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Leadership characteristics of mentor teachers that are perceived to be effective leaders is the focus of this study. The study is an attempt to ascertain what conceptual framework exists (if any) as to how leadership in the induction process is viewed by members of the group. It is being investigated to see if there is a commonality between mentor and inductee in this conceptual framework. What role the administrator/teacher leader plays in this process will be explored. If there is commonality, how might it impact the induction process?

There are three hypotheses undergirding the study: Mentors, administrators and inductees hold different perceptions of what leadership characteristics are necessary for the mentor to be
effective in his/her role; mentor teachers' views of mentoring are significantly different than the views held by administration; leader behavior is affected by the process used in selecting mentors.

The instrument used to gather the data in this study was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire or L.B.D.Q.-For XII (Halpin, 1957). The mean scores, standard deviation, and the F distributions are presented to explain the data analysis.

The first hypothesis is supported by significant differences in seven of the twelve subscales. In the second hypothesis, the null hypothesis was accepted and $H_2$ was rejected. In the subscale persuasiveness, mentors and administrators are significantly different than inductees in how they perceived leadership characteristics for mentors. In the third hypothesis, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was significant difference at the $p < .05$ level. In the process of selecting mentors according to the twelve subscales used in this process, leader behavior is affected because of the significant differences found between inductees-mentors and between inductees-administrators.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

It is significant to note that more than 350 definitions of leadership are recorded in the literature (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Yet there is no one clear definition of leadership. Leadership is defined many ways and is highly situational. It depends greatly upon the role of the leader as perceived by the leader or those working with a leader. Leadership is manifested in numerous ways. It is projected through gifts of birth, education, intellect, speech and personality. In writing of leadership characteristics projected by Mahatma Ghandi, Andrews (1930) said Ghandi possessed none of these leadership characteristics. The notion presented is that one can only lead when there has been experiential learning. Leadership and mentoring must concern themselves with the innate abilities to lead by the leader/mentor and the control the leader/mentor has in matters of fundamental human relationships.

These notions are not new. While interest in mentoring may be recent, the phenomenon itself is quite old. The word mentor comes from Greek mythology. Odysseus entrusted his house and son Telemachus to an old man called "Mentor," when he set off on a
ten-year journey. On one occasion, Mentor's advice saved 
Telemachus from death. The father-like relationship between young
Telemachus and the wise loving Mentor set a standard for character-
izing future mentoring relationships as history is replete with
examples of such relationships: Socrates and Plato, Freud and Jung,
Lorenze de Medici and Michelangelo, Haydn and Beethoven, Boar and
Mead, Sartre and de Beauvois (Merriam, 1983).

Today, mentoring has application in the preparation of nurses
(Fagan and Fagan, 1983), psychologists (Pierce, 1983), scientists
(Rawles, 1980), educational administrators (Hepner and Fraborg,
1979), sociologists (Phillips, 1979), and teachers (Gray and Gray,
1985; Gray and Rogers, 1982). These studies discussed the extent
to which mentoring fosters learning, psycho-social development and
career advancement. The implications of this research on mentoring
is inconclusive. Studies noted across several disciplines have yet
to be brought together and systematically examined for common find-
ings, trends, or generalizations. The research mentioned shows
that having a mentor or being a mentor is crucial to success. With
this being validated, it necessitates the initiation/incorporation
of the mentoring relationship into planned interventions. For such
interventions to occur, it becomes necessary to identify leadership
characteristics from both perspectives - mentor and inductee.
Purpose of the Study

This study is an exploration of leadership characteristics of mentors as perceived by mentor teachers, beginning teachers, and administrators/teacher leaders. The research on the role of mentors in induction programs in a pilot induction year project indicates greater clarity is needed in analysis and synthesis of leadership characteristics. Research indicates that researchers often restrict their attention to problems that appeal to them. An opportunity exists for more attention to be given to teachers' views on significant research problems such as the induction process. If mentor teachers are to effect positive influence on beginning teachers, those data are crucial from the mentor, inductee, and administrator/teacher leader perspectives.

This study investigated the leadership characteristics of mentor teachers in an induction program. This particular study emanates from a comprehensive induction program being conducted by five Franklin County (Ohio) school districts and The Ohio State University. A program for beginning teachers had been developed by the Franklin County schools and the County Office of Education. This collaborative program was also supported through a National Institute of Education grant received by The Ohio State University College of Education. The collaborative arrangement created a
design and implementation program for approximately one hundred beginning teachers.

The project has a two phase structure. Phase I, the development year, is detailed in the discussion that follows. Phase II, the demonstration phase (years 2 and 3) will be developed during Phase I. The development phase of this project has two purposes: first, to develop a pilot induction program that will help beginning teachers explore their own needs and classroom processes; and second, to collect data about induction through involvement with teacher participants and through evaluation of the pilot effort toward the creation of a demonstration induction year project (Zimpher, 1985, p. 1).

The problem of the study is to explore leadership characteristics of the mentor teacher and implications these characteristics may hold for development of new teachers. There is an implicit notion that leadership is considered instrumental in the development of professional careers (Cunningham, et al., 1983; Cunningham, 1976; Merriam, 1983; Fagan and Fagan, 1983; Naisbitt, 1982; Bradley, 1981). It is hoped that the results of this study will extend the existing knowledge base on the subject; provide direction for further research; suggest ideas that may add to the success of the mentoring program (in the induction process) that will expand benefits from the leadership phase of the program; and close the gap between the mentor and inductee's perceptions of just what the
mentor teacher can do in helping the new teacher develop leadership capabilities that will lead to more effective teaching. Also, the views of mentoring held by administrators and teacher leaders were explored. The intent will be to ascertain how administrators and teacher leaders choose mentor teachers for that role and the impact this may have on the induction process.

Concerted effort is needed to ensure that a higher proportion of those entering the profession receive an adequate, effective induction. Communication can be improved with closer collaboration of mentor and inductee in programs such as the Franklin County/O.S.U. induction program. Where beginning teachers are involved in induction activities, senior experienced colleagues are, more often than not, cast in the role of providers of information, including advice on programming and teacher classroom tasks. Rarely, does it appear that beginning teachers are invited to tell their senior colleagues about new knowledge and insights gained during preservice education. For professional growth to occur, induction must be a two-way process between new and experienced teachers. If beginning teachers are to feel they are fully accepted in their schools with worthwhile contributions to make, opportunities need to be presented where teachers share their
store of knowledge as well as receiving ideas from others. Also, if beginning teachers are to be viewed as providers of valuable ideas, changes may be needed of mentor teachers' perceptions of their new colleagues. This has definite implications for mutual understanding of definitions of leadership paradigms as viewed by mentor and inductee. The aforementioned notions will be explored with a research base in Chapter Two.

The mentoring leadership concept is very elusive. Howey and Zimpher (1985) state that leadership is difficult to define and understand in the mentoring concept because ...

the myriad interpersonal transactions of the leader profoundly impact another in a way that cannot be prescribed ahead of time ...
secondly, the person or persons particularly enabled are no more likely to clearly reconstruct and understand fully the significance of these several transactions and events than the mentor or leader is to anticipate them (p. 3).

This research attempted to give greater focus on how leadership is provided or is characterized in an interpersonal context. Merton (1969) described this interpersonal context as "leadership that is an interpersonal relation in which others comply because they want to, not because they have to" (p. 2615). This further illustrates that communication is a two-way phenomena.
Significance of the Study

Charles Garman posed an ideal concept of what a teacher should possess in his commitment to others (Ibid.). One of his mentees (Dyan, 1946) described him as follows:

He possessed a passion for intellectual truth, combined with a rare talent for communicating a sense of its importance. He possessed dignity with the grace of humor and the salt of speech. He possessed a conception of philosophy as a spiritual force and a conviction that ultimate reality was spiritual. He was, withal, an adept practitioner with young minds. He could awaken and stir them. He was skillful in promoting the belief that a clear and satisfactory conclusion always waits on persistent thinking, leaving his students not with an airtight conclusion but with a certain conviction that they had acquired a method by which conclusions could always be formed. In this, I think, lay the great secret of his teaching (p. 119).

These words express the highly interpersonal activity of mentoring and the need for mutual understanding of the leadership role as perceived by mentor and inductee in the induction process. Dedication may not be enough for the inductee to have a meaningful induction experience. The literature abounds with data to support the notion that the induction period for beginning teachers can be chaotic (Hawley and Rosenholz, 1984). Further,
lack of support for beginning teachers has them fighting for control rather than facilitating learners. Joyce and Clift (1984) contend that beginning teachers get immersed in the socialization process of learning to teach which encourages teachers to invoke the practicality ethic. Lortie (1985) addressed this issue when he described the "sink or swim" approach imposed on most beginning teachers.

There is clearly a lack of consensus in the literature with regard to the potency and influence of various socializing agents and mechanisms that affect the development of first year teachers. For beginning teachers to transcend or circumvent these socializing agents and mechanisms, it becomes crucial that leadership characteristics of both mentor and inductee received focus and definition. Some examples of these agents and mechanisms are that beginning teachers are not solicited for input into decision making processes such as potentially innovative ideas on discipline or classroom management. Beginning teachers are not expected to question teaching strategies and methodologies that have been in existence for a period of time (Lortie, 1966).

Studies exist which emphasize the socializing role of more experienced colleagues (Eddy, 1969). Because there are alternative views on school and university influence in teacher socialization,
there is a need for research in teacher education to offer closer and more subtle analyses of the impact of university courses, procedures, and symbols of professional perspectives of preservice teachers. The socialization of teachers has not focused on leadership characteristics of mentor teachers or inductees. Most studies in teacher education have focused on the processes of occupational socialization as they exist in schools (e.g., effects of cooperating teachers on student teachers). There has been very little direct analysis of the role that the form and content of teacher education plays in shaping the professional perspectives of students.

To address the issue of how teachers are socialized, linkage needs to be made between the processes of teacher education to ongoing patterns of schooling and to the social, psychological, economic, and political contexts within which both universities and schools exist. It becomes a collaborative effort of both the university and school to try and arrive at some semblance of consensus as to what leadership characteristics are deemed important to mentors, inductees and administrator/teacher leaders in the induction process.
The Hypotheses

The research in this project focused on the interaction process between inductees, mentors, and administrators/teacher leaders in an induction program for beginning teachers. These three members formed the independent variable-group. This study attempted to find if there was significant difference or similarities between members of the group on various subscale categories. The study examined the interaction process between the three members in the group in the induction process to see if the interaction process affects the leadership role of the mentor. The responses from the survey instrument LBDQ-Form XII were analyzed to test three hypotheses which state that relationships exist among variables.

H1: Mentors, inductees, and administrators/teacher leaders hold different perceptions of what leadership characteristics are necessary for the mentor to be effective in the role of mentor.

H2: Mentor teachers' views of mentoring are significantly different than the views held by administrators/teacher leaders.

H3: When administrators/teacher leaders select mentor teachers, there is significant difference between the viewpoints they held about leadership than those held by inductees and designated mentor teachers.
The subscales in the LBDQ-Form XII (developed by Stogdill) were used to see if there were any significant differences between members of the group in how they perceived leadership characteristics of mentor teachers.

Individual characteristics and environmental factors (described in the subscales) appear to be mediating variables between leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction or productivity. House (in Bass, 1981), for example, found that the more autonomous the subordinate, the more Initiating Structure correlated with the outcome measures of satisfaction and performance. Kerr and Jermier (in Howell and Dipboye, 1982) suggest that leader behavior can influence subordinate satisfaction and performance. In specific situations, characteristics of the subordinate, the task and the organization are mediating variables in the relationship.

Ellett and Walberg (in Walberg, 1982) also found a relationship between leader behavior and the environment. Of all the variable relationships studied, the strongest and most frequent were those between teachers' perceptions of characteristics of the school environment and their assessments of the behavior of the principal. In schools where administrators are perceived by teachers as frequently and effectively performing important behaviors in the school environment, teachers' attitudes toward a
A variety of work-related dimensions are positive and often show strong connections with student outcomes (p. 158).

Bass (1981), reviewing the literature, concludes that both relations orientation and task orientation are associated positively with group performance. This alludes to the hypothesis that leader behavior is affected by the process used in selecting mentors.

Methodology

Variables

This was a one-time survey with this specific population. Therefore, descriptive statistics have been used to analyze the data. The study sought to identify what the three participants in the induction process (mentors, inductees, and administrators) deem important in leadership characteristics of the mentor teacher.

Selection of Population

The target population was one-hundred and nine teachers and twenty-one administrators who are in five Franklin County, Ohio school systems. These five schools - Canal Winchester, Dublin, Groveport-Madison, Hamilton Township and New Albany, are involved with the Franklin County Board of Education and The Ohio State University College of Education in a three-phase induction program for beginning teachers.
The population consisted of mentor teachers, inductees and administrators/teacher leaders in schools that range from kindergarten to twelfth grade. These schools were a mix of rural and suburban type districts.

**Instrumentation**

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) Form XII (Stogdill, 1963) was used in this study to collect data on the perceptions of leadership characteristics of mentor teachers as perceived by mentor teachers, inductees, and administrators. This questionnaire was selected because of its extensive history in dealing with leadership styles and characteristics. Also, it was selected because the extensiveness of the twelve subscales would differentiate diverse notions about the perceptions of leadership. Yet the subscales also helped focus on the leadership characteristics since leadership definition can be ambiguous. The major reason for selection of this instrument was based upon its purpose to describe rather than to predict behavior.

A more extensive explanation and interpretation of this instrument can be found in Chapter Three and the Appendices.
Validity

The validity of the LBDQ has been demonstrated through numerous settings and over a long period of time (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). The twelve subscales have emerged through testing, changes, and new testing.

Due to the extensive nature of the concept of leadership, there are extraneous items that may exist which the LBDQ does not address. Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) found in their research that findings from the LBDQ Form XII were in the direction they were intended. As discussed in greater length in Chapter Three, extensive efforts have been made to establish construct and content validity in the LBDQ Form XII.

Reliability

The LBDQ Form XII is an instrument which describes but does not predict behavior. In describing behavior, a common error is to present a "halo effect" or as Gay (1976) describes the "generosity effect." This effect allows for personal feelings to enter an evaluation or description of a person and limits objectivity. Description can also lead to the opposite of generosity to that
of being overly critical. To alleviate this condition, honesty was increased by providing all respondents with sealed envelopes, no names, and only their title - mentor, inductee, or administrator/teacher leader was marked on the instrument. A cover letter was attached to the instrument explaining their anonymity in answering the questions.

**Data Analysis**

The instrument has one-hundred questions. The respondents were asked to describe the behavior of the leader on a five point Likert scale; always, often, occasionally, seldom or never. Separate scores to the twelve subscales are determined by summing the items response to each subscale.

This study dealt with an entire population and not samples. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the mean and standard deviation of the three types of respondents in the population. The data was analyzed to see if there is significant difference in the respondents' views of leadership characteristics of mentor teachers in each of the twelve subscales. The intent was to see if there is commonality or significant difference in these viewpoints which may affect the outcomes of an induction program for beginning teachers.
Collection of the Data

Before the administration of the survey, arrangements were made for the questionnaire to be administered. Each survey was delivered to the participants at their respective schools. The survey was picked up from the participants at their respective school buildings on the third school day after receiving the instrument. Those absent on this day mailed the instruments to the researcher. The respondents selected where they wished to fill out the instrument.

This instrument was delivered in the middle of May, 1986. It had a cover letter, instrument, and an eight and one-half by eleven envelope to seal the results. Each instrument and envelope was numbered to identify a) who has or has not returned the instrument; b) which type of respondent - mentor, inductee, or administrator; and c) to keep the instruments into categories as analysis of the data began.

Since the school districts have been involved in this year long project, special arrangements were not necessary to explain the instrument or gain entry into the schools.
Basic Assumptions of the Study

1. The instrument being utilized in this study was reliable, valid, and with such flexibility that it was adequate for the purposes of this study.

2. The year of involvement in this project by all of the participants rendered substantive data about the perceptions of leadership characteristics from the three groups in the population.

Limitations of the Study

A larger number of responses from participants may have given greater clarity to the perceptions of leadership characteristics from this group. Since this was a one time study, it was crucial that most participants returned the survey. It is not certain that generalizations made from this project and population can be made to projects in school districts that are not similar. The study did not address the variance that occurred between members of the group or the possible causation of this variance. It was assumed that the directions in the cover letter (see Appendix B) superceded the directions on the original LBDQ directions.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to improve the clarity and consistency of the terms used in this study.
Leader behavior is measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and is therefore defined by the LBDQ. It is a description of what inductees, mentors, and administrators/teacher leaders perceive as characteristic of effective leadership characteristics of mentor teachers.

Inductee is a beginning teacher that has been away from teaching for more than one year; a teacher that is new to the profession; and a teacher that is switching subject areas, buildings, districts, or grade levels.

Mentor teacher is a teacher that has exhibited leadership characteristics in the classroom over a period of time.

Administrators are school superintendents and building principals.

Teacher leaders are building representatives and teacher organization officers selected by the superintendents to participate in the selection of mentor teachers.

Induction program is provided to have mentor teachers assist inductees in making the transition to the new teacher role with as few adjustment problems as possible.

The Choosing of Mentors as Leaders

Beginning public school teachers have little opportunity for mentoring. Compton (1979) surveyed a large group of first year teachers about their orientation programs. Most of these teachers
replied that their principals expected them to be a finished product. In the words of one respondent:

I needed help in disciplining students. A new teacher in the school system is expected to rely totally on his/her own resources. It is strictly a sink or swim situation. Life is tough in this school and that attitude is extended toward teaching. Everyone is too busy to give an encouraging word. As one administrator told me, "You asked for this job - we didn't ask you." (p. 24).

This conceptualization of leadership by the administrator permeates the literature. According to Compton,

the principal should assign a compatible colleague to the beginner. This associate should receive modest remuneration and/or be freed an extra period each day to work with the beginner. He/she should be a proven veteran who has a similar teaching assignment and a common planning period. The initial contact should take place well before the planned orientation program (p. 26).

Most schools do not employ a procedure such as suggested by Compton. Salient leadership characteristics of mentors have not been clearly defined. Fagan and Walter (1982) concluded "we are not aware of any formal mentoring program for public school teachers similar to those in industry and programs for police officers" (p. 114). Since then, programs have emerged in some states (e.g., California, Ohio, et. al.). Even where such programs have emerged, clearly defined leadership characteristics have not been studied and clearly defined.
Leadership, or mentoring itself, cannot be forced or contrived. Professional development will occur when mentor, inductee, and administrators/teacher leaders have a clear perception of what leadership is really to be. A harmonious relationship occurs when a teachable attitude is displayed and there is an eagerness to learn. Michael (1973) suggests there is a moral imperative for leaders to teach their followers how to be competent long-range social planners. These social planners will assist organizations of the future to achieve future-responsive societal learning. According to Cunningham and Pazzant (1983) "leaders will live with a tripartite ethical and moral obligation - to themselves, to their organizations, and to the society - to further societal learning. Michael's thinking has special significance for leaders of the educational community" (p. 19). Once leadership characteristics have been identified by all members of the group (and agreed upon), advancements in the mentoring process for teachers will be made.

The era of the 1980's (and beyond) demands accountability by educational leaders. With the graying of the profession, population increases and relocating, the demand for new teachers will exacerbate the accountability issue if new teachers are not mentored and quickly develop their own leadership styles. There appears to be a need to give greater definition to more exact leadership characteristics, to develop a more proficient mode of
communicating between the mentor teacher and inductee; models need to be developed to appraise and evaluate educational leadership qualities; and new techniques need development to explore and expand the mentoring leadership process for greater adaptation to the milieu surrounding the mentor and inductee in the induction process.

In reference to Michael's moral imperative that leaders teach their followers how to be competent in future endeavors, several skills need to be developed for applicability in the mentoring/induction process. If mentor teachers, administrators/teacher leaders and inductees are to perceive mentors as leaders, several processes need to occur.

1. **Both mentor and inductee must learn to live with and acknowledge uncertainty.** There exists an attitude among teacher educators and teachers of conformist values (Fuller and Bown, 1975). It has been found that teachers rely heavily on strategies of previous role models (Pruitt, et.al., 1978). Often, this is found
in the student teaching experience. The controlled atmosphere of the student teaching experience often lends itself to such strategy. Once the inductee enters the induction process, the multiple variables involved in the classroom are now in the control of the teacher. If an induction program has not been followed by the inductee; if the inductee is unclear on his/her own leadership characteristics and style(s); if a model has not been exemplified by a mentor on how to function in various classroom climates and situations, the inductee may not acknowledge uncertainty as part of professional growth.

There is an apparent need for mentor teachers to recognize generic leadership styles and characteristics for individual efficacy and transference to the inductee. Through the induction process, the inductee learns to conceptualize leadership qualities that will possibly diminish skepticism and uncertain situations to be of less uncertainty.

2. To enhance leadership potential, the induction process must recognize the possibility of multiple errors. Much of teaching will be through trial and error. An induction process may alleviate or circumvent many of these errors through the understanding of leadership by all members of the induction process. A margin of error must be assumed by the teacher. There are many extraneous variables that
will interplay with classroom management, control, and climate. Copeland (1980) conducted a study of ecological factors in the classroom. He concluded that factors such as class size had an effect on the teachers' attitudes and behaviors. Through the induction process, mentoring can assist in recognizing these variables and assist in orchestrating handling these variables. The induction process may help the inductee come to the realization that errors in judgment in handling these concerns is all part of professional growth.

Lortie (1975) was impressed by the lack of specific attention to the aforementioned concerns in the teacher education curriculum:

Social workers, clinical psychologists, and psychotherapists are routinely educated to consider their own personalities and to take them into account in their work with people. Their stance is supposed to be analytic and open; one concedes and works with one's own limitations — it is hoped — in a context of self-acceptance. The tone of teacher interviews and their rhetoric reveals no such orientation; I would characterize it as moralistic rather than analytic and self-accusing rather than self-accepting. It does not appear that their work culture has come to grips with the inevitabilities of interpersonal clash and consideration of how one copes with them (p. 159).

Through recognized characteristics of salient leadership abilities by both mentor and inductee, recognizing that error will be made, and recognizing Lortie's concerns, teachers will not have
to go through the induction process as individuals but as members of cohort groups. Lortie is emphatic about the notion of sharing this important socializing factor, e.g., the induction process. He states that:

```
the function performed by shared ordeal in academia -- assisting occupational identity formation, encouraging collegial patterns of behavior, fostering generational trust, and enhancing self-esteem -- are slighted in classroom teaching. Although all students share in one sense, the ordeal of student teaching and the typically frightening first year of induction, they do so independently as opposed to collectively; as a consequence, these experiences do not induce "a sense of solidarity with colleagues" or "augment the 'reassurance capital' of classroom teachers" (Lortie, 1975, pp. 161-162).
```

The reassurance capital is recognizing that error will take place, is unavoidable, and part of the socialization process of teaching. Effective leadership will assist in recognizing these factors.

3. **Leadership development must be both retrospective and prospective;** long term professional growth will only be understood through past experiences and present anticipation.

Beginning teachers are concerned with survival. Kounin (1970) found that successful classroom managers kept their students actively involved in productive classroom work, thus minimizing the amount of trouble that they had to deal with. Through leadership training in the induction process, mentor teachers can
demonstrate leadership characteristics that will assist the beginning teacher in short-term survival that will possibly lead to long-term professional growth.

Evertson and Emmer (1982) and Emmer, Evertson and Anderson (1980) found that successful classroom managers planned classroom rules; made clear the consequences and rewards; carefully monitored the student work; held students accountable; and provided time for explanation, rehearsals, and feedback. These notions illustrate the need for greater collaboration between the mentor and inductee in the induction process in relation to leadership styles and characteristics. The implementation of these styles may require flexibility and organization on behalf of both participants in maximizing leadership in the professional growth process.

4. **Receptivity to change must be maximized.** Naisbit (1982) suggests that change is rampant in our primary institutions such as home, school, church, and other leading institutions. Pre-service educational programs that neglect to address this change factor in the schooling process may lend themselves to malfeasance and neglect in the training/educating of preservice teachers. The complexities of the school community are immense and ever changing. Without effective leadership during an induction program, beginning teachers may experience much frustration in being able to recognize
and adapt to these immense changes. This becomes a challenge to
the mentor teacher to recognize these changes; to identify salient
characteristics of these changes; to focus these changes in a
meaningful contextual framework; to recommend potential solutions
in handling these changes; and to promulgate the notion to the
inductee that changes are necessary, expected, and a part of the
professional experience. The notion of threat of these changes
must be minimized or negated by the beginning teacher. The mentoring
process during the induction phase of the inductee's professional
experience can provide necessary leadership in dealing with these
changes.

If beginning teachers are to do more than survive in the
highly complex milieu of public education, attitudes towards leader-
ship are of vast importance. Mentors must clearly understand what
leadership as mentor really means. Inductees must conceptualize
what leadership by mentors is supposed to be.

A mentoring program cannot present "functional" leadership without
leaders that clearly understand their roles and understand the
purposes of leadership. The cruciality of the need for effective
leadership cannot be merely assumed to emerge. Simply drifting
into leadership positions and casually assuming that leadership is defined and understood can be catastrophic in a teacher's professional growth cycle. Leadership development programs must be carefully designed, implemented and evaluated by school districts. Such is the case for more research to be done on leadership possibilities in the induction process of beginning teachers. A mentoring program may give definition and focus to leadership capabilities in the induction process.

These same leadership capabilities (skills) will require goals and objectives that are established to be accomplished. The perceptions of leadership held by members of the induction process are important for the success of leadership development in the induction process.

The vast array of intervening variables in this induction process (as it relates to leadership characteristics and possibilities) creates a very demanding task. Changes of direction will be expected to occur as circumstances and personalities may dictate. The literature suggests that this compatibility needs to become more precise. Clearly, the potential of leadership defined and understood may certainly lead to eradication of the "sink or swim" phenomena.
Bounding the Study

Guba and Lincoln (1981) speak both to the necessity and to the difficulty of determining the boundaries of a study. In this study, the broad area of leadership is involved. An assortment of aforementioned writers point out the vast array of personal and professional interactions that transpire affecting how and what leadership means to mentor and inductee. For example, there are conceivably as many definitions of leadership as there are perceivers. This perception is of extreme importance if mentors are to be effective in assisting inductees in having a successful experience during the initial stages of the professional teaching experience.

The main focus of the study is to ascertain what conceptual framework exists (if any) as to how leadership in the induction process is viewed by mentor, inductee, and administrator/teacher leader. It is being investigated to see if there is a commonality between mentor and inductee in this conceptual framework. What role the administrator/teacher leader plays in this process will be explored. If there appears to be commonality, how might it impact the induction process?
Research Questions

This study sought to answer these specific questions:

1) Do mentor teachers, inductees, and administrator/teacher leaders hold the same perceptions of what characteristics a mentor teacher should possess to be effective in that role?

2) What are the significant leadership behaviors as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire that the three sets of participants in the group view in similarities or differences?

3) When administrators/teacher leaders control the selection process of mentor teachers, is there significant difference in the viewpoints of this segment of the population with the viewpoints about leadership as held by inductees and designated mentor teachers?

In Chapter Two of this study, a comprehensive review of the literature was made on leadership, the beginning teacher, the mentor teacher and the administrator/teacher leader as related to the induction process.
CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. The Characteristics of a Leader

Some teachers are designated mentors by administrators and teacher leaders. This research pertained to the characteristics that mentor teachers were perceived to possess by these selectors. Several questions arose that directed this research. Who is the person(s) selecting these mentors? What characteristics did this chosen mentor possess that demonstrated leadership abilities? Does the designation as leader signify that this person had the necessary abilities to lead? What is unique about certain individuals that can get others to respond to their leadership role?

Leadership is one of the most studied and least understood of topics in the business world and the social sciences. There are hundreds of definitions (Stogdill and Coons, 1957) of leadership. A generic definition of a leader is one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).

The ability to perform these three tasks to be at the very central theme of the induction process of beginning teachers. The
beginning teacher is being enticed into action, e.g., classroom control; establishes classroom climate that is conducive to learning; motivates students to have a quest for knowledge; disseminates knowledge and purveys information; facilitates learning activities; and dedicates one's self to enhancing the profession.

According to Bennis and Nanus, a leader is one who reveals successes to the novice teacher. The leader exposes the learner to ideas that have worked in the past and attempts to extrapolate energies from the novice to implement established teaching practices and new concepts into a successful pattern of leadership for the inductee. To enhance leadership, followers must learn to become leaders.

Bennis and Nanus suggested that leaders become agents of change. Leaders are not just managers in this conceptual framework. They must be imaginative and creative. They must be persons of vision. They must be persons with a developed sense of mission. These notions are most applicable to the mentor's leadership role. In acting as an agent of change, the leader (mentor) must take the follower (inductee) to a new plateau. One can lead only where others will follow. One will follow until one denies followership either by becoming a leader, becoming professional stagnated, and possibly leave the profession.
Bennis writes:

"Often the enormity of present-day challengers and the pace of change seem unaccompanied by great notions and the great people to implement them. This void, like so many darknesses, may anger new leaders. And certainly in this moratorium new concepts of leadership have incubated. With the emergence of great men and women we can anticipate exciting new visions of power.

The need was never so great. A chronic crisis of governance - that is, the pervasive incapacity of organizations to cope with the expectation of their constituents - is now an overwhelming factor worldwide. If there was ever a moment in history when a comprehensive strategic view of leadership was needed, not just by leaders in high office but by large members of leaders in every job ... this is certainly it.

The concept of mentor is certainly not a novel issue. However, there appears to be a need for assisting new teachers to survive and to become leaders as well. Various trait theories emerge in the literature about leadership characteristics. If the leaders are endowed with superior qualities that differentiate from
their followers, it should be possible to identify these leadership characteristics. This assumption initiated and promulgated the trait theories of leadership (L.L. Bernard 1926, Bingham 1927, Lead 1929, Kilbourne 1935, Bird 1940, Smith and Kruger 1933, and W.O. Jenkins 1947).

The literature alludes to the importance of how the leader (in this study - the mentor) perceives the role of mentor and how the inductee views the role of the mentor. Moment and Zalenik (1963) perceived the personality of the leader being highly related to the kind of role the leader plays in a group. The personality of the mentor, as perceived by mentor, inductee and administrator/teacher leader, becomes a crucial factor in the type of leadership that is to be offered and, possibly, to be followed. To aid in the success of the induction process, it becomes noticeably apparent that matching personality types (mentor-inductee) is crucial to the success of the program. This is not to say that leadership characteristics will emerge from the mentor only if personality types are matched. This literature is suggesting that a correlation may exist between personality types and leadership effectiveness.

A theme in the literature (Hollander, 1964) is that perceived ability by leader and follower will influence emergence as a leader. This position counterpoints the personality match theory.
The notion is that the perceptions of the role of leader by mentor, inductee, and administrator/teacher leader are important if the induction process is to accomplish its goals and objectives. This process can be readily interpreted as credibility. Credibility appears difficult to achieve when the mentor is unclear of his/her leadership capabilities. It is equally unclear when the inductee is not sure of the leadership capabilities of the mentor. Certainly, this credibility is not achieved when there is unclear role clarity or when leadership on the part of the mentor is of an arbitrary and/or capricious nature. The leader/follower transaction must be harmonious. It seems natural that the mentor enjoys the role of immediate responsibility for leadership.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest that deep feelings of insecurity are the norm (p. 12). Often, leadership abilities are not revealed because of these deep feelings of insecurity that people often possess. Perceived ability by leader and follower becomes crucial to the success of an induction process. Succinctly, followers often are moved only by examples.

Cattell (1951) suggests that leadership represents a dynamic interaction between the goals of the leader and the goals and needs
of the follower. This mind-set will dictate the interfacing that transpires between the mentor, inductee and administrator/teacher leader. It will contribute to the selection of group and individual goals and assist in the achievement of these goals.

The perceived abilities of the mentor by the mentor, inductee, and administrator/teacher leader will undoubtedly impact the overall goals and objectives of both participants. A trust base is being established between the two participants. Cunningham and Pazzant (1983) define trust as an assured reliance on another’s integrity, veracity, or justice (p. 25). Taking this notion at face value, it appears logical that the perceived abilities of the mentor becomes a cornerstone for any visionary changes that may occur in the induction process for beginning teachers. Definitely, the literature is inconclusive on the finality of this notion.

Mentor behaviors are extremely important in the development of the trust base during the tutoring phase of mentor-protege process. Phillips (1977) suggested that these primary mentors took much more personal interest in the inductee (protege) and power was shared in equally. This personal touch by the mentor created a bond between the two participants and goals and objectives appeared more attainable by the participants. This benign interest in the protege made for more successful leadership.
Personal interest applies to a theory of leadership. Leadership theory should focus on the individual and, equally important, on the interaction between situation and individual. Barnard (1938) suggested the conditions in which organizational management are demanded determine to some extent the leadership qualities needed. Leadership theories contain elements about people as well as elements about situations. The inductee may be impacted by the milieu of educational setting, e.g., ordering of textbooks and supplies, filling out reports, making lesson plans and a plethora of other daily activities.

It becomes crucial to the mentor and the inductee as to what contextual framework the induction process will derive. For example, role clarification of mentor as leader must be defined and delineated. It may become an exercise in futility if the induction program does not clarify the purpose(s) of the mentor in the process. The role of the mentor is related to the goals and objectives of the induction program. Assigning a title as mentor does not necessarily guarantee leadership. Also, these leadership qualities may not harmoniously fit the design of the induction program.

Gerth and Mills (1953) hinted to this need for harmonious relationship when they discussed leadership in a broader conceptual
framework. It was their notion that leadership is a relation between the leader and follower in which the leader influences more than he/she is influenced. Specifically, because of the leader, those who are led will act or feel differently than they otherwise would. If this becomes the case, the notion presented earlier that conditions in which organizational management are demanded do, in fact, determine to some extent the leadership qualities needed. This supports the notion that inductees must see themselves as an integral part of the process. Also, they may wish to have a sense of direction provided for them by mentors.

Stogdill (1959) suggested that an individual's role is defined by mutually confirmed expectations. This would connect induction process dynamics with personality dynamics of the mentor and inductee. The leadership potential of any given member, e.g., inductee or mentor, is defined by the extent to which the leader initiates and maintains structure in interaction and expectations. This becomes of particular significance to the inductee's role.

Stogdill (1974) suggests that the influence concept should recognize the fact that individuals differ in the extent to which their behaviors affect activities of a group ... it merely states that leadership exercises a determining effect on the behaviors of group members and on activities of the group (p. 10). The
compliance induction theorists regard leadership as an undirectional exertion of influence and as an instrument for molding the group to the leader's will. How the view of leadership is shaped by the mentor, inductee, and administrator will affect the induction process as it recognizes (or fails to recognize) the rights, desires, and necessities of all participants in the induction process. Morse and Reiner (1956) found that when employees are integrated into decision making and authority is shared that satisfaction (job) was increased along with productivity. Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest that when people have a stake in an idea there is greater proclivity to see it through to its final developmental stage.

Leadership is not always a top-down arrangement. Mintzberg (1980), Scott (1981), Mintzberg (1984), and Miles (1980) all allude to this theory. The rigid, mechanistic organizational behaviors demonstrated and distributed throughout the past century have been challenged and proved ineffective in orchestrating behavioral change. Burns and Stalker (1961) discussed this mode of operation at length.
A group process requires dialogue among all participants. Each participant should feel free to have input into the process. It is a process of mutual trust and cooperation. This loose structuring allows a communication flow which will be directed toward peers and superiors. This becomes a system of flows of communication. Each participant's environment has an element of structuring, but the individual's autonomy is protected. Mistakes can be made; corrections can be made by mentors; and a no-lose situation has developed where professional growth can transpire. This type of an arrangement requires mutual cooperation by the members of the group with much flexibility from all participants.

The model of a power-down relationship does not appear to be an effective means of leadership in the induction process. In fact, the beginning teacher may be threatened by such a situational arrangement. Power is to be negated in this type of leadership paradigm. It becomes a relationship of sharing and a model of behavior by the mentor for the inductee. Power is not needed to effect change in the behavior of the inductee. The leader (mentor)
was chosen for the position because of expertise in mastering certain skills. The leader's behavior and assistance to the inductee have replaced the notion of power.

Fiddler and Chemers (1974) suggest that different types of situations call for different types of behavior, and that a highly structured leadership type of behavior will not always be effective. Failing to take into consideration the views of the inductee may undermine the whole induction process. There appears to be an implicit notion in education that leadership is of great importance to success in the profession. Failure to acknowledge this notion in the mentoring process may have negative ramifications for beginning teachers.

However, a dichotomous relationship emerges on this issue of power. Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest that power must be perceived for what it really is. They suggest that, basically, it's the reciprocal of relationship (p. 17). The dichotomy emerges when leaders are also expected to build and enhance the self-esteem of the followers. The art of leadership appears to be the abilities of the mentor to find ways of building confidence and self-esteem. The position of the model (mentor) must be viewed with respect, but the self-esteem of the inductee must be enhanced simultaneously. Power viewed in the wrong context may threaten the self-esteem of the inductee.
Concluding Remarks on Leadership

Leaders must maintain high levels of visionary principles, laced with arteries and veins of courage and idealism. Charisma may not be enough to sustain effective leadership capacities. Power may not be enough to enhance leadership capabilities. Wisdom may not be enough to answer the plethora of questions that arise in a leadership role. High levels of energies may not lead to effective leadership. Sagacity will not always conquer doubt. Past professional gains and successes may not be enough to temper the minds of the inductee into mirroring such successes. Failure may not be locked into time capsules. Titles, goals and objectives may not be substituted for humaneness. Physical appearance and personality may not displace compassion and understanding. Intuition may not completely replace trial and error. Demands may not displace inspiration. Inspiration may not exude without perspiration.

Leadership is laced with multiple variables. Its complexities are profoundly diverse and immense. Its possibilities are immense. The recognition of the concept of leadership creates a proper contextual framework in which to approach the issue of leadership in the induction process. Failing to recognize its potentials and
failures would mean that the induction process for beginning teachers is an exercise in futility. Howey, Matthes, and Zimpher (1985) emphasize the need to provide support for professional development in the transition from inservice to preservice and the need to research this process. Special attention will be given to the role of mentor in the induction process in Part Two.

Part II. Mentor as Leader: A Perceptual Framework

For teacher education to improve the quality of teaching, a mentoring program for beginning teachers is crucial to this process. New teachers need to be exposed to selfless role models during pre-service experiences and initiatory experiences in the profession. Dillon-Peterson (1982) pursues this issue further when she suggests that the inductee must be treated as respected colleagues. She suggests that the beginning teacher in the induction process should be viewed as a junior partner in the teaching/learning process.

Newberry (1977) suggests that once teachers are included in an induction process, it becomes important that mentors are placed in close proximity with the inductees. Teachers which are located in different places in the building (or in different buildings) may have very few opportunities to see each other. Things may arise during the course of a day which necessitate immediate attention or input from the mentor teacher. Poor geographic location may interfere with positive forms of mentoring.
The teachers in this study (21 elementary teachers) generally acquired information about the practices and beliefs of experienced teachers mostly in an indirect fashion (p. 37). This data appears as a central theme throughout the literature on mentoring. Brieschke (1981) suggests that peer influence as a key process in teacher socialization has little support in the literature. She lends support to the notion that proximity of the mentor teacher and the beginning teacher is crucial for professional development of the beginning teacher. Her research reveals that accessibility of peers for interaction is quite limited. A strong suggestion emerges from her research that emotional support is not enough in peer influence. Time and proximity become two crucial elements for inductionary success. Grant and Zeichner (1981) suggest that there is evidence that systematic efforts to help beginning teachers to adjust to the site-specific attributes of other initial settings of practice have been minimal.

Collectively, it becomes important for the mentor teacher to understand that a) the beginning teacher should be recognized as having personal and professional value and merit; b) that it is important for the mentor teacher to be situated near the classroom of the beginning teacher; and c) the mentor teacher should
acknowledge that the beginning teacher will need input on ideas and problems that he/she may have occur.

Gehrke (1982) lends support to the mentoring phase of the induction process. It is Gehrke's notion that it definitely makes sense to develop systematic procedures to help beginning teachers. It is important for beginning teachers to realize that they are not alone in their professional frustrations and anxieties. She suggests the mentor teacher is needed to provide the beginning teacher with some insights from experiences of the mentor teacher. These role-balancing decisions can only come from experiential learning on the part of the mentor teacher.

Blue (1980) feels that the induction program has merit for the development of the beginning teacher. However, he is quick to suggest that any such program must have ideological and logistical support by school administrators. He states:

A careful placement arranged and supervised by strong school administrators who make available opportunities for modeling by master teachers recognized by the profession and assistance by schools, colleges, and departments of education is required to make the induction experience a valuable and successful one for the beginning teacher (p. 40).

Without support from top to bottom in the school decision making positions, an induction program stands minimal chance for surviving.
For the mentor teacher, it becomes necessary for him/her to understand the political implications of Blue's notion on administrative support. The exhausting schedules of most teachers does not allow the necessary time nor energy to be an effective mentor. Free time must be made available to the mentor teacher to maximize the effectiveness of the mentoring role.

Throughout the literature a central theme appears to exist that all teachers become models for beginning teachers. Denemark and Nutter (1980) state that beyond the demands of knowledge and skill is the ultimate expectation that teachers become models or mentors for those they instruct (p. 33). This idea may very well fashion the mind-set of the mentor teacher. Mentor teachers may seek to exemplify in their behavior the qualities they seek to engender in others. Denemark and Nutter feel this expectation is nowhere more legitimate than in the process of teacher preparation and extended to the confines of an induction program.
The immensity of teaching begins in the preservice program for teachers. Howey (1977) suggests that training, both pre- and in-service, cannot continue to be treated as an enterprise fundamentally divorced from schooling itself (p. 28). Howey suggests that more effort needs to be given to the conceptualization of teacher roles. Within this conceptualization would be training plans and projections which would be needed in the initiatory stages of these changes. A program such as the induction program would help define and expand the roles of all the school personnel.

Taking the notion of Howey to another level of thinking is research on a five-year plan for teacher preparation. Dunbar (1981) proposes a fifth year for beginning teachers. The plan has ambiguities concerning the role of the mentor teacher. However, the plan is to reduce the problems of the beginning teacher through ideas similar to the induction program being discussed in this data.

The plan, suggested by Dunbar, is to initiate an induction program that results in less dropping out of excellent teachers because of overwhelming pressures and frustrations that often
confront the first-year teacher. The formative year also reduces subversion of strong teaching standards and ideas that may come from envious peers. This idea contradicts the role of the mentor teacher as being one of value to the beginning teacher. However, the basic premise of this program is the same as the induction program that has been described. That is, the sink-or-swim approach to first year teaching that is found in most teacher preparation programs can be avoided.

Taking Howey's and Dunbar's notions further is a program of design suggested by Nelli (1980). Nelli suggests that all who claim to have priority in this conceptualization of teacher preparation must come to some form of agreement as to what the induction process should look like. This is a reoccurring theme in the literature. It is not germane to any particular domain: teachers; legislators; school boards; state boards of education; administrators, nor college faculty. However, it is contiguous to each of these domains.

Without this joint effort for improving the plight of the first-year teacher, Zeicher and Tabachnick (1981) suggest that beginning teachers will continue to be high risks or potential washouts in the profession.
Armstrong (1983) suggests that professionals with interest in teacher preparation have long agonized over the loss of human capital (beginning teachers) represented by what was thought to be a decision of seemingly well-prepared first or second year teachers to leave the profession for a new career. Preparatory programs by teacher producing institutions have come under close scrutiny through self-analysis of their programs. The suggestion is that such programs should be evaluated and measured according to the relative propensity of their graduates to stay in the profession upon completion of the program and actually assuming positions in the field.

Armstrong suggests that experienced teachers have developed styles and techniques for handling the multiple roles a teacher must play. However, beginning teachers may need some help in this area. Zimpher, deVoss and Nott (1980) conducted ethnographic studies at The Ohio State University on student teaching. Even before the first year experience, students possess strengths and weaknesses that did not reflect on previous course work. This type of data substantiates the need for some type of induction program for beginning teachers with mentor teachers being an integral part of the process. Howey, Matthes and Zimpher (1985) express the need (concern) for reconceptualizing the very nature
of the professional development of teachers. In this emerging data, reconceptualization seems to be the central theme for an induction program.

A need for collaborative programs was made by Burden (1982), when he discussed professional development as a stressor. The thesis presented by Burden is that such a program must be on-going from university preparation well into the career. The theory is based on the notion that because of changing developmental characteristics, teachers may have various points in their careers where stress may impact on their teaching. An implication is that this may impact upon mentor teachers as well. A growing body of research indicates that teachers have different job skills, attitudes, and various professional and personal concerns in their careers. This research has been conducted by Fuller (1969); Fuller and Bown (1975); Newman (1978); Peterson (1978); and others.

Edwards (1984) addressed the issue of, both, mentor and beginning teacher concerns. Concerns such as time and finding the time necessary to make an induction program work. Induction programs require meetings, workshops, observations, filling out reports, keeping journals and meetings between the mentor and beginning teacher. A significant finding by Edwards was the issue of commitment by veteran (mentor) teachers. A central theme in the study was that not all veteran teachers were generally committed to the
success of the beginning teacher. This is a significant variable for the potential success of a mentoring program. Certainly, more research is needed on this topic before new mentoring programs can be implemented.

Concluding Remarks on Mentors as Leaders

The database on the role of the mentor as an integral part of a teacher induction program needs more research. Issues of mentor selection; free-time allocation; reimbursement; mentoring strategies and techniques; classroom proximity with the beginning teacher; personality compatibility; and many other facets of mentoring need research and experimentation. Joyce and others (1981), deal with some of these issues and concerns.

There appears to be little disagreement in the literature on the important role of the mentor in the success of an induction process. Greater exploration of this phenomenon, mentor teacher, must be given. In Part III, there will be discussion on the ever-increasing database on the inductee's perceptions of leadership.
Part III: The Beginning Teacher in the Induction Process

The wiser men are, the more humbly will they submit to learn from others; they do not disdain the simplicity of those who teach them ... many things are known to the simple and unlearned which escape the notice of the wise ... Let no one therefore, look down upon the lowly, who have knowledge of many secret things which God has not shown to those renowned for wisdom.

- Peter Peregrinus of Maricourt in Picardy, England

Who Am I Phase of Induction

Often, the inherent qualities that the beginning teacher brings to the profession may not be obvious. They, too, may create new ideas that may help students to learn and to make learning fun.
Wells (1984) accentuates, that more often than not, a reverse treatment is given the beginning teacher. She suggests that the beginning teacher is expected to conform to values and practices of the existing milieu in the school system. The easiest way for a beginning teacher to be accepted by the experienced faculty is to conform to existing rules and regulations already established in the school environment. Not to do so, may lead to ostracism from the experienced faculty. Wells suggests that a key variable in acceptance for the beginning teacher is to not only adjust to existing norms and values, but the beginning teacher is wise to adapt the traditional teaching methods and values if they are going to be accepted by their peers. An induction program may be an alternative method for altering this mind set.

Tischer (1979) feels strongly that an induction program may reveal more data for understanding this socialization process for beginning teachers. He feels it important to discover the various factors involved and their inner-connectivity that may affect whether new teachers internalize existing values (as the Wells' research indicated) or whether beginning teachers attempt to redefine the situations.

Tischer recognizes that the nature of the educational setting, contacts with peers, and the types of induction experiences are
among the most influential features affecting the beginning teacher. However, Fischer feels that the mixes of characteristics are the most powerful in enhancing professional development and that educational teaching skills and methodologies are not quite fully understood.

Succinctly, the beginning teacher's initial agenda of concerns, among others, does include clarifying the limits of his/her authority and responsibility, and deciphering the meanings of standards and regulations for others.

The beginning teacher may encounter more constraints than creative opportunities. However, Lortie (1966) suggested in his research that it is most unequivocal that a number of theoretical explanations place a greater emphasis on the constraining, rather than the creative features in the socialization process. Some emphasize the formative role of early experiences, such as protracted exposure to models (e.g., own previous teachers) which often results in the internalizing of types of behavior which recur in later teaching.

One of the themes emerging in the literature on the beginning teacher is his/her inability to know what is expected from the school principal and/or central office. The database needs additional development in addressing this issue. The literature
does often suggest that beginning teachers have little opportunity for learning the tricks of the professional trade. Compton (1979) surveyed a number of teachers on what they perceived their principals expected from them. Most of those surveyed teachers replied that their principals expected them to be a finished product (p. 25). Accepting this notion as being of certain validity, an induction program may remove some of these obstacles that interfere with the everyday activities of the beginning teacher.

Burden (1980) characterized first year teachers as possessing specific characteristics. These same characteristics tend to become a central theme in the literature. They are:

1) First year teachers have limited knowledge of teaching activities.
2) They have limited knowledge of resources available.
3) They conform to an image held of teachers.
4) They have limited professional insight and perception.
5) They take a subject-centered approach to curriculum and instruction.
6) They have feelings of uncertainty, confusion, and insecurity.
7) They are unwilling to try new teaching methods (p. 20).
Considering the above implications for teaching and professional enhancement, the induction program takes on additional importance. Watts (1980) suggests that the immediate and most obvious need of the beginning teacher is for reassurance and practical advice. Both of these should be of equal measure. Tischer (1980) suggests that inservice education programs need to be designed for experienced teachers involved in an induction program.

Glickman (1981) reveals from his studies that beginning teachers in the survival stage need assistance in many technical skills of teaching and a directive supervisory approach would be most useful. Teachers in the adjustment stage would probably benefit more from a collaborative supervisory approach where the mentor teacher and beginning teacher share responsibility in meeting the beginning teacher's needs. A non-directive approach would be utilized in the last professional stage of development. This type of data may lend credibility to an induction program for assisting beginning teachers.

Ellis (1982) has a parallel study of Glickman's (1981) and Burden's (1980) studies. He suggests that the beginning teacher has seven professional roles. Four of these professional roles are major problem areas for beginning teachers.
1) The teacher as planner.
2) The teacher as a director of learning.
3) The teacher as a mediator and interpreter of the cultures.
4) The teacher as a link with the community.

The remaining roles are:
5) The teacher as counselor and guide to the student.
6) The teacher as a member of the teaching profession.
7) The teacher as a member of the school community (p. 8).

Ellis drew the preceding categories from studies done with a population of five hundred thirty eight teachers. An emerging theme in the literature supports some of these categorical conclusions, especially the problem areas.

A persistent notion in the literature is the need for differential supervision and staff development activities for preservice and beginning teachers. Ellis's research suggests that specific courses, workshops, and instructional materials should be developed to promote beginning teacher competencies and skills. Induction programs for beginning teachers will address many of these.

Fagan and Walter (1982) discovered from their research that beginning teachers in the United States need help, now. We have
seen too many examples of the "sink or swim" attitude among administrators and senior teachers (p. 115). Burden's (1982) findings are that many first year teachers are concerned about surviving each day and completing the school year. These findings are in line with the first year survival focus discussed by Fuller (1969); Fuller, Parsons and Watkins (1973); Katz (1972); and Lortie (1966).

Feiman-Nemser (1984) studies suggest that various labels have been attached to induction phases or transition phases. These labels have been used to signal the fact that the first year of teaching has a unique character of its own, that it is different from what has gone on before and will, undoubtedly, influence what is to come in the future. Feiman-Nemser views the induction period as being most crucial to the survival of the beginning teacher. What happens during the first year of teaching may determine whether a teacher remains in teaching and what type of teacher they may become.

A major concern for Feiman-Nemser's research is the data does not have any longitudinal data to test these assumptions about the relationship between the induction period and the teacher's long term development.

Roth (1983) conducted a study on teacher attitudes and opinions on several issues. Forty-one percent of those responding
would not (twenty-nine percent certainly would not, and twelve percent would not) become teachers if they could start over again. Only thirty-nine percent felt that way in a 1979 N.E.A. poll and 10.7% in 1981. These growing statistics appear to parallel the problems that so many beginning teachers encounter in the initial stages of teaching. A hypothesis may be created stating that induction programs may reduce these mounting professionally negative statistics. A set of programs may need development to clearly define leadership skills in the induction process and programs to initiate them.

Weiler (1979) proposed that a new section be added to Teacher Corps legislation to provide funds for support for beginning teachers. The funds created would allow for released time for consultation, work with experienced teachers in the teacher center and observation in classrooms managed by successful teachers. The literature does not suggest that these noble notions are being implemented to any major extent in the public school system in the United States. The intent and practicality are in order, but the existing funds for such implementation of induction programs are still quite low and, for the most part, non-existent. A logical assumption is that until these types of programs emerge, little hope can be given to solving the sink or swim phenomena of beginning teachers.
Berry (1977) suggests support for the beginning teacher is certainly needed to overcome the many problems facing beginning teachers. She strongly states that beginning teachers especially must be frequently supervised, encouraged, directed and corrected. To do otherwise is a violation of justice (p. 5).

Berry feels it to be of extreme importance for the beginning teacher to have time to sit down and work one-on-one with the mentor. Berry's research indicates that genuine interest by the mentor has a more profound impact on the inductee.

Leadership has proven to be a most integral part of an induction program through research by the National Institute of Education. Their research signifies that the conditions under which a person carries out their first year of teaching will greatly impact the level of effectiveness which a teacher may achieve. Also, this effectiveness may be impacted longitudinally in one's career. The ultimate consequence would be the impact the leadership, or lack of, would have on a teacher's decision to stay in the profession or to leave.

Olson and Moore's (1984) research indicates that new teachers should be assigned a buddy faculty member within their department. It is important the pair have preparation planning periods simultaneously. They also wanted time to observe the mentor teacher
in the classroom. Both mentor and beginning teachers wanted time to brainstorm ideas in how to handle situations in the classroom and particular student problems.

Concluding Remarks on the Inductee's Perceptions of Leadership

Certainly, there is a need for leadership in the induction process that runs through the literature. This theme emerges from the various contextual frameworks that exist on this topic. The important aspect of this phenomena is not the need, necessarily. An emerging phenomena is the way in which leaders can/will provide for leadership for the beginning teacher. Howey and Zimpher (1985) clarify four major areas which would constitute core or commonplace knowledge (p. 15). In brevity, these four domains are: a) knowledge of the adult learner; b) knowledge of the school culture; c) knowledge of effectual interpersonal communication skills; d) and knowledge of how to seize upon opportunities for professional growth.

The concept of leadership evokes numerous possibilities. Within leadership lies ambiguities and nebulous meanings. The finality of leadership emerging into followership will depend upon those willing to assume the role; those willing to provide for leadership; those willing to support it morally and financially; and those willing to pay the price and share the burden. Duke
(1985) alluded to this as an uncommon valor to envision possibilities not ever imagined. A leader can transmit this valor into others. Schön (1983) suggested how this transmission could transpire through skillful practical theory implementation or reflections-in-actions.

One must discern between want and need regarding the leadership role. The case for need of leadership in mentoring and the induction process appears to have merit. The case for wanting to become a leader needs closer scrutiny and evolutionary treatment. This is especially significant for inductees.

When literature written for several purposes is juxtaposed, clarity of intent within the writings may suffer. It would be most difficult to discuss leadership without discussing leadership from the three paradigms described: a) generic concepts of leadership; b) leadership as perceived by the mentor teacher; c) and leadership as perceived by the beginning teacher. This study attempted to put clarity into the notion of leadership in the induction process as derived from the three conceptual frameworks listed. This study purported to bring attention to the notion of leadership within the induction process. The study attempted to take fragmented notions of what leadership is, can be, and possibly should be for the mentor teacher and give some lasting meaning to the conceptual framework of mentor as leader.
The voluminous literature base on leadership will be applied directly to the mentor teacher in the induction process of teaching. Through survey research, this study intended to complement the existing literature by contributing to the database on the mentor as leader.

The arrangement of the literature on leaders, mentors, and beginning teachers as related to salient leadership characteristics in the induction process will hopefully be given sharper focus.

In Chapter Three of this study the design and instrumentation of the study were explored. The study attempted to develop a conceptual framework as to how the induction process was viewed by mentor, inductee, and administrator/teacher leader. There was investigation for possible commonality of perceptions of what constitutes effective leadership as viewed by mentors and inductees. There was investigation of what role the administrator/teacher leader played in the induction process.

There were three research questions to be addressed in Chapter Three.

1) Do mentors, administrators/teacher leaders, and inductees hold different perceptions of what leadership characteristics are necessary for the mentor to be effective in the role of mentor?
2) Do mentor teachers' views of mentoring differ significantly with the views held by administrators/teacher leaders?

3) When selecting mentor teachers, do administrators/teacher leaders hold significantly different viewpoints than those held by inductees and designated mentor teachers?

The methodology used in Chapter Three attempted to add specificity in the data ascertained from the research question.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter contains a discussion of the methodology employed in this study, including the instrument's origin, development and administration. The discussion has as its foundation an investigation of leadership characteristics as perceived by three groups involved in the first-year teacher induction process. These groups are: a) mentor teachers; b) inductees; and c) school administrators/teacher leaders involved in selecting mentor teachers for the induction process. The study utilized the research on leadership behavior as originally conducted by Stogdill (1963) in his experimental revision of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire which will be referred to as Form XII. Hemphill (1949) spoke to the problem that much research on leadership becomes a mass of data on the personal qualities of leaders in many specific situations but not systematically related situations. This research attempted to develop a conceptual framework of how leadership of mentor teachers is viewed in the induction process through a correlative
in the three participating groups involved in the teacher induction process.

The investigation focused on the perceived leadership characteristics that are reflected by perceived effective mentors. How each of these general characteristics might be expressed in the specific acts of the mentor teacher in the induction process is not clearly understood. Therefore, this study (The Franklin County/Ohio State University Induction Project) is an ongoing collaborative program between five Franklin County (Ohio) school districts and The Ohio State University (Appendix A). The induction project began during the school year 1985-86 (Scholl, 1985). The development, implementation and research agenda began approximately at this same time (Zimpher, 1985). A planning committee was established consisting of the superintendents from each district in the project, the president of each local education association, and the University. Dr. Nancy L. Zimpher was the primary liaison between the University and the Franklin County school districts. Dr. Zimpher developed a team approach from the University's perspective. This included numerous professors, administrators and graduate students.

The mentor teachers for the induction program were chosen in one of three ways: (1) by administrators who called on teachers to serve; (2) by administrators and teacher leaders who called upon
teachers to serve; and (3) by direct volunteering of teachers who wished to participate in the program. Special attention was given to the task of matching mentors and inductees with regard to subject or grade level taught, building assignment, and common ground for affiliation.

What began as initial weekly meetings became bi-weekly meetings of the planning committee. This particular study on leadership characteristics of mentor teachers began at these meetings in August, 1985. The first mentor meeting was held on September 23, and the first inductee meeting on October 7, 1985. Ensuing meetings of the two groups were held monthly.

**Induction Project Focus**

The primary focus of this project was to provide inductees (beginning teachers) with a support system that would enable them to maximize their professional talents by removing or minimizing those factors that often interfere with classroom teaching. Also, the project provided career options available to the inductee. A salient feature of the induction program was to provide an environment for the inductee to be reflective about his/her teaching. The induction program gave the inductee a vehicle to give feedback to teacher preparation programs by means of the research element of the project. There are implications that this model program
will positively affect the entire teaching profession. The assumption is that mentor teachers do make a difference in this induction process.

The Survey Instrument Administration

The LBDQ-Form XII was distributed to each of the five participating school districts during the second week of May, 1986. The surveys were hand delivered by the researcher to five teacher leaders (presidents of their respective teachers' organizations) involved in this induction project. These teacher leaders have been actively involved in this project since the original organizational meetings began in the summer of 1985. Once they received these surveys, the teacher leaders hand delivered to each of the participants his/her individual survey in their respective school districts. Hand delivery of the instrument was done in order to portray the importance of each participant's involvement in answering the survey and in the attempt to increase the reliability and return rate of the instrument.

Each participant received the survey inside a large envelope. Each envelope and instrument was numbered in order to ascertain who returned the instrument. Each envelope had a throw-away name tag placed on the envelope for distribution purposes only.
Attached to the instrument was a cover letter with explanations on how to answer the survey. This cover letter can be found in Appendix B. The surveys were picked up by the researcher personally from each participant. This plan was established to increase the return rate and to insure complete confidence with the participant. Anonymity was protected by not putting any names of the survey, and by the fact that the researcher did not divulge any information to superordinates, subordinates, or significant others related to the induction project. Numbers were used as the return envelopes for the sole purpose of inventoring the returns by district and classification - mentor, inductee, or administrator/teacher leader. The surveys were picked up on the third school day after distribution. Those participants absent on this day, or those who did not have the survey answered, were contacted the following day of school or on an ensuing day by the researcher. The personal involvement and promotion of the induction project by the individual school districts contributed to a significant return of the surveys.
Demographic Data

Of the 71 mentors designated by school administrators in this program, 10 (14%) were male and 61 (86%) were female. Forty-nine (69%) are holders of Bachelor's degrees with 22 (31%) holders of Master's degrees. The average age of the mentor is 42.3 years of age. One hundred percent of the mentors are of Anglo-Saxon origin. The average years of experience for the entire mentor population is 13.1 years of experience. Forty-two (59%) of the mentors were of elementary certification, 24 (34%) were of secondary certification, with 5 (7%) holding special types of certification.

There were 79 inductees in the induction program. There were 16 (19%) males and 63 (81%) females. Sixty-nine (87%) were holders of a Bachelor's degree and 10 (13%) were holders of a Master's degree. The average age of the participant is 30.7 years of age. Seventy-eight (99%) are of Anglo-Saxon origin and 1 (1%) of African origin. The average years of experience is 4.03. Twenty-five (32%) are of secondary certification and 54
(68%) are of elementary certification. Twenty-seven (34%) had no experience in teaching. Fifty-two (66%) had experience in teaching.

There were 26 administrators/teacher leaders involved in the selection of mentor teachers.

**Type of Survey**

The inquiry was a cross-sectional survey. This was the most appropriate design since the researcher's aim is a single-time description (Babbie, 1973). This is a widely used procedure in needs assessment. Need surveys are most commonly used to gather facts, attitudes and opinions at one point in time, but they can be repeated over time to discover trends. This seemed most applicable to the induction program due to its multiple-year study. Also, this survey could be used in longitudinal studies that may develop in induction programs. The three groups of respondents in the survey will be able to provide data from their particular role in the induction process. Secondly, this type of survey allowed for cohort comparison. The knowledge gained from these comparisons adds greater focus to the understanding of the leadership role of the mentor teacher.

The cross-sectional survey design was being used with minor modification. Since this research problem was relevant to more
than one specific type of population, the instrument (Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII) with only slight modification was administered to each of the total population - mentors, inductees, and administrators/teacher leaders. The slight modification was to remind the mentor that s/he was evaluating what a mentor should be; the inductee was to describe the mentor from his/her perspective; and the administrator/teacher leader was describing why they selected the mentors. The responses were based on their perceived notions of effective mentors as related to the questions in the questionnaire. The results produced from the three groups were then compared in each subscale in the questionnaire. A subscale is a specific factor that accounts for observable variance in leader behavior.

Descriptive Behavior Objectivity

It is to be noted that the description and the evaluation of behavior are not identical processes. Stogdill and Shartle (1955) suggested that most studies of leadership seek to evaluate behavior, regardless how varied the behavior of persons may be, as it relates to effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The authors maintain that in a logical order of procedures, it only seems probable that description should precede evaluation. The Leader Behavior Descriptions were developed for the purpose of describing behavior objectively.
This objectivity is based on the number of occurrences of each behavior. This study concerned itself with description.

Working on the premise that leadership is concerned with problems of human performance and interaction, Stogdill (1957) suggests the leader is not an isolated individual, that leadership may derive from different members in the interaction process, and that the overall performance and effectiveness of the leader may affect the performance of other members of the process. This study examined these assumptions. The responses were analyzed to test three hypotheses which state that relationships exist among variables. The responses were set up by listing the twelve sub-scales of the LBDQ-Form XII. The means, standard deviations, and F were calculated for each member of the group. Analyses and comparisons of these data were made to see if there was significant difference among members in the group.

H1: Mentors, administrators, and inductees hold different perceptions of what leadership characteristics are necessary for the mentor to be effective in his/her role.

H2: Mentor teachers' views of mentoring are significantly different than the views held by administrators.
H3: Leader behavior is affected by the process used in selecting mentors.

**Nature and Sources of Data**

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII was the instrument used to gather data from the three groups discussed in the mentoring program and the induction process of new teachers. The original L.B.D.Q. was developed by John K. Hemphill at The Ohio State University in 1949. It was later expanded through a cooperative-interdisciplinary program consisting of psychologists, sociologists and economists. This instrument was used in common by all investigators.

The L.B.D.Q. has been administered in many situations. A partial list of participants that have utilized the L.B.D.Q. is as follows: the U.S. Air Force; the U.S. Navy; industrialists dealing with foremen in a manufacturing plant; executives; college administrators; school superintendents, principals and teachers; and a variety of other groups and organizations. During each survey implementation, successive adaptations and revisions were made (Stogdill & Coons, 1957).
The original L,B,D,Q. consisted of 150 items. The original list of these items can be found in Appendix C. The item Analysis Data for the 150 items can be found in Appendix D. The Monographs in the Leadership Series in Ohio Studies in Personnel can be found in Appendix E.

Developing a common instrument was a difficult task for the inter-disciplinary team of military, industrial and education organizations. After extended discussions, a list of dimensions was tentatively designated. The tentatively designated dimensions of behavior were: Ibid., pp. 8-9.

1. Integration - acts which tend to increase cooperation among members or decrease competition among them.

2. Communication - acts which increase the understanding of and knowledge about what is going on in the group.
3. Production emphasis - acts which are oriented toward volume of work accomplished.

4. Representation - acts which speak for the group in interaction with outside agencies.

5. Fraternization - acts which tend to make the leader a part of the group.

6. Organization - acts which lead to differentiation of duties and which prescribe ways of doing things.

7. Evaluation - acts which have to do with distribution of rewards (or punishment).

8. Initiation - acts which lead to change in group activities.

9. Domination - acts which disregard the ideas or person of members of the group.

These nine dimensions provided a framework for the collection of specific items of leader behavior, which were later closely examined and evaluated.

**Item Construction**

Suggestions for items were drawn from personal experiences of the interdisciplinary team and from familiarity with the literature concerned with leadership. To increase the range of behavior comprehended by the items, beyond
that suggested by the relatively homogenous experience of the members of the staff, a method of obtaining items from a larger population was devised. Members of two advanced university classes wrote 48 items each - 12 items in each of 4 different areas - as an exercise in item construction. The instructions to these students emphasized the following points:

1. Items should describe specific behavior, not general traits or characteristics.

2. Items should apply to various kinds of organizational structures, groups or situations. They should not be so specific as to apply to only a few groups or situations.

3. Items should be worded in terms meaningful to the respondents.

4. An item should apply specifically to the variable for which it is written. It may also overlap other dimensions of behavior.

5. The items should be written in the present tense.

6. The items should begin with the pronoun "He."

7. The items should be limited to one unit of behavior (Should not be "double barreled").

8. The items should not contain adverbs referring to the frequency with which the behavior occurs (always, never, etc.).
9. The items should not be emotionally or evaluatively toned except as that tone is an inseparable part of the behavior it describes.

**Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII**

The instrument used in this research (L.B.D.Q.-Form XII) is an outgrowth of the original Hemphill-L.B.D.Q. (Hemphill, 1949). Hemphill & Coons (1957) discussed further development of the scales by the staff of the Ohio State Leadership Studies and the original L.B.D.Q. Empirical research revealed that a large number of hypothesized dimensions of leader behavior could be reduced to two strongly defined factors. Halpin & Winer (1957) and Fleishman (1957) identified these as **Consideration** and **Initiation of Structure**. These two factors were not sufficient to account for all the observable variance in leader behavior. Stogdill (1959) developed a new theory of role differentiation and group achievement. A large body of research data was developed that supported Stogdill's premise. Possible factors suggested by the theory were: tolerance of uncertainty, tolerance of member freedom of action, persuasiveness, integration of the group, predictive accuracy, and
reconciliation of conflicting demands. Empirical research discovered possible new factors: representation of group interests, role assumption, production emphasis, and orientation toward superiors.

Items were developed for subscales. Questionnaires were developed and administered to successive groups. After item analysis, the questionnaires went through a series of analyses and revisions (Stogdill, Good & Day, 1962). Form XII represents the fourth revision of the questionnaire, and it is subject to further revision. Stogdill (1963) lists the complete definition of the subscales. They are:

Each subscale is composed of five or ten items. A subscale is defined by its component items. Each will represent a complex pattern of behavior.

1. **Representation** - speaks and acts as the representative of the group (5 items).

2. **Demand Reconciliation** - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system (5 items).

3. **Tolerance of uncertainty** - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset (10 items).

4. **Persuasiveness** - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions (10 items).
5. **Initiation of structure** - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected (10 items).

6. **Tolerance of Freedom** - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action (10 items).

7. **Role Assumption** - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others (10 items).

8. **Consideration** - regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers (10 items).

9. **Production Emphasis** - applies pressure for productive output (10 items).

10. **Predictive Accuracy** - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately (5 items).

11. **Integration** - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves intermember conflicts (5 items).

12. **Superior Orientation** - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status (10 items).

A scoring key for the L.B.D.Q.-Form XII can be found in Appendix F. A record sheet for scoring the subscales can be found in Appendix G.
Statistical Analysis

The first step in data analysis is to describe or summarize the data using descriptive statistics. In some studies, such as certain questionnaire surveys, the entire analysis procedure may consist solely of calculating and interpreting descriptive statistics (Gay, 1981, p. 281). The indices in the descriptive statistics used was referred to as parameters rather than statistics because they were calculated on the entire population rather than a sample. The rationale for the use of descriptive statistics is that this study pertained to a population and not a sample. Inferential statistics would lead to a Type II error because of rejection of the null hypothesis since there would be no statistical difference.

Identification of leader behavior of mentor teachers was computed through tabulation of the LBDQ Questionnaire for each segment of the population—mentors, inductees, and administrators. The means and standard deviation was computed for each of the subscales to see if there was meaningful difference between the three groups. A frequency distribution was made for comparisons with the analysis of variance scores. There are individual and group score comparisons. A post hoc test was used to pinpoint individual differences. The study emphasized agreed upon patterns of behavior and differences in patterns of behavior.
Each subscale represents a complex pattern of behavior. Mentors, inductees, and administrators responded to each subscale and the scores were tabulated in each subscale. The three sets of scores were correlated to ascertain what each group of participants views significant according to that particular subscale. Each complex pattern of behavior in each subscale was described in a statistical manner. This objectivity, according to each group responding, was based on the number of occurrences of each behavior. Those types of analyses helped describe what leadership characteristics were deemed significant of mentor teachers as perceived by mentor teachers, inductees, and administrators.

Summary of Data Scoring

The LBDQ--Form XII is composed of twelve subscales, each of which is totally independent. In completing the LBDQ--Form XII, the respondents will record selected answers on the provided answer sheet in the test booklet. The subject indicates his/her response by drawing a circle around one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) following an item. Most items are scored: A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, and E=1. There are twenty questions (starred in the scoring key) that are in reverse order or 1=always, 2=often, 3=occasionally, 4=seldom, and 5=never. A scoring key is provided in Appendix H.
Subscale Means and Standard Deviations

Stogdill (1963) states there are no norms for the L.B.D.Q. The questionnaire was designed as a research device. The means and standard deviations for several highly selected samples are shown in Appendix I.

Reliability of the Subscales

The reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The modification consists in the fact that each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in the subscale rather than with the subscale including the item. This procedure yields a conservative estimate of subscale reliability (see Appendix J). An extensive analysis of the original L.B.D.Q.'s reliability can be found in Stogdill & Coons (1957).

The Selection of the L.B.D.Q.-Form XII

For This Study

There are two specific reasons this instrument was chosen to gather data in this project. The primary reason is that it has a most comprehensive history of development and revision which has strengthened its validity and reliability as it specifically relates to leadership. Secondly, it possesses flexibility in that it can be used by peers or superiors in describing a given leader.
This is most appropriate when considering the components of the Franklin County/Ohio State University Induction Project.

Other instruments were given consideration for this study. These instruments were not rejected because of any particular weakness. They did not fit the research purpose well. The L.B.D.Q.-Form XII was chosen because of its specificity in dealing with leadership. Also it allowed for the flexibility needed to apply the instruments to three different segments of the population in the study - mentors, inductees, and school administrators.

Other instruments given consideration and sources where more extensive information can be found on them are:

a) Observational System for Instructional Analysis - (Hough & Duncan, 1970).
b) Myers-Briggs Type Indicator - (Lawrence, 1984).
c) Flanders Critical Incident Technique - (Flanders, 1970) and (Amidon & Flanders, 1967).
d) Kentucky Mentoring Survey - (Fagan & Walter, 1982) and (Fagan & Fagan, 1983).

**Administering the L.B.D.Q.-Form XII**

Usually the L.B.D.Q.-Form XII is used to describe various behaviors of leaders or supervisors by their subordinates. However, the flexibility of the instrument allows for individuals to evaluate
peers, subordinates, and superordinates. Another salient characteristic of the instrument is that with proper changes in instructions, a leader can use the instrument to describe his/her own behavior.

The instrument can be administered individually or in groups. Names of respondents are not needed on the questionnaires. However, it is important that each respondent marks his/her title—mentor, inductee, or administrator on the questionnaire. In this study, this is most crucial in that the perceived role of the mentor was being described from the three different perspectives—mentor, inductee, and administrator.

Several factors must be considered when explaining the instrument to the respondents (see Appendix K). Instructions should be clear and succinct regarding the marking of the answers on the questionnaire (a complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix L). Respondents need not be cautioned about honesty or frankness. Respondents should be asked just to describe the mentor as accurately as possible from their perspective (see Appendix B). Respondents should always be assured their responses will be in complete confidence, and that their descriptions will not be seen by any person they are asked to describe. These factors will be reviewed before the questionnaire is distributed. The participants had access to this information since the initial stages of the induction program.
In Chapter Four, analyses of these data (mentioned in Chapter Three) will be made and presented. Each of the twelve subscales will be represented by responses from the three groups in the population - mentor, inductee, and administrator. These analyses will provide data from three different perspectives to see if there is meaningful difference in what is expected in leadership characteristics of the mentor teachers. In addition, any similarities in expectations that may occur will be discussed for implications of leadership to mentoring in the induction process.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to determine what leadership characteristics are considered necessary and important for mentor teachers to possess in the induction process for beginning teachers. The population of this study consisted of three groups - mentor teachers, inductees, and school administrators/teacher leaders. The total population of respondents was 130. The instrument used to obtain these data was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ).

In this chapter, the mean scores, standard deviations, and the F distributions were presented to explain the data analysis. These data were presented in a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The twelve subscales of the LBDQ-Form XII will be independently analyzed with the ANOVA. A post hoc analysis was utilized to ascertain where there is difference. Tukey was used over other post hoc tests due to its conservativeness. It was the most conservative post hoc procedure to use for a small number of comparisons. Scheffe was used to support or reject the Tukey test findings where significant difference was not ascertained from the
Tukey-post hoc tests. The conservative post hoc test was chosen over other tests such as Duncan and Least Significance Test (LST), because tests such as Duncan and LST have tendencies to ascertain differences that are not truly different. There are no tests that are exact predictions when the group members are of unequal sizes.

All twelve subscales of the LBDQ-Form XII were used in this research to provide for an extensive exploration of perceptions that members of the group have about mentor teachers. The subscales can be meaningfully adapted to mentor activities in an induction process. Stogdill (1963) suggested the LBDQ-Form XII and its' subscales can be used to describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided those in the group have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader. All members of the induction program described in this research have had the opportunity to observe mentors over a period of time. Each member of the group had notions of what an effective mentor should possess in leadership characteristics. The subscales may not reflect all characteristics, but they do present a comprehensive analysis of many aspects of mentoring by teachers.
This study sought to answer these specific questions:

1) Do mentor teachers, inductees, and administrator/teacher leaders hold the same perceptions of what characteristics a mentor teacher should possess to be effective in that role?

2) What are the significant leadership behaviors as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire that the three sets of participants in the group view as similarities or differences?

3) When administrators/teacher leaders control the selection process of mentor teachers, is there significant difference in the viewpoints of this segment of the population with the viewpoints about leadership as held by inductees and designated mentor teachers?
RESPONSE RATE

The target population consisted of 176 administrators and teachers. This target population is located in five Franklin County, Ohio school districts. The actual return rate was as follows: 21 (80.7%) for administrators; 57 (80.2%) of inductees; and 52 (65.8%) of mentor teachers actually responded to the questionnaire (see Table 1). The total rate of return was 75.5% for all segments of the population. All data were collected from participants in the survey after the third day of distribution. These surveys were picked up individually from the participants. Some surveys were later returned by mail.

The returned surveys included people absent on the day they were to be picked up or respondents not having them completed. Five surveys were returned unmarked. Eleven surveys were returned after data analysis was made.

Subscale Group Analysis

The mean scores, standard deviations, and the F ratios will be presented for each of the three segments of the population in each of the twelve subscales described by Stogdill in the LBDQ-Form XII. Eight of the twelve subscales showed significant difference between participants.
TABLE 1
THE FRANKLIN COUNTY/OSU INDUCTION PROGRAM POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Return N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/Teacher Leader</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Teachers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Return</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) F ratio is formed by the ratio of two unbiased estimates of the population variance.
b) *p < .05 The F ratio has been found significant.
c) ab: p < .05 Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
d) Scheffé test.

SUBSCALE-GROUP RESPONSE DATA
The LBDQ-Subscale is necessarily defined by its component items, and represents a complex pattern of behaviors (Stogdill, 1963).

REPRESENTATION
With the group being the independent variable, a significant difference occurred between the inductees and mentors on this representative aspect of leadership (see Table 2). Repre-
sentation suggests that the mentor speaks and acts as representative of the group. The inductees placed greater emphasis on the mentor speaking and acting for the group than did the mentors. This was significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. There was not a significant difference between inductees and administrators or between mentors and administrators.

**TABLE 2**

**LBDQ: REPRESENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators - N = 21</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees - N = 57</td>
<td>3.87a</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors - N = 52</td>
<td>3.665</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = 4.33^*$

a) $^* - p \leq .05$ - The F ratios have been found significant.

b) $ab - p \leq .05$ Tukey - means with different letters, the members responses are significantly different from each other.
DEMAND RECONCILIATION

A significant difference occurred between inductees and administrators at the $p \leq .05$ level (see Table 3). Demand reconciliation suggests the mentor can resolve conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system. The inductee perceived the characteristic of demand reconciliation as reflective of effective mentor teachers. Administrators/teacher leaders did not see this as reflective of mentor teachers. There were no other group comparisons of significant difference. The F suggests that the group is affecting response between administrators and inductees. Inductees suggest this is very important to mentoring, and administrators/teacher leaders did not see this as significant.

TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY

A significant difference occurred between inductees and mentors at the $p \leq .05$ level (see Table 4). Inductees viewed effective mentors as being able to tolerate and postponement (flexibility) without being upset. The inductees perceived effective mentors as having the ability to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or being upset. The mentor teacher did not view these characteristics as important to effective mentoring. There were no other groups with significant differences.
TABLE 3

LBDQ: DEMAND RECONCILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.42a</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.87b</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F = 4.77**

a) *p ≤ .05 - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) ab - p ≤ .05 Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
**TABLE 4**

**LBDQ: TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.69a</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.42b</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 3.99^* \]

---

a) \( p < .05 \) - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) \( ab \ p < .05 \) Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
PERSUASIVENESS

A significant difference occurred between inductees and mentors, and there was significant difference between inductees and administrators at the $p < .05$ level (see Table 5). Persuasiveness is the ability to use persuasion and argument effectively and to exhibit strong convictions. The

TABLE 5
LBDQ: PERSUASIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.61a</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.92b</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.58a</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = 7.06^*$

a) $^*p < .05$ - The F ratio has been found significant.
b) $ab - p < .05$ Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
perception of the inductee is that an effective mentor uses
persuasion and argument effectively. Also, the inductee views
the effective mentor as one who exhibits strong convictions.
Administrators and mentors held nearly identical perceptions
in this categorization. The F (7.06) was the highest of the
twelve subscales. Administrators and mentors do not place the
emphasis on this leadership characteristic as do the inductees.

INITIATION OF STRUCTURE

A significant difference occurred between inductees and administra-
tors at the p < .05 level (see Table 6). Inductees perceived mentors to
be effective when role definition is clearly defined and when the mentor
lets followers know what is expected. Administrators/teacher leaders
and mentors did not hold the same perceptions on these issues.

TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM

There was no significant difference at the p < .05 level
among any of the members in the group (see Table 7). There was
no significant effect for the independent variable - group. The
means for the three members of the group were the highest means
of the twelve subscales. Each member perceived tolerance of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.60a</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.93b</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = 3.97^*$

a) $^*p \leq .05$ - The $F$ ratio has been found significant.

b) $ab - p \leq .05$ Tukey - means with different letters are significantly from each other.
### TABLE 7
LBDQ: TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 2.25 \]

a) \( *p \leq 0.05 \) - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) ab \( p \leq 0.05 \) Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
freedom as reflective of effective leadership in mentors. The entire group perceives that mentors should allow followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. Scope means the freedom to initiate, decide, and act.

The Scheffé test, which requires that a difference between means in comparisons need not be as large to reach significance, was utilized to find if there was significance at $p < .05$ level. This more liberal post hoc test substantiated the Tukey test that there was no significant difference between the three members in the group. There was no significant effect for the independent variable in the Scheffé test.

**ROLE ASSUMPTION**

There was no significant difference at the $p < .05$ level among any of the members in the group (see Table 8). There was general agreement among the members in the group that an effective mentor actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. There was no significant effect for the independent variable - group.

The Scheffé test did not find any significant difference at the $p < .05$ level among any of the members in the group. This more liberal post hoc test substantiates the findings of the more conservative Tukey test.
TABLE 8
LBDQ: ROLE ASSUMPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 2.95

a) *p < .05 - The F ratio has been found significant.
b) ab - p < .05 Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
CONSIDERATION

A significant effect occurred between inductees and administrators at the $p \leq .05$ level. There was no significant effect between other members of the group (see Table 9).

**TABLE 9**
LBDQ: CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.68a</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.04b</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = 3.71$

a) $p \leq .05$ - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) ab - $p \leq .05$ Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
The highest mean of any of the members in the twelve subscales was recorded by the inductees. This 4.04 mean was significantly different than the 3.68 registered by administrators. Inductees view mentor teachers as more effective leaders when they regard the comfort, well being, status and contributions of followers - as being significant. The 3.68 mean of administrators is significant in that it reflects administrative concerns for the leadership characteristic consideration. But it is significantly lower than that of inductees.

**PRODUCTION EMPHASIS**

There was no significant difference between members of the group at the $p < .05$ level (see Table 10). The F was the lowest of all twelve subscales (1.46). All members of the group perceive leadership characteristics of mentor teachers that do not apply pressure for productive output as being more effective. There was no significant effect for the independent variable. Administrators and mentors had identical means (3.25) in reflecting on this leadership characteristic.

The Scheffé test supported the Tukey test as it reflected no significant difference at the $p < .05$ level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 1.46

a) *p < .05 - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) ab - p < .05 Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
PREDICTIVE ACCURACY

There was significant difference between inductees and mentors at the $p < .05$ level (see Table 11). Inductees perceive effective leadership from mentors when they exhibit foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately. Mentors did not hold this same perception. Mentors and administrators held very similar perspectives on these leadership characteristics - 3.60 and 3.57 means respectively. The F reveals significant effect for the independent variable.

INTEGRATION

There was no significant difference between members of the group at the $p < .05$ level (see Table 12). The F (2.20) showed no significant effect for the independent variable. Each member of the group perceives mentors as having the leadership characteristics to maintain a closely knit organization, and one that resolves intermember conflict.

The Scheffé test supports the Tukey test by finding no significance at the $p < .05$ level. There was no significant difference among any members of the group in the Scheffé test.

SUPERIOR ORIENTATION

The test was significant at the $p < .05$ level but not with contrasting significance. The null hypothesis was accepted
### TABLE 11
**LBDQ: PREDICTIVE ACCURACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.84a</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.60b</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 3.77^* \]

a) \(^*p \leq .05\) - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) \(ab - p \leq .05\) Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
TABLE 12
LBDQ: INTEGRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 2.20

a) *p \leq .05 - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) ab - p \leq .05 Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
(see Table 13). The F was 3.72. With 2 degrees of freedom, the test is significant at the 3.92 level. The test is significant in that it shows all three members of the group feel that effective mentors reveal leadership characteristics that cordial relations be maintained with superiors. Also, effective mentors have influence with supervisors. The final significant factor is that effective mentors are striving for higher status.

Table 14 lists all of the findings for the group for comparison purposes. It lists levels of significance and tests utilized to project significant differences or lack of significant differences. Table 15 is a composite list of all data accumulated for the entire group in the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13</th>
<th>LBDQ: Superior Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators - N = 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean - 3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation - .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inductees - N = 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean - 3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation - .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors - N = 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means - 3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation - .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F = 3.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) *p < .05 - The F ratio has been found significant.

b) ab - p < .05 Tukey - means with different letters are significantly different from each other.
TABLE 14

GROUP=INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

THE FRANKLIN COUNTY/OSU INDUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>A (N=21)</th>
<th>I (N=57)</th>
<th>M (N=52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.87&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>3.42&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.87&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.69&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
<td>3.61&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.92&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>3.60&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.93&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Assumption</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>3.68&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>4.04&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.84&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Orientation</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) * p<.05 - The F ratio has been found significant.
b) ab: p<.05 Tukey - means with different letter are significantly different from each other.
c) Group=Independent Variable
d) Post hoc (Tukey) - Pinpoints individual differences.
e) Post hoc (Scheffe) - Provides a more liberal interpretation of F. Also, it is used to verify or reject the Tukey findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
<th>Std. Error of Mean</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>C.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>76.733</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>12.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>72.000</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>16.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>70.866</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>16.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>75.922</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>10.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>75.750</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>9.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>79.200</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>14.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>74.119</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>14.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>77.400</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>11.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>68.333</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>9.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>75.000</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>11.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>79.700</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>10.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>77.046</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>12.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Minimum Value</td>
<td>Maximum Value</td>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>C.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>221.000</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>14.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>220.950</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>17.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>210.633</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>15.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>223.833</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>13.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>224.477</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>14.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>229.516</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>13.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>219.250</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>16.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>230.433</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>13.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>194.450</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>15.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>219.350</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>15.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>222.916</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>17.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>224.971</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>12.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 15 (Continued)
### COMPOSITE DATA OF INDUCTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
<th>Std. Error of Mean</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>C.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>178.200</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>16.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>188.400</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>15.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>178.079</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>16.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>186.211</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>14.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>193.866</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>13.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>201.852</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>12.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>191.050</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>13.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>202.847</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>13.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>169.481</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>16.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>187.500</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>13.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>190.600</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>16.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>194.788</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>12.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to ascertain what leadership characteristics of mentor teachers are perceived as being significant to three groups - inductees, mentors, and administrators/teacher leaders. These perceptions were obtained within the parameters of an induction program for beginning teachers in a Franklin County (Ohio) Schools/The Ohio State University College of Education project.

The instrument used to collect these data was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ). All twelve subscales of the LBDQ were utilized so that the comprehensiveness of the study would render greater generalizability to the induction project study and implications for practicing education and for additional research. It was thought that by using all of the subscales, rather than just using some of them, that greater specificity could be given to what members perceived leadership characteristics to be if effective mentors. The more factors considered, the more data could be obtained to support generalizations made from the data. Generalizations made from a smaller
number of factors may limit the comprehensiveness of the study. Halpin and Winer (1957) suggest that in empirical research that a large number of hypothesized dimensions of leader behavior could be reduced to two strongly defined factors. These were defined as Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Consideration places high regard for the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers. Initiation of Structure suggests the mentor clearly defines his or her role, and lets followers know what is expected. Using only these two dimensions of leader behavior limits the generalizability of the data gathered on the induction process. This study attempted to contribute greater clarity to our understanding of the leadership role of mentors in the induction process.

Significance between the three members of the group (independent variable) was ascertained through the use of Analysis of Variance, F, Tukey post hoc test, and the Scheffe post hoc test.

The population in this study was full-time teachers and administrators in five public school systems. The N for administrators/teacher leaders was 21; 52 for mentor teachers; and 57 for inductees. The members of the population were administrators/teacher leaders, inductees, and mentors from five Franklin County,
Hypothesized Relationships

The hypotheses proposed to test the relationships among the variables in this study are as follows:

H1: Mentors, administrators/teacher leaders and inductees hold different perceptions of what leadership characteristics are necessary for the mentor to be effective in his/her role.

H2: Mentor teachers' views of mentoring are significantly different than the views held by administrators/teacher leaders.

H3: Leader behavior is affected by the process used in selecting mentors.

In this study, a significant difference occurred in 7 of the 12 subscales of the LBDQ-Form XII. In another subscale (Superior Orientation), there was difference between the three members of the group but not of a significant nature. Induction perceptions of leadership characteristics of effective mentors was significantly different than mentors' perceptions in four subscales. Inductees had viewpoints of significant difference with administrators/teacher leaders in four leadership behaviors of
perceived effective mentors. Significant difference was determined at the $p < .05$ level, and $ab p < .05$ means there was significant difference between two members of the group on that specific subscale (see Table 15).

**TABLE 16**

PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE MENTORS: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEMBERS OF THE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Differences</th>
<th>Inductees and Mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3) Persuasiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inductees and Administrators/Teacher leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Demand Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2) Persuasiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Initiation of Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inductees differed significantly with mentors and administrators/teacher leaders.

**No Significant Differences Between Members of the Group**

1) Tolerance of Freedom
2) Role Assumption
3) Production Emphasis
4) Integration
5) Superior Orientation
The first hypothesis was supported by significant differences in 7 of the 12 subscales. H1. Mentors, inductees, and administrators/teacher leaders hold different perceptions of what leadership characteristics are necessary for the mentor to be effective in the role of mentor. The following subscales showing significant differences were as follows: **Representation** with an F of 4.33; **Demand Reconciliation** with an F of 4.77; **Tolerance of Uncertainty** with an F of 3.99; and **Persuasiveness** with an F of 3.97; **Consideration** with an F of 3.71; and **Predictive Accuracy** with an F of 3.77. **Superior Orientation** showed difference but not statistically significant.

The greatest differences in all subscales occurred between inductees and mentors and between inductees and administrators. There was minimal difference between mentors and administrators/teacher leaders in all of the subscales.

Significant differences occurred between members of the group as proposed in the following subscale. In subscale **Representation**, the greatest significance occurred between inductees and mentors. The F was 4.33. In subscale **Demand Reconciliation**, there was significant difference between inductees and administrators. The F was 4.77. In subscale **Tolerance of Uncertainty**, there was significant difference between inductees
and mentors. The F was 3.99. In subscale **Persuasiveness**, the greatest significance occurred between inductees and administra-
tors/teacher leaders, and inductees and mentors. The F was 7.06.
In subscale **Initiation of Structure**, significant differences occurred between inductees and administrators. The F was 3.97.
In subscale **Consideration**, significant differences occurred between inductees and administrators. The F was 3.71. In sub-
scale **Predictive Accuracy**, significant differences occurred between inductees and mentors. The F was 3.77. In subscale **Superior Orientation**, significant differences did not occur between members, but it was significant that all members in the group perceived this factor to be important and should be reflected by mentor teachers. The F was 3.72.

Inductees view the following subscales as characteristics that mentor teachers should reflect in their leadership role: **Tolerance of Freedom; Role Assumption; Production Emphasis; and Integration**. Inductees reflect that all twelve subscales hold significance for mentor teachers in a leadership capacity. In the above four subscales, all members of the group revealed in-
significant differences on these leader behaviors associated with leadership characteristics of effective leaders. It is to be noted that in subscale **Production Emphasis**, all members of all
three groups had the lowest mean scores for all the subscales. Applying pressure for productive output was not considered to be a characteristic that a mentor teacher should reflect in the leadership role.

In the second hypothesis, the null hypothesis was accepted and $H_2$ was rejected. Mentor teachers' views of mentoring are significantly different than the views held by administrators/teacher leaders. In the subscale Persuasiveness, mentors and administrators were significantly different than inductees in how they perceived this leadership characteristic for mentors. Mentors and administrators were in agreement that this leadership characteristic was not considered as important to effective leadership as did the inductees. In each of the remaining twelve subscales, mentors and administrators never significantly differed at the $p < .05$ level.

In the third hypothesis, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was significant difference at the $p < .05$ level. $H_3$ Leader behavior is affected by the process used in selecting mentors. The independent variable (group) reveals that in seven of the twelve subscales, there was significant difference in the perceptions of leadership characteristics that effective mentors should reflect. In the process of selecting mentors according to the
twelve subscales used in this process, perceptions of what constituted effective leadership by mentors were significantly different between inductees-mentors and between inductees-administrators. Succinctly, role perceptions of the mentor as leader are perceived in different perspectives between members of the group. This independent variable (group) does affect the process used in selecting mentors. These different perspectives on leadership found among members of the group may affect the outcomes of the induction program.

**Major Findings and Conclusions**

The results of this study can be generalized and summarized in four major sub-question/findings listed and explained below. These subquestions derive from the research questions.

1. Do mentor teachers, inductees, and administrators hold the same perceptions of what characteristics a mentor teacher should possess to be effective in that role?

The central focus of this study was to find what all members of the three groups (mentors, inductees, administrators) perceive as relevant characteristics to be effective mentors in an induction program. The LBDQ-Form XII was selected as the survey instrument to gather this information, because (Stogdill, 1959) research
showed that a number of variables operate in the differentiation of roles in social groups. The factors suggested by this theory are those that are proposed in the LBDQ-Form XII. The ANOVA was used to determine whether there is significant difference between two or more means at a selected probability level. A ratio was formed (F) with group differences as the numerators (variance between groups). At the conclusion of the study a determination was made to see whether the treatment variance was enough larger than the error variance, a significant F ratio resulted. If the F ratio was not significant, the null hypothesis was rejected. The greater the difference, the larger was the F ratio.

Conclusion

The results of this study provide evidence that each member of the group (mentor, inductee, administrator) do not hold the same perceptions of what characteristics a mentor teacher should possess to be an effective mentor. A pattern emerged in this study that shows inductees answered questions regarding the twelve
subscales (LBDQ) with greater values in the answers marked than did mentors or administrators. They had a twelve scale combined mean of 3.85 for all questions as compared to mentors' 3.58 and 3.63 for administrators. The higher mean for inductees suggests that inductees view all twelve subscales as more important in determining characteristics that are reflective of effective mentors in the induction process than do administrators/teacher leaders and mentors.

There was significant difference at the $p < .05$ level between inductees and administrators in four subscales: Demand, Reconciliation; Persuasiveness; Initiation of Structure; and Consideration. There was significant difference at the $p < .05$ level between inductees and mentors in four subscales: Representation; Tolerance of Uncertainty; Persuasiveness; and Predictive Accuracy. These significant differences indicate that mentors, inductees, and administrators do not hold the same perceptions of what characteristics a mentor teacher should possess to be effective in that role.
2. What are the significant leadership behaviors, as measured by the LBDQ-Form XII, that the three members in the group view similarly or differently?

Similarities and Conclusions

In the subscale Tolerance of Freedom, all members of the group perceived that effective mentors should allow followers scope for initiative, decisions, and action. In the subscale Role Assumption, all members of the group perceived mentor teachers as being effective leaders when the mentor actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. In the subscale Production Emphasis, the smallest F of all subscales was recorded. All members of the group believed that effective mentors should not apply pressure for productive output. In the subscale Integration, all members of the group believed that an effective mentor should maintain a closely knit organization. Also, all members believed that an effective mentor should resolve intermember conflicts. In the subscale Superior Orientation, there was very close agreement by members of the group that an effective mentor should maintain cordial relations when working with superiors. Also, effective mentors were perceived as reflecting positive leadership characteristics when they had positive influence with their superiors.
When a mentor assumes a leadership role in an induction program, it is necessary that the mentor has vision (initiative) and can make decisions and take proper action in implementing these decisions into procedures. Mentors, once assuming this leadership role, must assume this role with confidence and take command of the position. The mentor must reflect through observable behavior to inductees and administrators/teacher leaders that they can effect change as a leader. Mentors are perceived as effective leaders when they do this, but they are not perceived as effective leaders if they do not take command of their role or if responsibility is decisively delegated to others.

Two variables, Tolerance of Freedom and Role Assumption, appear to create a dichotomous relationship. Members of the group accept the mentors as effective leaders when they allow degrees of freedom for followers to chart their own course(s) of action, but, simultaneously, the leader should not surrender leadership responsibility. This creates a fine line of discretion for the mentors as to what course(s) of action they should pursue in their mentoring capacity.
In Production Emphasis, it appears most significantly that mentors should not attempt to apply pressure for productive output. Succinctly, inductees are not to have pressure applied to them by mentors to pursue a particular course of action in the classroom in dealing with such things as classroom management, evaluation of students, teaching methodologies and strategies, or any aspect of their teaching. This substantiates the findings found in the subscale Tolerance of Freedom.

In Integration, members of the group feel that effective mentoring requires maintaining close ties with all members of the group. It suggests that the amount of time the mentor spends with the inductee is significant and logistics such as room proximity between inductees and mentors is significant to the success of the leadership role of the mentor.

The fact that all members stressed the need for resolution of intermember conflicts is significant in that the socialization and politicalization of new teachers definitely impacts the behaviors of new teachers. Resolution of intermember conflicts minimizes the potential for this process to negatively impact the beginning teacher.
Differences and Conclusions

In Representation, it is significant that mentors speak and act as representatives of the group as perceived by inductees. This substantiates the findings in Role Assumption. However, mentors have conflicting views on these two subscales. In Representation, mentors perceive themselves as effective leaders without acting as representatives of the group. In Role Assumption, mentors feel they should actively exercise the leadership role.

In Demand Reconciliation, administrators disagree with inductees in that mentors are not perceived to be effective leaders in reconciling conflicting demands and reducing disorder to the system. The implications are that administrators wish to retain authoritative control in the system. The inductee is looking to the mentor for this leadership behavior as well. Another implication is that inductees place greater emphasis on the role of the mentor in their lives than do administrators or mentors.

In Tolerance of Uncertainty, the inductees' perceptions of tolerance and emotional control (anxiety) are significantly different than the mentor. The implications may deal with the characteristic of confidence. Beginning teachers may maximize
this characteristic due to their inexperience, while mentors minimize this leadership characteristic because of their experience. The implication is that mentor teachers may wish to place greater sensitivity on this characteristic in the attempt to minimize the amount of anxiety an inductee may experience in the induction process.

In Persuasiveness, the inductees significantly differed with both mentors and administrators. Mentors and administrators perceived their roles as that of reducing persuasiveness and argument and refraining in portraying strong convictions. These behaviors substantiate the findings under Tolerance of Freedom. The mentors and administrators reflect an attitude that allows the inductee to grow professionally and to gain confidence with minimal interference in the professional growth of the inductee. A significant point to be made is that according to the literature described in Chapter Two, these perceptions held by mentors and administrators may interfere with the induction process. The inductee expects the mentor to be persuasive. But what may occur is that the mentor does not perceive this as being important, and the induction program effects are minimized by this perception held by the mentor.
In *Initiation of Structure*, the inductees' perceptions of leaders defining their own roles were significantly different than administrators. Administrators may experience difficulty in relinquishing perceived authoritative control to mentors. If there is validity in this assumption, induction programs may experience less success as a result of this perception of leadership held by administrators.

In *Consideration*, administrators significantly disagreed with the perceptions of what an effective mentor is in the perceptions held by inductees. Administrators did not perceive comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers as significant to the perceived notions of what constitutes an effective mentor. These data conflict with the perceptions held by administrators in *Tolerance of Freedom and Role Assumption*. There may be a possible correlation between this perception and the perceptions administrators held in *Initiation of Structure*. Administrators may experience difficulty in relinquishing perceived authority to mentor teachers. The implication may suggest that administrators may need to further sensitize their perceptions of the needs of the inductee and the role of the mentor in the induction process.
The administrators' duties and obligations may be too extensive for them to have sufficient time to devote in assisting inductees and monitoring mentors in the induction program. Actually, it is not relinquishing authority but rather, it is assigning responsibilities.

In Predictive Accuracy, mentors did not perceive effective leadership as exhibiting foresight and predicting outcomes. The inductees significantly disagreed with this. The implications for mentors and inductees is that the inductees exhibit high levels of confidence in the mentor teacher. The socialization of the teacher may have subliminally affected the perceptions of leadership as held by the mentor teacher. There may be a tendency for the mentor teachers to significantly minimize their importance to the inductee and the induction program. These issues were explored and documented quite thoroughly in the research by Lortie, 1975; Howey & Zimpfer, 1986; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Joyce & Cliff, 1984 and other researchers (see Chapter Two).

In Superior Orientation, administrators perceive as important the need for mentors to maintain cordial relations with superiors. In Consideration, the comfort and well being of followers was not considered significant by administrators. The implications can be made in the analysis of these two sets of data that administra-
tors are crucial to the success of an induction program. There may be a question of turf custody. How secure the administrator perceives his/her position may affect several facets of an induction program. One, to participate or not to participate in an induction program? Two, how does the administrator choose mentor teachers for their role? And, finally, how the administrator may socialize the inductee into their new professional role?

3. Do mentor teachers differ in their perceptions of leadership characteristics as described in the twelve subscales of the LBDQ-Form XII with the perceptions of administrators/teacher leaders?

There was no significant difference between mentors and administrators in any of the twelve subscales as to their perceptions of what an effective mentor should be in a leadership capacity. Juxtaposed, the data for both of these members had great similarities in their responses.

The implication may suggest that administrators/teacher leaders choose mentor teachers who hold similar philosophical tenets of education and not necessarily those whose abilities suggest that they would be effective leaders. In the subscales Representation, Persuasion, and Predictive Accuracy, the mentors' significantly
different responses connote an apathy or submission to superordinate decision making. In most subscales (8), the administrators projected a more conservative attitude as to what makes a mentor teacher a more effective leader.

4. How do inductees view leadership characteristics of mentor teachers as compared to administrators and mentors?

Inductees had eight subscales in which they significantly differed from mentors and administrators. There was no particular pattern of differences. There appears to be greater emphasis stressed (according to the marks made on the answers) by inductees on the role a mentor teacher should perform in the induction process. An assumption is made that the socialization of the teacher has not yet transpired. Support for this assumption is in the subscale Persuasion. Inductees place heavy emphasis (F - 7.06) on persuasion and exhibiting strong convictions. The large significant difference by administrators and mentors imply that once in the profession, a teacher is socialized to control his or her convictions, argumentation, and persuasiveness. There appears to be validity in this assumption.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to find out if there were significant differences in how inductees, mentors, and
administrators/teacher leaders perceived leadership characteristics of mentor teachers in the induction process. If there were differences, how would they impact the induction process? An ongoing induction program could provide data on the significance or insignificance of this impact.

The instrument used to make this investigation was utilized to focus entirely on leadership. The results in using this instrument strongly suggest there are significant differences within the independent variable (the group) on what constitutes effective leadership by mentors. Some implications are that mentors are considered important figures in the professional life of an inductee. The inductee looks to the mentor for advice, support, direction, and strength in the leadership role. There is an implication that teacher mentoring may be desired by the inductee. When there is not a mentoring/induction program, this may significantly contribute to poorer performances and potential early dropouts from the teaching profession. There are implications that administrators/teacher leaders may wish to project more sensitivity to the needs of the beginning teachers and to the complexities that come from the mentoring role.
Recommendations for Further Research

Leadership is a complex phenomena. Bennis and Nanus established that there are over 350 working definitions of leadership. Much additional research is needed for greater specificity on the concept of leadership as related to teacher mentoring. Leadership by mentors in induction programs is crucial to the successes or failures of induction programs. More knowledge needs to be obtained about this concept of mentoring/leadership so that inductees can become more efficient/productive in their new professional careers. Effective leadership by mentors may lend itself to greater security on behalf of the inductees. More research is needed on the administrator/teacher leader selection process of mentor teachers. What criteria are being used to describe what an effective mentor is in the mentor selection process?

The generalizability of this study may not apply to all school districts. A logical and fruitful extension of this study would be to make replication in various school districts in different regions and covering all socioeconomic classes. Future research studies could be designed to use other instruments to make comparisons in the accumulation of data. A survey designed specifically for induction programs may increase generalizability of the study.
Longitudinal studies are needed to add more clarity into the significance or insignificance that induction projects may have on its participants. Studies could be designed to investigate specifically how administrators select mentor teachers. This could be of great significance on impacting induction programs. Presently, there does not appear to be parameters for this selection process. There needs to be a more extensive scientific analysis of data to determine their authenticity (external criticism).

There could be induction projects of an experimental design that involves two or more independent variables (at least one of which is manipulated) in order to study the effects of the variables individually and in interaction with each other. For example, there could be a control group in an induction program and a group where inductees choose mentors at random to assist them without administrators selection of mentors.

Further research is needed to ascertain why inductees are significantly different (in most subscale categories) than administrators and mentors in their perceived characteristics that
are reflective of effective mentors. Through the emphasis that inductees put in most of their answers to the questions in the twelve subscales, a projection is made that inductees take the induction program and the concept of mentoring quite seriously. This significant difference in 7 subscale categories projects that greater emphasis be placed upon role clarification of all members in the group. Succinctly, there appears need for sensitivity/awareness sessions by all members in the group as to the responsibilities one member has to the other members. Also, these sessions may focus on rights clarification of each member of the group.

The size of the standard deviation in this study indicates variance within members of the group. Research is needed to investigate the sources of variance.

Only through extensive research can the database and knowledge base on induction be expanded. The vast database on the problems of beginning teachers strongly suggests that much is to
be accomplished in assisting beginning teachers to lead productive and rewarding careers. This condition is exacerbated by the fact that vast arrays of new teachers will be entering the profession in the late 1980's and on into the 1990's. Extended research on the induction process can only benefit these large numbers of new teachers. The complexities facing teachers in the late 1980's and early 1990's are vast. Inductees cannot be expected to handle these complexities on their own. This research has attempted to emphasize the leadership responsibilities of mentor teachers; their selection process; and the impact they have on beginning teachers. Effective induction programs for these inductees are a fact of life. These programs become effective through strong leadership. Strong leadership is attained where the knowledge base is such that it reveals the importance of this role and how leaders can become more effective in making changes.
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THE FRANKLIN COUNTY/OSU INDUCTION PROJECT

The survey (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII) which you are being asked to respond to is a part of the total induction project that you have participated in this past school year. It is to be answered from your particular perspective--mentor, inductee, or administrator/teacher leader. It is imperative that you note this on your questionnaire. No names are to be placed on the survey as your anonymity is guaranteed.

You should answer each question by placing a circle around the letter provided on the survey which you feel best describes the perceived characteristics of an effective mentor.

After completion, the survey should be placed in the provided envelope. The survey will be picked up from you personally on the third school day after receiving it. The survey can be completed with relative ease in twenty minutes. You should feel free to take more time if needed.

Your serious attention to this survey is greatly appreciated.

THANK YOU
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List of Items in the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
(Original Form of 150 Items)

He plans his day's activities in detail.
He refuses to compromise a point.
He makes his attitudes clear to the group.
He does personal favors for group members.
He encourages the members to work as a team.
He expresses appreciation when a member does a good job.
He defends the group against criticism.
He encourages overtime work.
He tries out his new ideas in the group.
He has everything going according to schedule.

He rules with an iron hand.
He seeks information from group members.
He invites members to his home.
He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
He criticizes poor work.

He makes outside contacts for the group.
He talks about how much should be done.
He stresses the need for new practices.
He meets with the group at regularly scheduled times.
He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.

He is easy to understand.
He engages in friendly jokes and comments during group meetings.
He sides with the same members in cases of disagreement.
He compliments a member on his work in front of others.
He sells the public on the importance of his group.

He asks for more than the members can get done.
He follows routine to the letter.
He works without a plan.
He uses his veto powers.
He keeps informed about the work that is being done.
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He helps members of the group with their personal problems.
He helps new members make adjustments.
He criticizes a member in front of others.
He stands up for the group even if it makes him unpopular.
He encourages slow working members to greater effort.

He waits for the group to push new ideas.
He assigns members to particular tasks.
He insists that everything be done his way.
He keeps the group informed.
He works right along with the group.

He asks for sacrifices from individuals for the good of the group.
He sees that a member is rewarded for a job well done.
He speaks in public in the name of the group.
He sets an example by working hard himself.
He pushes new ways of doing things.

He asks that members follow organizational lines.
He yields to others in a discussion.
He finds time to listen to other members.
He asks to be called by his first name.
He encourages the group to organize social activities.

He criticizes members for small mistakes.
He seeks special advantages for his group.
He sees to it that members are working up to capacity.
He rejects suggestions for change.
He figures ahead on what should be done.

He has members share in making decisions.
He calls the group together to talk things over.
He discusses his personal problems with group members.
He encourages understanding of points of view of other members.
He reacts favorably to anything members do.

He takes the blame when outsiders criticize the group.
He emphasizes the quantity of work.
He changes his approach to meet new situations.
He maintains definite standards of performance.
He changes the duties of members without first talking it over with them.
He keeps well informed about the progress of the group.
He keeps to himself.
He gives personal attention to members who seem neglected.
He criticizes his own performance.
He is spokesman for the group.

He lets members work at their own speed.
He suggests new approaches to problems.
He treats members like cogs in a machine.
He encourages members to express their ideas and opinions.
He gives information on how to do things.

He calls members by their first names.
He puts group welfare above the welfare of any member.
He gives credit when credit is due.
He tries to keep the group in good standing with those in higher authority.
He emphasizes the quality of work.

He resists changes in ways of doing things.
He budgets his time.
He follows the guidance of the group.
He asks to be informed on decisions made by members.
He looks out for the personal welfare of individual members.

He tries to stop rumors when they occur.
He "rides" the member who makes a mistake.
He reverses his stand when he meets outside opposition.
He advises members to take it easy.
He originates new approaches to problems.

He sees that members have the material they need to work with.
He lets others do their work the way they think best.
He provides means for members to communicate with each other.
He attends social events of the group.
He blames the same members when anything goes wrong.

He tells a member when he does a particularly good job.
He presents only his own point of view to outsiders.
He stresses being ahead of competing groups.
He encourages members to start new activities.
He shows members how each job fits into the total picture.
He refuses to explain his actions.
He is aware of conflicts when they occur in the group.
He draws a definite line between himself and the rest of the group.
He discourages individual criticism of group behavior.
He explains the reasons for criticisms.
He speaks favorably of the group when talking with outsiders.
He "needles" members for greater effort.
He is first in getting things started.
He uses a standard method of evaluating members.
He acts without consulting the group.
He gives advance notice of changes.
He associates with members regardless of their position.
He stresses the importance of high morale in the group.
He uses constructive criticism.
He backs up the members in their actions.
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**ITEM ANALYSIS DATA FOR THE ORIGINAL L.B.D.Q.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Scoring Form Key</th>
<th>Own Dimension</th>
<th>Other Dimensions</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Communication Up</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Communication Up</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Scoring Form</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Correlation with:</td>
<td>Own Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Initiation</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Domination</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Communication Down</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Membership</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Integration</td>
<td>B -</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Recognition</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Representation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Production</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Initiation</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Organization</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Domination</td>
<td>B -</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Communication Up</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Membership</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Integration</td>
<td>B -</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Recognition</td>
<td>B -</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Representation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Production</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Initiation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Domination</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Communication Down</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Membership</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Integration</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Recognition</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Representation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Production</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Initiation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Domination</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Communication Up</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Membership</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Integration</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Recognition</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Representation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Scoring Form Key</td>
<td>Correlation with Own Dimension</td>
<td>Correlation with Other Dimensions</td>
<td>Correlation with Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-81</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Communication Up</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-89</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Communication Up</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Scoring Form</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Correlation with Own Dimension</td>
<td>Correlation with Other Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .81</td>
<td>- .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Communication Up</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .76</td>
<td>- .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A -</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .87</td>
<td>- .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>B -</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .53</td>
<td>- .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>B -</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .06</td>
<td>- .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>A +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>B +</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Analysis Data for 150 Items—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Scoring Form</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Correlation with:</th>
<th>Correlation with:</th>
<th>Correlation with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Own Dimension</td>
<td>Other Dimensions</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Communication Up</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Communication Up</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Communication Down</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Correlation values range from -1 to 1, indicating the strength and direction of the relationship between the item and the dimension or other items.
- A positive correlation indicates a positive relationship, while a negative correlation indicates an inverse relationship.
- The table includes correlations for within-dimension (Own Dimension) and across-dimension (Other Dimensions) evaluations, as well as an overall evaluation (Self) for the item.
APPENDIX E

MONOGRAPHS IN THE LEADERSHIP SERIES

IN OHIO STUDIES IN PERSONNEL
Appendix E

MONOGRAPHS IN THE LEADERSHIP SERIES
IN OHIO STUDIES IN PERSONNEL
R-80 Methods in the Study of Administrative Leadership,
by Ralph M. Stogdill, and Carroll L. Shartle

This monograph consists of a set of manuals which describe various
methods that were developed for use in the Ohio State Leadership
Studies. The methods include interviews, measures of organization
structure, sociometric measures of personal interaction, measures of
work performance, responsibility, authority, delegation and leader
behavior, and ratings of effectiveness. Data on the reliability and
validity of the various methods, and directions for administration and
scoring the various tests and scales are included.

R-81 Patterns of Administrative Performance,
by Ralph M. Stogdill, Carroll L. Shartle and Associates

The four studies included in this monograph attempt to answer
questions concerning the relationship of performance to the type of
position occupied by the administrator. The methods used for the
collection of data are those described in Monograph No. R-80. The
data are analyzed in terms of differences between persons, between
types of positions, between types of organizations and between levels
(status) in the organization hierarchy.

R-82 Leadership and Perceptions of Organization,
by Ellis L. Scott

In this study of enlisted men aboard submarines, each man's percep-
tion of the structure of his unit or organization was compared
with an organization chart prepared for his unit. The data are analyzed
in terms of (1) discrepancies between perceived organization and
charted organization, and (2) correspondences (reciprocations) be-
tween the perceptions of superiors, peers and subordinates. The re-
lationship of perceptual error and perceptual reciprocation to morale,
unit effectiveness and other variables is discussed. The methods used
are based, in part, on those described in Monograph No. R-80.
R-83 *Leadership and Its Effects upon the Group*,
by Donald T. Campbell

This monograph, based on the study of a squadron of submarines, is concerned with the effects of leadership upon group performance and morale. A wide variety of criterion scores, including some 60 measures of effectiveness and morale for ships and for units of organization within ships, are analyzed and related to measures of leadership among commissioned and non-commissioned personnel. The criterion scores include objective measures as well as reputational data and evaluative ratings. The methods are based in part on those described in Monograph R-80.

R-84 *Leadership and Structure of Personal Interaction*,
by Ralph M. Stogdill

This monograph describes (1) a sociometric study of personal interaction in organizations of various sizes, and (2) a study of responsibility-authority relationships between superiors and subordinates in large and small organizations. Data on the relation of interaction measures and of responsibility and authority scores to measures of status, leader behavior and other variables are presented. Analysis of the data indicate that the performances, interactions, responsibility and authority of superiors exert a direct effect upon the performances and interactions of subordinates.

R-85 *A Predictive Study of Administrative Work Patterns*,
by Ralph M. Stogdill, Carroll L. Shartle, Ellis L. Scott, Alvin E. Coons and William E. Jaynes

Twenty Navy officers were studied before being transferred to new positions. The twenty officers whom the transferees were to replace were also studied. The data obtained from the study of these two sets of officers were used to predict the future behavior of the officers being transferred. Six months later they were restudied on their new jobs. It was found that some forms of behavior were predicted more accurately in terms of the previous behavior of the men being transferred. Other behaviors were predicted more accurately in terms of the behavior of the previous occupants of the jobs. The methods for collecting data are described in Monograph No. R-80.
Leadership and Role Expectations
by Ralph M. Stogdill, Ellis L. Scott, and William E. Jaynes

In this study of a large research organization, 57 civilian and military administrators were asked to describe what they do and what they ought to do on 45 items of work performance, leader behavior, responsibility and authority. The "does" and "ought to do" behaviors of each subject were also described by two subordinates. The data are analyzed in terms of relationships between expectations and performance, as well as in terms of discrepancies between expectations and performance. The methods for collecting data are described in Monograph R-80.

Group Dimensions: A Manual for Their Measurement,
by John K. Hemphill

This monograph describes a set of scales for the measurement of thirteen different dimensions of social groups. Normative data derived from the study of a wide variety of groups, as well as data on the reliability and validity of the scales are presented. The instructions include directions for administration and scoring. Data on the relation of group dimension scores to measures of productivity and job satisfaction are presented.

Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement,
by Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, Editors

This monograph consists of a collection of papers by staff members of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. The papers describe the development, analysis and application of a set of items devised for the description of leader behavior. These items were used for the description of the leader behavior of business executives, foremen, teachers, college administrators, Air Force officers and Navy officers. Data on the relation of leader behavior to effectiveness measures, group descriptions and attitude climate are presented. A copy of the Leader Behavior Descriptions Questionnaire and directions for its use are also included.
No. 32  *Situational Factors in Leadership*,
by John K. Hemphill, 1949, 144 pp.

This monograph presents the results obtained from a questionnaire study of 500 groups and their leaders. Each group was described by a member who checked scaled statements designed to describe 15 different group dimensions. The same member also described the behavior and evaluated the adequacy of the top leader of the group. The data are analyzed in terms of the interrelationships between leader behavior, leadership adequacy and group dimensions.

No. 33  *Leadership and Supervision in Industry: An Evaluation of a Supervisory Training Program*,

This monograph describes a study designed to evaluate the results of a training program for foremen in a large manufacturing plant. The subjects were three matched groups of foremen who had completed the human relations training course at different times, and a matched group of untrained foremen. The subjects described their own attitudes about how groups should be supervised and also described the behavior of their own supervisors. The superior and the subordinates of each foreman also described the behavior of the foreman and indicated their conception of the behavior of an ideal foreman. The analysis compares trained and untrained foremen, and compares the behavior, attitudes and effectiveness of foremen who operate under different patterns of leadership.
APPENDIX F

SCORING KEY  LBDQ FORM XII

157
Appendix F

SCORING KEY LBDQ FORM XII

*Starred items are scored 1 2 3 4 5
All other items are scored 5 4 3 2 1

13. 37. *61. 84.
15. 39. *63. 86.
*16. 40. 64. *87.
17. 41. 88.
18. *42. *65. 89.
19. 43. *66. 90.
20. 44. 67. *91.
22. *46. 69. 93.
23. 47. 70. 94.
24. 48. *71. 95.

1. 25. 49. 72. 96.
3. 27. 51. 74. 98.
4. 28. 52. 75. 99.
5. 29. *53. 76. 100.
*6. 30. 54. 77.
7. 31. 55. 78.
8. 32. *56. 79.
9. 33. *57. 80.
10. 34. 58. 81.
11. 35. 59. 82.
*12. *36. 60. 83.
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LBDQ FORM XII - RECORD SHEET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ Form XII - RECORD SHEET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tol. Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tol. Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

SCORING KEY

161
Appendix H

Scoring Key

The subject indicates his response by drawing a circle around one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) following an item. As indicated on the Scoring Key, most items are scored: A B C D E

5 4 3 2 1

A circle around A gives the item a score of 5; a circle around B gives it a score of 4; and a circle around E gives the item a score of 1.

The 20 starred items on the Scoring Key are scored in the reverse direction, as follows: A B C D E

1 2 3 4 5

In use at the Bureau of Business Research, the score is written after each item in the margin of the test booklet (questionnaire).
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Appendix I

Subscale Means and Standard Deviations

There are no norms for the LBDQ. The questionnaire was designed for use as a research device. It is not recommended for use in selection, assignment, or assessment purposes.

The means and standard deviations for several highly selected samples are shown in Table 1. The samples consist of commissioned and noncommissioned officers in an army combat division, the administrative officers in a state highway patrol headquarters office, the executives in an aircraft engineering staff, ministers of various denominations of an Ohio community, leaders in community development activities throughout the state of Ohio, presidents of "successful" corporations, presidents of labor unions, presidents of colleges and universities, and United States Senators.

Reliability of the Subscales

The reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The modification consists in the fact that each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in its subscale rather than with the subscale score including the item. This procedure yields a conservative estimate of subscale reliability. The reliability coefficients are shown in Table 2.
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**Table 2. Reliability Coefficients (Modified Kuder-Richardson)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Army Division</th>
<th>Highway Patrol</th>
<th>Aircraft Executives</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Community Leaders</th>
<th>Corporation Presidents</th>
<th>Labor Presidents</th>
<th>College Presidents</th>
<th>Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance Uncertainty</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiating Structure</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance Freedom</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Assumption</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE--FORM XII
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—Form XII

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

Purpose of the Questionnaire

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

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

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

1. Acts as the spokesperson of the group ...................................... A B C D E
2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision ................................ A B C D E
3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group .................................... A B C D E
4. Lets group members know what is expected of them ................... A B C D E
5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work ................... A B C D E
6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group ............................ A B C D E
7. Is friendly and approachable .................................................. A B C D E
8. Encourages overtime work ..................................................... A B C D E
9. Makes accurate decisions ....................................................... A B C D E
10. Gets along well with the people above him/her ........................... A B C D E
11. Publicizes the activities of the group ........................................ A B C D E
12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next ... A B C D E
13. His/her arguments are convincing ........................................ A B C D E
14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures ......................... A B C D E
15. Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems ... A B C D E
16. Fails to take necessary action .............................................. A B C D E
17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group .... A B C D E
18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups .......................... A B C D E
19. Keeps the group working together as a team ....................... A B C D E
20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority .......... A B C D E
21. Speaks as the representative of the group ............................ A B C D E
22. Accepts defeat in stride .................................................... A B C D E
23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view ....................... A B C D E
24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group .................................... A B C D E
25. Encourages initiative in the group members ....................... A B C D E
26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group .... A B C D E
27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation ................ A B C D E
28. Needles members for greater effort ...................................... A B C D E
29. Seems able to predict what is coming next .......................... A B C D E
30. Is working hard for a promotion ......................................... A B C D E
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present .................... A B C D E
32. Accepts delays without becoming upset ............................. A B C D E
33. Is a very persuasive talker ................................................ A B C D E
34. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group .......................... A B C D E
35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best .......... A B C D E
36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her ..................... A B C D E
37. Treats all group members as his/her equals ...................................... A B C D E
38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace ........................................... A B C D E
39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group ............................... A B C D E
40. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions .......... A B C D E
41. Represents the group at outside meetings .......................................... A B C D E
42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments ..................... A B C D E
43. Is very skillful in an argument ...................................................... A B C D E
44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done ......................... A B C D E
45. Assigns a task, then lets the members handle it ............................... A B C D E
46. Is the leader of the group in name only .......................................... A B C D E
47. Gives advance notice of changes ................................................... A B C D E
48. Pushes for increased production ...................................................... A B C D E
49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts ..................................... A B C D E
50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position ......................................... A B C D E
51. Handles complex problems efficiently ............................................. A B C D E
52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty ............................... A B C D E
53. Is not a very convincing talker ...................................................... A B C D E
54. Assigns group members to particular tasks ....................................... A B C D E
55. Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it ................ A B C D E
56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm ................................... A B C D E
57. Keeps to himself/herself ................................................................. A B C D E
58. Asks the members to work harder ................................................... A B C D E
59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events .................................... A B C D E
60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members ...... A B C D E
61. Gets swamped by details .................................................. A B C D E
62. Can wait just so long, then blows up ................................. A B C D E
63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction .............................. A B C D E
64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members .................................................... A B C D E
65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action ........ A B C D E
66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep .... A B C D E
67. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members ........ A B C D E
68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work ................ A B C D E
69. Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated ............ A B C D E
70. His/her word carries weight with superiors ........................ A B C D E
71. Gets things all tangled up ................................................ A B C D E
72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events .......... A B C D E
73. Is an inspiring talker ...................................................... A B C D E
74. Schedules the work to be done ........................................ A B C D E
75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative ...................... A B C D E
76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise ........................ A B C D E
77. Is willing to make changes .............................................. A B C D E
78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done ...................... A B C D E
79. Helps group members settle their differences .................. A B C D E
80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors .............. A B C D E
81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order .................... A B C D E
82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs .......... A B C D E
83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage .... A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

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

The LBDQ is usually employed by followers to describe the behaviors of their leader or supervisor. However, the questionnaire can be used by peers or superiors to describe a given leader whom they know well enough to describe accurately. With proper changes in instructions, the questionnaire can also be used by a leader to describe his own behavior.

The questionnaire can be administered individually or in groups. It is usually not necessary for the person making the description to write his name on the test booklet. However, the name of the leader being described should be written on the test booklet. It is necessary to identify the person being described whenever it is desired to add together (and obtain an average of) the descriptions of several describers.

How may describers are required to provide a satisfactory index score of the leader's behavior? Halpin (7) suggests that "a minimum of four respondents per leader is desirable, and additional respondents beyond ten do not increase significantly the stability of the index scores. Six or seven respondents per leader would be a good standard."

In explaining the purpose and nature of a research project to a group of respondents, it has not been found necessary to caution them about honesty or frankness. It has been found sufficient to say, "All that is required is for you to describe your supervisor's behavior as
accurately as possible." Whenever possible to do so, it is desirable to assure the respondents that their descriptions will not be seen by any of the persons whom they are asked to describe.
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