3. self-confidence and evaluation. Sufficient numbers characterize these choices to have them seen as probably significant of the Ohio program, with the acknowledgment that much interaction takes place between the concepts in practice. The first three topics will be discussed in some detail.

**Group Involvement/Interaction.** Relative to this first choice under program strengths, further coding deduced that three main themes characterized responses in this category, herein listed and discussed in their order of frequency: a) small group interaction, b) integration of diverse community interests, and c) putting into practice leadership skills. Within the first theme, subjects referred to various aspects, including "Interaction between participants," "The meeting with and interaction with other community leaders," and "Personal involvement with the group," all reflecting the interactive concept. Others mentioned more expressive benefits to the workshops, such as "Meeting others," "Talking to others," and "(Getting) better acquainted."

Small group action seemed to be perceived either synonymously with involvement, or as a vehicle for its manifestation, as seen in relevant quotations: "Small group action," "Able to get involved because of the small group," and "With small groups, your participation is much more effective." One individual even felt that this area could be improved: "One major benefit of the series was that the participants were provided the opportunity to become a little better acquainted with other community members. This could have been enhanced with some small group projects and/or discussions."
Affiliation needs likely underlie this particular theme, with some individuals seeking purely social expression, while others see the small group as a learned and valued means of achieving instrumental objectives. Crosbie (1975, pp. 36-39) has summarized the various motives for group affiliation that form the basis of this theme:

Although there are a number of individual motives that seem to be best satisfied through affiliation, we can conveniently arrange these into three categories: instrumental, expressive, and ascriptive. Each of these reflects a somewhat different interest in the group. Instrumental motives are motives that are satisfied by a group's goals or accomplishments. . . Many people join groups for the interaction and activities of the group, rather than for the group's goals and accomplishments. Such motives are classified as expressive. . .

In the second topical breakdown, integration of diverse community interests, respondents expressed their belief in the value of bringing together individuals and other leaders representing a variety of personality and organizational differences in the community. Relevant citations in this section include: "Brought together many varied interests in community that wouldn't have met otherwise," "The program makes you aware of different personalities a group situation can involve," "It was good to involve people from different sectors of the community," and "Helped better understand and appreciate other people's feelings and values and how their values are developed." It is difficult to attempt a social-psychological explanation of the foregoing expressions. Similarities can be found in sociometric structure postulates, where complementary interests requiring interdependent behavior are necessary for maintaining rewards.

The third apparent topic found in the group interaction theme is that of putting into practice leadership skills. Participants felt that group involvement helped to solidify or sharpen leadership skills being
discussed: "The chance to practice ideas on others in the group made more of an impact," with another individual mentioning a program strength as being "The experience in the practice of leadership with others in the program and their evaluation of each effort."

**Workshop Leaders and Presentation Methods.** This second most frequent category in program strengths also has three main themes, gleaned from a study of all responses. These (sub-)themes, again in order of frequency, are: a) presentation, b) knowledge of material, and c) organization.

In the presentation theme, by far the largest in this category, respondents expounded upon what they felt to be superior teaching by the Extension specialist and other instructors. As examples, some individuals wrote generally: "... The people that taught the classes were very good," and "I was very impressed by the program and the speakers, and they were very helpful to me." Others referred to the absence of ambiguity in the subject matter: "Approach to subject topic easily understood," "They (the leaders) presented each session so they could be easily understood," and "It was presented in a frank, easily understood manner." Still others praised the leadership skills of the instructors, both in general terms, and in reference to their ability to involve the class in discussions. Related citations include: "Well led and directed as I remember them," "The instructor did a good job of involving all the class in the discussions," and "The strength came from the leaders of the workshop - their ability to lead, as well as those who participated and were quite active."

Workshop attendees also mentioned that leaders manifested a high degree of subject-matter knowledge, and were able to plan and organize for its effective presentation. References were made both to academic
expertise and to capacity to empathize with students and ascertain needs: "The people involved in the presentation were very well prepared," "The knowledge and expertise of the leaders," and "Awareness of instructors of what is valuable to students." Participants also referred to program organization: "Programs were well organized and presented," and "(The) staff was well prepared."

**Building Self-Confidence and Evaluation.** These two concepts were aggregated in the same category because of their close interrelationship and similarity. They were somewhat arbitrarily subdivided into sub-concepts that reflected respondent statements and feelings: a) self-confidence (general), b) self-evaluation (general), and c) leadership self-evaluation. Approximately equal choices characterized each sub-concept.

Encompassed by the general self-confidence theme were statements relating to abstract self-improvement: "Creating confidence stands out as important," "(The program) enabled me to have more confidence in myself," and "(The) workshop was very helpful in building confidence in your own abilities." Relative to general self-evaluation, comments ranged from basic awareness, such as "Knowing self better" and "Analysis of our leadership ability," to reflective insight, seen in the following:

I think the program was good for me. It showed me things about myself I didn't really know about, or at least things that were hiding inside me. I can do things on my own, now, and I have others following just the way I want.

Another individual commented that:

I was impressed by the way in which the focus was placed on oneself - before that individual began reaching out in the community. In other words, I could see where I would have to have a clear picture of myself - strengths, weaknesses etc. before any attempt to "see" the needs of the community.
Several participants referred to the workshops as having engendered a conscious evaluation of self in reference to leadership concepts being taught in the classes. While many of the mentioned program attributes could be seen as reflections of the same process, the following quotations are examples of having specifically singled out leadership self-evaluation: "Helping me learn to evaluate my qualifications as a leader," and "Gave us tools to evaluate our leadership skills." And, while using the word "confidence," one respondent was able to make a broad assessment:

(The strength was the) emphasis on developing confidence for personal leadership. Personally, the realization that all people in leadership positions are not leaders, and that I apparently have some of those qualities. Gave me more self-confidence, and (an) overall view of what leadership consists of.

Remaining program strength concepts discussed by respondents were mentioned at much lower frequency rates and therefore not as thematically divisible. Choices four through six included: 4. communication, speaking, and self-expression, 5. the topic of "parliamentary procedure," and 6. introductory leadership concepts/techniques. Presentation materials, and "helpful suggestions" comprise the remaining concepts having more than three selections.

Ten references were made to communication. Included in this small category were discussions about the workshop having had an effect on communication skills improvement, in a practical sense: "I think it has helped me make it easier to communicate with other people." Others referred to skills concepts presented by the instructors - "Introduction to communication skills," and communication practice: "Giving the talk, videotaped, and then the critique." Further comments were made about class opportunities to be able to express opinions: "We all had a chance to say what we thought was important."
An equal number of attendees (10) felt that the "parliamentary procedure" topic was a program strength. In fact, some had attended for the express purpose of skill acquisition in this area, while others were emphatic in lauding its merits: "(I) learned more about how to properly conduct a meeting - my primary reason for attending," and "(The workshop was) effective in showing us how to improve ourselves in public meetings and interacting with others."

Even though it might be expected that a leadership program would have as one of its primary effects the transmission of leadership concepts, the present research found that only five percent of those who responded indicated this as a strength. The theoretical rationale for this: a general dependence upon program length (intensity) will be explored later. Of respondents in this category, some replied with non-specific language: "Good beginner leadership courses. . .," and "Learning some techniques for leadership." Others referred to concrete topics: "The techniques taught about group dynamics," and "There was a segment on planning for a project that explained the importance of involving and getting the support of various segments of the community that was useful to me."

Table 13 summarizes three key sub-concepts in the first three program strengths.
Table 13
Program Strength Key Sub-Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths(^a)</th>
<th>Key Sub-Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small Group Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of Diverse Community Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Skill Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-Confidence (General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Evaluation (General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1. Group Involvement and Interaction  
2. Workshop Leaders and Presentation Methods  
3. Building Self-Confidence and Evaluation
Program Effects on Community Contributions

This question was designed to assess participants' tangible community accomplishments, to fill in gaps in the literature, and to help concretize program effects. Analysis of responses demonstrated that a sizable 52% discussed impacts that could generally be termed social-psychological. And, while social-psychological development may be said to underlie leadership growth, the fact that participants chose to emphasize this aspect is probably significant, especially since the question asked for specific community accomplishments.

As with program strength findings, those here also demonstrated wide variability, with the original list containing some 10 categories comprised of single and double responses. However, the total number of responses (128) was some 23% less than those under program strengths, limiting the ability to divide into sub-concepts. Again, what were seen as major themes, based on frequency, were organized in Table 14 and discussed in order. The three key themes were: 1. self-confidence and evaluation, 2. increased involvement in community groups, and 3. understanding group dynamics and awareness of other's values and needs.

Self-Confidence and Evaluation. Within this thematic area, there were two discernible sub-concepts having approximately equal numbers of responses: a) leadership self-confidence, and b) general/personal confidence and evaluation. Within the first sub-theme, participants discussed the motivating impetus given to their leadership responsibilities and ambitions: "It added confidence. I am not so reluctant to take on a new project if it is in a field I'm acquainted with or have a willingness to learn more about," "I am not gifted in leadership abilities and am
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>N&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-Confidence and Evaluation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&quot;Gave me confidence as a leader, and gained new insights for effective leadership.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Getting in touch with myself: my needs and my goals.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased Involvement in Community Groups</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;I became much more involved in community: church: many areas; Kiwanis: President, V.P., Sec. . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understanding Group Dynamics and Awareness of Other's Values and Needs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;Better awareness of how others in the community relate to different problems; more aware of group feelings and needs.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enhancement of Existing Leader Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;I am more aware of: where to start with my ideas, chain of command to follow. . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>%&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Illustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improved Communication Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;They have helped me to organize my thoughts and to express my opinions in a positive way.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increased Involvement at Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;I am sure that it helped me in performing my duties in the office I held at that time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taking Specific Action(s) to Improve Community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;Since the workshop, I have taken charge of a fund-raising project that was successful.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Motivation to Work/Become Involved in Public Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;... As a result of the workshop, I have become interested in serving on community improvement committees.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lecturing/Speaking Activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;I have lectured at colleges and churches.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>N&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. No Effect</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Not Indicated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>N represents total number of indications in category, with more than one possible per participant.

<sup>b</sup>Cited figures represent percentages of those who responded, except for #12, which is a percentage of total responses and non-responses.
not very involved in community affairs, but would like to take a more active role. I think (the) workshops could increase my self-confidence and help me become more involved." A Junior High School guidance counselor related that "It helped me to feel more confident in directing groups for which I found myself responsible. I had no major accomplishments, but just felt more comfortable directing those groups in which I was already involved." In another reference to the workshops having conveyed confidence to accept new responsibilities, a secretary wrote that:

It has given (me) more confidence to accept positions of leadership. Many organizations have difficulty filling official positions, because of members' lack of confidence to accept the positions. Therefore, the same people consistently serve in the offices, and no new innovations are implemented.

Other individuals within this first sub-theme addressed what they felt to be increased confidence in leadership skills, especially those relating to self-expression or communication: "I believe, now, that my ideas are worth listening to, and (I) am able to present them. I was very shy and wouldn't speak up," and "They have helped me to organize my thoughts and to express my opinions in a positive way."

The second sub-concept within this theme revolved around what participants expressed to be a generalized enhancement of self-confidence/concept, usually with an attendant evaluation. Often comments had to do with an undefined feeling of satisfaction or assurance with self: "The workshop boosted my ego a bit where I now feel more self-assured and confident," "I feel much better about myself and what I have to contribute." More frequently, individuals indicated that they had made some attempt to resolve personal feelings of inadequacy relative to group or leadership interaction. Relevant quotations include: "I know
what I did wrong, so I could correct it. I built more confidence in myself," and "(The workshop) basically increased my confidence, thereby enabling me to act with increased decisiveness." One (the only) professor in the program perhaps summarized the thoughts of many others in relating: "Learning that 'problems' I have recently found and will face are common to others and solvable. Getting in touch with myself, my needs and my goals."

Increased Involvement in Community Groups. As in the foregoing concept, two sub-themes were discernible here, also. These are: a) general increased group involvement (statements), and b) involvement motivated by enhanced knowledge. Reasons for this categorical division are based on respondent statements. As always, it is possible that all increased involvement is due to gains in knowledge, or that this fact in conjunction with others is conducive to enhanced self-concept, itself motivating the involvement. However, the statements about involvement (and others in the study) are important in themselves and valid to the participants, hence, valid in the study. Sixteen percent of all respondents (Table 14) referred to increased group involvement as a program effect.

With the present topic, many more responses were made to the first sub-theme, probably because of the explicit wording of the question. Analysis of statements indicated greater involvement in a variety of community groups, including the following: 1. 4-H/youth, 2. Extension committees, 3. "general" (unspecified), 4. service clubs, 5. united way, 6. school board, 7. woman's club, 8. school, 9. city council, and 10. church, listed in order of frequency. Statements relative to these groups usually were brief, and to the effect that the individual
had either recently joined an organization, or, far more often, had strengthened his/her membership activities. For example, one individual mentioned that: "(Following the workshop), when we have problems in (the) community, I go to council meetings; when we have problems in school with a teacher, I . . . go to (the) school board."

Several individuals commented about intensified leadership behavior following the workshops: "Helped me do a better job as president of Al-trusa," "The workshop helped me be more positive on being V.Pres. of (the) 4-H council," and "As president of (the) Betsy Mills Club, (I) have been able to assume leadership in contacting SCORE, plus others who can help in long-range planning. (I made) good headway in effecting changes in a long-established organization."

Involvement statements in the second sub-theme dealt with participant gains in organizational activity as a result of what they conceived to be knowledge imparted by the workshops. This codification melds and interacts with apparent feelings of self-confidence and leadership skill increases: "I do feel more at ease (going) to public meetings, because I don't feel like everyone else is better informed than (me)," and "... Any knowledge helps with being a leader in the clubs you belong to." One 47 year old female having many community memberships, states: I enjoy entertaining and working with youth. With the Market Steer Club, I'm involved with 70+ young people, and make it a point to get to know each of them personally. With the Livestock Club, there are 60+ youth, and I am totally responsible for helping them reach their goals. As president of (the) 4-H committee, I found I could also relate to adults on an intelligent level (italics added).

Understanding Group Dynamics and Awareness of Other's Values and Needs. This third most frequent choice under program effects was
comprised of those writings that could be codified within a theme dealing with the understanding of group interaction. Equitable numbers of subjects emphasized factors related to the following two areas: a) understanding of internal group dynamics, and b) community-wide group interest and understanding. As always, while conceptually interwoven, the two areas within this theme represent respondent perspectives.

The first sub-theme is derived from written responses relative to group dynamics. Statements coalesce around individual's apparent feelings of concern, understanding, and value-appreciation for other participants and the group itself. Illustrations include: "An increased understanding of group dynamics has helped in all areas of effort," "By being more cognizant of different views. Recognizing people and becoming more interested in them and their problems," "Yes, I think I listen to the opposing side a little better than I did before the workshop," and "... (The workshop) has made me aware of what other people think and feel." A possible theoretical explanation for the ideas expressed here can be found in symbolic-interactionism's view of group behavior, where certain goals or experiences can be accomplished only with the cooperation of others; the resultant value and ideational recognizance (seen above) is a necessary component in working together.

The second theme in this section consisted of respondent ideas about effects of the workshop on their community-mindedness. More concretely, participants felt that they had become more aware of community-group interrelations, as well as values, problems, and needs of community residents, as seen in the following citations: "I work in public service, and am more aware of problems and needs of the people,"
"... It has made me more aware of problems and the fact that I can help change things," "Better awareness of how others in the community relate to different problems." One 34 year old female rehabilitation consultant responsible for much intra-community work commented that:

The workshop increased my awareness of the makeup and functioning of a community. Many groups must be taken into account when attempting to accomplish a task in a community. I believe I am more effective in my approach as a result of the workshop.

As with the program strength analysis, the remaining choices four through eleven comprised less than half of all responses, being, of course, at much lower rates of mention. Concepts developed around these responses include: 4. enhancement of existing leader skills, 5. improved communication skills, 6. increased involvement at work, 7. taking specific action(s) to improve the community, 8. motivation to work/become involved in public service, 9. lecturing/speaking activities, 10. others, and 11. "no effect."

Concept number four (Table 14): enhancement of existing leader skills, shows a close approximation in choice when comparing Tables 12 and 14. Under program effects, subjects variously mentioned that the workshops had had both "general" effects, and specific effects, referencing several leadership skills. Under general effects, participants said (e.g.): "... Gained new insights for effective leadership," "... I'm sure that the effectiveness of leadership was enhanced by the workshops," and "... I expect this workshop to have a positive effect on my overall performance in the future." Those individuals who discussed specific skill improvement made reference to (primarily) improved capacity to handle meetings, as well as interpersonal working skills and other specific concepts, seen in: "I feel I have gained
much in conducting a better more efficient meeting, in getting everyone to give their view and evaluate all of the phases of a problem," and "I am more aware of: where to start with my ideas, chain of command to follow, the importance of the lay person to the community."

Improved communication skills was specified by some five individuals, as a program effect. In reality, this skill undergirds most leadership improvement, and is generally part and parcel of concept number four, but again being singled out because of respondent mention. Again, the position and percentage of choice between this concept in Tables 12 and 14 is parallel. Within the current program effect context, question replies usually assumed the form of very general statements referring to communication improvement: "Helped me express my opinions to others," "... Not being afraid to speak out," "Overall, the workshop helped me review my leadership skills and improve my communication skill." Some related this area with critical-thinking ability and self-concept: "They have helped me to organize my thoughts, and to express my opinions in a positive way. They have given me more confidence in dealing with my superiors," "I speak out more on issues I feel need attention. This has improved my self-esteem."

Five individuals each specified program effects in the following areas: 6. increased involvement at work, and 7. taking specific action(s) to improve the community. All responses in category six were abstract or general: "It also helped me get involved with helping people at my work," "I am sure that it helped me in performing my duties in the office I held at that time," "I have expanded in my work area." In category seven, concrete community accomplishments were listed, perceived as attributable
to the leadership program, and seen in the following list: a) tax increase, b) fund-raising project, c) community watch program, d) planning of and participation in a community bicentennial, and e) founding of outdoor education program (in SCS), and acquisition of 44 acres of land. Even though of limited numbers, comments were laudatory: "Gave me the impetus to convince council we need a 1% city income tax in order to turn more lights on and fix the streets, which are in very bad condition."

The concepts of "motivation to work/become involved in public service," "lecturing/speaking activities," and "others" comprised the balance of choices in this section. However, 19 individuals stated that the workshops had had no effect, and a sizable 55 (30%) respondents made no indication.

The sub-concepts discussed with the first three themes are summarized in Table 15.
Table 15
Program Effects Key Sub-Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Key Sub-Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General Increased Group Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Understanding Internal Group Dynamics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>General/Personal Confidence and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General Increased Group Involvement</td>
<td>Involvement Motivated by Enhanced Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Understanding Internal Group Dynamics</td>
<td>Community-Wide Group Interest and Understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Self-Confidence and Evaluation
2. Increased Involvement in Community Groups
3. Understanding Group Dynamics and Awareness of Other's Values and Needs
Improvement of Workshops by Participants

The third open-ended question in the participant survey asked how the workshops could be improved. Codified results are given in Table 16, where it is seen that 25 fewer responses were offered, compared to the second question (program effects), with a proportionately larger number of non-responses. Somewhat counteracting this trend, however, was the finding that written answers were generally more comprehensive than in former questions. The first three participant choices were: 1. lengthen, repeat, or conduct advanced workshop, 2. greater participation/involvement, and 3. topical teaching emphasis.

Lengthen, Repeat, or Conduct Advanced Workshop. Analysis of responses in this theme yielded three sub-concepts: a) intensify/lengthen program, b) repeat workshop, and c) conduct advanced workshop. A further breakdown of the first sub-concept further yielded comments (not outlined) relative to the felt need for an expansion of the program, and for an upgrading of the teaching level. Participants expressed concern about the perceived brevity and superfluity of the program, where only abbreviated or incomplete presentations were made. A corporate training manager related:

The workshop was well done as far as the topics included, and the method of presentation. However, we seemed to "skim the surface" as two hours is not much time to develop each of the major topics. Further corroborative illustrations include: "Should be longer and more comprehensive. This was just a good introduction, and we had just begun to become a group ready to learn when it ended," and "More time spent on each area, which would make it a three-day or so workshop."
It was found that this first sub-section was comprised almost exclusively of individuals with college diplomas, including two with a master's or doctorate degree. This fact would help explain the responses, especially those from several who commented about what they saw as an elementary teaching style: "Much of the information given was pretty elementary to me, since I had a lot of this information in college," and "One specifically was very basic in communication, since I taught a mini-course in CLHS on that subject." One individual summed up the feelings of respondents in this sub-concept:

... I would have needed a much longer workshop to help me feel able to become involved in community affairs. The workshop just started to show people they could partake in community programs. Then it didn't follow through with any more help, and it was too easy to fall right back in the same old rut.

Another very close and conceptually related sub-theme found in response analysis is that of workshop repetition. As in the first sub-concept, participants appeared, again, to be expressing a need to explore workshop topics in much greater depth than they experienced:

"The offering of subsequent workshop sessions of this type would probably provide a community service, if the topics are dealt with in more depth," and "It would be beneficial to have a series, instead of just two. That was a lot of material to cover in that length of time; also, more time would allow for more participation." The following respondent took it upon herself to assess fellow attendees' perceptions:

The overwhelming response by many attending was that there needed to be more presentations on this subject, but definitely a follow-up session on the same subject matter. Still would like to see just that.

Several participants specifically referred to what they saw as a need for a graduate or advanced workshop, that would expand upon the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>N&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lengthen, Repeat, or Conduct Advanced Workshop</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&quot;... I would have needed a much longer workshop to help me feel able to become involved in community affairs.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;You now need to conduct an advanced leadership course.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Greater Participation/Involvement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>&quot;I think the best way to impress people in the value of (the) workshops is to directly involve as many as possible in the planned program.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Topical Teaching Emphasis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;There is a definite need for workshops on current and anticipated problems of the agricultural community.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;Program Already Good&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;I was very satisfied with the workshop as it was presented.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Time of Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;For me, early morning sessions would work better than Thursday P.M. from (a) time standpoint.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Update Audio-Visual Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;The movie used was very outdated and should be reworked.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Others</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Not Indicated</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN represents total number of indications in category, with more than one possible per participant.

bCited figures represent percentages of those who responded, except for #8, which is a percentage of total responses and non-responses.
basic course's concepts: "... I'm looking forward to an advanced course," and "A follow-up meeting a year later would be helpful, or perhaps a Leadership II course." In later sections, the ramifications of these statements will be explored in somewhat more depth.

**Greater Participation/Involvement.** It was earlier observed, under program strengths, how workshop attendees listed group involvement and interaction as the first choice. Somewhat surprisingly, this same concept was identified here, in a close second choice with workshop lengthening. The codified sub-concepts were also very similar, although with few references to integration of diverse community interests. Sub-concepts with roughly equal selection numbers were: a) general participation and involvement, and b) skill-practice participation.

The comments relative to general participation were usually brief and to the point, entailing little elaboration, but expressing perceptions about the value of group interaction. Relevant illustrations include: "More participation of the members (and) encouraging them to speak up," "More participation," "More active participation of the people attending," and "I think the best way to impress people in the value of (the) workshops is to directly involve as many as possible in the planned program." A certain number of participants did indicate the advisability of seeking out and bringing into the program leaders and others within the community: "Having more elected officials involved," and "Contact more local organizations by letter, or in person, to bring them into the workshop." A good deal of similarity exists between group interaction concepts in program strengths and in improvement recommendations. The key difference ascertained was that under program
improvements, expressions were oriented more to skill improvement.

The second most frequent sub-concept in this series centers around those statements dealing primarily with specific leadership skill practice. Diverse responses also characterized this section, as represented in the following list: role-playing, small-group discussions, problem-solving, discussing specific situations, community development planning, group evaluation, and contributions by elected officials. Again, while participants in the first sub-concept appeared to have leadership improvement as the motivation for their comments, here, interaction statements were specifically oriented around that theme. As an example, a training manager wrote a comment that interfaces with the need for repeating the workshops:

The more community members develop these kinds of skills, the more comfortable and, therefore, the more willing they are to become active participants in the various community organizations and activities that are necessary for the optimum development of the community.

Some respondents replied with one-liners: "More time could be spent for individuals to practice parliamentary procedure in an actual meeting situation—role-playing," and "Need to help group interacting—examples of working puzzles etc. are important." Other subjects offered recommendations accompanied by some degree of explanatory rationale, as block-quoted above, and in the following, where the time factor interface is also mentioned:

If more time is available, that time could probably best be used by practice within the group, along with group evaluation. After all, one's success will depend entirely upon how well he comes across with his audience or group.

Topical Teaching Emphasis. Table 16 demonstrates that there were approximately (depending upon coding) ten responses in this category.
It was uncertain whether to even classify these responses together, due to their complete dissimilarity, with possibly only two topics being mentioned more than once. However, classification was made due to the number of indications, and their unity under the conceptual umbrella of requests for subject matter emphasis in workshop teaching.

The following topics (teaching requests) were represented in this category: motivation, communication/speaking, decision-making, current and anticipated problems of the agricultural community, senior citizen problems, effective meetings, stress on the job, "thorough preparation," and objectivity. Two of the more illuminating illustrations are: "The greatest emphasis must be placed upon (the topic of) communication. The lack of the same results in unresolved conflict. People who learn to be good listeners will be good communicators," and:

There is a definite need for workshops on current and anticipated problems of the agricultural community. Not presentations after the fact as is so often the case with Extension programs--(e.g.) innovative techniques, financial structure, personal family relationships for tough times--farmers have them too--, (and) certainly more on belt-tightening methods for short as well as long-term situations.

Only slightly fewer responses (8) were made in the fourth most frequently cited concept, or that of satisfaction with the existing program. Written comments were very uniform and concise: "They were pretty good as is," "I was very satisfied with the workshop as it was presented," and "At this time, I think they are managed very well." An incidental observation was that, with one exception, all individuals in this category had no more than high school educational levels.

The two remaining categories (5 and 6) in Table 16 were "time of workshop," and "updating of audio-visual resources," respectively.
As with satisfaction with the program, the first of these categories had differing respondent perceptions of improvement recommendations, with therefore no identifiable theme. Within the workshop time category, four suggestions were made: a) hold in early A.M., b) hold sessions closer together, c) hold on weekends, and d) make shorter in length. Under updating of audio-visual resources, all individuals felt that films utilized in workshop presentations should be kept current, as exemplified in the following citation: "The movie used was very outdated, and should be reworked."

The key sub-concepts from the two themes that could be subdivided are outlined in Table 17.

Table 17
Program Improvement Key Sub-Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths a</th>
<th>Key Sub-Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intensify/Lengthen Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct Advanced Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General Participation and Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill-Practice Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a1. Lengthen, Repeat or Conduct Advanced Workshop
2. Greater Participation/Involvement
COUNTY AGENT FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

As discussed under methodology, county agents were interviewed from each county where the leadership workshops had been conducted. Reasons for this, again, revolve around the agent's important responsibilities in: a) determination of need for the program, b) participant selection for the workshop, and c) tailoring of the workshop to local community needs, with each of these three issues corresponding to the first three interview questions. Agents were additionally asked to assess: d) workshop effects, and to recommend e) program improvements. All information was gathered from personal (1-2 hr.) tape-recorded interviews, arranged at the agent's convenience, usually in their particular county office. Results were intended to provide an additional analytical focus on program conduct and efficacy, helping to establish agent responsibility and provide insights for improvements.

Workshop Need Determination

The importance of need determination, as well as participant selection, and workshop tailoring, has been theoretically explored in the literature review. A synopsis of the rationale for being deliberate in assessing a county or community's need for a workshop centers around Extension's provision of a service that is likely to have an impact upon formal and informal organizations, as well as individuals. While a need for leadership is always present, the need for training of such may depend upon an estimate of the variety of leadership positions in a county, previous or current alternative training programs, and an expression of desire for an Extension program by residents etc. Again, what is important is
that the agent or trainer make a deliberate attempt, by qualitative and/or survey means to ascertain local needs.

In the current analysis, Table 18 demonstrates that the predominant means of assessing leadership need was through observation by the county agent. This should not be construed as a superfluous or entirely subjective phenomenon as the agent had, in all cases, based his/her conclusion on a variety of group and interactive experiences where the need for leadership was perceived. This may be considered non-systematized but nevertheless efficacious participant (qualitative) observation. The agent through wide exposure to formal and informal meetings where he was called upon to establish, assist, or observe, had learned to be attentive to appropriate cues:

This (workshop determination) happens pretty naturally and easily. The rural community (or) the Extension community is loaded with people who are assuming leadership roles. Every county has hundreds of 4-H club advisors. There are probably a dozen or more Extension committees. Each has a whole set of officers. Even those that don't elect officers have people who are informal chairmen or leaders of that group. As you observe their successful functioning or unsuccessful work, (or) as you watch them perform in meetings, there is a pretty clear picture of whether or not they're skillful leaders. And, based on this, Extension agents will often call a meeting together and outline this problem, and the result is something like what we're doing here in (---) County.

Some were more explicit about the agent's role: "Always, at the county level, it's an agent's responsibility to be perceptive either to non-verbal cues that a program or that education is needed. . ."

Advisory committee recommendations figured prominently in 28% of stated need determination sources. The role of advisory committees as important exponents in presenting felt needs to development authorities has also been explored earlier. Their function is made concrete in the present section, where agents are seen to interact positively with and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Observation by Agent of Need</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&quot;As you observe their (community leaders) successful functioning or unsuccessful work, or as you watch them perform in meetings, there is a pretty clear picture of whether or not they're skillful leaders. And, based on this, Extension agents will often call a meeting together and outline this problem. . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advisory Committee Recommendation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&quot;The way that we decided last year to go ahead was discussed with an advisory committee of citizens (who) were helping us in planning agriculture and (CNRD) programs—a joint committee. . . . And, out of that, this was one of the things that was recommended that we start again that were held several years ago.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) CNRD Sub-committee - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) General - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N(^a)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs Assessment Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot;We did conduct a community needs survey on every area of our Extension program, here, a couple of years ago. Well, every county in the state did, as a matter of fact. . . I think people feel like they can use some help in this area.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indication of Interest by Community Residents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot;Every once in a while, I'll get a Farm Bureau leader or some other farm organization leader who says: '. . . I just wish I knew more about conducting this meeting. . .' . . . And, I hear probably more from farm organization leaders than anybody.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)N designates total number of responses
give much credence to committees:

... We appointed a (sub-) committee through the Extension advisory committee to determine whether there was the need, and if so, plan the series. ... We've had a committee, even way back then. Even then (1978), a committee determined that this (leadership program) was needed, evidenced by the number of young people coming in off the farm that were being elected to positions of leadership, on our Extension advisory committee, our 4-H committee, regional planning, (and) township trustees. We could just see that those people being elected to an office were struggling in how to communicate, in how to conduct a meeting. And, because of the kind of things that were going on, we—the committee and I—both felt a need to help develop their confidence in those kinds of activities.

Even though only six of the ten agents interviewed specifically mentioned advisory committees, it can be safely assumed that the committees' recommendations, when made, are a large factor in determining the type of county programs offered.

Three choices each were made for needs assessment surveys, and community resident interest. Even though it may be thought that surveys should fill an important systematic role in needs assessment (Cole & Cole, 1983; Robinson, 1984; Neuber, 1980), their usage among this survey population actually proved to be quite ancillary. The state had conducted or initiated a broad survey in the early 1980's, and two agents referred to the use of this in program planning. Others made no mention, while three agents, in response to a survey query, replied: "No," "No, we haven't recently," and "I've not really done something along that line in leadership development." Only one individual had initiated an original instrument, seen in the following quotation:

Since then, the first couple of years I was here I didn't do anything. (1) was just trying to find out where people were and who they were. But then I'll tell you what happened. The first workshop was one of those things where... it's been said it's needed. I went to the township trustees, and said "... I'm going
to provide this for you; these are some of the things I can do; what do you want?" I sent out a survey to them and it came back. So I formed a workshop.

Even though state survey results were consulted or used, it was almost considered a unique experience: "That is not routine. . . . It was a major undertaking. . . . I don't think it's something we'd do very often, maybe once every five years."

Indications of community resident interest were those expressions of concern or need made to the county agent in the course of routine interaction, seen in the example in Table 18, and in: "One is you know there are people who do indicate an interest. We have had requests from people saying that they felt something like this was worthwhile."

The program manager's report (referencing the Ohio Handbook) elucidated that Extension Service guidelines revolve around general need identification, based on collaboration between staff, advisory committees, and organizations at the federal, state, and local levels. CNRD program priorities (p. 1.03.00) cite leadership and organizational development. And, the handbook does (p. 3.01) reference the determination of need based on "research information, geographical and local industry differences, interests and needs of people, public policy and governmental programs, and the judgment of the . . . faculty, (as well as). . . working with local leaders." As is probably necessary (due to space limitations) specific methods of contextually (community) relevant need determination were not found either in the Extension Handbook or the leadership program materials.
Selection of Participants

Participant selection has been examined and seen to be of significance in reference to the conclusion (Cole & Rossmiller, 1970; Thomason, 1969; Taylor, 1962 etc.) that certain individuals are more pre-disposed or have more latent talent as leaders, thereby being more able to benefit from a training program and spread these benefits in the community. All major rural leader training programs to date (Kellogg; Sigurd Olson Institute; LEAD) have made use of formal pre-designed selection criteria, with these programs also entailing far greater financial and time commitments. The Ohio Extension Handbook afforded only general guidelines relative to participant composition, again (as in needs) centered around "satisfy(ing) the interests of those who most need the assistance" (p. 3.01), which in itself appears to favor a degree of selection.

Table 19 summarizes agent response categories to this question. Categorization was difficult and was accomplished based on the type of contact made with potential program participants, and the method of determining who the prospects should be. Analysis of the transcribed tape recordings demonstrated that, as in need determination, there was no formal or deliberately reasoned methodology for selecting participants. Established modalities predominated, such as a) the mailing of specific letter requests, b) mass media notices and mass letter mailings, and c) personal contacts, comprised of telephonic, mail, and individual approaches.

Specific letter requests, which made up half of all responses, consisted of the various (6) distinctions seen in Table 19. In spite of these distinctions, nearly all requests were made to organization heads,
Table 19
Selection of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method &amp; Source</th>
<th>N^a</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Specific Letter Requests</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>&quot;We sent specific letters to training supervisors and leaders of the business community. . . The Chamber of Commerce was behind us in sending out information (about it), and so we co-sponsored one with the Chamber. But, the first time it was directed at the heads of different companies and cities; they came. The second one, ... when we sent the information to them, they sent their employees, like the last one we had at (----). . . We've also sent letters to community organizations and groups, saying: 'we're having this; maybe you want to send your officers.' So, like the Moose (Lodge). . ., their president and treasurer came. Some of the church groups have sent some of their people. The Farm Bureau sent some of their people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For leader attendance, with attendee designates often sent), to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Large number of organization heads in county (from Chambers of Commerce, and community leader lists), based upon agent and committee recommendations - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Organization heads based upon agent assessment only - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) &quot;Various (community) organization key people,&quot; based upon local committee and agent's assessment of needs - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Presidents of service clubs and other groups - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Mayor and Service Director, who sent key employees - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) &quot;Middle management&quot; individuals (hospitals, city govt., garden shops, and township trustees) - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method &amp; Source</th>
<th>N(^a)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) All current Extension clientele, as well as newspaper and radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Agent newsletter and radio program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 4-H advisors, junior leaders, key committee people, homemakers advisory committee, and newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Posters, newspaper, and radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot;And (the leadership brochure) wasn't limited just to those; that's also mailed to our current clientele. . . , which includes 4-H advisors. In fact, it went to all of our clientele listed here, as well, (on) a direct mailing. That made it a pretty large mailing as well. Now, we did advertise in the newspaper (and) radio as well.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Personal Contacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) By several agents in one county, to hand-picked Extension committee leaders, by telephone and letters (one personal, and second official if required)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) By one agent, to: township trustees, hospital, mayor, regional planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Citizen expression of interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&quot;They (county agents) established two mailing lists. The first was what you might call the prime target, or people they really wanted to have attend, and a two-step program was designed to involve them. The first was personal contacts: telephone, letters, and so forth, almost a casual effect, saying 'we're going to have this leadership school; it looks like a good one; why don't you come in. . .'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. &quot;Open to the Public&quot; only (no attempt at leader selection)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;In this case, it was open to the public.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)N designates total number of responses
key people, and "middle management" individuals either (usually) from publicly published sources such as Chamber of Commerce or economic leader lists, or from leaders known to the agent. One agent outlined the process in the course of the interview:

Ours is open to the general community. . . . The way we handle it here is we make. . . an invitation mailing to community leaders, and that is pretty intensive; there are three or four hundred on that list. . . . We gleaned that from the two Chambers of Commerce, plus I have an economic and community leaders mailing list, which gave us an identified list already to go. . . . (The leaders mailing list was) put together from Chambers and other sources. You just continually add to it. . . . You pick up that "well, so and so is president of (----)," and you add that individual. The other way that we identified who should get an invitation was the committee itself. And, they took a look at that list. They identified individuals that they thought might be interested in that kind of topic.

The distinguishing characteristic in this category was that letters of request for program attendance were specifically targeted and addressed to identified community leaders by name. In some cases, the agent acted alone in arriving at the list, while in others it was derived in consultation with an advisory committee and/or the Chamber of Commerce. Agents seemed to usually leave the responsibility for deciding who would attend the program with the organization leader written to. And, with but one exception, all respondents asserted that the workshops were open to the public--anyone who wanted to attend--, in spite of the directed letter. For example: "Right (the organization selects the attendee). There's no application process. Anybody who wants to come is welcome to come," and "Open to the public. I let every Tom, Dick, and Harry know about it."

The second category discussed in the table was: "mass media notices and mass letter mailings." While showing many points of similarity with letter requests, what is unique in this case is that notices of the
workshop were either displayed in mass fashion (posters), advertised in
the mass media (newspaper, radio), or, if letters were the medium, they
were disseminated impersonally, usually in a broad mailing. Again,
agents differentiated between letter invitations addressed and per­
sonally soliciting a leader's attendance, and those directed in a mass
mailing to the (Extension) groups listed in the table. And, all four
respondents in this section did make use of the mass media sources, with
it often being the predominant part of the recruitment: "We developed
a very strong mass-media kind of a program. . . making posters that we
placed in grocery stores, in store windows all around town," and
". . . What I've done have been ones that I've publicized through my
newsletter, my radio programs, and so forth."

In the third category, agents indicated that there was a need for,
or that they had made use of personal/individual contacts to approach
potential attendees. Methods used in personal contacts included inter­
personal interaction as well as telephone calls and letter requests.
Again, differentiation between letter requests in this category versus
those made under the first was made solely because agents usually included
the letter requests with other methods as a form of personal contact.
In one county, to elaborate on the quotation in Table 19, agents alone
hand-picked current clientele they thought would benefit most from the
training:

Each of the three agents here in the county brought together about
ten candidates that they felt were key leaders. . . . We kind of
hand-picked the people that were serving in key leader positions on
some of our other committees in agriculture, 4-H, and also in
home economics, only in this particular type of program.
Another agent, while citing the openness of the program, also emphasized what was felt to be a need for the personal contacts:

We gave the opportunity to the man on the street to attend. ... But we also needed to really get down to personal contacts, we felt, to really get them here. So we were making, in addition to all those, personal contacts with the township trustees, (the hospital), the mayor, the regional planning, and those groups.

And, one agent mentioned citizen expression of interest as a motivating impetus for the holding of the workshops: "And, people have come to me who've been interested in the type of thing that we've offered."

The program manager's report almost duplicated the agent interview findings, in stating that "some committees have limited their workshops to leaders in a specific program. Others have invited 'any person desiring to improve his or her efforts as a leader.' Both procedures have had their advantages." Therefore, as with the Ohio Handbook, no specific guidelines are offered for leader selection, with agents being relatively free to plan best-case programs.

Again, all but one of the ten interviewed county agents emphasized that programs were open to the public. Even those who hand-picked participants and made specific leader attendance requests always reiterated that anyone who wished could attend. While some spoke openly about workshop recruitment as a means of filling quotas so the program could be conducted, most seemed to genuinely feel that those individuals attending had a need for, and could benefit from the training: "... The reason that we went to those lists is (that) those people are already in a role (where they) would be interested and/or need those kind of skills of leadership development." Echoing previous research conclusions about leader selection, one agent said:
I think you aim your program at someone who is currently in a position where they're looked upon as being a leader. And they would normally, in my mind, be in need of that sort of thing, whereas if you're just going out and naming persons, you may miss the person's entire idea of what they need. They may not see the need for anything like that if they're not really actively being in a leader position.

**Tailoring Workshop To Local Community Needs**

The need to make situationally relevant leadership or other concepts has been found to be of much significance when evaluating extension-type teaching efficacy. Community residents (and others) are better able to conceptualize and absorb abstract principles (even those presented on a basic level) when they are able to establish empirical referents, or concrete examples, relating to their everyday world of understanding. This does not necessarily implicate teaching oriented around one local issue (e.g. utility improvements), but rather the liberal usage of contextually appropriate illustrations revolving around concerns facing broad segments of the community that participants could be expected to be familiar with.

Analysis of agent interviews (Table 20) as to how, if at all, their own workshops were tailored to local issues, revealed that nearly 50% of all responses centered around the conduct of a generalized program. Most agents initially indicated that a general workshop was their original intention. Only further directed queries elicited remarks oriented to tailoring, demonstrating that there were few pre-planned attempts to utilize community-relevant illustrative material. These conclusions may be premature or apply only to those individuals surveyed, as the one area agent (district specialist) interviewed related that differences in county circumstances precipitate differences in subject matter. However, this same district specialist did somewhat qualify the observation in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. General Program                         | 8  | 53 | "I would have to have a general training workshop, I think, in this county, because the audience I could expect from a specific group would be too small. If I were to have just one for, let's say, county administration or county administrators, or township—that type of political administrators—if I were to have one just for those, I would not have enough. If I were to have them just for farm organizations, I don't think I would have enough. So, I have to, in this case,... have a general type of leadership training class."
| 2. Program Partially In Response to Citizens' Interests | 3  | 20 | "But, we have outlined what we were going to do during the workshops, but when it came to the first session, we also talked over with the clientele involved what they wanted to get out of it—what they were there to learn. And, if they didn't appear to be interested in what we had planned, we made some shifts before the future session."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Community and/or Participant-Relevant Illustrations Used During Workshops by Instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, the leadership seminars, themselves, are quite different. Even the subject matter varies quite a bit from one workshop to another. And, this has to do with the local situation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Program Determined by County Agents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;In this county, it was the agents that actually selected the topics that would be started in tonight's program. . . They picked a total of five subjects which would be delivered in the four evening programs, here in this county.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Citizen Committee Determined Program Content Applicable to County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;We organized an ad-hoc committee to plan the workshop, and they, then, determined what the subject matter would be in the workshop. The leadership topics. . . were those that (the state specialist) has for the workshop, and they selected the things most applicable for this county.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN designates total number of responses
saying that while the workshops often begin around local problems, they usually devolve into a general program:

(The community problem) is the spark, then, that generates a leadership workshop. Ultimately the participants include a wider scope than just members of the (e.g.) fair board. It becomes more community-wide or Extension-wide for subject matters of Extension. . . . Unless the participants are only fair board members, it generally broadens out a little bit more, and includes those outside the fair board, and maybe outside of Extension.

Further questioning of the district specialist elicited that "The examples are, as much as possible, selected based on the kinds of situations the participants. . . will be faced with." Analysis revealed that the specialist's comments applied primarily to his own teaching style, and that many agents (who did take a subordinate teaching role) overlooked or were unaware of the importance of the use of locally important examples: "General (workshop). . . no, we did not (tailor it)," and "Basically, this is a general basic leadership/communication kind of a program."

Other agents, while referring to a general program, did make use of certain practices conducive to adapting the workshop to the community, including: a) sounding out citizen interests at some point in the program, b) employment of locality-relevant illustrations in teaching, and c) leaving content determination to an ad-hoc citizen's committee. In one county, as discussed both by the agent and the district specialist, the program content was determined entirely by an agents' committee.

Three respondents mentioned that some attempt had been made to solicit or survey participants relative to their concerns about subject-matter content. One Home Economics agent explored class topical areas with participants both at the time of the workshop, and also distributed
a brief questionnaire requesting opinions prior to it:

They were general workshops, but when the audience arrived, we did try to determine what their interests were for the future (classes). These were not a one-day thing. . . . There were some people who had indicated to me an interest in leadership development prior to the class. So I had contacted them with just a brief questionnaire as to what their interests were. Here again, we used the same basic information, but we patterned the class after what they had indicated in the survey they were interested in.

Other agents made similar reports: "... We asked the people... We said: 'here are the topics; which do you want us to teach?,'" and another elaborated about an elementary in-process evaluation:

And, so, at that point, you know about what their abilities are, and after you start into this school, you start looking at it and say "yes, we're hitting things that are helping that person, or, no, here are some things we better change in our next two or three sessions." So, it's an evaluation as you move through.

Two respondents cited the use of community-relevant examples in the course of workshop instruction. This categorization was somewhat nebulous, however, since one agent related that these examples had only been used in much earlier programs. Commendably, the other respondent did cite what he believed to be their common employment, and his specific employment of them: "I'll be paying very close attention to who's there, ... (and) what are some things coming up for them. That's when I begin to get in mind their tailor-made examples that will best suit them, that really hit their particular need."

As observed in the earlier Table 19, and as explained by two respondents, one county's program content was arrived at by the agents, solely, although in consultation with the specialist. In this case, it was uncertain as to whether there had been any prior consultation with county leaders, or whether staff decisions were made exclusively. Even in this circumstance, it would be presumed that topical areas were chosen based
upon agents' experiences in the county: "(Topics) came out of the leadership manual, but it's expanded beyond that. There are some additional topics (offered). . . . These are things we found are needed, and so based on that we offer it. Sometimes these are selected, sometimes not."

In one instance, it was explicitly explained that an ad-hoc citizen's committee was formed solely for selecting workshop content. The topic alternatives were somewhat circumscribed by being offered in the form of the workshop manual. But, ". . . There was one topic that was not on Phil's list that was added that they thought was important."
The agent concurred with a question asking whether the assumption behind the committee selections was that subjects would be germane to the local context.

Several workshop participants had appropriate comments relative to community needs tailoring, written in response to the workshop improvement question. One participant advised that attendees be sent ". . . To a real situation, like a school or club to address members."
Another cited what he felt to be the need to concretize the subject matter:

(The) workshops would work if instead of being so very general they would take a very specific issue (and) examine how to handle that issue— what sources were available to handle the issue— , and then witness the interpersonal relationships and leadership. . . . necessary in dealing with any specific issue.

The program manager's report indicated that local committees should assist in program planning whenever a workshop is conceived, in order to see that specific local needs are accommodated. As a further means of comparison, the major-length leader training programs, such as
Kellogg and LEAD offer locality-relevant examples in the following manners: a) classroom illustrative material, presented by a variety of resource personnel, and b) field trips to appropriate sites in the community, as well as (in some instances) to international locations. However, germane mechanisms for infusing local examples into introductory leader courses would not have to be so intensive or extensive compared with the longer programs.

**Workshop Effects**

All agents were asked, in the course of the interview, to indicate how they perceived the workshops had affected the participants. Tangible and intangible results were asked for, although, in all but one case, respondents were requested to assess changes in organizational participation and leadership positions. This was done in order to afford a broad comparison with participants' quantitative and qualitative self-assessments.

Agents were more verbose in their replies than in the first three questions. From Table 21, 44 responses were made that could be codified. In contrast with the participants who detailed many more social-psychological effects, and among whom self-confidence was the first choice, agents predominated in outlining tangible workshop consequences. This agent emphasis on tangible effects is probably a result of the more facile observation of behavior, rather than of thought processes or beliefs, which would have to be pursued with qualitative or other systematic methods. Assumption of leadership positions (27%) and usage of workshop skills and techniques (23%) constituted the two most prevalent codified
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>N&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assumption of Leadership Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Soil Conserv. Serv. - 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;Several of the participants have moved through the advisory committee system, and have served as president of the county 4-H advisory committee after they participated in the workshop, and I think that had some influence on them.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Public Office - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) General - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Farm Bureau (Pres.) - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Formal Organizations - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Informal Organizations - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Extension 4-H - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Hospital - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Emergency Ad-Hoc Group - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Usage of Workshop Skills &amp; Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) General - 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&quot;I've had several people say that because of going they feel they're more effective in their job. (----), the local commissioner, attended when he first was elected. . . . , and he's very supportive of the program.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) At Work/With Employees - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In Service Organizations - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) With Ad-Hoc Community Groups - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 4-H/Youth - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other Extension Organizations - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) In Public Office - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> N = Number of participants
Table 21 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>N&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-Confidence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;Confidence level is high. They are very aware of the skills that they can incorporate to become more effective.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Beneficial Knowledge/Skills Acquired</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;(The workshop) probably improved their listening skills. It's probably improved their ability to conduct a meeting, because we give them that opportunity in the thing.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Effective Meetings - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) General Leadership Concepts - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Speaking/Communication - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) &quot;Listening&quot; - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aided Extension Agent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;I think it's helped me in the Extension process, because I've spread out and met more people in the community who're interested, and they've been involved in our program development.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Increased Contacts - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Started Toastmasters Club - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Joined Chamber of Commerce - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. None Seen by Agent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;You know, I'd have to say no. I have not assessed them... I don't know that I've recognized anything like that.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>N designates total number of responses
concepts at a 50% total, with self-confidence a close third at 18%.

As seen, assumption of leadership positions was the most frequently mentioned workshop effect by the agents. Again, it must be stressed that this could have been the most observable, and all respondents in this category stated that there had been no attempt at follow-up. Twelve identifiable responses were made, with all referencing individuals known by the agent to have assumed a leadership role at some point after the workshop. Illustrations include:

... There are several examples of where (the participants) have assumed more leadership responsibility, either formal or informal, either in an organization or, in fact, positional leadership for public office etc. after they participated. Now, whether the workshop initiated that, or that was an objective and the reason they attended is a bit difficult.

And similarly,

(In the) hospital, some of those people have moved up to greater positions of leadership. I remember the president of our Extension advisory committee attended, and he's now chairman of the Soil and Water Conservation District, and on the dairy board, and moving on to those kinds of things.

A closely related concept constitutes the second most frequent workshop category, that of the usage of workshop skills and techniques. What distinguishes this from the first category is that no specific mention was made of leadership position assumption; rather, agents emphasized that participants had been able to put into practice information or skills acquired from the program, and had become more active or involved in the process. For example, "I guess we've seen some people who probably have become more active in groups because of the workshop. They were active or involved in things before, but they probably didn't say near as much as they have now."
And,

(Participants) did indicate that they had been able to use the skills and techniques that they had learned in the workshop. Now, some of the people were there to learn the skills to use in an organization. I'm thinking of two gals who were nurses, and were wanting to use some of the skills they learned as they dealt with nurses who were under their supervision. They indicated that they had found the things worthwhile. In the same workshop I'm involved in a service organization with two of the women, and I do know that they, again, utilized some of the skills that they used.

In the third category, self-confidence, agents made statements that could be classified in one of two ways: a) basic references to enhanced self-confidence, and b) references to self-confidence as a result of the workshop having served as an integrating mechanism of leadership concepts. In the latter classification, agents often said that the program had been very basic or elementary, and that participants were able to readily pull together a variety of experiences into a meaningful whole:

The course is so basic that we've had. Most of these people have been involved in some way or another, and it's given them the opportunity to take maybe a lot of things that they've read or seen at other times, and put it together in one chunk, and say "that's not so difficult; that's good; yes, I know that." And they see the big picture. . . , and it improves their ability to react to other people.

Another agent relayed essentially the same appraisal:

. . . One thing they said that surprised me was that they probably knew many of the things that were covered in the workshop, but all of a sudden they felt a self-confidence to move ahead and put them into play and be more effective. They kept coming back to self-confidence. . . . So, I think that is a key. I think that some of us think we can run a meeting, but all of a sudden if we've got specific information, we're just refreshed, and we know the rules of parliamentary procedure, then we can step in confidently and do it. A lack of self-confidence probably holds a lot of our rural leaders back.
Seven references were made to the acquisition of beneficial knowledge and skills by participants, including (from the table): a) effective meetings, b) general leadership concepts, c) speaking/communication, and d) "listening." In three instances, agents related that the workshops had aided them in some capacity. For example: "Another thing, we started Toastmasters Club in this town as a result. . . and now we have a very active (club); we have about 20 people who come." Two agents said that no consequences of the workshops had been seen.

Relevant portions of the program manager's report pointed out that: a) there have been testimonials (one reported) about positive program impact from a city mayor and agent observations, b) a specific group action that emerged from the workshops was a clean-up and restoration effort in Cardington, Ohio, following a tornado, c) graduates have become favorably disposed toward the Extension Service as a result of the program, d) participants have become inclined to see Extension as a resource in the solution of personal and public problems, e) the program has enhanced the participants' understanding of Extension's role in the solution of public problems, and most significantly f) "(The program) increased their self-confidence that in fact they could be good leaders."

Workshop Improvement

Agents were also asked to specify their perceptions relative to ways the workshops could be improved. Again, this information was sought both as a means to assess and compare agent and participant statements, and to serve as a basis for recommendations. As with the
other open-ended questions, all data were organized in a combination frequency/qualitative style in Table 22.

Upon comparison of participant and agent recommendations (Tables 16 and 22), it is seen that the first two topics are identical, except that participants listed workshop lengthening first, while agents responded with this concept as a second choice. Similar percentage levels also characterized these choices. The agents' first choice, "increased participation/interaction," was coded (as were all topics) according to number of separate identifiable responses; even though one more response characterized this first choice, more agents specified longer workshops, so the ordering is somewhat inconclusive. Remaining agent choices include: 3) community-relevance of workshops, 4) research, development, or updating, and 5) use of resource persons. There was a difference of only one indication between each of the first three categories, pointing to the close similarity of belief about the value of these concepts.

Analysis of agent responses in the first category demonstrated a high similarity with the same participant concept. References to the felt need for generally increased group participation/interaction had slightly higher choice levels in each case (when comparing individual responses), although, with the agents, there were many more combined references to specified means of interaction, including role-playing, parliamentary procedure, self-evaluation, communication, decision-making, goal-setting, and development of self-esteem. Underlying most comments in this section was the belief that extra time was needed to help further develop classroom presentation ideas: "And, when we got all done, there was just everybody indicating (that) we needed more time; we
Table 22
Workshop Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased Participation/Interaction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;We should have... spread that (workshop) out (and) done more interactive kinds (of things)... The evaluation that came back from that one was the opportunity for more interaction.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Group Interaction (General) - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Communication - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Role-Playing - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parliamentary Procedure - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Self-Evaluation - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Decision-Making - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Goal-Setting - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Development of Self-Esteem - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Longer or Advanced Workshops</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>&quot;I had some requests from the participants from this last one. And, they were the same people who said 'this workshop was excellent, (but) it had some things in it that were really review and were too basic, and I'd really like to go in-depth; can you do something?'. And, that's what motivated that (plan for an advanced workshop).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Greater Length/Intensity - 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Advanced/Follow-up Program - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) More Workshops - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community-Relevance of Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Now, I really think if I were going to go with a second type of a school, I would do more (designing), in terms of picking a specific thing that we're attempting to accomplish within a school, or within a community, and try to tailor the school more toward those types of projects—you know—, the things they're going to need to accomplish a specific project.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Survey Community Leaders and/or Participants About Needs - 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Workshop Designed Around Specific Community Need - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) On-Site Field Trips - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research, Development, or Updating of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... Definitely (there is a need) to update some of the visual aids, and so forth, that we're using in that workshop, because they're becoming outdated.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Leader Concepts - 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teaching Methods - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) References/Tests - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A.V. Materials - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of Resource Persons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;That (use of resource persons) has some potential here, in that we have... college faculty who are also interested in that, and doing workshops in group dynamics and so forth.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^{a} \text{N designates total number of responses} \)
needed more time to really get more practice or better understanding," and "More time on using skills, more common role-playing."

Agents mentioning longer workshops had two key perceptions in mind, as seen in the table: a) workshops of greater length/intensity, and b) advanced or follow-up programs. One individual cited what he felt to be a need for workshops to be held in more counties. Again, as discussed in the increased interaction concept, it was felt that too little time existed in the original workshops to develop leadership skills. Apparently, both participants and agents place a high value on behavioral or acted-out skills, over and above the cognitive.

In three instances, agents expressed their belief in the value of having an advanced or follow-up program for those having participated in the basic course. Fundamental to respondents' discussions about an advanced program were feelings that the workshop, as presented, was too basic, either in level of instruction or in subject-matter:

"There were a portion of them who felt that we've re-hashed old material. They would have liked to have gone in-depth—more in-depth in certain areas. They would have liked to have covered some topics in detail."

These comments virtually dovetail participants' statements under workshop improvements. However, all agents did say that the advanced course should be predicated upon or built upon a knowledge base first established in the basic program:

I guess what I see is that more counties have them, and the counties that have them come back and have a follow-up, perhaps involving these same people, taking them a step further, polishing some of the things that were introduced. We have to enter at a fairly basic or elementary level, and in four two-hour programs you have to really use your time well to cover the important things. . . . The opportunity to come back and work again with this group would be one way I think it could be improved.
And similarly,

Well, like I say, you start out with the basic and then you put together an intermediate workshop. You can only hold their attention so long, and that's what we're going to find out next week when we meet—can we go for a ten-week workshop? do we have to go to a four-week workshop? Because there are certain sessions (where) you come in, and you start talking about them, and you create interest, and they sit there and listen and they're all enthused. And there're other sessions you have that are really boring, but they are important material for them. And you have to figure out a way to keep their excitement going, and their speakers, and so forth.

In the third category, agents discussed methods of improving the workshops that could be classified as dealing with issues of community-relevance. These issues were further delineated into the following:

a) surveying community leaders and/or participants about needs, b) designing the workshop around a specific community need, and c) conducting on-site field trips, listed in order of frequency of mention. In the first sub-category, agents made generally brief statements about assessing felt needs for future programs through the use of surveys, or in meetings:

And, next week we will meet with a group that I met with last Spring. They said "yes, let's put an intermediate school together"; they give me ideas. We've taken these ideas and put them into programs. Two weeks from now, the 22nd, we're going to meet with them and go back to them and say: "here are these ideas; which ones do you want in a program? Do you want the program to be two solid days? Do you want it to be spread out over six weeks?," and we're going from there.

Three agents referred to plans or desires to design a workshop around specific community needs. While two individuals merely mentioned a need or aspiration for these, one expounded upon active plans to develop and present an advanced program revolving around county government problem areas. This latter was even instigated by county officials who felt that a trained corps of local people having an enhanced
understanding of local government functioning would be an asset:

... These people will agree to participate in like two or three full-day programs. These are the participants. And, we have cooperation from all the county officials. And these participants will come in and they will meet the county commissioners. And the county commissioners will explain what their role is in county government, and answer questions, talk about how a budget is developed on a county level, and where their money comes from and how it's spent. They'll meet the recorder. They'll meet the auditor. ... In the course of this many-day workshop, these people will meet every county official. ... Extension will be bringing in some topics...

Improvement recommendations were made by three individuals relative to the research, development, or updating of leadership concepts, teaching methods, references/tests, and audio-visual materials. Interview responses were comparatively loquacious, and in the absence of leading questions, strong convictions can be presumed. Agents elucidated on the need for instructors to keep abreast of current developments in fields relating to leadership and its presentation so that participants are not given substandard or obsolete material:

(There is a need) to bring in some of the new leadership materials that are available; that's already being done, I understand, but we haven't made that change locally, so I would still say that because these participants were somewhat aware of some of the new leadership concepts/terminology that's being used, and so they would like to have moved on to what they're currently reading in their trade magazines and so forth; we need to update that, too.

Three references were made to the use of resource persons as a means of improving workshops. The meaning of one of these references pointed to upgrading of the teaching to an acceptable level, as one of the workshops was largely presented by "local people." The other two respondents, when questioned, related that resource persons would likely improve the leadership program. One qualified his statement by saying that "I would say that, yes, there would be some benefits to that, but I'm not sure
that for the basic leadership workshop that that would add that much to it." The third agent, while affirming the value of resource persons, referred to the paucity of available talent in the county and that resource speakers, to be effectual, would have to be superior in knowledge and communication ability.

**PROGRAM MANAGER'S REPORT**

The manager's report, as described in the second chapter, was intended to acquire adjunctive information, from the state specialist/instructor, that would help clarify workshop survey results and complement possible weak areas. A questionnaire copy is included in the appendices. Relevant extracts and explanatory data have been appended to agent findings, and, therefore, previously explicated.

An additional function of the manager's report, conceived by the Kellogg Foundation evaluation studies, was to determine if new or related leadership educational programs had developed as a result of the initial workshop, if additional resources had been expended, or if there were any further program spinoffs. From Howell, Weir, and Cook (1982, pp. 62-63), results of the Kellogg programs, for comparative purposes, were: a) continuation of overall program in California and Montana after cessation of original financing source, b) development of related spinoff educational programs in Pennsylvania and Michigan, and c) formation of alumni groups in all states.

Relative to the Ohio workshops, the program manager provided negative responses to Part IIIB (#'s 1-8) of the questionnaire referencing: a) development of new educational programs, b) allocation of new resources, c) development of new relationships in the university,
d) new relationships with other institutions, e) new relationships between faculty, f) allocation of new monies for research and public service, g) priority shifting to leadership development, and h) commendations given by outside agencies to the university.

The manager's report did disclose that Extension's public image has improved as a result of the workshops, and that the leadership reference materials "have been requested by extension people throughout the U.S.A." (#'s 9 & 12). A further positive impact of the Ohio program is seen in the opening of new opportunities for public service on the part of Extension faculty (#10): "Yes, many individuals who have participated in the workshops have invited Extension resource persons to speak and make presentations as a result of getting acquainted at the workshop."
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter is comprised of a summary, and a statement of conclusions and recommendations.

SUMMARY

The primary objective in this study was to evaluate the leadership workshops conducted by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service from 1975 to 1984. The importance of local leaders has been recognized for many decades. These individuals contribute to an overall community development process in a variety of ways: a) in their current work-related leadership roles, b) in a voluntary capacity in community groups, and c) as an aid to an Extension agent in furthering his teaching/outreach efforts. The identification and training of those with leadership capacity in the community has far-reaching effects.

The social-psychological perspective of symbolic-interactionism afforded the conceptual model for the study. From the general model, a variety of open-ended participant questions and county agent interviews were derived, based on a literature review of factors deemed most significant to workshop conduct. An exploratory approach was utilized, in which meaningful patterns from the data were sought. To afford a broad means of evaluation, information was also pursued relative to organizational and committee membership changes of participants. This (quantitative) data was used to effect comparisons with other rural (Kellogg) leadership studies of varying lengths. The evaluative
methodology, therefore, was designed around combined quantitative/qualitative (triangulated) collection and assessment procedures.

Three instruments were employed for data collection: two major, and one supplementary. The first surveyed all identifiable participants (311) in cooperating counties, by mail, with a questionnaire seeking organizational membership and committee reports, scaled self-assessment data referencing workshop effects, as well as open-ended narratives regarding program strengths, effects on community contributions, and program improvements. The second instrument was a general interview approach with all (10) county agents in counties where workshops had been held. Five questions were explored, in the course of the personal interviews, with detailed analyses being sought in regard to: a) workshop need determination, b) tailoring workshop to community needs, c) participant selection, d) workshop effect assessment, and e) program improvement. The final instrument was a single extensive questionnaire administered to the overall program manager/instructor, designed to investigate supplementary information relative to the program's environmental setting, operation, and success in goal achievement.

Quantitative data, from the organizational membership and 23-item self-assessment reports, were analyzed with descriptive statistics. These were intended to demonstrate patterns of gain with the organizational information, and (primarily) measures of central tendency with the self-report findings. Again, comparisons were made with results of other (longer) rural program evaluations. Participant open-ended question responses and county agent narratives were content analyzed into categories having conceptual identity and integrity, and displayed in
frequency/illustration tables. Because of non-randomization, tests of significance were ruled out. The program manager's report was used as an explanatory adjunct to the main data sources.

Study limitations, from the natural science paradigm, may be considered to be the following: the quantitative design was a one-shot case study, although utilizing retrospective pre-tests. Subjects were not randomly selected for the workshops, selection being largely accomplished by the county agents, presenting the researcher with a performed fact. Also, no comparison group was available against which findings could be contrasted, although this was partially accomplished by utilizing Kellogg study data. Further, because of workable numbers, a full population (non-randomized) study was employed to maximize, especially, qualitative returns. As discussed in Chapter III, however, the bulk of the research was centered around qualitative designs where the former limitations have little or no importance, since patterns of indigenous meanings are what is sought.

A summary of findings is presented in the following discussion. Surveys were returned by 50% (156) of the participants. The respondent population consisted of an equal distribution of the sexes, primarily rural-resident, with a mean educational level of somewhat more than high school, and with a mean age (at time of survey) of 46.8 years. Occupationally, participants demonstrated a predominance in professional fields (20.3%), with farming being third (12.4%), although there was considerable variability in occupations.

Among the evaluational findings, organizational changes were seen to be relatively modest compared with the longer leadership programs,
but to parallel them in some important respects. Organizational memberships increased 11.1% (504 to 560), with major gains shown in voluntary public service types (71%). Expressive (2%) and political (4%) types evidenced the smallest proportion of gain. Both male and female participants had greater gains in voluntary public service organizations. Women showed slightly higher increases in government and political groups, with men being higher in gains among expressive and economic organizations. Overall, instrumental organizations manifested 98.2% of all group increases, with there being a negligible net change of two affiliations among expressive groups.

Committee memberships showed even more pronounced changes, especially in relation to instrumental versus expressive comparisons. There was actually a combined net loss of memberships, from 344 to 292, although this figure was comprised largely of expressive committee losses; instrumental committees showed gains from 165 to 202. And, again, voluntary public service committees had the largest gains, with the total gain percentage among all group types (12.2%) being similar to the organizational figures; the large expressive category loss accounted for most of the combined net decrease in memberships. Male participants also registered most of the losses in memberships (42% greater), showing slight increases only among economic associations. In contrast, females, while having almost identical expressive group declines, had gains in all other types of committees, especially in the voluntary public service.
Analysis of the 23-item (attitudinally scaled) participant self-assessment of program effects evidenced the following findings. Three life-area sets were surveyed: a) participant involvement in community activities, b) perceptions of individuals as leaders in their community, and c) orientation toward community issues and effectiveness as leaders, with two additional questions included. These three sets had very similar mean score results, being 3.8, 3.7, and 3.6 respectively, on a five point scale from strong decreased (1), to strong increased (5). Therefore, participants rated the program as having had a near moderate increased effect on their attitudes and abilities in these areas. Fifty seven percent of those responding indicated that the program had had an increased effect, while 41% indicated no effect, and a negligible three percent mentioned a decreased effect.

Program participants were asked to respond at length to three open-ended questions discussed earlier. Again, responses were content analyzed with conceptual categories designated and illustrated for each of the three data sets. Program strengths listed in order of frequency were: a) group involvement and interaction (27%), b) workshop leaders and presentation methods (21%), and c) building self-confidence and evaluation (12%), with five other categories presented in Table 12. Respondents had several meanings that could be sub-divided under each main category. Under group involvement, these sub-divisions were: small-group interaction, integration of diverse community interests, and putting into practice leadership skills. Included in the workshop leader strength category, three sub-themes found were: presentation, knowledge of material, and organization. Under building self-confidence
and evaluation, three sub-themes deduced were: self-confidence (general), self-evaluation (general), and leadership self-evaluation. Other concepts mentioned included communication, parliamentary procedure, introductory leadership concepts, presentation materials, and "helpful suggestions." The (specifically named) leadership concept category represented only 5% of all responses. Most responses were characterized by more than one concept.

Workshop participants were asked to specify what effect the program had had on specific community accomplishments, this being designed to fill in gaps in the literature, and to further attempt to concretize workshop effects. Significantly, 52% of responses were those that could be classified social-psychological, including self-confidence and evaluation (23%), understanding group dynamics (13%), enhancement of existing leadership knowledge (9%), improved communication skills (4%), and motivation to become involved in public service (3%). Areas of mention that tended to indicate tangible enhanced community involvement included: increased involvement at work (4%), taking specific action(s) to improve the community (4%), and lecturing/speaking activities (2%). Again, here, the first three program effect concepts were sub-divided.

Relative to participant perceptions of workshop improvement, fewer responses were forthcoming compared with the other questions. The first choice was for lengthening, repetition, or conduct of an advanced workshop (30%), followed by greater participation/involvement (24%), and topical teaching emphasis (10%). Only the first two choices were divisible, since topical teaching comprised a highly diverse
number of suggestions. Three remaining concepts were: "program already good," time of workshop, and updating of audio-visual resources. Participants generally felt that programs were too abbreviated to accomplish more than the presentation of elementary leadership ideas, and that program brevity prevented more complete interaction and skill practice.

County agents were interviewed in an attempt to determine how their responsibility for the planning and conduct of the workshops had affected program success. Five questions were explored. Relative to how the need for a workshop is determined, most agents (9) indicated that this arose out of the observation of a need for such training, in the course of their work in the county where leadership shortcomings were noticed. From an analysis of the transcribed interviews, this method of need determination was concluded to be somewhat efficacious, being a variant of (qualitative) participant observation. The second most frequent means of need determination was the acting upon recommendations of an Extension advisory committee, with general and sub-committees being mentioned in equal numbers. A needs assessment survey was initiated by only one agent, while two others had made use of a state-conducted survey. Three agents related that an indication of interest by community residents was partially responsible for workshop inception.

Leader selection has been theoretically reviewed to be significant as a means of achieving the greatest community impact by virtue of training those with pre-existent aptitude. Agents relied upon no logical pattern when selecting participants, but usually directed requests for attendance to existing community leaders. Specific letter requests was
the most frequent method, with leader names often derived from Chamber of Commerce and other published lists. Mass media notices and mass letter mailings were mentioned by four agents, these being directed to diverse sources, such as Extension clientele, with media notices placed through newspaper, radio, and poster mediums. Personal contacts was the final selective method, with one agent leaving the shops open to the public only (no selection). As a qualifier, all agents indicated that all programs could be attended by the general public. Only one county specifically hand-picked attendees, with this being an infrequently employed procedure.

In reference to the tailoring of workshops to local community needs, eight agents said that no or few contextually-relevant examples were used in the course of the instruction (or) in other words that it had been a general program. There seemed to be little conceptualization of the importance of this idea-set, although two respondents did say that the program was tailored, whenever possible, to community exigencies. Three agents sounded out participant interests at some point prior to, or during the workshop, and one each related that the program was determined by agents, or by an ad-hoc citizen's committee. Workshop tailoring has been identified as a way of upgrading teaching impact by having students share a common set of symbols having local referents (meanings).

Agents cited far more empirical workshop effects than participants. Twelve instances of participants having assumed leadership positions were related, including those in Extension, the Farm Bureau, the Soil Conservation Service, and others. Only slightly fewer references were made to the usage of workshop skills as a factor improving performance
at place of employment or with community organizations. The third and fourth most frequent citings were for the enhancement of participant self-confidence and the acquisition of beneficial leadership knowledge. Two agents remarked that the program had assisted them, in the community, by leading to additional contacts and involvement in organizations.

Very similar (compared with participant) conceptions of workshop improvement were voiced by agents. Only one reference each separated the first three categories about which strong feelings were expressed: 1) increased participation/interaction, 2) longer or advanced workshops, and 3) community-relevance of workshops. Again, the feeling was that too little time existed to achieve any realistic degree of leadership skill training and that greater interaction among participants was the best way to accomplish this. Nine references were made to enhancing the community relevance of the workshops by means of needs surveys, design of the shops around community need, and field trips. Further improvements recommended revolved around the updating of teaching materials and the use of resource persons.

The program manager's report provided accessory or supplementary reports relative to a wide variety of workshop inception, conduct, and effect considerations. The report also provided information leading to the conclusion that no spinoff programs, resource allocation, institutional relationships, or priority shifting etc. had resulted as a consequence of the program. However, the report did allow that Extension's public image had improved, that leadership reference material had been requested by other institutions, and that new public service opportunities had opened up for Extension faculty following the workshops.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations are presented together, due to their conceptual unity, and the explanatory narrative woven around each issue.

1. Training length is directly related to degree and manner of workshop impact. Ohio leadership programs can be improved by lengthening.

While support for this conclusion is not entirely forthcoming from this particular study, it is definitely seen when comparing Ohio results with those from longer leadership programs evaluated with two comparable instruments. Specifically, organizational membership data demonstrated very modest increases in relation to Kellogg programs, showing an overall figure of 11.1%, compared to the latter's 57.6%. Committee membership figures were even more pronounced. In addition, the 23-item self-assessment list of program effect questions manifested mean rating results below those of the four-state Kellogg programs. In all fairness, the four-state programs were all of one to three year duration, and a variant one to three week ("freshman" or "sophomore") series of workshops did not have similar evaluative data available. Nevertheless, Williams (1983, p. 12) concluded that even in the shorter workshops (in Montana) "The program evaluation data suggested a monotonic relationship between length of training experience and impact on participants. . . . Specifically, the Freshman workshops (one week) had a relatively modest effect upon trainees, compared to the Sophomore (two week) and Conflict Management (three week) workshops and the study-travel programs."
It is not anticipated that a program measured in days or weeks would favorably compare with those of one to three year duration, especially in regard to the inculcation of leadership skills. The issue boils down to the relative value of a current two to three day program contrasted with an extended one week or two week workshop. Admittedly, data is lacking to substantiate a relevant hypothesis for Extension-type training, leaving the Williams/Howell findings as indicative. Further, consideration of findings resulting from qualitative analysis procedures demonstrated that shorter-length programs probably have as their primary effect the modest enhancement of group-process skills and self-confidence, as detailed in participant findings. While both concepts are important workshop objectives and findings, process skills have another important function in the form of leadership skill practice. This, along with conceptual knowledge relative to leadership functions grounded in a specific socio-economic context, can be more effectively conveyed with the advantage of additional time.

It is recommended that the Ohio and similar workshops be expanded in length and coverage (discussed below), within financial and program planning limits. And even though the longer leadership programs conveyed the greatest benefits in terms of knowledge and skills, Williams found that the three one-week workshops were the most cost-effective in conveying leadership skills. The current program could likely be expanded to encompass a one-week period of time, or, more beneficially, an advanced workshop could be held, some of which have already taken place. Collective support for this recommendation is found in both participant (first choice) and agent (second choice) suggestions.
2. The value of group interaction processes was evidenced, with enhancement being conducive to further workshop success.

Support for this conclusion was strongly indicated through qualitative analysis of agents' and participants' open-response descriptions. This concept was the first choice among participant program strengths, and the second improvement choice. Similarly, this was the agents' first choice among program improvement recommendations.

Affiliation needs partially underlie this particular theme, with some individuals seeking purely social expression, while others see the small group as a learned and valued means of achieving instrumental objectives through complementary interests requiring interdependent behavior.

In addition, the value of leadership skill-practice was alluded to above. Skill practice serves the important role of developing functional capacity, or working ability to put into action leadership concepts that when only conveyed by lecture may remain latent. In other words, practice can help develop "how-to" skills and confidence therein. Verification for this discussion is found in an educational model developed by Joyce and Showers (1980). In the model, program trainees progress through four different stages, from awareness, to conceptual framework, process skills, and finally problem-solving skills. Progression is dependent upon adequate time at each stage and especially for feedback and coaching.

It is recommended that the workshops make provision (largely through a time increase) for an upgraded level of participation, including (e.g.) role-playing, discussion forums, speaking, and parliamentary procedures.
3. Increased topical coverage is called for, especially in reference to those subjects having locality-relevance.

Again, consideration of findings generated from both participant and agent qualitative procedures supports this conclusion. Ten (nine different) topics were suggested by participants as a means of improving the program. While these topics were all somewhat diverse, they represented considerations deemed important to the individual in his leadership (or expected) role in the community, therefore locality-relevant.

As discussed in the agent findings, only two individuals employed locality-relevant themes in the workshops, with most sanctioning a general program or doing some sounding-out of citizen interests beforehand, leaving a void, according to prior research. Conversely, under improvement recommendations, the third most frequent citing was for the generation of more community-relevant programs through surveys, identified needs, or field trips. In addition, both sets of respondents made occasional references to what they considered a very elementary or generalized subject-matter presentation.

Therefore, it is suggested that within time constraints, and again through an expanded program, that further topics be added. These topics should revolve around broad identified community concerns and their relationships to extra-local forces (social, political, economic) affecting the community. Resource speakers could be utilized for subject-matter expertise.
4. Systematic or more formalized participant selection procedures should be implemented.

Participant selection for leadership training has been identified as maximizing the chances that the community and state will benefit by virtue of having enlisted in the program those most likely to succeed. Formal selection procedures are employed by all identified leader training programs (Kellogg, Sigurd Olson Institute, LEAD). Selection processes in the Ohio workshops centered around targeting letters and requests to current leaders on the presumption that they would benefit the most rather than making judgments about their need or suitability. Often mass letter mailings were employed and all agents stated that the programs were open to the public.

Extension is often popularly believed to have the role of making information available to the general public. While there is probably some justification to agents' expressions of concern about filling workshop minimum quotas, all policy and academic sources consulted indicate that the basis for programming should be demonstrated needs of the people. This would implicate leadership training being given to those having both the need and the talent. Having a program always open only to the general public would insure only mediocrity and poor transmittal of leadership skills into the community.

A lengthy or complex application process for a workshop of limited length would probably intimidate prospective attendees, but is strongly recommended for longer programs, which this study advises. However, a short (1-2 page) application could be requested of those who express an interest in the program. In addition, agents could increase their
attentiveness of those with latent talent, directing letters and requests to them, as well as to identified leaders, suggesting that they, or designates, apply. Advisory committees could also play an important role in helping to identify local leaders and those with potential.

5. Workshop need determination could benefit from more extensive employment of surveys, interviews, and other deliberate methods.

Support for this conclusion is derived from agent interview responses, and, in reality, is aimed more at improvement recommendations, rather than the finding of any glaring inadequacy. Need determination methods employed by agents included, in order of frequency: observation of need, advisory committee recommendations, assessment survey use, and community resident expression of interest.

In practice, most agents did make use of a variety of methods for ascertaining workshop need. While observation comprised the largest number of statements, the method utilized at any particular time appeared to be fortuitous, with little deliberation exercised. Exceptions to this might be advisory committee recommendations and the annual agent program planning session, where a variety of workshop types is offered.

Ideally, an agent would attempt to systematically compare and contrast assessment information from a wide range of sources relative to county/community needs prior to finalization of an annual program. A literature review has identified, among others, the following methods: key informant interviews, demographic statistics, public forums, and surveys. Time constraints may preclude maximum utilization of needs
assessment procedures, but it would not be a complicated matter to
generate a locality-relevant assessment survey that could tap areas of
concern and interest in the community.
APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE
OHIO LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The following question pertains to your involvement in community activities. Please be assured that your answers to this and all questions will be held in strict confidence. Please refer to the cover letter for explanatory information.

1. Indicate your past and current membership in organizations 5 years prior to the workshop and to the present time. Include high school, college, agricultural, civic, church, governmental, and fraternal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>How long a member? (Give dates)</th>
<th>Offices/Committee memberships (Give dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. We want to know how you feel the leadership workshops affected you. Please circle the number from 1 to 5 which reflects the strength of your feeling. Number 1 would mean a strong decreased effect; number 5 would mean a strong increased effect. Please be as frank as possible.

---

**Degree of Workshop Effect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Strong Decreased</th>
<th>(2) Moderate Decreased</th>
<th>(3) No Effect</th>
<th>(4) Moderate Increased</th>
<th>(5) Strong Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Degree of Workshop Effect:**

1. Your interest in public affairs.  
2. Knowledge of resources to use in the solution of public problems.  
3. Your willingness to listen to others and consider alternative points of view.  
4. Your feeling of confidence in openly promoting causes about which you feel strongly.  
5. Perseverance in working toward the accomplishment of what you feel is right.  
6. An appreciation of the importance of fact gathering, thorough study, and planning in dealing with public issues.  
7. Your feelings of independence, growth, and self-worth as a person.  
8. Your confidence in your long-range future as a public affairs participant.  
9. Your awareness of connections among problems and the ability to take a comprehensive view of the needs of a community.  
10. Your knowledge of your limits and strengths as a participant in public affairs.  
11. Your feeling that you can motivate and inspire people to work together.  
12. Recognition of your own biases and prejudices.  
13. Your feelings about your ability to influence community affairs.
### Degree of Workshop Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Strong Decreased</th>
<th>(2) Moderate Decreased</th>
<th>(3) No Effect</th>
<th>(4) Moderate Increased</th>
<th>(5) Strong Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Degree of Workshop Effect:**

14. Your ability to involve others in public affairs.  

15. The breadth of your interest in a variety of community problems and issues.

16. Your feeling that you should concentrate on selected issues rather than getting involved in many.

17. The priority you place on participation in economic development activities.

18. Your desire to serve the common good.

19. Your feeling that others accept you as a leader and look to you for advice in public affairs.

20. The priority you place on participation in environmental improvement programs.

21. Your use of group skills in community life.

22. The priority you place on participation in social service programs.

23. Strain and tension between you and older community leaders.
C. In your own words, please evaluate the leadership workshops. If additional space is needed, use blank sheets at the end of the booklet.

1. What were the strengths of the program?

2. How have the workshops helped you make a positive contribution in your community, if at all? Please list specific accomplishments.

3. How could the workshops be improved?
D. Would you also kindly provide us with the following information:

1. Highest level of education completed: (circle one)
   1. No high school
   2. Some high school
   3. High school graduate
   4. High school graduate, plus short courses
   5. Some college
   6. College graduate
   7. College graduate, plus short courses
   8. Advanced degree (please name) _______

2. Marital Status
   (circle one)
   1. Single
   2. Married
   3. Other

3. Age _______ (years)

4. Sex
   1. Male
   2. Female

5. Length of Residence at Present Address
6. Length of Residence in Ohio

7. Where do you presently live? (circle one)
   1. On a farm
   2. In the country, but not on a farm
   3. In a town or village of less than 2,500
   4. In a town of 2,500 - 10,000
   5. In a city of 10,000 - 100,000
   6. In a city over 100,000

8. Have you moved since first attending the leadership program?
   Yes ______ No ______

9. Where was your former residence located? (circle one)
   1. On a farm
   2. In the country, but not on a farm
   3. In a town or village of less than 2,500
   4. In a town of 2,500 - 10,000
   5. In a city of 10,000 - 100,000
   6. In a city over 100,000

10. Present Occupation & Duties: ____________________________________________

     ____________________________________________

     ____________________________________________

11. Occupation at time of workshops (if different): ____________________________

     ________________________________

     ________________________________
12. Household Income (circle one)
   1. Less than $20,000.
   2. 20,000 - 40,000
   3. More than 40,000

   If self-employed, please indicate the value of the business: __________
Leadership Workshops
Program Manager's Report

Directions: Please provide a narrative report to each question on attached blank sheets.

Part I. Environmental Setting

A. Sponsoring organization and its primary goals

1. What were the primary goals of the organization before beginning the leadership development program?

2. What were the specific goals in mind for conducting the leadership workshops? Were these articulated and used as guides? Give brief synopsis of program history to explain.

B. Relationships between the primary sponsoring organization and other organizations with which it operates to achieve its goals.

1. What was the nature of working relationships between the primary sponsoring organization (Coop. Ext. Serv.) and the following agencies and organizations:

   a) farm organizations
   b) other special interest groups to which participants were affiliated
   c) the state department of agriculture
   d) other state departments of state government
   e) other departments or agencies within the college of agriculture
   f) other departments in the university with which the sponsoring agency worked to achieve its primary goals.
Part II. Program's Operation, Financial Support, and Structure

A. Budget and operational funds

1. What were the major sources of financial support for conducting the program for a typical group?

2. How many man-days of faculty, resource person, and clerical time did the financial support referred to in question 1 purchase for a typical group?

3. What proportion of the overall budget was from inkind services from the university?

4. How many days did the participant in a typical group devote to the total program, and what other costs were incurred (e.g. transportation expenses)?

5. How should the programs you would like to have continued be supported financially (e.g. through the regular Coop. Extension budget, through state legislature appropriation, from participant contributions, from business/industry/foundation etc. assistance)?

6. If you feel that participant contributions are warranted, how large should the contribution be in one year? Should a participant scholarship fund be established?

7. What approaches have been used to obtain funds for continuing the program, and what were the successes and failures encountered?

B. Design and content

1. What methods, if any, were used to select participants for the program?

2. Outline a typical program design, with a summary of topics presented.

3. Please indicate the individual or persons (by title only) having teaching responsibilities for the workshops.

4. What were the main instructional approaches used, and which do you consider most effective? Why? What approaches were least effective and why?

5. What were the major changes in your program curriculum and educational methods since the program for Group or Class I was developed? If changes were made, please explain why.

6. Is the leadership development program or a close substitute still in operation in Ohio? What are the major factors which have led to its continuation?

7. What effort, if any, was made to contextualize the program's content, or make the content relevant to participant's community or special needs?
8. What topics, field trips or specific aspects of the program do you feel were most effective for achieving your program's educational objectives?

9. What topics, field trips or specific aspects of the program do you feel were least effective for achieving your program's educational objectives?

10. What combination of participants is best for achieving program goals? For example, is the inclusion of women, minorities, persons from different types of agriculture or different interest groups, a mix of different age groups etc. beneficial for achieving specific program objectives? If you feel a mix of people is important, what proportion of men to women, farm to agribusiness, lay leaders to professionals etc. do you feel is best?

C. Organizational structure and approaches used to implement the program

1. Did the program have any advisory councils or governing boards? What role did these councils or boards play in the process of program development and implementation? What recommendations would you make for the involvement of advisory councils in other leadership development programs?

2. What kind of an organizational (or management) structure is best for developing and implementing similar leadership development programs? How should the educational program for a specific group be coordinated? Should one person be assigned to work with each group throughout their program, or should coordinators develop functional specialties and only be responsible for one or two aspects of the program?

3. Should this or an expanded program be operated by an academic department, the Coop. Ext. Serv., a university-wide extension organization, an agency of state government, an independent non-profit corporation, or a combination of these agencies?

4. Were there any groups which were not included (or represented) among the participants in the leadership development program who might profit from such an experience in the future?

5. What use, if any, was made of resource persons for program presentation? Please assess how they were, or could be effective.

Part III. Indications of Program Success or Failure in Achieving its Goals and Educational Objectives

A. Impact of the program upon participants

1. Is there any evidence to indicate the success or failure of the program in achieving its goals and educational objectives? (Evidence may include letters from participants about their accomplishments in agricultural and public affairs as a result of the program, or documented comments by persons who have observed the way the program may have improved the leadership skills, knowledge, and effectiveness of a participant).
2. Has any specific group action emerged as a result of the program's influence upon a participant's efforts to solve a specific public problem (e.g. the formation of a planning commission, health council, or other action to help citizens)?

3. Are the program graduates favorably disposed toward the extension service because of their program experience?

4. Are the participants more likely to see the extension service as a resource to help them solve personal and public problems as a result of their involvement in the program?

5. Do the program graduates represent a new resource for the extension service now that they have completed the course? If so, in what ways?

6. Has the program enhanced the participants' understanding of the role of the extension service in public service programs directed at solving contemporary public problems?

7. Have other community residents who were not involved in the program begun using the university's resources in solving private and public problems as a result of the participants' reports and discussions connected with the program? Can you cite instances where this has already happened?

8. Were there any unanticipated consequences that developed as a result of the program (e.g. strained relationships between participants and their peers or other leaders, marital problems, misguided community actions, or positive actions that were unexpected)?

9. In what way did the program have its greatest effect upon the participants?

10. What efforts have been made to maintain contact between graduates of the program?

11. Do program graduates continue to get together as a group on a regular basis?

B. Impact of the program upon the university

1. Have new educational programs developed as direct spinoffs from the leadership workshops? If so, please list these new programs and provide documentation regarding their magnitude.

2. Have new resources (e.g. faculty, staff, additional funds) been allocated to related educational efforts as a direct result of the leadership development program?

3. Have working relationships between the unit responsible for conducting the program and other parts of the institution (e.g. other academic departments/faculty members) been strengthened as a direct result of the program? If so, please cite specific instances.
4. Have new working relationships developed between the university and:
   a) other universities or colleges
   b) units of government
   c) specific economic or professional interest groups
   d) associations of government officials
   e) other community or voluntary organizations?

5. Have new working relationships developed between faculty in your institution, including resident and Extension staff, and participants as a direct result of the program?

6. Have new monies been allocated to the university for research and public service as a direct result of the program?

7. Has the university shifted its priorities, either at the statewide level, or within specific counties, to more programs related to leadership development or community and rural development as a direct result of the program?

8. Have outside agencies (e.g. farm organizations, professional societies, the state legislature) commended the university for their work in conducting the program? If so, in what ways?

9. Has the program improved the institution's public image? If so, in what ways has it been improved?

10. Have new opportunities for public service in the state on the part of resident and extension faculty developed as a result of the program (e.g. presentations, consultations etc.)?

11. Would you involve other universities and/or other departments within the university in future programs? If so, in what ways?

12. Have other states or groups expressed interest in beginning a rural leadership development program similar to this one?
November 2, 1984

Dear Workshop Participant:

We are writing to you because of your participation in one of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service's leadership workshops. These workshops have been held throughout Ohio, and we are interested in determining the effectiveness of this educational effort. With this information, Extension hopes to be able to better serve its clientele by changing the content of the programs offered.

You can be of much assistance to us by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Your opinions are important because of the small number of participants in each group. The questionnaire will take only about 20 minutes of your time to complete. Please return this by November 20 in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

You can be assured of complete confidentiality. Each questionnaire contains an identification number which will enable us to examine possible group changes as a result of the program. Your name will never be placed on the survey or used in any way.

Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Philip L. Grover
Extension Specialist, CRD

Randy L. Long
Department of Rural Sociology

Enclosure
Dear Workshop Participant:

About two weeks ago we sent you a questionnaire concerning your participation in one of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service's leadership workshops. As of this date, we have not received your reply.

Your opinion of these workshops, along with other information, is very important to our evaluation efforts. We would like to ask, again, that you return the completed questionnaire, in the postage-paid envelope, as soon as possible. We are enclosing an additional questionnaire, which should only take about 20 minutes of your time.

We would like to emphasize the importance of your cooperation, both in making the study valid, but especially in the future improvement of the leadership workshops. The information you provide will be held in complete confidence and not be associated with your name.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Philip L. Grover
Extension Specialist, CRD

Randy L. Long
Department of Rural Sociology

Enclosure
November 3, 1984

Dear Sir/Ma'am

I am writing to you because of your participation in one of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service's leadership workshops.

We, at the Extension Service, are trying to evaluate these workshops in order to improve the content and better assist Extension clientele.

In one or two days, you will receive a survey questionnaire. Your cooperation in completing and returning the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Randy L. Long
The Ohio State University
November 30, 1984

Dear Sir/Ma'am

Recently we sent you another mailing of a questionnaire concerning your participation in one of the Extension Service's leadership workshops.

If you have already returned it, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. Your contribution is very important, and should be included both to validate the study and to improve the workshops.

Thank you again for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Randy L. Long
The Ohio State University
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