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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The need for effective local governance systems has never been greater. Actions by the federal and state governments have shifted responsibility for many programs and services to the local level and local officials are being required to make decisions having significant political, social and economic consequences. In Ohio 12,126 men and women held county, township, and municipal government positions in 1988 (Collamore, 1988). These positions include commissioners, mayors, trustees auditors, treasurers and other elected and appointed department heads. Leadership and managerial skills are essential qualities for elected officials to possess. Several agencies provide general training after the leaders have been in office for a time, however little evidence is available regarding new and emerging elected leaders in small and mid-size communities having access to personal assessment of their public administration and leadership skills (Boothe, 1990).

Turnover is high among elected officials with nearly 20% of Ohio's elected officials being replaced biennially (Collamore, 1988). Dr. Cornelia Flora, of the Kansas Rural Development Center, has suggested that one
characteristic of strong, innovative rural communities is a flexible, dispersed leadership (Flora, 1988). Both turnover and the need for broad based public policy leadership point to the growing demand for preparation in public decision making.

Officials, most of whom are part-time volunteers in service to their communities, find themselves overwhelmed at the number and scope of decisions they must make and the criticism heaped on them. A complaint about public life is that when well-motivated individuals leave their comfortable private-sector occupations to take on elective or appointive office they often find themselves in hopelessly frustrating bureaucratic situations, strangled by red tape, and thwarted by poorly designed public process (Gardner, 1990). Both elected and appointed local government officials make important decisions affecting the lives of all citizens. Officials in rural areas face particularly difficult challenges. With little access to professional advice and expertise, these citizen-leaders must provide an integrated package of programs and services, manage the funds to pay for them, and face the pressure of eliminating some popular programs because local funds are insufficient to support them. Information to make these decisions is not always available, and the expertise local officials bring to public office is not always sufficient to do the job (CIES, 1987).

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) developed an assessment center to assist current and aspiring county commissioners in
identifying their current managerial capabilities and training needs. The assessment center is composed of seven different exercises which enable participants to demonstrate their abilities on fifteen job related dimensions. The fifteen job related dimensions were based on a competency profile developed in February, 1991 of rural Ohio county commissioners. These dimensions were identified through the DACUM process. DACUM (Developing A Curriculum) was the method used to determine the competencies or tasks that must be performed by county commissioners. A group of eight experts selected from all county commissioners in Ohio were recruited to serve on the DACUM committee. The committee worked for two days under the guidance of three facilitators to develop a DACUM chart. (Appendix A) Modified, small group brainstorming techniques were used to obtain the expertise and consensus of the committee.

The job related dimensions of the Assessment Center for County Extension Chairs, The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service were also utilized. The fifteen dimensions were: oral communication, written communication, leadership, initiative, planning/organizing, decision making/judgement, development of coworkers, behavioral flexibility, organizational sensitivity, assertiveness, objectivity, perception, sensitivity, management control and collaborativeness.
Statement of the problem

The assessment center for public officials was developed to identify and evaluate managerial and leadership capabilities of current rural Ohio county commissioners and or those that aspire to be. The problem investigated was:

To determine the managerial and leadership skills of county commissioners and to determine the difference in perceptions of county extension chairs, county commissioners and assessors of county commissioners' managerial and leadership skills concerning the fifteen assessment center dimensions. The study attempted to define the leadership and managerial skills that the county commissioners possess by asking the three groups.
Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

1. To describe perceptions of assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

2. To describe perceptions of county commissioners of their leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

3. To describe perceptions of county extension chairs of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

4. To compare the perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs, and assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.
Definition of Terms

In order to maintain clarity, the following terms were defined:

Assessment Center: A set of standardized procedures used to identify managerial potential (Yukl, 1989).

Assessor: A member of a trained team of evaluators drawn from within The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service who observed participant performance during the assessment center process and judged the extent to which each participant exhibited certain desired behaviors.

County Chair: County Extension Agent with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service who has management and supervisory responsibilities for the county extension office in addition to their program responsibilities.

Dacum: (Developing A Curriculum) A method used to determine the competencies or tasks that must be performed by persons employed in an occupational area.

Dimension: One of fifteen behaviors that were considered specific, identifiable and measurable by a competency profile on county commissioners. They include:

1. Oral communication: The extent to which one can give an oral presentation and communicate on a one-to-one basis by listening and responding. Specific behaviors include: public speaking skills, uses active listening skills, negotiation skills, ability to conceptualize ideas, comments clearly stated and understandable, provides reasonable
arguments to support views.

2. Written communication: The extent to which one can express effectively his/her ideas in writing. Specific behaviors include: organization skills, ability to conceptualize and convey ideas effectively, reasonable in length, misspelled words or poor grammar do not detract from quality of information presented.

3. Leadership: The ability to influence others to move toward the attainment of a specific goal as efficiently as possible using such techniques as delegation and persuasiveness. Specific behaviors include: uses a team oriented, positive approach, sets goals, defines and solves problems proactively, motivates a group or individual, handles indepth/complex issues, demonstrates vision, understands parliamentary procedure, expresses self forcefully, and influences other group members’ or an individual’s final decision.

4. Initiative: The ability to begin actions without stimulation and support from others, the capacity to see courses of action and to discover new means of goal achievement. Specific behaviors include: ability to conceptualize and communicate ideas, "timing skills", uses a proactive approach.

5. Planning/organizing: The process of establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal. Specific behaviors include: ability to conceptualize ideas, approaches problems
systematically using time and organizational management skills, sets priorities, ability to handle indepth/complex issues and provides follow-up necessary to assure solutions.

6. Decision making/judgment: The process of identifying problems securing relevant information, developing alternative courses of action, and the readiness of making a decision from the information gathered. Specific behaviors include: ability to handle indepth/complex issues, problem solving skills, has good arguments to support ideas, questions problems instead of accepting at face value, sets priorities, develops solutions that are practical and realistic, demonstrates ethical behavior and long range vision.

7. Development of coworkers: The extent to which one develops and/or assists in developing the skills and competencies of coworkers through training and development activities, counseling, and delegating the duties related to current and future jobs. Specific behaviors include: uses active listening skills, delegates responsibility to individuals in order to provide experience in new areas, assists coworkers in the development of a plan to improve performance, helps coworkers analyze their strengths and weaknesses, recognizes and helps manage employee stress and values a team approach.

8. Behavioral flexibility: The extent to which one's behavior is flexible, adaptable and effective when confronted with different situations,
circumstances or personalities. Specific behaviors include: ability to adapt to change and responds effectively to crisis, willing to work toward consensus and compromise view when necessary, adjust approach to individual(s) he/she is working with, demonstrating patience, compatibility, diplomacy, and encouragement, yet willing to challenge when appropriate.

9. Organizational sensitivity: The degree of knowledge or awareness one has of formal and informal organizational policies and procedures. Specific behaviors include: recognizes, understands, and ethically considers existing or pending policy or legislation when making decisions and correctly utilizes this information in order to solve problems; understands and responds appropriately to fiscal matters.

10. Assertiveness: The degree to which one can effectively state his/her position positively and forcefully without being hostile or destructive. Specific behaviors include: proactively backs own view/position, expresses self forcefully, participates actively, demonstrates a willingness to challenge a position without being argumentative or aggressive, displays self-confidence, perseverance and stamina, utilizes negotiation skills when appropriate.

11. Objectivity: The extent to which one can analyze, judge and make a fair decision about a person or situation regardless of one's own attitudes or feelings. Specific behaviors include: considers and fairly
applies appropriate legislation and codes, approaches situations with an open mind.

12. **Perception**: The ability to identify or recognize a problem or potential problem. Specific behaviors include: demonstrates "timing skills", demonstrates ability to comprehend the scope of the problem or situation.

13. **Sensitivity**: The ability to respond/react to a problem considering the feelings, emotions, and needs of others. Specific behaviors include: recognizes stress, uses active listening skills, demonstrates patience and diplomacy.

14. **Management control**: The extent to which one maximizes and monitors the use of all resources to obtain effective outcomes. Specific behaviors include: understands and utilizes codes, legislation, fiscal and organizational resources that are consistent with sound business practices; demonstrates knowledge of parliamentary procedure and its uses, and handles in-depth/complex issues effectively.

15. **Collaborativeness**: The degree to which one is willing to work cooperatively with others in making decisions. Specific behaviors include: works effectively with group members, uses a team oriented approach, demonstrates compatibility and works toward consensus when appropriate, supportive of others, willing to share with others and to consult on important items.
Need For The Study

The assessment center serves as a basis for evaluation of the participating county commissioners. Currently the only evaluation they receive is the vote of their constituents. If they are not elected or re-elected they can only assume it was due to poor performance. Having experienced the assessment center and upon review of, self, assessor and extension chair assessments, the commissioners will recognize their strengths and weaknesses and overall potential for self development. The benefits to the participants will also include a better understanding of what a commissioner does and the qualities needed to be successful. When used effectively, these benefits provide a basis for career development, placement and manpower utilization. (Boehm & Hoyle, 1977) The assessment center ratings provide information to plan a personal development program for county commissioners.

The assessment center process is time consuming and expensive. The sample size for this study is small due to the number of county commissioner assessment centers that have been conducted. A principle criticism of assessment center research has been lack of representative validation samples. Studies range in sample size from 12 to 5943 with the median being 55 (Thornton & Byham, 1982).
The results of the study will help 1) to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills; 2) to provide a basis for planning personnel development opportunities for participants with regard to assessment identified weaknesses; and to 3) help to provide a liaison between The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and county commissioners by providing research based information on the assessment center.

The fact that this study is descriptive in nature and the results are drawn from the perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs and assessors is a limitation. The results are a reflection of what the three groups believe to be true. In addition the county commissioners that participated did so on a volunteer basis. Therefore it is assumed that those that participated typically participate in development programs to improve their performance and would therefore score higher in the assessment center.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The assessment center has been one of several methods available to organizations for use in evaluating and/or predicting managerial success of individuals. Assessment centers are currently being used in industrial, educational, military, government and other organizational settings (Smith & Boone, 1989). Organizations use assessment centers for a wide variety of purposes, including selection, placement, early identification of management potential, promotion, development, career management and training (Gaugler, et. al., 1990). To obtain knowledge of the assessment center process, a review of literature was conducted.

The use of assessment centers is on the increase. Moses (1987) estimated that over 5,000 organizations are utilizing assessment centers. A large number of published articles and chapters in books, reflect this increase. This increase according to Byham (1977) has been due to several key factors including:

- a process that has considerable scientific research and evaluation prior to widespread implementation;
- a number of organizations with a management climate that fostered research and development in the personnel selection area;
- a scientific and business community which facilitated communication of this idea; and
- the development of software items (manuals, techniques, simulations) which enabled smaller organizations to adopt the method.

Description

The term assessment center refers to a set of standardized procedures used to identify managerial potential (Yukl, 1989). Assessment centers are often defined as "a variety of testing techniques designed to allow candidates to demonstrate, under standardized conditions, the skills and abilities most essential for success in a given job" (Joiner, 1984). No two programs are specifically alike, however each utilizes multiple methods of assessing traits and skills, including projective tests and situational tests in addition to traditional methods like interviews and written tests (Yukl, 1989).

Usage has been most common among relatively large organizations such as American Telephone and Telegraph (T&T), IBM, General Electric (GE), JC Penny Comp. Inc., and Sears, Roebuck & Co. (Int. Staffing). Now the assessment center process is used in a variety of firms.
Thornton and Byham's (1982, p.1) definition of an assessment center is:

An assessment center is a comprehensive, standardized procedure in which multiple assessment of techniques such as situational exercises and job simulations (i.e. business games, discussion groups, reports and presentations) are used to evaluate individual employees for various purposes. A number of trained management evaluators, who are not in direct supervisory capacity over participants, conduct the assessment and make recommendations regarding the management potential and development needs of the participants. The results of the assessment are communicated to higher management and can be used for personnel decisions involving such things as promotion, transfers, and career planning. When the results are communicated to the participants, they form the basis for self-insight development planning.

Moses and Byham (1977) defined an assessment center as both a place and a process. It is a place where individuals participate in a variety of measurement techniques to measure predetermined qualities or abilities. It is also a process designed to provide standardized and objective conditions for evaluation. It is a physical center where individuals are evaluated for potential or for development or for placement purposes (Moses, 1987).

An assessment center is a process, an application of a specific methodology to the development of information about a candidate's job-
related strengths and weaknesses. This methodology includes an analysis of the skills required by a person to succeed on the job, the development of instruments to assess these critical skills in a job-related context, and the training of fair and impartial judges to process the information (Jaffee & Sefak, 1980).

According to the Task Force on assessment center standards (1979) an assessment center must meet the following criteria:

* Multiple assessment techniques must be used, one of which must be a simulation.
* Multiple assessors must be utilized. These assessors must be thoroughly trained prior to participating in the center.
* Judgements resulting in an outcome (i.e., recommendation for promotion, specific training on development) must be based on an integration of information from assessors and techniques.
* The overall evaluation of behavior must be made by the assessors at a separate time from the observation of behavior during the exercises.
* Simulation exercises must be included. These exercises are to be developed to tap a variety of predetermined behaviors and must have been pretested prior to use to insure that the techniques provide relevant, reliable, and objective behavioral information for the organization in question. The simulation must be job related.
*The dimensions, attributes, characteristics, qualities, skills, abilities or knowledge evaluated by the assessment center are to be determined by an analysis of relevant job behaviors.

*The techniques used in the assessment center should be designed to provide information which is used in evaluating the dimensions, attributes or qualities previously determined.

Assessment center procedures use a variety of methods to assess traits skills of candidates. The process normally lasts 2 - 5 days in which time projective tests, situational tests and traditional tests such as interviews and written tests are given. Writing exercises may be given to assess written communication skills and speaking exercises to evaluate oral communication skills (Yukl, 1989).

Assessment centers are most appropriate and likely to result in better predictions when the target job requires a variety of complex skills, the requirements of the target job vary substantially from those at the next lowest level in the organization or when applicants come from a variety of different backgrounds or locations making it difficult to obtain objective data upon which to make accurate predictions (Joiner, 1984).
History

Assessment centers have a long history dating back to before World War II. At that time the German army implemented a multiple assessment technique procedure they believed would greatly help in selecting military officers (Farago, 1942). The Germans knew that paper and pencil tests alone did not give a proper or total picture of a person's potential as an officer and wanted to be able to observe the behavior of potential candidates under different situations. Soon, England and the United States followed, using a similar procedure to select spies. Candidates went through a series of interviews, tests and performance simulations designed to reveal whether they possessed the qualities for intelligent work. The program was designed to reveal every asset and weakness the candidate possessed which could affect their subsequent job performance (Beatty, 1977). Since that time American and European businesses have used and improved the multiple assessment concept, now using these centers for staff development and promotional purposes (Cascio, 1982).

American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T) was the first industrial firm to initiate an assessment center in 1956. Cascio (1982) reported that this study was the largest and most comprehensive investigation of managerial career development ever undertaken. This longitudinal study was designed to try to "understand what characteristics (cognitive, motivational and attitudinal) are important to the career progress of young employees from the
time they take their first job in the Bell system and as they continue to move into middle and upper management level" (Cascio, 1982).

Process

The assessment center process consists of five steps: Job Analysis, Selecting of Dimensions and Activities, Training the Assessors, Conducting the Simulations and the Evaluation Report (Beatty & Schneier, 1977).

The first step in developing an assessment center is to conduct a job analysis to determine the major job elements of the candidates participating and to define the dimensions to be measured. Dimensions are those areas which will be evaluated.

Exercises are developed which simulate the most essential task areas in the classification. This allows assessors to observe, record, classify and evaluate job relevant behavior in job relevant situations. Using job simulation exercises tailored specifically to the classification of the job not only increases candidate acceptance and compliance with legal requirements for content validity, but also allows candidates to "get into" the simulations "as if" they were real life. In this way, candidates are in the best position to minimize the artificial stress (test anxiety) and demonstrate the extent to which they possess job relevant knowledge, skills, abilities and behaviors (Joiner, 1984).
Types of activities can vary among assessment centers. Burack (1972) identified the most common as the following:

1. **Inbasket** - usually considered the most important. Assessees are given a number of memos, reports, phone messages, letters, etc.. Their task is to dispose of the materials and then to defend to the assessor their actions or nonactions.

2. **Leaderless group discussion** - assessees are given a discussion question and asked to derive a group decision within an allotted time. No leader is designated.

3. **Management games** - assessees solve problems comparatively or competitively.

4. **Presentation** - assessees are given time to make oral presentations on a management topic or theme (5 - 10 min.).

Joiner identified two additional exercises commonly used:

5. **Role Play Exercise** - assessees assume the role of the incumbent of the position and must deal with a given situation.

6. **Written Report/Analysis Exercise** - assessees are given a job relevant document to analyze or a topic pertinent to the position and are instructed to provide a written report, position statement, outline a policy, etc.
There are a number of activities that are conducted and vary among different assessment centers. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service identified sixteen job related dimensions for their assessment center to assess county chairs. (Smith & Clark, 1987). Activities to assess the dimensions used by OCES include inbasket, leaderless group (assigned roles and unassigned), case study analysis, background interview, fact finding and interview simulation.

The next step is to identify and train the assessors in the activities to be conducted. Often assessors are managers that are two or more levels above the level being assessed. The number of assessors is normally a 4:6 or 4:4 to 1:1 ratio (Burack, 1972).

The evaluation of the assessees by the assessor is a critical step in the assessment center process. Overall evaluation of each candidate’s management potential is made by several staff members who interview the candidate, examine the results and observe the situational exercise. Each candidate receives a formal written report that summarizes the findings and recommendations. The assessors attempt to integrate the information from these diverse sources into coherent pictures of the motives, skills and behavioral tendencies of each candidate (Yukl, 1989). How the evaluations are provided to the candidates vary among organizations. The evaluation may give ideas for future direction and/or discuss particular exercises completed in the center.
The job of an assessor in an assessment center is exceedingly complex. Assessors must observe and record the performance of several candidates in job simulations and situational exercises, classify the recorded behaviors into dimensions of performance, and rate each candidate on each dimension. Assessors evaluate each candidate, taking into account performance across all exercises, and make recommendations regarding each candidate's potential or developmental needs (Gaugler & Thornton, 1989).

Dacum

Dacum (Developing A Curriculum) is a method used to determine the competencies or tasks that must be performed by persons employed in an occupational area. The profile chart that results from the DACUM analysis is a detailed and graphic portrayal of the skills or competencies involved in the occupation being studied. The DACUM analysis can be used as a basis for curriculum development, student learning, training needs assessments, worker performance evaluations and competency test development.

DACUM has been successfully used to analyze occupations at the professional, technical, skilled and semiskilled levels. DACUM operates on the following three premises: 1) expert workers are better able to describe/define their job than anyone else, 2) any job can be effectively and sufficiently described in terms of the tasks that successful workers in that occupation perform, and 3) all tasks have direct implications for the knowledge and attitudes that workers must have in order to perform the tasks
A carefully chosen group of about 8-12 experts from the occupational area form the DACUM committee. Committee members are recruited directly from business, industry, or the professions. The committee works under the guidance of a facilitator for two days to develop the DACUM chart. Modified small-group brainstorming techniques are used to obtain the collective expertise and consensus of the committee. (Norton, 1985)

Reliability and Validity

Considerable research has been conducted to determine the reliability, validity, and fairness of assessment centers. The majority have been very positive and supportive. Positive research findings concerning validity have found increased validity when compared to traditional selection and promotion techniques (McNutt, 1979). Studies of the validity of assessment center predictions of managerial potential usually examine the correlation between the composite evaluation and later managerial success. The research evidence suggests that assessment centers can effectively predict managerial success (Huck, 1973; Wexley & Yukl, 1984; Yukl, 1989). Byham (1983) reported that assessment centers are better indicators of future success than any other tool management has yet devised. He also reported that in addition to those indicators assessment centers provide other benefits such as positive influence on morale and job expectations. Candidates see the assessment center as a chance to show their ability in fair and realistic
There have been questions raised as to the reliability of the assessors. Gaugler and Thornton (1989) reported that although assessors are instructed to consider all information and all dimensions when evaluating assesseses, several lines of research suggest that only a few dimensions are typically used (Hinrichs & Haanpera, 1976; Russell, 1985; Sackett and Hakel, 1979; Schmitt, 1977; Kwartang, 1986). In addition, factor analytic research suggests that assessors' initial dimension ratings are dominated by a single general factor (Russell, 1985, Sackett & Hackel, 1979; Kwartang, 1986), which is probably best described as halo. This halo may be an overall evaluation of whether a particular manager is good or bad and may be derived from assessors' schemata of what is a good manager. In a study conducted by Nathan and Tippins (1990) on the effect of halo error in performance ratings it was concluded that "halo error is not nearly as serious a problem as has generally been presumed" (Kozlowski & Kirsch, 1987). Requiring assessors to rate a large number of dimensions has the additional disadvantage that it may adversely affect the discriminate validity of their ratings. In spite of overwhelming evidence that assessors do not make discriminations among more than a few dimensions, the number of dimensions assessors can effectively use has not been directly assessed.

Another issue is the concern of the lack of knowledge by the assessor and county chairpersons of the county commissioners job and it's demands
(as defined by the fifteen dimensions). Assessors should know what it takes to succeed. Some organizations use a combination of managers and "outside" assessors assuming that the manager will provide the necessary input on standards. There are situations where it is advisable to use professionals but usually the arguments are strongly in favor of using trained managers as assessors because of their greater job knowledge, their greater credibility to the assesses, and the greater acceptance of their conclusions by their fellow managers (Thornton & Byham, 1982). The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service assessment center for county commissioners have so far used "outside" assessors.

Studies indicate that assessment centers are often superior to other techniques in identifying management potential (Huck, 1973). Assessment centers are deemed more accurate because they sample actual behavior, not what the candidate says he or she would do. The assessment center method appears to provide validity above that normally associated with tests or panel interviews.

One of the best examples of validity is the longitudinal study conducted at American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T) by Bray, Campbell and Grant (1974). Eight years after the group of candidates were assessed, each candidate's progress in advancing into middle management was related back to assessment scores. Sixty four percent of the candidates predicted to reach middle management did, whereas only thirty two percent of the remaining
candidates reached middle management (Yukl, 1989).

From the studies to date; overall ratings of potential or performance from assessment center procedures generally have shown predictive power in determining future job success (Howard, 1974). Studies conducted by McEvoy & Beatty (1989) produced evidence that assessment centers are likely to be valid predictors of managerial performance over the long run, in a variety of different organizations.

Difficulties in assessments stem from the very nature of leadership. For example, measurements of steadiness and courage in a test that lasts for an hour (or a day) may be useful, but not necessarily predictive of steadiness and courage over weeks and months of stress, a very common circumstance for leaders (Gardner, 1990).

There is difficulty in defining any job. No one job description deals effectively with the complexity of all sets of requirements. In other words, managers seldom do the same thing repeatedly in the same way. Judgements of competence to perform in a management position is based on observations in job simulations in the assessment centers (Thornton & Byham, 1982).
**County Commissioners**

County commissioners are elected for four-year terms. Two are elected the year of the presidential election and one the year of the gubernatorial election. County commissioners are the general administrative body for the county government. They can perform those duties which are specifically authorized by the state legislature and no more. They are the county government taxing, budgeting, appropriating and purchasing authority. They hold title to county property.

County commissioners hold and adjudicate hearings on such matters as county zoning and county drainage petitions. In addition they appoint directors for human services, building inspector, county home, children’s home, etc. and appoint boards such as planning commission, zoning boards and children services board (Brubaker, 1989).

**Leadership**

Leadership means different things to many people and the number of definitions developed are too numerous to count. Stodgill (1974, pg.259) concluded after comprehensive research that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept."

The term often is confusing because of imprecise terms such as power, authority, management, administration, control and supervision to describe the same phenomena (Yukl, 1979). Most definitions of leadership reflect the
assumption that it involves an influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by the leader over followers. It is difficult to determine a single definition and depends on the objective and purpose of the researcher. The purpose of the assessment center is to determine the leadership effectiveness and managerial skills of the participants.

Stodgill (1974) suggested eleven perspectives of leadership. Leadership may be defined as:

1. Personality or effectiveness of personality.
2. The art of inducing compliance.
3. The exercise of influence.
4. A function of group process.
5. A form of persuasion.
6. A set of acts or behaviors.
7. A power relationship.
8. An instrument of goal achievement.
9. An effect of interaction.
10. A differentiated role.
11. The initiation of structure.

Any one of these meanings may apply to a certain circumstance, but no single definition is universally accepted. However leadership is clearly a role that leads toward goal achievement, involves interaction of influence, and usually results in some form of changed structure or behavior of groups,
organizations or communities. (Lassey, 1976).

The expectations of the individuals making the judgment of leadership effectiveness are also highly important. Molding the expectations of those enabled to make such a judgment may be a prime function of leadership. If the persons in a position to judge effectiveness perceive leadership to be effective by whatever criteria they will probably consider the leader good and effective even when he/she has performed poorly and ineffectively (Herman, Snyder, Cunningham, 1980).

An age old question is "Are successful leaders and managers born or made?" Prior to the 1930's it was believed that leadership was a property of the individual, that a limited number of people were uniquely endowed with abilities and traits which made it possible for them to become leaders. These abilities and traits were believed to be inherited rather than acquired (McGregor, 1974).

The trait measures of assessment center studies are not independent aspects of personality or ability, so these studies sometimes include a factor analysis to identify a smaller number of distinct traits and skills (Yukl, 1979). Dunnette (1971) reviewed four such studies and found that there was considerable agreement that the following six traits related to managerial success: 1) energy level, 2) organizing and planning, 3) interpersonal skills, 4) cognitive skills, 5) work-oriented motivation, and 6) personal control of feelings and resistance to stress. Comparably Kotter (1990) identified four
traits which he believes are developed from heredity or childhood. These traits are 1) drive/energy, 2) intelligence/intellectual skills, 3) mental/emotional health and 4) integrity.

Findings from research on leadership traits and skills have the greatest potential application to the selection and development of managers and administrators in large organizations. Intensive measurement procedures such as those used in assessment centers provide moderately accurate information about managerial motivation, personality traits, interpersonal skills and cognitive skills. When analyzed together with information about the person’s prior experience and performance, these assessments can be used to make reasonably good predictions about likely success in a higher managerial position. Accuracy of prediction increases when skills, traits and knowledge relevant to the position are determined in advance. Information about the person’s traits and skills are useful for identifying training needs in current jobs as well as preparing for higher level jobs. (Yukl, 1979).

The assessment center looks for traits that predict advancement to higher levels of management. In trait studies conducted by Stogdill (1974) conclusions were reached that recognized certain traits increase the likelihood that a leader will be effective, but they do not guarantee effectiveness and the relative importance of different traits is dependent on the nature of the leadership situation (Bass, 1981). A major limitation of this research is the possibility that some traits predicting advancement are not
relevant for effective performance of the present managerial job (Yukl, 1989).

Leadership development is a process that extends over many years. The realities of life require selection and training that occur early in the individual’s career, but that is only the first step. Leadership development calls for repeated assessments and repeated opportunities for training. All talent develops through an interplay - sometimes over many years - between native gifts on the one hand and opportunities and challenges on the other. (Gardner, 1990)

Distinction Between Leadership and Management

Managers, consultants, and management educators have developed and refined the processes which make up the core of modern management. These processes include planning and budgeting, organizing and staffing, and controlling and problem solving. These processes produce a degree of consistency and order. Leadership is different. It does not produce consistency and order, it produces movement. Leaders create change. They establish direction, align people, motivate and inspire.

Gardner has maintained that the word manager indicates that the individual so labeled holds a directive post in an organization, presiding over the processes by which the organization functions, allocating resources prudently and making the best possible use of people (Gardner, 1990). Yukl uses the terms leader and manager interchangeably.
Zaleznik (1977) observed that ".....managers and leaders are very different kinds of people. They differ in motivation, personal history, and in how they think and act." Some of the differences Zaleznik has suggested are: 1) whereas leaders shape organizational goals, managers react to preset organizational goals; 2) managers act to limit choices, enabling the work process to continue, while leaders are interested in fresh approaches and new alternatives; 3) managers are interested in how things get done, leaders in what the things being worked on will mean to those influenced or involved; and 4) managers maintain the status quo, while leaders act as agents for change. These statements suggest that the manager is a doer, the leader a motivator. Bennis (1978) has noted: "Many an institution is very well managed and very poorly led. It may excel in the ability to handle each day all the routine inputs - yet may never ask whether the routine should be done at all."

Some have proposed that for leadership to occur, one needs to be both manager and leader (Smith, 1992). Certain settings, organizational roles, and situations may require the combination of management and leadership while other settings, roles, and situations may require separate functions.
Summary

The increasing popularity of the assessment center method has stimulated a great amount of research concerning its effectiveness (Gaugler, B.; Rosenthal, D.; Thornton, G.; Bentson, C., 1990). There have been numerous published articles supporting the use of assessment centers for selection and personal development (Joiner, 1984; Smith & Clark, 1987; Finkle, 1976; Huck, 1977; Klimoske & Stickland, 1977; Klimoski & Brickmer, 1987). Additionally, many books have included in chapters, information on assessment centers (Gardner, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1990; Moses, 1987; Dreher & Sackett, 1983; Ulschak, 1983; Preestly, 1982).

Research conducted by Smith and Clark (1987) produced the following findings:

1) The assessment center has greater validity for promotion and selection than traditional techniques (McNutt, 1979).

2) The assessment center, having been developed on the basis of a job analysis, is inherently content valid (Jaffee & Sefcik, 1980; Kwartang, 1986).

3) The assessment center has shown itself to be a better indicator of future progress than any other tool yet devised (Byham, 1983; Dreher & Sackett, 1983).
4) The assessment center is relatively objective, provides uniform standards for judgement by trained observers, is valid, and can serve as a developmental experience for the participants (Byham, 1983; Hinnricks & Haanpera, 1976; Bart, 1986).

5. Assessment centers could aid an organization in early identification of management potential and in the diagnosis of individual management development needs so that training and development efforts can be invested more effectively (Bart, 1986; Byham, 1977).

Numerous assessment centers are conducted yearly however no assessment centers or evaluation programs specifically designed for public officials were identified in the literature review process.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs, and assessors of County Commissioners’ managerial and leadership skills as related to the assessment center dimensions. The population, instrumentation, instrument validity and reliability, data collection procedures and analysis will be described in this chapter.

Objectives of the study were:

1. To describe assessors’ perceptions of the county commissioners leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

2. To describe county commissionners’ perceptions of their leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

3. To describe county extension chair’s perceptions of the county commissioners’ leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.
4. To compare the perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs, and assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

Research Design

A descriptive study was utilized to gather data on the nature and strength of the relationships between the variables in the study. Data were collected to answer the research question, "What is the relationship between perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs, and assessors of county commissioner's leadership and managerial skills as related to the fifteen dimensions of The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

Population

The populations in this study were county commissioners who participated in The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center between July 1991 and October 1991 (N=16), county extension chairs of The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service from those counties represented by the commissioners (N=15) and assessors taking part in the process (N=6). The Ohio County Commissioners Association advertised the assessment center opportunity to the association members through their newsletter and annual meeting. County commissioners who participated in the Assessment Center volunteered their participation. County commissioners were randomly assigned to groups during the Assessment Center exercises. Assessors
consisted of trained extension personnel that were members of the development committee for the assessment center for county commissioners.

Instrumentation

A one part questionnaire was utilized for the purpose of collecting data from county extension chairs. This instrument is the same as that completed by the participating commissioners and assessors. (Appendix A) The instrument measured the perceptions of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills on fifteen job related dimensions identified by a panel of experts. These experts were current county commissioners serving terms in rural Ohio counties. Respondents were asked to rate the commissioners on a five-point Likert-type scale. The five points on the response scale were: 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Average, 4 = Very Good and 5 = Excellent. Each score was used as a single item rating.

The assessment center used for the study was developed by The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service to assess county extension chairs. Sixteen county extension chairs identified by The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service administration developed the dimensions for the assessment center over a two day period. These chairs were chosen on the evidence that they had been successful chairs as viewed by administration. The overall assessment center reliability for the assessment center was computed by Kwartang (1986) which resulted in a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .95. In addition
he computed an inter-rater reliability value of .79. The instrument has been utilized since 1985. The same format was used for the county commissioners' assessment center with modifications of the activities to relate to the role of a county commissioner.

Face validity of the questionnaire instrument was established by a group of eight county commissioners selected by The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. These experts, through the DACUM process developed a competency profile for the position of county commissioner (Appendix C). This profile identifies required duties and competencies for county commissioners.

The assessment center for county chairs identified sixteen dimensions for which to measure participants performance. The assessment center for commissioners utilized fifteen of those dimensions. From the competency profile the expert group defined each dimension as they relate to the job of a county commissioner.

Data Collection

Three sets of data were collected in this study.

1. The first set of data consisted of the performance ratings on the fifteen dimensions of the assessment center for each county commissioner that participated in the assessment center. These ratings were determined by the assessors participating in the assessment center. Assessors observed the commissioners over a two day period as they participated in eight
activities to measure their leadership and managerial skills. Activities in which the commissioners participated were: background interview, group discussion-assigned roles, group discussion-non-assigned roles, inbasket, interview simulation, fact finding, case study, and press conference. Each commissioner was assigned a lead assessor that compiled a final rating on each of the fifteen dimensions. Ratings ranged from 1-5 where 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = average, 4 = very good and 5 = excellent. For this study information was obtained from the records of The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

2. The second set of data was collected from county extension chairs representing the counties of the participating commissioners. A questionnaire gathering respondents perceptions of leadership and managerial skills as related to the fifteen dimensions was mailed to county extension chairs February 7, 1992. The chairs rated the commissioners on a 1 - 5 scale where 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = average, 4 = very good and 5 = excellent.

A cover letter from the Acting Director, OCES, accompanied the questionnaire to encourage response. (Appendix B) Also included was a stamped, self addressed envelope for use in returning the questionnaire.

A two week deadline was set for respondents to return their questionnaire. One hundred percent of the questionnaires were received after the first mailing.
3. The third set of data consisted of post assessment center evaluations completed by the county commissioners. After completing the two day assessment center process the commissioners completed a self evaluation and rated themselves on the fifteen dimensions using a score of 1 - 5 where 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = average, 4 = very good and 5 = excellent. This information was obtained from records of The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Responses were obtained from twelve of the sixteen county commissioners.

To ensure complete confidentiality and anonymity in this study all information was numerically coded. The use of the individuals' names was omitted.

Data Analysis

The statistical package SPSSX (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was utilized from the Instruction and Research Computer Center (IRCC), The Ohio State University for analysis of this study.

Descriptive statistics were utilized to organize and describe data. Frequencies, percentage distributions, and means were computed to describe the county commissioners', county extension chairs', and assessors' perceptions of the county commissioners leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

One way ANOVA was computed to describe the differences between the perceptions of three groups 1) county commissioners and county
extension chairs; 2) county commissioners and assessors and 3) county extension chairs and assessors on each of the fifteen assessment center dimensions. A Tukey test was conducted on each dimension to determine which groups were significantly different. The dimensions analyzed were oral communications, written communications, leadership, initiative, planning/organizing, decision making/judgment, development of co-workers, behavioral flexibility, organizational sensitivity, assertiveness, objectivity, perception, sensitivity, management control, and collaborativeness.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This study was descriptive in nature. The primary purpose of this study was to examine the differences in perceptions of county extension chairs, assessors, and county commissioners of County Commissioners' managerial and leadership skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

Descriptive statistics were used to organize and describe data. One way ANOVA was computed to determine the differences in perceptions between the county chairs, assessors, and county commissioners with respect to each of the fifteen dimensions.

The fifteen dimensions in this study were: oral communication, written communication, leadership, initiative, planning/organizing, decision making/judgement, development of co-workers, behavioral flexibility, organizational sensitivity, assertiveness, objectivity, perception, sensitivity, management control and collaborativeness.

Data for this study were collected through 1) personal records of The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and 2) a mailed survey instrument. The questionnaire was designed to measure county extension chairs perception
of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the fifteen dimensions.

Objectives of the study were:

1. To describe perceptions of assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

2. To describe perceptions of county commissioners of their leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

3. To describe perceptions of county extension chair's of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

4. To compare the perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs, and assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.
Assessor Ratings

Objective: To describe perceptions of assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

The assessors' ratings of their perception of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills ranged in mean scores from 3.348 - 3.813 on a five-point scale of 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=average, 4=very good, and 5=excellent (Table 1). The mean scores and standard deviations show that the assessors were fairly consistent in their ratings of the commissioners' performance on the fifteen dimensions. The top three dimensions as viewed by the assessors were organizational sensitivity, Mean = 3.813, SD = .544 (the degree of knowledge or awareness one has for formal and informal organizational policies and procedures); assertiveness, Mean = 3.813, SD = .544 (the degree to which one can effectively state his/her position positively and forcefully without being hostile or destructive); and objectivity, Mean = 3.813, SD = .655 (the extent to which one can analyze, judge and make a fair decision about a person or situation regardless of one's own attitudes or feelings). The assessors rated 85% of the commissioners very good on the dimensions organizational sensitivity, 68.8% on assertiveness and 56.3% on objectivity.

The assessors' lowest ratings of the commissioner's performance were on the dimensions leadership, Mean = 3.563, SD = .727 (the ability to
influence others to move toward the attainment of a specific goal as efficiently as possible using such techniques as delegation and persuasiveness); perception, Mean = 3.563, SD = .727 (the ability to identify or recognize a problem or potential problem); and written communication, Mean = 3.348, SD = .692 (the extent to which one can express effectively his/her ideas in writing). Fifty percent of the county commissioners were rated very good on each of the fifteen dimensions by the assessors. The assessors rated 6.3% of the commissioners average on organizational sensitivity, 25% average on assertiveness and 31.5% average on objectivity. Average ratings were made by assessors on leadership (37.5%), perception (37.5%) and written communication.

The most frequently used rating by the assessors was 4, very good. None of the assessors used the rating 1, poor and the rating 2, fair was not used to a great extent. This implies that the commissioners participating in the assessment center performed well above average, as perceived by the assessors, in the exercises measuring the fifteen dimensions.
Table 1

Assessors' Ratings of County Commissioners on Assessment Center Dimensions Using Frequencies, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations (n = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Sens.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. of Coworkers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beh. Flex.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Mkg/Judge.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/Organ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.565</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Poor  2 = Fair  3 = Average  4 = Very Good  5 = Excellent
Ratings by County Commissioners

Objective 2: To describe self perceptions of County Commissioners’ leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

The county commissioners’ self rating of their leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions was represented on the following five-point scale: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=average, 4=very good and 5=excellent. Their ratings ranged in mean scores from 3.000 - 3.833 as noted in Table 2. The self rating showed the top three rated dimension to be sensitivity, Mean = 3.833, SD = .577 (the ability to respond/react to a problem considering the feelings, emotions, and needs of others); collaborativeness, Mean = 3.750, SD = .622 (the degree to which one is willing to work cooperatively with others in making decisions); and planning and organizing, Mean = 3.667, SD =.651 (the process of establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal).

The county commissioners tended to rate themselves average and just approaching very good. Standard deviations were fairly consistent between the fifteen dimensions. Fifty percent rated themselves very good on sensitivity, 43.8% on collaborativeness and 37.5% on planning and organizing.

The self ratings showed the lowest three dimensions to be management control, Mean = 3.000, SD = .426 (the extent to which one maximizes and monitors the use of all resources (personnel, office, committee, etc.) to obtain
effective outcomes); written communication, Mean = 3.167, SD = .577 (the extent to which one can express effectively his/her ideas in writing); and assertiveness Mean = 3.167, SD = .577 (the degree to which one can effectively state his/her position positively and forcefully without being hostile or destructive). Of the self ratings 65.5% of the ratings were average for management control, 50% for written communication and 50% for assertiveness.

The rating 3, average was used slightly more often than the rating 4, very good, by the county commissioners. None of the commissioners rated themselves as 1, poor and very few rated themselves as either 2, fair or 5, excellent. This implies that the commissioners feel that their performance is nearer to the average than what the assessors or county extension chairs perceived them to be.
Table 2

County Commissioners' Self Ratings on Assessment Center Dimensions Using Frequencies, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations \((n = 16)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>5 f</th>
<th>4 f</th>
<th>3 f</th>
<th>2 f</th>
<th>1 f</th>
<th>(\bar{x})</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>8 50.0%</td>
<td>3 18.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>7 43.8%</td>
<td>4 25.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/Organ.</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>6 37.5%</td>
<td>5 31.5%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>6 37.5%</td>
<td>4 25.0%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>6 37.5%</td>
<td>4 25.0%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beh. Flex.</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>7 43.8%</td>
<td>5 31.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Mkg/Judge.</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>6 37.5%</td>
<td>4 25.0%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>6 37.5%</td>
<td>6 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>6 37.5%</td>
<td>6 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Comm.</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>7 43.8%</td>
<td>4 25.0%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 18.8%</td>
<td>8 50.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. of Coworkers</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>4 25.0%</td>
<td>7 1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 18.8%</td>
<td>7 43.3%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 18.8%</td>
<td>8 50.0%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comm.</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 18.8%</td>
<td>8 50.0%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. Control</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>10 65.5%</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Poor  4 = Very Good  
2 = Fair   5 = Excellent  
3 = Average
Ratings by County Extension Chairs

Objective 3: The county extension chairs' ratings of their perception of the commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions generated a range of mean scores of 3.313 - 4.375 as noted in Table 3. The ratings used the following five-point scale: 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = average, 4 = very good, and 5 = excellent. The chairs rated the commissioners highest in oral communication, Mean = 4.375, SD = .619 (the extent to which one can give an oral presentation and communicate on a one-to-one basis by listening and responding); leadership, Mean = 4.250, SD = .775 (the ability to influence others to move toward the attainment of a specific goal as efficiently as possible using such techniques as delegation and persuasiveness); and assertiveness, Mean = 4.240, SD = .775 (the degree to which one can effectively state his/her position positively and forcefully without being hostile or destructive). The county extension chairs rated 43.8% of the county commissioners excellent.

Their lowest ratings were on the dimensions behavioral flexibility, Mean = 3.313, SD = .602 (the extent to which one's behavior is flexible, adaptable and effective when confronted with different situations, circumstances or personalities); development of coworkers, Mean = 3.375, SD = .500 (the extent to which one develops and/or assists in developing the skills and competencies of coworkers through training and development activities, counseling, and delegating the duties related to current and future
jobs); and sensitivity, Mean = 3.533, SD = .516 (the ability to respond/react to a problem considering the feelings, emotions, and needs of others). Of this group of county extension chairs, 56.3% of the commissioners were rated average and 37.5% very good on behavioral flexibility, 62.5% were rated average and 37.5% very good on development of coworkers and 43.8% rated the commissioners average and 50% very good on sensitivity. The county extension chairs’ mean scores were higher than the other two groups on eleven of the fifteen dimensions.

The county extension chairs rated the commissioners a 4, very good, more frequently than the other ratings. Many rated the commissioners a 5, excellent. No one gave a rating of 1, poor and very few gave a rating of 2, fair.
### Table 3

**County Extension Chairs' Ratings of County Commissioners on Assessment Center Dimensions Using Frequencies, Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations** *(n = 15)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>5 f</th>
<th>4 f</th>
<th>3 f</th>
<th>2 f</th>
<th>1 f</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Comm.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sensitivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making/Judge.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Organizing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Coworkers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.867</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Average, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent

Note: One county chair rated two commissioners.
Comparison of Perceptions

Objective 4: To compare the perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs and assessors of the county commissioners’ leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

One way ANOVA was computed to describe the differences between the ratings of three pairs of groups: 1) county commissioners and county extension chairs; 2) county extension chairs and assessors and 3) county commissioners and assessors. A Tukey test was run on each dimension to identify those pairs that were significantly different.

From the results of the test, four dimensions were found to be significant at the .050 level (Table 4). The groups county extension chairs/county commissioners and county extension chairs/assessors differed significantly on the dimensions oral communications (p = <.01) and leadership (p = <.01). The county extension chairs’ mean score for oral communications was 4.375 and 4.250 for leadership. The county commissioner’s scores for these dimensions were 3.500 and 3.273 respectively. Assessors rated the commissioners a mean of 3.688 on oral communication and 3.563 on leadership. The groups of assessors/county commissioners and county commissioners/county extension chairs differed significantly on the dimension assertiveness (p = <.01). The assessors’ mean score for assertiveness was 3.813, the county commissioners’ mean score was 3.167 and the county
extension chairs' mean score was 4.240. County commissioners and county extension chairs differed significantly on the dimension management control (p = .02). The county commissioners self rating obtained a mean of 3.000 on management control while the county extension chairs' mean score was 3.733. The differences between the other eleven dimensions were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations and F-Ratios for Assessment Center Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Assessors (n=6)</th>
<th>County Comm. (n=16)</th>
<th>County Chairs (n=15)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organ. Sens.</td>
<td>3.813 .544</td>
<td>3.583 .793</td>
<td>4.071 .829</td>
<td>1.490</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>3.813a .544</td>
<td>3.167ab .577</td>
<td>4.240b .775</td>
<td>9.654</td>
<td>&lt;.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>3.813 .655</td>
<td>3.500 .522</td>
<td>3.667 .724</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. of Coworkers</td>
<td>3.750 .775</td>
<td>3.250 .622</td>
<td>3.375 .500</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>3.750 .577</td>
<td>3.833 .577</td>
<td>3.533 .516</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td>3.750 .683</td>
<td>3.750 .622</td>
<td>3.867 .516</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Comm.</td>
<td>3.688b .602</td>
<td>3.500a .674</td>
<td>4.375ab .619</td>
<td>7.907</td>
<td>&lt;.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beh. Flex.</td>
<td>3.688 .479</td>
<td>3.583 .515</td>
<td>3.313 .602</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Mkg/Judge.</td>
<td>3.625 .619</td>
<td>3.583 .793</td>
<td>4.000 .816</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. Control</td>
<td>3.625 .719</td>
<td>3.000a .426</td>
<td>3.733a .799</td>
<td>4.347</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/Org.</td>
<td>3.565 .727</td>
<td>3.667 .651</td>
<td>3.933 .799</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.563b .727</td>
<td>3.273a .467</td>
<td>4.250ab .775</td>
<td>7.392</td>
<td>&lt;.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>3.563 .727</td>
<td>3.182 .603</td>
<td>3.750 .775</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comm.</td>
<td>3.348 .692</td>
<td>3.167 .577</td>
<td>3.571 .756</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranges</td>
<td>3.348-3.813</td>
<td>3.000-3.750</td>
<td>3.313-4.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significant at the .050 level
Means with common superscripts are significantly different at the .050 level

Scale: 1 = Poor
2 = Fair
3 = Average
4 = Very Good
5 = Excellent
Purpose of the study

The primary purpose of the study was to investigate the differences in perceptions among county extension chairs, assessors, and county commissioners of county commissioner’s managerial and leadership skills as related to the fifteen assessment center dimensions.

Objectives of the study were:

1. To describe county commissioners’ perceptions of their leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

2. To describe assessors’ perceptions of the county commissioners leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

3. To describe county extension chair’s perceptions of the county commissioners’ leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.
4. To compare the perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs, and assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

Methodology

The population in this study was county commissioners who participated in The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center between July 1991 and October 1991 (N=16), county extension chairs of The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service from those counties represented by the commissioners (N=15) and assessors taking part in the process (N=6). County commissioners that participated in the Assessment Center volunteered their participation. County commissioners were randomly assigned to groups during the Assessment Center exercises.

Data Collection

There were three sets of data collected in this study in February, 1992. Two methods were used to collect data: 1) personal records of The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and 2) a mailed survey instrument. Personal records were examined for individual performance scores by the assessors on the fifteen assessment center dimensions and for post self evaluation scores of commissioners on the fifteen dimensions.

The questionnaire was designed to measure perceptions of county commissioners leadership and managerial skills on fifteen job related
dimensions identified by a panel of experts. One hundred percent of the questionnaires were received after the first mailing.

Data Analysis

The statistical package SPSSX (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was utilized from the Instruction and Research Computer Center (IRCC), The Ohio State University for analysis of this study.

Descriptive statistics were utilized to organize and describe data. Frequencies, percentage distributions, and means were computed for describing the county commissioners', county extension chairs', and assessors' perceptions of the county commissioners leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

One way ANOVA was computed to describe the differences between the perceptions of three groups 1) county commissioners and county extension chairs; 2) county commissioners and assessors and 3) county extension chairs and assessors on each of the fifteen assessment center dimensions. A Tukey test was used to determine which groups were significantly different on the dimensions. The fifteen dimensions were oral communications, written communications, leadership, initiative, planning/organizing, decision making/judgment, development of co-workers, behavioral flexibility, organizational sensitivity, assertiveness, objectivity, perception, sensitivity, management control, and collaborativeness.
Summary of Findings and Implications

Objective one: To describe perceptions of assessors of the county commissioners leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

Assessors' perceptions of the county commissioners performance in the assessment center ranged in mean scores from 3.348 - 3.813. According to the assessors' ratings, commissioners performed highest on the dimensions organizational sensitivity, assertiveness, and objectivity. Their lowest mean scores were on the dimensions written communications, perception and leadership. As a group, the commissioners performance was above average in the activities measuring leadership, written communication and perception. They were rated very good on their performance measuring organizational sensitivity, assertiveness and objectivity.

The assessors' ratings are based on what they observed during the simulation activities of the assessment center. It should be noted that the behavior in one exercise could have influenced the individual dimension ratings. County commissioners could have also fallen victim to the halo effect where assessors have their own idea of what a good manager is and their ideas may not be appropriate for the job of a county commissioner.

The assessors rated the commissioners well above average with the majority being rated very good. It is speculated that those commissioners that participated in the assessment center are what would be considered "top"
commissioners in the state. These individuals participate in training programs to better their performance and therefore it is concluded that is the reason for high ratings.

Objective two: To describe perceptions of county commissioners of their leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

Mean scores for the county commissioners self perceptions ranged from 3.000 - 3.833. The commissioners did not tend to rate themselves below the average however the group did score themselves lower than the group of assessors and county chairs. The commissioners' scores indicated that they felt their highest performance was on the dimensions sensitivity, collaborativeness and planning and organizing. Their lowest rating was on the dimensions management control, written communication and assertiveness.

This implies while the commissioners did not score themselves below average they did perceive themselves to be slightly above average. It is noted that the self assessment was taken following their participation in the assessment center which may have a reflection on the ratings. They may have realized that what they thought were their strong points really needed further development. Additionally, the assessment took place over a two day period. Measurement of their leadership and managerial skills may not necessarily indicate how they would perform over time and with stress.
Objective three: To describe perceptions of county extension chairs' of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

The county extension chairs rated the county commissioners higher than the other two groups. Mean scores ranged from 3.313 - 4.375. The county chairs perceived the commissioners to perform highest in oral communication, leadership and assertiveness and lowest on behavioral flexibility, development of coworkers and sensitivity. This is interpreted that the county chairs typically are in contact and interact with the commissioners on a one-to-one basis and may explain the highest rating of oral communication. Lower ratings could be explained by the fact that the county chairs may not clearly understand the dimensions and may not see the commissioners in all of the dimension roles. The county extension chairs probably rated the commissioners according to their perception of commissioners performance on a daily basis. Their ratings were probably based on how they see the commissioners actually performing on the job.

This suggests that the commissioners perform better in "real life" than they do in the assessment process and that others believe them to be higher performers than they believe themselves to be. One limiting factor may be that some of the commissioners were made aware of the assessment center opportunity by the county extension chairs in their county and may be an explanation for the high ranking in leadership. The county chairs may have
felt that their commissioners were good leaders and would be good candidates for the assessment center.

Objective four: To compare the perceptions of county commissioners, county extension chairs, and assessors of the county commissioners' leadership and managerial skills as related to the assessment center dimensions.

Significant differences were found among the groups on four of the fifteen dimensions. The groups of county extension chairs/county commissioners and county extension chairs/assessors differed significantly on the dimensions oral communication and leadership. The assessors/county commissioners and county commissioners/county extension chairs groups differed significantly on the dimensions assertiveness and management control. County extension chairs rated the county commissioners much higher than the assessors or the county commissioners rated themselves.
Conclusions

1. County extension chairs tended to rate the county commissioners higher on the fifteen dimensions.

2. County commissioners tended to perceive themselves closer to the average and tended to rate each dimension lower than county extension chairs or assessors.

3. The results indicated that the highest ratings, from the county extension chairs, were perceived from observing the commissioners on a daily basis while on the job rather than through the assessment center simulations.

4. County extension chairs and county commissioners differed significantly on their perceptions of the commissioners on oral communication and leadership abilities.

5. County extension chairs and assessors differed significantly on their perceptions of the commissioners on oral communication and leadership abilities.

6. Assessors and county commissioners differed significantly on their perceptions of the commissioners on assertiveness and management control.

7. County commissioners and county extension chairs differed significantly on their perceptions of the commissioners on assertiveness and management control.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based upon the findings from this study and suggestions arising out of this study.

1. The Ohio County Commissioners Association should encourage all county commissioners and those that aspire to be county commissioners to participate in training and development programs such as an assessment center.

2. Research should be conducted to determine inter-rater reliability to ascertain whether the assessors are consistent in observing dimensions of the assessment center for county commissioners.

3. A longitudinal study should be conducted to compare the performance of the commissioners during the assessment center and with on the job performance.

4. Follow up studies should be conducted to determine if developmental plans recommended by the assessors as a result of their assessment center performance have been implemented.

5. Periodic research should be conducted to ensure the fifteen assessment center dimensions remain appropriate for rural Ohio county commissioners.
6. Research should be conducted to determine the perceptions of clientele of the county commissioner's leadership and managerial performance as related to the fifteen assessment center dimensions.

7. Training and development recommendations need to be identified for each level of performance for each of the fifteen dimensions.
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## COMPETENCY PROFILE OF COUNTY COMMISSIONER IN OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>A-1 Post board agenda</th>
<th>A-2 Maintain office calendar</th>
<th>A-3 Conduct meetings/hearings</th>
<th>A-4 approve payment of bills</th>
<th>A-5 Receive mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-13 Complete surveys/questionnaires</td>
<td>A-14 Complete reports</td>
<td>A-15 Manage specialized county facilities/properties (i.e., recycling center, hospitals)</td>
<td>A-16 Develop benefits' packages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>B-1 Develop preliminary county budget</td>
<td>B-2 Interact with elected officials and department heads</td>
<td>B-3 Determine budget priorities</td>
<td>B-4 Adopt appropriations resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>C-1 Obtain adequate insurance</td>
<td>C-2 Arrange for property security</td>
<td>C-3 Provide maintenance equipment/supplies</td>
<td>C-4 Evaluate conditions of county properties</td>
<td>C-5 Provide interior/exterior signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>D-1 Develop job descriptions</td>
<td>D-2 Develop personnel policies</td>
<td>D-3 Determine salary levels</td>
<td>D-4 Employ personnel</td>
<td>D-5 Maintain personnel files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>E-1 Return phone calls</td>
<td>E-2 Respond to letters</td>
<td>E-3 Verify concerns of constituents</td>
<td>E-4 Implement new policies</td>
<td>E-5 Meet with constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>F-1 Evaluate infrastructure to develop future priorities</td>
<td>F-2 Conceptualize ideas, plans and goals</td>
<td>F-3 Develop county land-use plan</td>
<td>F-4 Update existing plans (i.e., Economic Community Development, subdivision regulations, economic development plans)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>F-11 Participate in public/private partnerships</td>
<td>F-12 Cooperate with political subdivisions</td>
<td>F-13 Establish enterprise zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>G-1 Formulate personal professional development plan</td>
<td>G-2 Participate in professional associations (i.e., CCAO, NACO)</td>
<td>G-3 Participate in seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>G-9 Develop public speaking skills</td>
<td>G-10 Research pertinent documents (i.e., Ohio Revised Code, maps, journals)</td>
<td>G-11 Read publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>H-1 Develop rapport with media</td>
<td>H-2 Prepare press releases</td>
<td>H-3 Hold press conferences</td>
<td>H-4 Make public presentations</td>
<td>H-5 Issue proclamations/resolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>A-6 Sign County Commissioner's Journal</td>
<td>A-7 Maintain records</td>
<td>A-8 Approve transfer of funds</td>
<td>A-9 Approve supplemental appropriations</td>
<td>A-10 Administer Ohio Drainage Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-17 Approve credit card &amp; anticipated expenditures</td>
<td>A-18 Approve out-of-county travel</td>
<td>A-19 Award grants</td>
<td>A-20 Administer grants</td>
<td>A-21 Mediate disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-5 Research alternative funding sources</td>
<td>B-6 Develop long range fiscal plan</td>
<td>B-7 Issue notes and bonds for public funding</td>
<td>B-8 Approve permissive taxes and fees</td>
<td>B-9 Approve grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-6 Provide adequate office space</td>
<td>C-7 Comply with applicable codes</td>
<td>C-8 Develop preventative maintenance plans</td>
<td>C-9 Direct exterior/interior maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-6 Identify employee workplace needs</td>
<td>D-7 Arrange for training</td>
<td>D-8 Evaluate personnel</td>
<td>D-9 Dismiss personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-6 Disseminate resource information</td>
<td>E-7 Serve as liaison between constituent and appropriate agency/individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>F-5 Utilize existing plans</td>
<td>F-6 Participate in community projects</td>
<td>F-7 Select professional assistance</td>
<td>F-8 Act as liaison with state and federal officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G-4 Network with internal elected officials (i.e., Treasurer, Auditor)</td>
<td>G-5 Network with external public officials (i.e., state officials, other Boards of Commissioners)</td>
<td>G-6 Network with professional business leaders</td>
<td>G-7 Participate in research projects</td>
<td>G-8 Work with professional consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-6 Participate in community activities (i.e., youth, senior citizens)</td>
<td>H-7 Acknowledge special achievements</td>
<td>H-8 Encourage staff professional image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPETENCY PROFILE OF COUNTY COMMISSIONER IN OHIO

General Knowledge and Skills

Understanding of Ohio Revised Code
Understanding of federal legislation/codes
Crisis management skills
Problem-solving skills
Decision making skills
Communication skills (verbal and written)
Understanding of Parliamentary Procedure
(i.e., Roberts Rules of Order)
Ability to integrate previous leadership experience and traits into job
Time management skills
Organizational skills
Public speaking skills
Stress management skills
Strong business experience/background
Ability to handle simultaneously indepth/complex issues
Understanding of pending/new legislation
Active listening skills
Comprehension skills
Leadership skills
Ability to adapt to change
Negotiation skills
Understanding of fiscal management/responsibility
Ability to utilize available resources/materials
People skills
“Timing skills”

Worker Behaviors (Traits and Attitudes)

Ethical
Flexible
Team-oriented
Maintain professional image
Creative
Willing to take initiative
Ability to follow through
Ability to conceptualize ideas
Diplomatic
Maintain open door policy/philosophy
Positive attitude
Demonstrate sensitivity
Perceptive
Concerned/caring
Conscientious
Demonstrate perseverance
Very hard working
Compatbility

Tools, Equipment, Supplies and Materials

Auditor’s certificate
Previous budget/appropriation/expenditure reports
Ohio Revised Code Manual
CCAO (Commissioner’s Handbook)
Phone
FAX
Computer
Duplicating equipment
Reference materials

Auditor’s certificate
Directories
Commissioner’s Journal
Vehicles
Answering machine
Calculator
Maps
Audiovisual equipment
(i.e., VCR/VHS)
Cameras
Office equipment/furniture
Dictionary
Personal calendar

Acronyms

CCAO - County Commissioners Association of Ohio
CDBG - Community Development Block Grant
CIC - Community Improvement Corporation
PIC - Private Industry Council
JTPA - Jobs Training Partnership Act
EDA - Economic Development Administration
NACO - National Association of County Organizations
SWMP - Solidwaste Management Plan
LEPC - Local Emergency Planning Committee
ARC - Appalachian Regional Commission
CAC - Community Action Committee
SERB - State Employee Review Board
SERC - State Emergency Response Commission
FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency
RCRA - Resource Conservation Recovery Act
EPA - Environmental Protection Agency
OCES - Ohio Cooperative Extension Service
ODOT - Ohio Department of Transportation
SWCD - Soil and Water Conservation District
SCS - Soil Conservation Service
ASCS - Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service
LEO - Local Elected Official
WIC - Women, Infant, and Children
CSEA - Children Services Enforcement Agency
FOJ - Furtherance of Justice Fund
DAS - Department of Administrative Services
DHS - Department of Human Services
ODNR - Ohio Department of Natural Resources
HUD - Housing Urban Development
TAC - Technical Advisory Council (coordinates with SWMP)
OBES - Ohio Bureau Employment Services
ORC - Ohio Revised Code
PERS - Public Employees Retirement System
CORSAs - County Risk Sharing Authority
APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL

ASSESSMENT

FOR

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

THE OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

FEBRUARY 1992
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL ASSESSMENT

INSTRUCTION: Please rate the county commissioner identified in your introductory letter on the fifteen dimensions identified below. Write the number in the blank that best describes your own perception of the commissioner's level of strength on that dimension.

1 = Poor  2 = Fair  3 = Average  4 = Very Good  5 = Excellent

Dimension Definitions

1. ___ Oral communication - the extent to which one can give an oral presentation and communicate on a one-to-one basis by listening and responding. Specific behaviors include: public speaking skills (ie. express oneself clearly, quality of speaking voice, eye contact, hand gestures, small signs of nervousness); uses active listening skills, negotiation skills, ability to conceptualize ideas, comments clearly stated and understandable, provides reasonable arguments to support views.

2. ___ Written communication - the extent to which one can express effectively his/her ideas in writing. Specific behaviors include: organization skills (ie. answers are well organized, clearly written, readable), ability to conceptualize and convey ideas effectively, reasonable in length, misspelled words or poor grammar do not detract from quality of information presented.

3. ___ Leadership - the ability to influence others to move toward the attainment of a specific goal as efficiently as possible using such techniques as delegation and persuasiveness. Specific behaviors include: uses a team oriented, positive approach, sets goals, defines and solves problems proactively, motivates a group or individual, handles indepth/complex issues, demonstrates vision, understands parliamentary procedure, expresses self forcefully, and influences other group members' or an individual's final decision.
1 = Poor    2 = Fair    3 = Average    4 = Very Good    5 = Excellent

4. **Initiative** - the ability to begin actions without stimulation and support from others, the capacity to see courses of action and to discover new means of goal achievement. Specific behaviors include: ability to conceptualize and communicate ideas, "timing skills" (i.e. realizing appropriate timing for specific actions), uses a proactive approach.

5. **Planning/organizing** - the process of establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a goal. Specific behaviors include: ability to conceptualize ideas, approaches problems systematically using time and organizational management skills, sets priorities, ability to handle indepth/complex issues and provides follow-up necessary to assure solutions.

6. **Decision making/judgment** - the process of identifying problems, securing relevant information, developing alternative courses of action, and the readiness of making a decision from the information gathered. Specific behaviors include: ability to handle indepth/complex issues, problem solving skills (i.e. recognize need for additional information, considers several alternatives, focuses on overall situation rather than on individual items), has good arguments to support ideas, questions problems instead of accepting at face value, sets priorities, develops solutions that are practical and realistic, demonstrates ethical behavior and long range vision.

7. **Development of coworkers** - the extent to which one develops and/or assists in developing the skills and competencies of coworkers through training and development activities, counseling, and delegating the duties related to current and future jobs. Specific behaviors include: uses active listening skills, delegates responsibility to individuals in order to provide experience in new areas, assists coworkers in the development of a plan to improve performance, helps coworkers analyze their strengths and weaknesses, recognizes and helps manage employee stress and values a team approach.
1 = Poor      2 = Fair      3 = Average      4 = Very Good      5 = Excellent

8. ___ Behavioral Flexibility - the extent to which one's behavior is flexible, adaptable and effective when confronted with different situations, circumstances or personalities. Specific behaviors include: ability to adapt to change and responds effectively to crisis, willing to word toward concensus and compromise to view when necessary, adjust approach to individuals(s) he/she is working with, demonstrating patience, compatibility, diplomacy, and encouragement, yet willing to challenge when appropriate.

9. ___ Organizational sensitivity - the degree of knowledge or awareness one has for formal and informal organizational policies and procedures. Specific behaviors include: recognizes, understands and ethically considers existing or pending policy or legislation (ie. Ohio Revised Code, federal, state and local codes, etc.) when making decision and correctly utilizes this information in order to solve problems; understands and responds appropriately to fiscal matters.

10. ___ Assertiveness - the degree to which one can effectively state his/her position positively and forcefully without being hostile or destructive. Specific behaviors include: proactively backs own view/position, expresses self forcefully, participates actively, demonstrates a willingness to challenge a position without being argumentative or aggressive, displays self-confidence, perseverance and stamina, utilizes negotiation skills when appropriate.

11. ___ Objectivity - the extent to which one can analyze, judge and make a fair decision about a person or situation regardless of one's own attitudes or feelings. Specific behaviors include: considers and fairly applies appropriate legislation and codes, approaches situations with an open mind.

12. ___ Perception - the ability to identify or recognize a problem or potential problem. Specific behaviors include: demonstrates "timing skills" (ie. realizing appropriate timing for specific situations), demonstrates ability to comprehend the scope of the problem or situation.
1 = Poor  
2 = Fair  
3 = Average  
4 = Very Good  
5 = Excellent

13. ___ Sensitivity - the ability to respond/react to a problem considering the feelings, emotions and needs of others. Specific behaviors include: recognizes stress, uses active listening skills, demonstrates patience and diplomacy.

14. ___ Management control - the extent to which one maximizes and monitors the use of all resources (personnel, office, committee, etc.) to obtain effective outcomes. Specific behaviors include: understands and utilizes codes, legislation, fiscal and organizational resources that are consistent with sound business practices; demonstrates knowledge of parliamentary procedure and its uses, and handles indepth/complex issues effectively.

15. ___ Collaborativeness - the degree to which one is willing to work cooperatively with others in making decisions. Specific behaviors include: works effectively with group members, uses a team oriented approach, demonstrates compatibility and works toward consensus when appropriate, supportive of others, willing to share with others and to consult on important items.

THANK YOU

Please return in the envelope provided to:

Susan Hodson
111 Mae Ave.
Logan, Ohio 43138
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>BACKGROUN Interview</th>
<th>GROUP DISCUSSION ASSIGNED ROLES</th>
<th>GROUP DISCUSSION NON-ASSIGNED ROLES</th>
<th>IN-BASKET</th>
<th>INTERVIEW SIMULATION</th>
<th>FACT FINDING</th>
<th>CASE STUDY</th>
<th>PRESS CONFERENCE</th>
<th>OVERALL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making/Judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Co-Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT CENTER POST SELF-RATING EVALUATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Prior to participating in the assessment center, you were asked to rate yourself on each of the fifteen job-related dimensions. Now that you have observed yourself in the various assessment center exercises, we would like you to critique your performance on these same fifteen dimensions. Use only your performance in the assessment center exercises to make your evaluations. Do not evaluate yourself as you "think you normally are" or "how other people have always seen you".

Please write the number in the blank that best describes your own perception of your level of strength on that dimension.

1 = Poor  2 = Fair  3 = Average  4 = Very Good  5 = Excellent

Dimension Definitions

1. **Oral communication** - the extent to which one can give an oral presentation and communicate on a one-to-one basis by listening and responding. Specific behaviors include: public speaking skills (i.e. express oneself clearly, quality of speaking voice, eye contact, hand gestures, small signs of nervousness); uses active listening skills, negotiation skills, ability to conceptualize ideas, comments clearly stated and understandable, provides reasonable arguments to support views.

   Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, group discussions, background interview, fact finding, interview simulation and speech/media presentation, how would you rate your oral communication?

2. **Written communication** - the extent to which one can express effectively his/her ideas in writing. Specific behaviors include: organization skills (i.e. answers are well organized, clearly written, readable), ability to conceptualize and convey ideas effectively, reasonable in length, misspelled words or poor grammar do not detract from quality of information presented.

   Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket and case study analysis, how would you rate your written communications?
3. **Leadership** - the ability to influence others to move toward the attainment of a specific goal as efficiently as possible using such techniques as delegation and persuasiveness. Specific behaviors include: uses a team oriented, positive approach, sets goals, defines and solves problems proactively, motivates a group or individual, handles indepth/complex issues, demonstrates vision, understands parliamentary procedure, expresses self forcefully, and influences other group members or an individual's final decision.

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, group discussions, background interview, interview simulation, how would you rate your leadership ability?

4. **Initiative** - the ability to begin actions without stimulation and support from others, the capacity to see courses of action and to discover new means of goal achievement. Specific behaviors include: ability to conceptualize and communicate ideas, timing skills (ie. realizing appropriate timing for specific actions), uses a proactive approach.

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, group discussions, background interview, interview simulation, and speech/media presentation, how would you rate your initiative?

5. **Planning/organizing** - the process of establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal. Specific behaviors include: ability to conceptualize ideas, approaches problems systematically using time and organizational management skills, sets priorities, ability to handle indepth/complex issues and provides follow-up necessary to assure solutions.

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, fact finding, case study, and speech/media presentation, how would you rate your planning and organization ability?

6. **Decision making/judgment** - the process of identifying problems securing relevant information, developing alternative courses of action, and the readiness of making a decision from the information gathered. Specific behaviors include: ability to handle indepth/complex issues, problem solving skills (ie. recognize need for additional information, considers several alternatives, focuses on overall situation rather than on individual items), has good arguments to support ideas, questions problems instead of accepting at face value, sets priorities, develops solutions that are practical and realistic,


1 = Poor  2 = Fair  3 = Average  4 = Very Good  5 = Excellent

demonstrates ethical behavior and long range vision.

Thinking back to your performance in all of the exercises, how would you rate your decision making and judgment ability?

7. Development of coworkers - the extent to which one develops and/or assists in developing the skills and competencies of coworkers through training and development activities, counseling, and delegating the duties related to current and future jobs. Specific behaviors include: uses active listening skills, delegates responsibility to individuals in order to provide experience in new areas, assists coworkers in the development of a plan to improve performance, helps coworkers analyze their strengths and weaknesses, recognizes and helps manage employee stress and values a team approach.

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket and interview simulation, how would you rate yourself on development of coworkers?

8. Behavioral flexibility - the extent to which one's behavior is flexible, adaptable and effective when confronted with different situations, circumstances or personalities. Specific behaviors include: ability to adapt to change and responds effectively to crisis, willing to work toward consensus and compromise view when necessary, adjust approach to individual(s) he/she is working with, demonstrating patience, compatibility, diplomacy, and encouragement, yet willing to challenge when appropriate.

Thinking back to your performance in the group discussions, background interview, in-basket, interview simulation and speech and media presentation, how would you rate yourself on flexibility and adaptability?

9. Organizational sensitivity - the degree of knowledge or awareness one has to formal and informal organizational policies and procedures. Specific behaviors include: recognizes, understands and ethically considers existing or pending policy or legislation (e.g. Ohio Revised Code, federal, state and local codes, etc.) when making decisions and correctly utilizes this information in order to solve problems; understands and responds appropriately to fiscal matters.

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, group discussions, fact finding, case study analysis, background interview and interview simulation, how would you rate your organizational sensitivity?
10. **Assertiveness** - the degree to which one can effectively state his/her position positively and forcefully without being hostile or destructive. Specific behaviors include: proactively backs own view/position, expresses self forcefully, participates actively, demonstrates a willingness to challenge a position without being argumentative or aggressive, displays self-confidence, perseverance and stamina, utilizes negotiation skills when appropriate.

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, group discussions, background interview, interview simulation, and speech/media presentation how would you rate yourself on assertiveness?

11. **Objectivity** - the extent to which one can analyze, judge and make a fair decision about a person or situation regardless of one's own attitudes or feelings. Specific behaviors include: considers and fairly applies appropriate legislation and codes, approaches situations with an open mind.

Thinking back to your performance in all of the exercises, how would you rate your objectivity?

12. **Perception** - the ability to identify or recognize a problem or potential problem. Specific behaviors include: demonstrates "timing skills" (i.e. realizing appropriate timing for specific situations), demonstrates ability to comprehend the scope of the problem or situation.

Thinking back to your performance in all of the exercises, how would you rate your perception?

13. **Sensitivity** - the ability to respond/react to a problem considering the feelings, emotions, and needs of others. Specific behaviors include: recognizes stress, uses active listening skills, demonstrates patience and diplomacy.

Thinking back to your performance in all of the exercises, how would you rate your sensitivity?

14. **Management control** - the extent to which one maximizes and monitors the use of all resources (personnel, office, committee, etc.) to obtain effective outcomes. Specific behaviors include: understands and utilizes codes, legislation, fiscal and organizational resources that are consistent with sound business practices; demonstrates knowledge of parliamentary procedure and its uses, and handles indepth/complex issues effectively.
1 = Poor   2 = Fair   3 = Average   4 = Very Good   5 = Excellent

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, background interview, interview simulation, group discussion, and fact finding, how would you rate yourself on management control?

15. Collaborativeness - the degree to which one is willing to work cooperatively with others in making decisions. Specific behaviors include: works effectively with group members, uses a team oriented approach, demonstrates compatibility and works toward consensus when appropriate, supportive of others, willing to share with others and to consult on important items.

Thinking back to your performance in the in-basket, group discussions, interview simulation, and fact finding, how would you rate yourself on collaborativeness?

**** How do you think the assessors will rate you on these dimensions? (Check one)

_____ Generally higher than you rated yourself

_____ About the same as you rated yourself

_____ Generally lower than you rated yourself

_____ Higher on some dimensions, lower on others

**** How much do you feel you learned about your own management abilities by participating in the assessment center? (Check one)

_____ Nothing

_____ A moderate amount

_____ A little

_____ A great deal
February 7, 1992

Dear

We would like to invite you to participate in a study we are conducting. The purpose of the study is to determine your perception of the leadership and managerial skills of your county commissioner ______. This past October commissioner ______ participated in an assessment center sponsored by The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service to assess his/her current leadership and managerial skills and to identify future training needs. The aim of this study is to look at the relationship of his/her assessment center scores with your perception, the assessors' perception and his/her own perception of his/her skills.

Your response to this questionnaire is critical to the success of this study. All information requested in the questionnaire will be kept in strict confidence. The code number, plainly displayed in the right hand corner of the questionnaire is to assist us in identifying those questionnaires that have not been returned so as to initiate follow up with specific individuals without having to recontact all those involved in the study.

Please respond to every item on the questionnaire. We thank you for your prompt and honest responses. If you have any questions or concerns as you complete the questionnaire please call Susan Hodson at (614) 385-3222 (W) or 385-5215 (H). Please return the completed questionnaire to Susan Hodson, 111 Mae Avenue, Logan, Ohio 43138 by February 21. Thank you for your valuable time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Dr. Keith Smith
Acting Director

Susan Hodson
County Extension Agent, 4-H/CNRD
LIST OF REFERENCES


