

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
LYRASIS Members and Sloan Foundation

<http://archive.org/details/perceivedleaders00carr>

PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP NEEDS, SATISFACTIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF
VOLUNTEER LEADERS IN THE KANSAS QUALITY OF LIVING
EXTENSION PROGRAM

by

Linda Lee Carr

B. S., Kansas State University, 1962

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1978

Approved by:

Warren Prawl

Document
LD
2668
T4
1978
C377
c. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF STUDY	1
BACKGROUND	2
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	5
HYPOTHESES	6
DEFINITION OF TERMS.	9
LIMITATIONS.	9
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
INTRODUCTION	10
LEADERSHIP NEEDS	11
LEADER SATISFACTIONS	13
LEADERSHIP TRAINING.	15
CONTRIBUTIONS OF LEADERS	19
SUMMARY.	20
3. PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY	22
METHODOLOGY.	22
INSTRUMENT	24
DATA COLLECTION.	25
STATISTICAL TREATMENT.	25
SUMMARY.	25

Chapter	Page
4. FINDINGS	27
Characteristics of the Population	28
Perceived Needs of Volunteer Leaders.	28
Leader Satisfactions.	35
Discussion of Hypotheses.	35
Benefits of Belonging to KEHC	53
Leader Contributions.	57
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . .	62
SUMMARY.	62
CONCLUSIONS.	66
IMPLICATIONS	67
RECOMMENDATIONS.	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	70
APPENDIX I-A	73
APPENDIX I-B	75
APPENDIX I-C	78
APPENDIX I-D	81
APPENDIX II.	88

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Warren Prawl who guided her in the development of this thesis. The suggestions of the other committee members, Dr. Barbara Reagan and Dr. Jerry Parsons, were also appreciated.

The suggestions of Dr. Hallie Clonts were most helpful in preparing this thesis. Her willingness to share her knowledge and experience is deeply appreciated.

Appreciation is also extended to the Kansas Extension Staff, Quality of Living Programs and to the members of the Home Economics Advisory Committees and officers of the County Extension Homemakers' Councils in the counties selected for the study.

Without the cooperation and support of the author's family and friends it would have been impossible to attend Kansas State University. A sincere thanks to them for their help and encouragement.

To Kansas State University and the Montgomery County Extension Council Executive Board for granting sabbatical leave, making it possible to study for an advanced degree.

Finally, a word of thanks is given to Mrs. Cindy Fletcher for the time she spent in the editing and typing of the final manuscript.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Counties Selected for Study.	23
2	Percentages and Frequencies for Population on Characteristics Studied.	29
3	Population Familiarity with the Kansas Extension Homemakers Council	32
4	Perceived Needs of Volunteer Leaders	34
5	Leader Satisfactions as Assessed by Respondents.	36
6	Percentages and Frequencies of Respondents That "Strongly Agreed" with Leader Satisfactions.	38
7	Educational Level of Respondents and Office Held on CHEAC	40
8	Educational Level of Respondents and Office Held on CEHC.	42
9	Relationship of Level of Income to Selected Variables.	45
10	Comparison of Respondents on Satisfactions and Contributions.	52
11	Significant Relationship Between Years of Service on CEHC and Contributions.	54
12	Benefits of Belonging to KEHC.	55
13	Relationship of Satisfactions and Contributions to Employment Status.	58
14	Summary of Leader Contributions.	60

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study was to determine leadership needs as perceived by volunteer leaders for the development of a leader training program to meet the needs of Kansas women. A secondary purpose was to assess present leader satisfactions as seen by the leader. A third purpose was to determine the extent of contributions (time, money, and other resources) of volunteer leaders. A fourth purpose was to determine the relationship between participation in leadership training schools and the perceived leadership needs, satisfactions and contributions of leaders.

Additional concerns of this study were the relationship of employment, level of education, income, place of residence, office held on County Extension Homemakers Council (CEHC) and County Home Economics Advisory Committee (CHEAC), and attendance at leader training schools to the needs, satisfactions, and contributions of present volunteer leaders.

Today, agencies and organizations are in competition in the recruitment and use of volunteers to serve as an extension of their paid professional staff. Volunteers are being sought to serve in many capacities. The effectiveness with which an organization uses its

volunteers is dependent on how well the agency or organization has prepared itself to include the volunteer as part of its staff.¹

BACKGROUND

"Without trained leaders an endeavor has two strikes against it before it starts!" The quality of work that a person can do is directly related to his preparation for the task.²

According to the 1970 Census, women make up fifty-one percent of the Kansas and United States population. The twentieth century emergence of the American women from the status she historically held is a phenomena dramatically illustrated in the Census Bureau data.³

Women want to achieve in leadership roles. They need opportunities and practice to develop their leadership skills.

Women are becoming better educated, enabling them to move up the job ladder and increase their earning power. Of the 314,221 employed women in Kansas, 53,079 are professional, technical and kindred workers; 13,976 are managers and administrators, except farm; 25,778 sales workers; 106,387 clerical and kindred workers; 65,434 service workers, except private household; 10,972 private household workers; 6,290 craftsman, foreman, and kindred workers; and 32,302 in other types of employment.⁴

¹Hope M. Martin, Managing 4-H Volunteer Staff. Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., September 1973.

²Reginald M. McDonough, Working with Volunteer Leaders in the Church. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1976, p. 36.

³We the American Women. U.S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, Feb. 1972.

⁴1970 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics-Kansas, U.S. Department of Commerce Publication, Bureau of the Census, February, 1972.

The number of women in political leadership positions are increasing. They served in the United States Congress and in the Kansas Legislature. Kansas has one woman in the Senate and ten women in the House of Representatives.⁵

In the church, women are becoming ministers. They also serve in other capacities commonly associated with women such as Sunday school teachers.

Women belong to many organizations. Federated clubs, garden clubs, study clubs, and social clubs, to name only a few, provide them with the opportunity to develop leadership skills.

Over 566,368 women in the United States belong to the National Extension Homemakers Council.⁶ In 1977, 30,000 women participated as members of Extension Homemakers Units (EHU) in Kansas.⁷ Extension Homemakers Units in Kansas provide women the opportunity to develop their leadership skills, social skills, and stimulate educational interest. Representing them are women serving on the County Extension Homemakers Council (CEHC) and County Home Economics Advisory Committee (CHEAC).

The Home Economics Advisory Committee members are elected to serve on the committee for three years by residents living in their commissioner district in counties with a population of less than 150,000. In counties with a population of more than 150,000, the citizens may

⁵House Floor Seating, 1978. 336-H.

⁶National Extension Homemakers Council Handbook. National Extension Homemakers Council. 1977.

⁷Office of Quality of Living Programs, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. 1977.

elect members at large or by county commissioner districts as determined by the executive board of the County Extension Council. There are three women from each commissioner district serving on the County Home Economics Advisory Committee. Elections are held each fall with one member being elected each year for a three-year term. The Advisory Committee meets with the County Extension Home Economist to discuss and plan programs in the area of Extension Quality of Living. This advisory committee is responsible for helping plan, implement, and evaluate the County Extension Quality of Living Programs.⁸

The County Extension Homemakers Council (CEHC) consists of persons elected or appointed by members of their EHU or according to by-laws of their council. Their primary purpose is to coordinate EHU activities in the county. This is a voluntary group, not established by law.⁹

Implementing and coordinating the County Extension Quality of Living Programs in Kansas are 122 Extension Home Economists (all Kansas State University faculty). These home economists cooperate and assist the County Extension Home Economics Advisory Committee and County Extension Homemakers Council to meet the educational needs of women in Kansas.¹⁰

The support of volunteer leaders is vital in continuing to maintain and expand Extension Quality of Living Programs in Kansas. Without these leaders, Extension Quality of Living Programs would be

⁸ Handbook for County Extension Councils, Cooperative Extension Service, Kansas State University, Manhattan, October, 1975. p. 14.

⁹ Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁰ Official Roster of the K.S.U. Cooperative Extension Service, Kansas State University, March/April 1978.

reduced to a token of their present size and significance. Quality of Living Programs reach more people in both rural and urban areas than ever before, thus a concern is being expressed at the state and national levels that very limited information is available as to what private resources are involved in supporting the Quality of Living Programs at the local level.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It has been recognized that there is a lack of research on needs as perceived by the volunteer leaders in the development of leader training programs in organizations. Research findings regarding needs of volunteer leaders are limited.

The leader satisfactions, as seen by the volunteer leaders, have not been sufficiently researched. Research findings on the relationship of job satisfaction and production are limited and serve only as a clue to this relationship, since dissatisfied volunteer leaders often leave the organization and no salary is involved.

It has been recognized that a void exists on research done with volunteer leader's contributions (time, money, and other resources) in an organization. The relationship of contributions to leadership needs and satisfactions have not been sufficiently researched.

Therefore, it was the primary purpose of this study to determine leadership needs as perceived by volunteer leaders, assess present leader satisfactions, and determine the extent of volunteer leader contributions. The study was further concerned with the relationship that exists between employment, level of education, income, place of residence, office held on the County Extension Homemakers Council and County Home Economics Advisory Committee, and attendance at leader

training schools to the needs, satisfactions, and contributions of present volunteer leaders.

HYPOTHESES

Two very broad questions were considered for this inquiry.

1) Is there a relationship between the perceived leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions of present volunteer leaders and employment, level of education, income, place of residence, and office held on County Extension Homemakers Council and County Home Economics Advisory Committee? 2) Does the number of leadership training schools attended make a difference on the perceived leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions of the leader?

Related to the central purpose of the study and specific questions asked are the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference on perceived leadership needs between officers of the County Extension Homemakers Council and members (including officers) of the County Home Economics Advisory Committee.

2. There is no significant difference on leader satisfactions between officers of the CEHC and members of the CHEAC.

3. There is no significant difference on leadership needs between officers on the CHEAC and other committee members.

4. There is no significant difference on leader satisfaction between officers on the CHEAC and other committee members.

5. There is no correlation between leadership needs for respondents attendance at one to six leadership training schools.

6. There is no correlation between leader satisfaction for respondents attendance at one to six leader training schools.
7. There is no significant difference between respondents on leadership needs in counties based on population and the control counties.
8. There is no significant difference between respondents in counties based on population and the control counties on leader satisfactions.
9. There is no significant difference between mean scores of respondents in counties based on population and the control counties on leader contributions.
10. There is no significant difference between respondents in control counties and respondents in other counties on leadership needs.
11. There is no significant difference between respondents in control counties and respondents in other counties on leader satisfactions.
12. There is no significant difference between respondents in control counties and respondents in other counties on leader contributions.
13. Years of service on the CEHC has no correlation with leadership needs.
14. There is no significant difference between leader satisfactions and length of time the respondents served on the CEHC.
15. There is no significant difference between leader contributions and length of time the respondents served on the CEHC.
16. Years of service on the CHEAC has no correlation with leadership needs.

17. Years of service on the CHEAC has no correlation with leader satisfactions.

18. Years of service on the CHEAC has no correlation with contributions.

19. There is no significant difference between educational level of the respondent and the office held on the County Home Economics Advisory Committee.

20. There is no significant difference between educational level of the respondent and the office held on the County Extension Homemakers Council.

21. Level of income has no relationship to membership on the County Home Economics Advisory Committee.

22. Level on income has no correlation with officers serving on the County Extension Homemamkers Council.

23. There is no significant difference between level of income and office held by the respondent on the CEHC and CHEAC.

24. There is no significant difference between level of income and length of time in office of the respondents on the CEHC and CHEAC.

25. There is no correlation between the benefits of belonging to KEHC and leadership needs.

26. There is no correlation between the benefits of belonging to KEHC and leader satisfactions.

27. There is no correlation between the benefits of belonging to KEHC and leader contributions.

28. There is no relationship between employment outside the home and perceived leadership needs.

29. There is no relationship between employment outside the home and leader satisfactions.

30. There is no relationship between the level of contributions and employment outside the home.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions have been used in this study to facilitate development of the conceptual framework.

Volunteer leader--one who influences the attitudes and actions of others and receives no financial pay for doing so.

Leadership needs--the lack or absence of something required for one's ability to use her leadership potential--personal and interpersonal needs of leaders.

Leader satisfaction--the giving and fulfillment of a person's desires, hopes, and demands as a leader.

Contributions--time, money, and other resources given by leaders to the Extension Quality of Living program.

Leadership schools--formal and informal sessions held for the purpose of leadership skill development.

Control counties--counties in which one or two formal leadership training schools were conducted by State Extension specialists on leadership skill development and how to conduct better meetings.

LIMITATIONS

A limitation of the study was the time of year the survey was made. Some respondents had been serving less than three months. Respondents begin their service on the CHEAC and CEHC in January, therefore, if the survey was made in the fall "new members" that year would have completed 10-12 months.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Leadership training is an integral part of many organizations. Its effectiveness depends on how well it fulfills the needs and satisfies its leaders.

Koch reports that traditional voluntary associations devoted to community service are losing ground in the United States. Leaders of some of these organizations report difficulties in recruiting new members, involving them in programs, and motivating them to accept leadership responsibilities. This is unfortunate because voluntary associations are just as vital to community life today as they were in the past when groups of neighbors came together to resolve community problems.

It is crucial that those in leadership positions in such associations continue to learn how to lead effectively, particularly in response to the challenges of contemporary society and the alienation that affects its younger members. Koch further suggests that leadership is shared. A voluntary association is not an authoritarian or bureaucratic organization. If the people have a "piece of the action," they are far more likely to contribute to the organization's work and life than if they are somebody else's pieces on the checkerboard. Involvement is the key to organizational success.¹

¹William H. Koch, "Voluntary Leadership Today: Is It Really Different?" Adult Leadership, February, 1974, p. 280-284.

LEADERSHIP NEEDS

Identifying personal needs of leaders is no simple task. There are many different theories of needs.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs can be used to assess some personal needs of leaders. He arranges human needs in five categories: physiological; safety or security; love or belonging; status or self-esteem; and self actualization. Through his experimentation and study he found that some of these needs are stronger than others. The lower, primary needs, called physiological needs are required to exist physically. These needs must be satisfied even if other needs go unmet. As this need is met the person can progress upward to the next higher level of safety or security. When this need is met the person can move upward to the next higher level of security, belonging, and self-esteem. The self actualization is the highest category of needs, it is also the category that a person is least likely to achieve.²

Needs of volunteer leaders emphasized by Arthur Pell include the following:

1. The need for recognition as an individual.
2. The need for accomplishment.
3. The need for fair treatment.
4. The need to be heard.
5. The need to belong.
6. The need to maintain status.⁶

²A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

³Arthur R. Pell, Recruiting, Training and Motivating Volunteer Leaders. New York: Pilot Industries, Inc., 1972.

Since volunteer leaders receive no monetary reimbursement for their services, their "pay" must be derived from the psychological rewards. Pins or mementos often are used to provide recognition or reward.

Leaders have a need for status. Results obtained by Cohen suggest that leaders under threat of status reduction may also redefine the group boundaries in such a manner as to isolate themselves from the very members whose support they need. It was found that high-status members in unstable positions communicate less with low-status members than high-status members in stable positions.⁴

Melvin Glasser in What Makes a Volunteer? reports that in many jobs a man works on a part of something most of his life. He may never see the whole job or the completed job. He feels the need to belong to a group of people with similar interests to accomplish something he can see, to achieve satisfaction in a completed job. Volunteer service can be an answer to this need.⁵

The need for belonging is fulfilled by volunteer service. This need of individuals is being met through volunteer groups instead of within their families.

In 1900, the average household had five and one-half members. Today the family units are almost 40 percent smaller, with three and one-half members. This decrease is due to fewer children and the fact that there is no longer a place in the household for relatives. There was a time when grandparents, widowed relatives, and maiden aunts lived with the family and helped with the work. The family produced much of what it consumed and provided the social satisfactions within its own

⁴A. R. Cohen, "Upward Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies." Human Relations Journal, 1958, p. 11, 41-53.

⁵Melvin Glasser. What Makes a Volunteer? Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 1955.

circle. Today's families are smaller so members seek the satisfaction of belonging by volunteering services in group experiences.

From a survey conducted by Barbara Scott of Kansas farm women, she found that non-formal education can be offered in several areas. The respondents were instructed to order their first three choices in each area. One area stated was "self development toward leadership roles." Forty-one percent rated self-confidence first, 26.2 percent rated self-confidence second and 17.2 rated it third.⁶

LEADER SATISFACTIONS

The needs of volunteers was discussed before the satisfaction of leaders because the needs as perceived by the leaders are a determining factor as to how satisfied volunteer leaders are with an existing program. Satisfaction of volunteer leaders in an organization is difficult to assess since dissatisfied volunteer leaders simply leave the organization or group.

Literature revealed a fragmentation of opinion concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. Maslow⁷, Van Dersal⁸, and Herzberg⁹ believed that satisfaction lead to

⁶Barbara Scott, "Kansas Farm Women Speak Out." Kansas Farmer September 3, 1977, p. 48-49.

⁷Abraham H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality, 2nd ed., New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1970. p. 107-122.

⁸William R. Van Dersal, The Successful Supervisor in Government and Business, Rev. ed., New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1969. p. 52-87.

⁹Frederick Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man, New York: World Publishing Co., 1966, p. 71-91.

productivity. Brayfield and Crockett concluded that no consistent relationship exists.¹⁰

Klein and Maher report that, with more education, a manager will feel less satisfied with his pay.¹¹ However, Lawler and Porter found no relation between education and satisfaction with pay.¹²

With regard to age, Saleh and Otis asked 80 managers, age 60-65 to think back over their careers and indicate the age at which they had derived the most satisfaction from their work. Satisfaction increased to age 59, then showed a sharp decrease. Another sample, aged 50-60 also showed an increase in satisfaction to age 59, they anticipated a decrease in satisfaction after age 60. The authors interpreted the reduced enjoyment after age 60 as due to a blockage of channels for further development and advancement.¹³

Michael Beer suggests that one of the main reasons for interest in the relationship between leadership and need satisfaction is the supposed positive relationship between higher order need satisfaction and motivation. The correlation between actual need satisfaction and

¹⁰A. R. Brayfield and W. R. Crockett, "Employee Attitudes and Performance," Psychological Bulletin, 1955, p. 396-424.

¹¹S. M. Klein and J. R. Maher, "Education and Satisfaction with Pay," Personnel Psychology, 1966, p. 195-208.

¹²E. E. Lawler and L. W. Porter, "Predicting Manager's Pay and Their Satisfaction With Pay," Personnel Psychology, 1966, p. 363-374.

¹³S. D. Saleh and J. L. Otis, "Age Level and Job Satisfaction," Personnel Psychology, 1964, p. 425-430.

motivation were not statistically significant in the sample of workers studied.¹⁴

Keffer and Cunningham reported that the best indication of overall job satisfaction of field staff of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division was the five job satisfier factors: achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself.¹⁵

No research is available on the relationship between needs and satisfactions of volunteer leaders in organizations, thus the reason for this study. Therefore studies on the relationship of production, age, education of employees, achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility and the work itself to job satisfactions are the only available clues to this relationship.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Determining the needs of volunteer leaders is not sufficient for an organization, if the organization wants to grow and continue its leadership in community activities.

Organizations must plan their leadership development programs based on volunteer leaders' needs. According to McDonough, "Without trained leaders an endeavor has two strikes against it before it starts!" The quality of work that a person can do is directly related to his preparation for the task. Some leaders bring a background of experience to their job and need little basic training to help them

¹⁴Michael Beer, Leadership, Employee Needs and Motivation, Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Division of Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University, 1966

¹⁵Wayne M. Keffer and Clarence J. Cunningham, Job Satisfaction of Field Staff of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1977, p. 17.

continue to grow as they serve. Others have little experience or training. Their reason for accepting a particular job is their concern for needs and their commitment.

McDonough suggests that leader training is so important it should not be left to sporadic efforts on an "as needed" basis. A definite continuing organization is needed to determine leader training needs and a comprehensive leader training program should include potential leader training, pre-service leader training and in-service leader training.¹⁶

The purpose of potential leader training is to help people identify abilities and interest, learn general leadership skills, and determine where they feel they want to begin their leadership responsibilities. In selecting potential leaders, studies show that leadership in high school and college tends to be predictive of leadership in adult life.¹⁷

Lawson, Griffin, and Donant report that when volunteers have been nominated for a leadership position, the next objective should be to acquaint members with their qualifications. Selecting the wrong person to a leadership position is a difficult thing to undo. They make these two suggestions:

1. Have volunteers participate in a symposium-forum with part of the group "on stage" at the same time. Follow this with questions from the rest of the group.
2. Have volunteers stand up one at a time in a meeting and give speeches (be sure to set time limit), then allow time for them to interact with the group for a limited amount of time. This takes longer but is more personal.¹⁸

¹⁶Reginald M. McDonough, Working with Volunteer Leaders in the Church, Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1976, p. 36-49.

¹⁷Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, New York: The Free Press, 1974, p. 35-65.

¹⁸John D. Lawson, Leslie J. Griffin, and Franklyn D. Donant, Leadership is Everybody's Business, San Luis Obispo, California: Impact Publishers, Inc., 1976, p.

This aspect of leadership is important to assess during potential leader training.

McDonough noted that a person's readiness for training is greatest just after accepting a specific office or responsibility and during the first few months of leadership. The emphasis of this training should be to help the person achieve an adequate level of performance for the job.

Training is a life-long need. It is estimated that one-third of the leaders resign or change positions after one year of service. Although the high rate of turnover can be attributed to many factors, a lack of continuing development in a job is a major cause. Many workers fear they will run out of ideas and different things to say. One leader was heard to say, "I don't stay in a job but one year. I run out of anything new to say and begin to repeat myself." Continued freshness of content comes from continued training and development.

In-service training has the potential of being very practical because it relates to work that a person is presently doing. If the training is planned according to the felt needs of leaders participation should be excellent. Some professionals make a serious mistake by not planning events that leaders feel they need. The most successful and meaningful in-service training is that which makes easier and more effective the real, every day kinds of jobs that leaders must do. Persons are not as interested in studying the principles of learning as they are in knowing how to carry out next month's meeting. The principles of learning and other theoretical content should be taught in the context of the immediate, practical concerns of the volunteer leaders.¹⁹

¹⁹ McDonough, p. 36-49.

Leadership training is a continuous process in the Kansas Extension Quality of Living Program. On subject matter it is offered through leader training on eight to ten "lessons" each year. State Extension specialists or county Extension home economists present the subject matter to the volunteer leaders who have agreed to take the lesson back to their community and present it to their Extension Homemaker Unit members or other interested groups. Methods used in the presentation are discussed and other methods for presentation reviewed.

Leadership training is conducted in many counties for E.H.U. officers. In the Southeast area, home economists reported that Morris, Neosho, Wilson, Coffey, Linn, Woodson, Elk, Montgomery, Miami, Lyon and Cherokee Counties had conducted training for officers on their duties and responsibilities in 1977. Chase County had mailed their officers materials.²⁰ Miami County reported leader training on "Styles of Leadership"²¹ and Montgomery County reported leader training on "How to Have Better Meetings"²² conducted by Les Frazier, Extension Specialist, Community Resource Development.

Kansas Extension Homemakers Council held a Leadership Development Conference at Rock Springs Ranch in the fall of 1976.

²⁰ Reports given by County Extension Home Economist at meeting in Yates Center on May 31, 1978.

²¹ Leslie Frazier, Improving Leadership for Better Groups and Communities, Cooperative Extension Service, Kansas State University, Manhattan.

²² Leslie Frazier, How to Have Better Meetings, Cooperative Extension Service, Kansas State University, Manhattan.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF LEADERS

More research is needed on leader's contributions (time, money, and other resources), for an organization, however, it is difficult to obtain this information from leaders.

Several studies have been conducted to determine leader contributions. In 1973-74, the Kansas Extension Homemaker's Council (KEHC) volunteer service survey was performed on the number of hours of volunteer service given by EHU members in Kansas. Volunteer time categories included hours spent as lesson leader or teacher of subject matter, participating in community activities (such as fairs, hospital work, cancer drives), planning or carrying out projects or programs which improve the community, working with other agencies, maintaining own unit, and raising money.

EHU members gave an average of 58 hours of volunteer services per member during a twelve month period. If these services were to be hired at the minimum wage of \$2.00 per hour, they would have an average value of \$116.00 per member. Kansas had a membership of 28,724 EHU members who were affiliated with KEHC. Based on an average of 58 hours of service per person this equates into 801 years of volunteer service to Kansas communities. Translated into dollar value at the minimum rate of \$2.00 per hour, EHU members have given over three million dollars (\$3,332,160) of service to Kansas communities.²³

²³Norma J. Redeker, "KEHC Volunteer Service Survey," Kansas State University, 1974.

In 1975, private support of Extension 4-H-Youth programs in Michigan was conducted. From the study it was estimated that the value of private support is approximately four to five times that of public appropriated dollars. For the contributions given by leaders to 4-H, the average was \$1,289.97 per leader for one year.²⁴

In 1976, a similar study on the private support of 4-H-Youth programs in Kansas was conducted. Kansas adult volunteer leaders averages \$1,013.00 per leader for one year.²⁵

SUMMARY

The review of literature indicated leadership needs of volunteer leaders. Some of the needs identified were Maslow's Hierarchy of needs: physiological; safety or security, love or belonging; status or self-esteem; and self actualization. Additional needs cited were self-confidence, to feel satisfaction from a completed job, and the need for belonging. These findings were used to strengthen this study.

Little research was found on the relationship of needs and leader satisfactions of volunteer leaders. Studies in industry on the relationship of production, age and education of employees on job satisfaction can only serve as a clue to this relationship since volunteer leaders receive no financial support for their work.

Studies on the contributions (time, money and other resources) of volunteer leaders to an organization are limited. In 1973-74, the

²⁴ Lowell Rothert, "Summary of 4-H Private Support Studies in Illinois, Kansas and Michigan," Michigan State University, September 1975.

²⁵ Carolyn Olson, "Private Support of 4-H-Youth Programs in Kansas," Kansas State University, 1976.

Kansas Extension Homemakers Council volunteer survey given by EHU members in Kansas was conducted with the findings of an average value of \$116.00 per member. No study was found on the contributions of volunteer leaders in this organization, thus providing the rationale for this study.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

The procedures used to carry out this research dealing with the identification of leadership needs, satisfaction, and contributions of volunteer leaders are described in this chapter. The chapter is divided into four sections: methodology, instruments, data collection methods, and statistical treatment.

METHODOLOGY

The population for this study were the leaders of the Extension Quality of Living Programs in Kansas serving as members of the County Home Economics Advisory Committee and officers, President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Public Relations Chairman, of the County Extension Homemakers Council.

To obtain a representative sample of these leaders a random sampling procedure was used. The Cooperative Extension Service in Kansas has assigned each county a number. The counties were classified as under 5,000 population, 5,000-10,000 population, 10,000-30,000 population and over 30,000 population. A table of random numbers was used to select the counties in each category in the same proportion as found in the state, to obtain 25 percent or 26 counties out of a possible 105 counties in Kansas. See Table 1.

Table 1

Counties Selected for the Study

Under 5,000 Population	5,000-10,000 Population	10,000-30,000 Population	30,000 and over Population	Control Counties
Greeley	Anderson	Cherokee	Barton	Finney
Haskell	Clay	Cloud	Reno	Miami
Logan	Doniphan	Jefferson	Sedgwick	Montgomery
Morton	Jewell	Marion	Wyandotte	Ness
Rawlins	Kingman	Rice		
Rush	Morris	Seward		
Wallace	Pawnee	Wilson		
Woodson	Pratt			

Control counties used in this study were counties in which one or two formal leader training schools had been conducted on leadership skill development and how to have better meetings by State Extension specialists. Three counties, Finney, Miami, and Ness, have had the school on leadership skill development. Montgomery County has had both schools.

INSTRUMENT

The instrument utilized in this study was developed by the researcher with contributions and assistance from Warren L. Prawl, Extension Specialist, Staff Development; Hallie L. Clonts, Extension Specialist, Programs; and Leslie P. Frazier, Extension Specialist, Community Resource Development.

The instrument (see Appendix I) used a 5-point Likert scale on leadership needs and leader satisfactions. The instrument was subdivided as follows:

Background Information, Questions 1-6

Leadership Needs, Questions 7-25

Leader Satisfactions, Questions 26-44

Leader Contributions, Questions 45-61

General Information, Questions 62-74

Kansas Extension Homemakers Council, Questions 75-79

The instrument was pretested in five counties not selected for the study. The respondents' comments and suggestions were utilized to revise the final instrument.

DATA COLLECTION

The instrument was administered to the nine members of the County Home Economics Advisory Committee and five officers of the County Extension Homemakers Council as part of their regular meeting. The County Extension Home Economist contacted any member or officer not at the meeting to fill out the questionnaire. Each respondent placed the completed questionnaire in an envelope, sealed it, and the County Extension Home Economist returned it to the researcher.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

The analysis of variance technique was selected to measure the relationship of the selected variables for the study. F tests were used to test the significance of the relationships as stated in the null hypotheses and that the variables identified in the study were statistically independent of one another. The alpha level of significance was set at the .05 level.

The analyses were programmed and ran by the K.S.U. Computing Center. Mean scores were used in the discussion.

SUMMARY

The population for this study were the leaders of the Extension Quality of Living programs in Kansas serving as members of the County Home Economics Advisory Committee and officers, President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Public Relations Chairman, of the County Extension Homemakers Council.

The instrument used to obtain the data for this study was developed by the researcher with contributions and assistance from Kansas State University Extension faculty.

An analysis of variance technique was selected to measure the relationships of the selected variables for the study. F tests were used to test the significance of the relationships as stated in the null hypotheses and that the variables identified in the study were statistically independent of one another. The alpha level of significance was set at the .05 level.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

This study was based on the supposition that volunteer leaders have perceived leadership needs on which leader training programs can be developed to meet these needs of Kansas women. The identification of needs, satisfactions, and contributions was determined from data obtained from the Leadership Needs Questionnaire.

The relationship between employment, level of education, income, place of residence, office held on County Extension Homemakers Council and County Home Economics Advisory Committee, and attendance at leader training schools to the needs, satisfactions, and contributions of present volunteer leaders was determined from the data.

It was hypothesized that there were no significant differences between perceived leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions of volunteer leaders serving on the County Extension Homemakers Council and County Home Economics Advisory Committee, length of service time, office held, age, income, marital status, number of children, employment, and level of education. It was also hypothesized that there was no significant difference between the control counties and the other counties on perceived needs and satisfactions.

The results of the F tests and their significance non-significance are stated in this chapter. Analysis of variance was used to test thirty null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

The null hypotheses were accepted when the tests were found to be non-significant and rejected when the computed F-ratios were larger than the Tabled F values. It was concluded that by rejecting the null hypotheses there was significant mean differences between groups.

Characteristics of the Population

Findings on the characteristics of the population studies are presented in Table 2. Statistical frequencies were obtained from nominal measurements for marital status, number of children, residence, present employment, gross family income, and highest educational level.

Findings on the knowledge and opinions of the population concerning the Kansas Extension Homemakers Council are presented in Table 3. Statistical frequencies were obtained from nominal measurements for membership in KEHC, materials and information provided by KEHC, and benefits of belonging to KEHC.

Perceived Needs of Volunteer Leaders

Findings on the perceived needs of volunteer leaders are given in Table 4. As McDonough suggested, if leadership training is planned according to the felt needs of leaders, participation should be excellent.¹ It was noted that 86% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that communication effectively was a leadership need. Fifty-eight percent strongly agreed that communicating effectively was a felt leadership need. Refer to Appendix I-A for a complete report on response to various needs. Mean scores on leadership needs are given in Table 4 (strongly agree = 5), agree = 4, undecided = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1).

¹Reginald McDonough, p. 43.

Table 2
 Percentages and Frequencies for Population
 on Characteristics Studied

Characteristic Studied	Percent	Frequencies	Characteristic Studied	Percent	Frequencies
Marital Status			Number of Children 6-12 Years		
Married	87.1	250	1 Child	17.8	51
Single	3.5	10	2 Children	10.8	31
Divorced	0.7	2	3 Children	1.4	4
Widowed	6.6	19	No Children or No Response	70.0	201
No Response	2.1	6	TOTAL	100.0	287
TOTAL	100.0	287			
Number of Children Under Five Years			Number of Children 13--18 Years		
1 Child	11.5	33	1 Child	18.1	52
2 Children	7.7	22	2 Children	5.9	17
3 Children	0.3	1	3 Children	2.1	6
No Children or No Response	80.5	231	4 Children	0.7	2
TOTAL	100.0	287	No Children or No Response	73.2	210
			TOTAL	100.0	287

Table 2 (continued)

Characteristic Studied	Percent	Frequencies	Characteristic Studied	Percent	Frequencies
Number of Children 19 Years and Older			Present Residence		
1 Child	10.8	31	Farm	50.9	146
2 Children	17.8	51	Rural Non-Farm	7.0	20
3 Children	13.2	38	Small Town	30.3	87
4 Children	5.9	17	City	10.1	29
5 Children	2.1	6	No Response	1.7	5
6 Children	1.4	4	TOTAL	100.0	287
7 Children	0.3	1			
8 Children	0.3	1	Presently Employed Outside Home		
9 Children	0.3	1	Yes	32.8	94
No Children or No Response	47.7	137	No	62.4	179
TOTAL	100.0	287	No Response	4.9	14
			TOTAL	100.0	287
Age of Subject					
Under 25 Years	3.1	9			
26-35 Years	23.0	66			
36-45 Years	16.0	46			
46-55 Years	20.9	60			
56-65 Years	22.0	63			
66 and Over	12.5	36			
No Response	2.5	7			
TOTAL	100.0	287			

Table 2 (continued)

Characteristic Studied	Percent	Frequencies	Characteristic Studied	Percent	Frequencies
Occupation			Highest Education Level		
Other*	10.3	31	Less Than High School	2.8	8
Partner on Farm	5.6	16	High School But Less Than High School Diploma	3.8	11
Secretary	4.5	13	High School Diploma	40.1	115
Bookkeeper	2.8	8	Junior College or Vocational-Technical		
Medical	2.4	7	School Diploma Attended College But Did Not Graduate	8.7	25
Teacher	2.1	6	College Graduate, Bachelor's Degree	26.1	75
Sales Clerk	2.1	6	Master's Degree	11.5	33
Social Worker	1.0	3	Other	2.4	7
Restaurant	0.7	2	No Response	2.4	7
Child Care	0.3	1	TOTAL	100.0	287
Executive	0.3	1			
No Response	67.2	193			
TOTAL	100.0	287			
Gross Family Income					
Under \$5,000	6.6	19			
\$5,001-\$19,000	14.3	41			
\$19,001-\$35,000	18.1	52			
\$35,001-\$50,000	13.6	39			
\$50,001-\$75,000	13.2	38			
\$75,001 and over	14.3	41			
No Response	19.9	57			
TOTAL	100.0	287			

*Include combination of other occupations listed and occupations not listed.

Table 3

Population Familiarity With the Kansas
Extension Homemakers Council

Variable	Percent	Frequencies	Variable	Percent	Frequencies
Member of KEHC			Leaders Feel Confident With Present Skills When Presenting a Lesson		
Yes	71.8	206	Always	17.8	51
No	19.5	56	Depends on Subject	33.4	96
No Response	8.7	25	Depends on Time to Prepare	7.7	22
TOTAL	100.0	287	Depends on Experience	1.0	3
KEHC Provides Materials for Leadership Development			Most of the Time	13.2	38
Yes	75.6	217	Depends on Subject and Time to Prepare	5.9	17
No	5.6	16	Always-Most of the Time	1.0	3
No Response	18.8	54	Depends on the Subject-Most of the Time	2.8	8
TOTAL	100.0	287	Depends on Time to Prepare-Most of the Time	1.7	5
			No Response	15.3	44
			TOTAL	100.0	287

Table 3 (continued)

Variable	Percent	Frequencies	Variable	Percent	Frequencies
KEHC Program of Work Guide Provides Information for Active County Program in the Six Program Areas			Benefits of Belonging to KEHC		
Yes	59.9	172	Social, Educational, Community Service	26.1	75
No	2.8	8	Educational Social	8.7	25
Not Sure	21.3	61	Educational, Community Service, Homemaker		
No Response	16.0	46	Publication	15.7	45
	100.0	287	Social, Educational, Community Service, Keep Busy	8.4	24
			Other	12.6	36
			None	1.0	3
			No Response	15.3	44
			TOTAL	100.0	287

Table 4

Perceived Needs of Volunteer Leaders

Need	Mean Score	Absolute Frequency		Relative Frequency		Total of Answers		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Agree	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Communicating effectively.	4.154	246	85.7	81	28.2	165	57.5						
Developing self-confidence.	4.062	239	83.3	66	23.0	173	60.3						
How to work with committees.	3.945	237	82.6	39	13.6	198	69.0						
Discovering the needs and interests of others.	4.15.	234	81.6	88	30.7	146	50.9						
To plan and carry out productive meetings.	4.018	232	80.9	57	19.9	175	61.0						
Planning more effectively.	3.963	231	80.5	48	16.7	183	63.8						
Enlisting persons to help.	3.967	224	78.0	58	20.2	166	57.8						
Using a variety of teaching methods.	3.897	220	76.6	42	14.6	178	62.0						
Understanding myself.	3.897	217	75.6	42	15.0	174	60.6						
Using resource materials effectively.	3.864	216	75.3	45	15.7	171	59.6						
Knowing how to involve persons in a discussion.	3.971	206	71.7	53	18.5	160	55.7						
How to manage time.	3.881	205	71.4	54	18.8	151	52.6						
Evaluating results.	3.763	196	68.3	28	9.8	168	58.5						
Knowledge of group member roles.	3.660	183	63.8	18	6.3	165	57.5						
Dealing with resistance to change.	3.730	183	63.8	28	9.8	155	54.0						
Identifying problems.	3.734	182	63.4	34	11.8	148	51.6						
Knowing how to deal with difficult persons.	3.816	179	62.3	65	22.6	114	39.7						3
Knowledge of the styles of leaders.	3.543	150	52.3	16	5.6	134	46.7						4

On a five-point Likert scale the interval between each point on the scale is assumed to be equal. Therefore in assessing perceived leadership needs it is significant to ascertain the rank of leadership needs on "strongly agree". Table 4 ranks leadership needs on how strongly respondents agreed on the need.

Leader Satisfactions

Results of the data on leader satisfactions are presented in Table 5. Ninety-six percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they have the opportunity to work with others. Ninety-five percent felt that someone else is capable of filling in for them when they are unable to function. On freedom to express their opinions and suggestions to the County Extension Agents, ninety-four percent strongly agreed or agreed they could. For a complete listing of responses to leader satisfactions refer to Appendix I-B. Median scores on leader satisfaction is given in Table 5 (strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, undecided = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1).

Viewing leader satisfactions as assumed by respondents can be further studied on how strongly respondents agreed on satisfaction. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents strongly agreed on having freedom to express their opinions and suggestions to the County Extension Agents. The top ten satisfaction respondents "strongly agreed" on are given in Table 6.

Discussion of Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were accepted in this study:

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference on perceived leadership needs between officers of the CEHC and members (including officers) of the CHEAC.

Table 5

Leader Satisfactions as Assessed by Respondents

Satisfaction	Mean Score	Total of Answers		Strongly Agree		Agree	
		Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
I have the opportunity to work with others.	4.226	275	95.8	72	25.1	203	70.7
Someone is capable of filling in for me when I am unable to function.	4.210	273	95.1	70	24.4	203	70.7
There is freedom to express my opinions and suggestions to the County Extension Agents.	4.338	270	94.0	106	36.9	164	57.1
I have the opportunity to develop meaningful relationship with others.	4.108	259	90.3	49	17.1	210	73.2
There is opportunity to utilize my abilities as a leader.	4.101	252	87.8	55	19.2	197	68.6
There is opportunity to develop my potential as a leader.	4.032	248	86.4	41	14.3	207	72.1
There is freedom to use my judgment as a leader.	4.029	247	86.0	36	12.5	211	73.5
Adequate information about programs for which I am responsible is available.	4.022	243	84.6	48	16.7	195	67.9
There is opportunity for personal growth in my leadership role.	4.029	242	84.3	48	16.7	194	67.6
I have knowledge of Extension programs.	3.993	238	82.9	48	16.7	190	66.2
I am given credit for doing a good job.	3.952	229	79.7	34	11.8	195	67.9

Table 5 (continued)

Satisfactions	Mean Score	Total of Answers		Strongly Agree		Agree	
		Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency Percent	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency Percent	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency Percent
I have sufficient authority for leadership expected of me.	3.801	209	72.8	27	9.4	182	63.4
I am aware of what is expected of me.	3.836	208	72.5	28	9.8	180	62.7
My suggestions for changes are welcomed.	2.819	203	70.7	27	9.4	176	61.3
I have the feeling of self-fulfillment from using my capabilities as a leader.	3.801	198	69.0	28	9.8	170	59.2
Others listen to what I say.	3.756	192	66.9	19	6.6	173	60.3
Other leaders in the county respect me.	3.800	191	66.5	27	9.4	164	57.1
I feel important to the organization.	3.756	190	66.2	27	9.4	163	56.8
Leadership gives me status.	3.342	125	43.6	12	4.2	113	39.4

Table 6
 Percentages and Frequencies of Respondents That
 "Strongly Agreed" with Leader Satisfactions

Leader Satisfaction	Absolute Frequency Count	Relative Frequency Percent
There is freedom to express my opinions and suggestions to County Extension Agents.	106	36.9
I have the opportunity to work with others.	72	25.1
Someone is able to fill in for me when I am unable.	70	24.4
There is opportunity to utilize my abilities as a leader.	55	19.2
I have the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with others.	49	17.1
Adequate information about programs for which I am responsible is available.	48	16.7
There is opportunity for personal growth in my leadership role.	48	16.7
I have knowledge of Extension programs.	48	16.7
There is opportunity to develop my potential as a leader.	41	14.3
There is freedom to use my judgment as a leader.	36	12.5

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference on leader satisfactions between officers of the CEHC and members (including officers) of the CHEAC.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference on leadership needs between officers on the CHEAC and other committee members.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference between leadership needs for respondents attendance at one to six leader training schools.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between leader satisfaction for respondents attendance at one to six leader training schools.

The hypothesis 10 that there is significant difference between respondents in control counties and all other counties on leadership needs was accepted.

Hypothesis 14. Years of service on the CEHC has no relationship with leader satisfactions was accepted.

Years of service on the CHEAC has no correlation with leader satisfactions (hypothesis 17) was accepted. Leader contribution had no correlation with years of service on the CHEAC (hypothesis 18) was accepted.

There is no significant difference between educational level of the respondent and the office held on the CHEAC (hypothesis 19) and the CEHC (hypothesis 20) were accepted, refer to Table 7 and 8 for more information.

Table 7

Educational Level of Respondents
and Office Held on CHEAC

Educational Level	Office	Number	Percent
Less than high school	President	0	0.0
	Vice-President	1	0.6
	Secretary	0	0.0
	Public Relations Chairman	0	0.0
	None	3	1.8
Some high school	President	1	0.6
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	1	0.6
	Public Relations Chairman	0	0.0
	None	5	3.0
High school diploma	President	7	4.2
	Vice-President	3	1.8
	Secretary	7	4.2
	Public Relations Chairman	2	1.2
	None	46	27.9
Juco-Votech	President	0	0.0
	Vice-President	1	0.6
	Secretary	2	1.2
	Public Relations Chairman	1	0.6
	None	11	6.7
Some college	President	7	4.2
	Vice-President	7	4.2
	Secretary	7	4.2
	Public Relations Chairman	0	0.0
	None	26	15.8
Bachelor	President	5	3.0
	Vice-President	1	0.6
	Secretary	5	3.0
	Public Relations Chairman	0	0.0
	None	10	6.1
Masters	President	0	0.0
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	2	1.2
	Public Relations Chairman	0	0.0
	None	1	0.6

Table 7 (continued)

Educational Level	Office	Number	Percent
Other	President	1	0.6
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	0	0.0
	Public Relations	0	0.0
	None	2	1.2

Table 8

Educational Level of Respondents
and Office Held on CEHC

Educational Level	Office	Number	Percent
Less than high school	President	0	0.0
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	1	0.7
	Treasurer	1	0.7
	Public Relations Chairman	0	0.0
	None	2	1.5
Some high school	President	1	0.7
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	1	0.7
	Treasurer	0	0.0
	Public Relations Chairman	1	0.7
	None	2	1.5
High school diploma	President	12	9.0
	Vice-President	11	8.2
	Secretary	4	3.0
	Treasurer	1	0.7
	Public Relations Chairman	11	8.2
	None	16	11.9
Juco-Votech	President	5	3.7
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	2	1.5
	Treasurer	2	1.5
	Public Relations Chairman	3	2.2
	None	0	0.0
Some college	President	5	3.7
	Vice-President	5	3.7
	Secretary	5	3.7
	Treasurer	2	1.5
	Public Relations Chairman	3	2.2
	None	13	9.7
Bachelor	President	5	3.7
	Vice-president	2	1.5
	Secretary	3	2.2
	Treasurer	2	1.5
	Public Relations Chairman	2	1.5
	None	3	2.2

Table 8 (continued)

Educational Level	Office	Number	Percent
Masters	President	1	0.7
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	0	0.0
	Treasurer	1	0.7
	Public Relations Chairman	1	0.7
	None	1	0.7
	Other	President	0
	Vice-President	0	0.0
	Secretary	1	0.7
	Treasurer	0	0.0
	Public Relations Chairman	2	1.5
	None	1	0.7

Level of income has no relationship with service on CHEAC (hypothesis 21), service on CEHE (hypothesis 22), offices held on CEHC and CHEAC (hypothesis 23), length of time in office (hypothesis 24). Refer to Table 9.

Hypothesis 28. There is no relationship between employment outside the home and perceived leadership needs was accepted.

The following null hypotheses were rejected:

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference on leader satisfaction between officers or the CHEAC and other committee members. CHEAC members had a significantly higher mean score than CHEAC officers on the satisfaction of having knowledge of Extension programs.

Members of the CHEAC had a significantly higher mean score than the officers on the satisfaction that their suggestions for changes are welcomed.

Respondents in counties with a population of less than 5,000 felt a greater need for time management than respondents in the counties having a population of 10,000-30,000. Knowledge of the styles of leaders was perceived as a greater need for respondents in counties with a population of 30,000 and more than respondents in counties with 5,000-30,000 population but were not significantly higher than respondents in counties with a population of less than 5,000 and the control counties. Therefore, hypothesis 7, that there is no significant difference between respondents on leadership needs in counties based on population and the control counties was rejected.

Table 9

Relationship of Level of Income
to Selected Variables

Gross Family Income	Type of Service					
	Advisory		Council		Both	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
Up to \$5,000	8	7.1	7	7.5	3	13.0
\$5,001-10,000	22	19.5	14	15.1	5	21.7
\$10,001-15,000	24	21.2	24	25.8	4	17.4
\$15,001-20,000	15	13.3	21	22.6	3	13.0
\$20,001-25,000	18	15.9	15	16.1	5	21.7
\$25,001 and over	<u>26</u>	<u>23.0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12.9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13.0</u>
TOTALS	113	100.0	93	100.0	23	99.8

Gross Family Income	Length of Time Served on Advisory Committee							
	1-3 Years		4-6 Years		6-10 Years		11 and more	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
Up to \$5,000	8	8.6	2	8.0	1	7.7	0	0.0
\$5,001-10,000	15	16.1	6	24.0	5	38.5	0	0.0
\$10,001-15,000	24	25.8	1	4.0	2	15.4	0	0.0
\$15,001-20,000	12	12.9	3	12.0	2	15.4	1	50.0
\$20,001-25,000	16	17.2	5	20.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
\$25,001 and over	<u>18</u>	<u>19.4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>32.0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTALS	93	100.0	25	100.0	13	100.0	2	100.0

AF = Absolute Frequency (count)

RF = Relative Frequency (percent)

Table 9 (continued)

Length of Time Served on Council						
Gross Family Income	1-3 Years		4-6 Years		6-10 Years	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
Up to \$5,000	5	5.7	3	14.3	1	50.0
\$5,001-10,000	13	14.8	5	23.8	1	50.0
\$10,001-15,000	20	22.7	5	23.8	0	0.0
\$15,001-20,000	21	23.9	3	14.3	0	0.0
\$20,001-25,000	16	18.2	3	14.3	0	0.0
\$25,001 and over	<u>13</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTALS	88	100.0	21	100.0	2	100.0

Office Held on Advisory Committee										
Gross Family Income	President		Vice-Pres.		Secretary		Pub. Rel.		None	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
Up to \$5,000	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	33.3	9	10.7
\$5,001-10,000	3	18.8	3	33.3	6	28.6	1	33.3	13	15.5
\$10,001-15,000	2	12.5	1	11.1	5	23.8	0	0.0	20	23.8
\$15,001-20,000	1	6.3	0	0.0	3	14.3	1	33.3	13	15.5
\$20,001-25,000	7	43.8	1	11.1	5	23.8	0	0.0	9	10.7
\$25,001 and over	<u>3</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>23.8</u>
TOTALS	16	100.2	9	99.9	21	100.0	3	99.9	84	100.0

AF = Absolute Frequency (count)

RF = Relative Frequency (percent)

Table 9 (continued)

Length of Time in Office on Advisory Committee									
Gross Family Income	1 Year		2 Years		3 Years		4 Years		
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	
Up to \$5,000	4	9.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$5,001-10,000	10	24.4	3	23.1	2	33.3	0	0.0	
\$10,001-15,000	6	14.6	3	23.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$15,001-20,000	4	9.8	1	7.7	0	0.0	1	100.0	
\$20,001-25,000	9	22.0	5	38.5	2	33.3	0	0.0	
\$25,001 and over	<u>8</u>	<u>19.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	
TOTALS	41	100.1	13	100.1	6	99.9	1	100.0	

Office Held on Council													
Gross Family Income	President		V-Prés.		Secre.		Treas.		P. Rel.		None		
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	
Up to \$5,000	2	8.3	1	6.7	1	7.1	1	14.3	2	9.5	4	12.5	
\$5,001-10,000	4	16.7	6	40.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	3	14.3	4	12.5	
\$10,001-15,000	7	29.2	5	33.3	2	14.3	2	28.6	2	9.5	9	28.1	
\$15,001-20,000	2	8.3	0	0.0	4	28.6	1	14.3	8	38.1	9	28.1	
\$20,001-25,000	3	12.5	1	6.7	5	35.7	1	14.3	4	19.0	4	12.5	
\$25,001 and over	<u>6</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6.3</u>	
TOTALS	24	100.0	15	100.0	14	99.9	7	100.1	21	99.9	32	100.0	

AF = Absolute Frequency (Count)

RF = Relative Frequency (Percent)

Table 9 (continued)

Length of Time in Office on Council

Gross Family Income	1 Year		2 Years		3 Years		4 Years	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
Up to \$5,000	6	10.3	2	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$5,001-10,000	10	17.2	3	13.6	1	33.3	1	33.3
\$10,001-15,000	13	22.4	3	13.6	1	33.3	1	33.3
\$15,001-20,000	14	24.1	4	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$20,001-25,000	5	8.6	7	31.8	1	33.3	1	33.3
\$25,001 and over	<u>10</u>	<u>17.2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTALS	58	99.8	22	99.9	3	99.9	3	99.9

AF = Absolute Frequency (Count)

RF = Relative Frequency (Percent)

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference between respondents in counties based on population and the control counties on leader satisfaction was rejected.

The satisfaction on having the opportunity to utilize abilities as a leader had greater agreement by respondents in counties with a population of over 30,000 respondents than respondents in counties having a population from 5,000-30,000 but was not significantly greater than counties having less than 5,000 population and the respondents in the control counties.

Respondents expressed a greater need for having sufficient authority for leadership expected of them in counties with a population over 30,000 than in counties with a population less than 10,000

Data revealed that respondents in counties with 30,000 or more population felt that they received more credit for doing a good job than respondents in counties having 10,000-30,000 population and the control counties.

Respondents in counties with a population of less than 5,000 had greater satisfaction in feeling they had the freedom to express their opinions and suggestions to the County Extension Agents than respondents in counties with populations of 5,000-30,000 but were not significantly greater than respondents in counties over 30,000 population.

Data revealed that respondents in counties with a population of 30,000 and more had a significantly higher mean score on the satisfaction of "I feel important to the organization" than respondents in counties with population of 5,000-10,000 but not significantly higher than counties under 5,000 population, 10,000-30,000 population and the control counties.

Hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference between respondents in counties based on population and the control counties on leader contributions.

Respondents in counties with a population of 30,000 and more had a significantly higher mean score than respondents in counties with under 5,000 population, 5,000-10,000 population and 10,000-30,000 population but not significantly higher than leaders in the control counties on hours per month spent on participation in local meetings and activities.

Respondents in counties with population of 30,000 and more had a significantly higher mean score than respondents in all other counties, including the control counties on hours per month spent on preparing for local meetings.

Respondents in the control counties had a significantly higher mean score than respondents in counties up to 10,000 population and over 30,000 population on hours spent per month on fund raising but not significantly higher than respondents in counties with 10,000-30,000 population. Respondents in counties with population of up to 10,000 population were not significantly lower than counties having a population of 10,000-30,000.

Respondents in counties with 30,000 population or more had a significantly higher mean score on the average number of people served per meeting than respondents in all other counties except the control counties. Respondents in control counties had a higher mean score than respondents in counties up to 10,000 population but not significantly higher than counties with 10,000-30,000 population. Respondents in counties up to 10,000 population were not significantly lower than counties with a population of 10,000-30,000.

Respondents in counties under 5,000 population and over 30,000 population had a significantly higher mean score than respondents in counties with 5,000-10,000 population but not significantly higher than respondents in the control counties and 10,000-30,000 population on the estimated cost for one serving of refreshments. Respondents in counties with 5,000-10,000 population were not significantly lower than respondents in counties with 10,000-30,000 population and the control counties.

Hypothesis 11 that there is no significant difference between respondents in control counties and other counties on leader satisfactions was rejected. Respondents in the control counties had a significantly higher mean score on the freedom to express their opinion and make suggestions to the County Extension Agents than respondents in all the other counties. Respondents in the control counties had a significantly higher mean score on having the opportunity to develop their potential as a leader than respondents in the other counties.

Hypothesis 12 there is no significant difference between respondents in control counties and all other counties on leader contributions was rejected. Respondents in the control counties had a significantly lower mean score on time spent receiving/conducting leader training sessions than respondents in the other counties. Respondents in the control counties had a significantly higher mean score for time spent on fund raising than leaders in all other counties. Respondents in control counties had a significantly higher mean score for time spent on other activities than respondents in other counties. See Table 10.

Table 10
 Comparison of Respondents on
 Satisfactions and Contributions

Satisfaction		Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation
There is freedom to express my opinions and suggestions to the County Extension Agents.	Control Counties	38	4.5263	0.557
	All Other Counties	243	4.3086	0.545
There is opportunity to develop my potential as a leader.	Control Counties	38	4.1579	0.370
	All Other Counties	239	4.0126	0.554
Receiving/conducting leader training sessions.	Control Counties	26	1.3462	0.629
	All Other Counties	133	1.7143	1.171
Fund raising.	Control Counties	18	2.9444	2.413
	All Other Counties	93	1.6237	1.276
Other contributions	Control Counties	11	4.0000	3.406
	All Other Counties	83	2.3614	2.330

Hypothesis 13, years of service on the CEHC has no relationship with leadership needs was rejected. Respondents having served from one to three years on the CEHC had a significantly higher mean score on the need of knowing how to involve persons in a discussion than respondents having served four or more years.

Hypothesis 15, length of service on the CEHC has no relationship with leader contributions was rejected. Respondents serving one to three years on the CEHC were significantly more involved with state committees and councils than were respondents serving four or more years. On number of telephone calls made per month, respondents serving on the CEHC for four or more years were significantly higher on the separate variance estimate than respondents having served one to three years. Respondents having served on the CEHC four or more years furnish refreshments significantly more often than respondents serving from one to three years. Number of miles driven per year on Quality of Living Program business was significantly higher for respondents serving four or more years on the CEHC than the respondents having served from one to three years. (Refer to Table 11.)

Hypothesis 16, length of service has no correlation with leadership needs was rejected. Respondents serving on the CHEAC from one to three years have a significantly higher mean score on the need for using resource materials effectively than respondents having served six to ten years but not significantly higher than respondents serving four to six years.

Benefits of Belonging to KEHC

The benefits leaders gave for belonging to KEHC are related to leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions. Respondents

Table 11

Significant Relationship Between Years of Service
on CEHC and Contributions

Variables	Years of Service	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation
Knowing how to involve persons in a discussion.	1-3	101	4.1683	0.788
	4-6	30	3.5667	0.935
State committees or council.	1-3	33	3.1818	2.530
	4-6	8	1.2500	0.707
Number of phone calls made per <u>MONTH</u>	1-3	85	2.8000	2.219
	4-6	29	4.2759	2.389
Number of times per <u>YEAR</u> you furnish refreshments.	1-3	88	1.2841	0.843
	4-6	31	1.8065	1.302
Number of miles driven per <u>YEAR</u> on Quality of Living Programs each year.	1-3	77	3.2597	2.816
	4-6	25	5.1600	3.287

were divided into seven groups based on the benefits they gave for belonging to KEHC. See Table 12. Refer to Appendix I-C for complete data.

Table 12
Benefits of Belonging to KEHC

Group	Reasons for Belonging
1	Educational
2	Social, educational, community service
3	Social, educational
4	Social, educational, community service, The Homemaker Publication
5	Educational, community service
6	Educational, community service, the Homemaker publication
7	Social, educational, keep busy, community service

In this section of the findings respondents will be referred to by a group number.

Hypothesis 25, there is no correlation between the benefits of belonging to KEHC and leadership needs was rejected. Respondents in groups 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 had a significantly higher mean score than Group 7 on the need for communicating effectively but not significantly higher than Group 1. Group 7 was not significantly lower than Group 1. Respondents in Groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 had a significantly higher mean score on the need for using a variety of teaching methods than Group 7. Respondents in Group 4 had a significantly higher mean score on the need for knowing how to involve persons in a discussion than respondents

in Groups 2, 6, and 7 had significantly higher mean scores than Group 4, but no significantly higher than Groups 1, 3 and 5.

Respondents in Groups 4 and 5 had a significantly higher mean score on the need of how to work with committees than respondents in Group 7 but not significantly higher than respondents in Groups 1, 2, 3 and 6. Respondents in Group 7 were not significantly lower than leaders in Groups 1, 2, 3 and 6.

On having the opportunity for personal growth in their leadership role respondents in Groups 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 had a significantly higher mean score than respondents in Group 3 but not significantly higher than leaders in Group 1. Respondents in Group 3 were not significantly lower than respondents in Group 1. Hypothesis 26 that there is no correlation between the benefits of belonging to KEHC and leader satisfactions was rejected.

Hypothesis 27 that membership in KEHC has no influence on the amount of leader contributions were rejected. Respondents in Group 4 had a significantly higher mean score on cost for one serving of refreshments than leaders in Groups 1, 5, 6 and 7 but not significantly higher than respondents in Groups 2 and 3. Respondents in Groups 1, 5, 6 and 7 were not significantly lower than respondents in Groups 2 and 3. Kitchen facilities were furnished more often by respondents in Group 5 than respondents in Groups 2, 3, 4 and 7 at a significant level of .0369, but not significantly higher than respondents in Groups 1 and 6. Respondents in Groups 1 and 6 were not significantly higher than respondents in Groups 2, 3 and 7 but were significantly higher than Group 4. Respondents in Group 4 were not significantly lower than leaders in Groups 1, 2, 3 and 7.

That there is no relationship between employment outside the home and leader satisfaction (hypothesis 29) was rejected. Respondents employed outside the home had significantly higher mean scores for the opportunities to utilize my abilities as a leader and for having the opportunity for work with others than did respondents not employed outside the home. Respondents employed outside the home had the feeling that "other leaders in the county respect me," at a significantly higher mean score than respondents not employed. See Table 13.

Hypothesis 30, that there is no relationship between employment outside the home and contributions was rejected. Respondents employed outside the home on providing kitchen facilities had a significantly higher mean score than respondents not employed outside the home. Respondents employed outside the home had a significantly high mean score on contributing more other assistance than did respondents not employed. See Table 13.

Leader Contributions

The information collected from the survey of volunteer leader contributions to the Extension Quality of Living Program was combined to ascertain the total dollar value. The monthly figures were converted to annual figures.

The following categories of contributions were analyzed: number of hours, number of telephone calls, number of people served refreshments, dollar value of supplies furnished, number of miles driven, and other resources furnished.

Dollar values were placed on each resource being measured. The figures for each category were combined to give a total dollar value. The total dollar value for each category was taken and divided by the

Table 13
 Relationship of Satisfactions and Contributions
 to Employment Status

Satisfaction/Contributions		Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation
There is opportunity to utilize my abilities as a leader.	Employed Outside			
	Home	92	4.2065	0.504
	Not Employed	173	4.0405	0.564
I have the opportunity to work with others.	Employed Outside			
	Home	93	4.3118	0.489
	Not Employed	176	4.1818	0.479
Other leaders in the county respect me.	Employed Outside			
	Home	91	3.9341	0.629
	Not Employed	166	3.7229	0.599
Other assistance you provide for Quality of Living Programs each year. Kitchen facilities.	Employed Outside			
	Home	38	2.2368	1.837
	Not Employed	58	1.5517	0.921

number of respondents to obtain an average per individual leader.

(See Appendix I-D for calculations and totals.)

The dollar value on volunteer time is based on the opinion that one cannot buy the quality of volunteer staff for the minimum wage. This is judgment and undoubtedly some volunteers are worth more and some less.

The basis for determination of dollar value of leader contributions was:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Assigned</u>
Volunteer time	\$3.50 per hour
Phone calls	.10 per call
Miles driven	.13 per mile
Refreshments	.35 per serving - the average cost was extrapolated from the data.
Sewing machines	.80 per day - Based on rental fees charged by two firms.

The average dollar value for each volunteer leader was determined by dividing the total dollar value by the number of leaders responding in each category. The summary of leader contributions is given in Table 14.

Leader contributions (time, money, and other resources) totaled approximately \$226,725.10 or \$1,334.47 per leader. Refer to Appendix I-D for details.

Table 14

Summary of Leader Contributions

Activity	Total dollars/ year for time contributed.	Total dollar value/leader per year.	Number Respon- dents
Participation in local meetings and activities.	\$ 53,844.00	\$ 209.50	257
Preparing for local meeting.	24,864.00	115.65	215
Receiving/conducting leader training.	22,092.00	138.94	159
Involved in county-wide committees/ councils.	32,676.00	153.41	213
Communications-newsletters, reports, etc.	<u>37,716.00</u>	<u>170.66</u>	221
SUBTOTAL	\$ 171,192.00	\$ 788.16	
County Events	\$ 18,200.00	71.65	254
State Events	7,087.50	50.98	139
State committees and councils.	2,887.50	41.85	69
Fund raising	3,570.00	32.45	111
Other	<u>4,200.00</u>	<u>44.68</u>	94
SUBTOTAL	\$ 35,945.00	\$ 241.61	
Number of telephone calls/year	\$ 2,260.80	11.25	201
Dollar value of supplies other than food	2,480.00	17.34	143
Number of miles driven per year	4,432.50	23.33	190
Refreshments	2,711.80	191.10	221
Kitchen facilities	2,790.00	27.90	100
Meeting place	4,545.00	26.42	172
Sewing machine	<u>368.00</u>	<u>7.36</u>	50
SUBTOTAL	\$ 19,588.10	\$ 304.70	
Total Value of Time and Contributions	\$ 226,725.10	\$ 1,334.47	

The dollar value on volunteer time is based on the opinion that one cannot buy the quality of volunteer staff for the minimum wage. This is judgment and undoubtedly some volunteers are worth more and some less.

The basis for determination of dollar value of leader contributions was:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Value Assigned</u>
Volunteer time	\$3.50 per hour
Phone calls	.10 per call
Miles driven	.13 per mile
Refreshments	.35 per serving - the average cost was extrapolated from the data.
Sewing machines	.80 per day - Based on rental fees charged by two firms.

The average dollar value for each volunteer leader was determined by dividing the total dollar value by the number of leaders responding in each category. The summary of leader contributions is given in Table 14.

Leader contributions (time, money, and other resources) totaled approximately \$237,260.00 or \$1,800.00 per leader. Refer to Appendix 1-D.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The final chapter was included to provide summary information concerning the problem studied, the sample, procedures used, results of the research, conclusions based on the findings, and finally, implications and recommendations.

The primary purpose of the study was to determine perceived leadership needs of volunteer leaders for the development of a leader training program to meet the needs of Kansas women. A secondary purpose was to assess present leader satisfactions. A third purpose was to determine the extent of contributions (time, money, and other resources) of volunteer leaders. A fourth purpose was to determine the relationship between attendance at leadership training schools and perceived leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions.

Additional concerns of this study were the relationship of employment, level of education, income, place of residence, length of service on the County Extension Homemakers Council (CEHC) and the County Home Economics Advisory Committee (CHEAC), office held on CEHC and CHEAC and benefits of belonging to Kansas Extension Homemakers Council (KEHC) to the needs, satisfactions, and contributions of present volunteer leaders.

Important leadership needs identified were communicating effectively, developing self-confidence, enlisting persons to help, discovering the needs and interests of others, and planning productive meetings. Over eighty-one percent of the subjects agreed and strongly

agreed with the leadership needs. Eighty-six percent agreed and strongly agreed that communicating effectively was a leadership need.

Ninety-six percent of the respondents agreed that there is opportunity to work with others. Eighty-eight percent or more of the leaders were satisfied that someone was capable of filling in for them when they were unable to function, that there was freedom to express their opinions and suggestions to County Extension Agents that they had the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with others, and that of utilizing their abilities as a leader.

Leader contributions (time, money, and other resources) amounted to \$226,725.10 or \$1334.47 per leader.

The categories of contributions analyzed were number of hours, number of telephone calls, number of people served refreshments, dollar value of supplies furnished, number of miles driven, and other resources furnished.

Three general hypotheses were stated for this study. They were: 1) there are no significant differences between leadership needs, satisfactions and contributions and level of education, employment, income, place of residence, length of service on the CEHC and CHEAC, office held on CEHC and CHEAC, and benefits of belonging to KEHC; 2) there are no significant differences between leadership needs, satisfactions and contributions of volunteer leaders based on county population; and 3) there are no significant differences between attendance at leadership training school and needs, satisfactions, and contributions.

The population for this study was the leaders of the Extension Quality of Living Programs in Kansas serving as members of the County Home Economics Advisory Committee and officers of the County Extension Homemakers Council. The Leadership Needs questionnaire was administered

to each of the subjects. The raw data was scored and an analysis of variance was made. A computer program was developed and the data was analyzed using statistical treatments of F tests of significance. Null hypotheses were analyzed and found to be significant or non-significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The F test comparisons revealed that there were significant differences between respondents on:

Leader satisfactions and officers on the CHEAC and other committee members;

Leadership needs and county population;

Leader satisfactions and respondents in counties based on population and the control counties;

Leader contributions and respondents in counties based on population and the control counties;

Leader satisfactions and respondents in control counties and other counties;

Leader contributions and control counties and other counties;

Leadership needs and years of service on CEHC;

Leader contributions and length of time the respondents served on the CEHC;

Years of service on the CHEAC and perceived leadership needs;

Benefits of belonging to KEHC and perceived leadership needs;

Leadership satisfactions and benefits of belonging to KEHC;

Benefits of belonging to KEHC and leader contributions;

Employment outside the home and leader satisfactions; and

Level of contributions and employment outside the home.

Fourteen of the null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of significance.

It was revealed from the F tests that there were no significant differences between respondents on:

Leadership needs of officers of the CEHC and members (including officers) of the CHEAC;

Leadership satisfactions and officers of the CEHC and other committee members;

Leadership needs and attendance at leadership training schools;

Leader satisfactions and attendance at leadership training schools;

Control counties and other counties on leadership needs;

Leadership satisfactions and length of time served on the CEHC;

Years of service on the CEHC and leader satisfactions;

Years of service on CEHC and leader contributions;

Educational level and office held on CHEAC;

Educational level and office held on CEHC;

Level of income and CHEAC and CEHC;

Length of service on the CEHC and CHEAC and level of income;

Level on income and office held on the CEHC and CHEAC;

Length of time in office and level of income; and

Employment outside the home and perceived leadership needs.

Therefore, sixteen of the null hypotheses were accepted at the .05 level of significance.

CONCLUSIONS

Leaders serving on the County Home Economics Advisory Committee and the County Extension Homemakers Council represented all social-economic backgrounds.

Some of the demographic characteristics of the respondents were: eighty-seven percent were married, fifty-one percent lived on a farm, thirty-three percent were employed outside the home and forty percent had a high school education, twenty-six percent had attended college and eleven percent were college graduates. Most of the leaders (72%) belonged to the Kansas Extension Homemaker's Council.

Significant leadership needs identified were (1) communicating effectively, (2) developing self-confidence, (3) enlisting persons to help, (4) discovering the needs and interests of others and (4) planning productive meetings. Over eighty-one percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the above leadership needs.

The findings of this study indicate a significant difference between certain leadership needs of respondents and their attendance at leadership training workshops, county population, years of service on CEHC and CHEAC, and benefits of belonging to the KEHC.

High leader satisfaction was found on (1) opportunities to work with others, (2) that someone was capable of filling in for them when they were unable to function, (3) freedom to express their opinions and suggestions to County Extension Agents, (4) opportunities to develop meaningful relationships with others, and (5) utilizing their abilities as a leader.

The findings indicate a significant difference between certain satisfactions of respondents and county population, control counties and other counties, employment outside the home and benefits of belonging to KEHC.

Attendance at leadership training workshops and length of service on the CEHC had a minimum influence on leader satisfaction.

Contributions of volunteer leaders totaled \$226,725.10 or \$1,334.47 per leader in this study. The categories analyzed were number of hours, telephone calls, people served refreshments, miles driven, dollar value of supplies furnished and other resources furnished. Each county in Kansas has nine members serving on the County Home Economics Advisory Committee and five officers, four in a few counties, on their County Extension Homemakers Council. Therefore, if leaders in counties not included in the study are contributing the same as those in the study, a total of \$1,961,670.90 will have been contributed in one year.

IMPLICATIONS

Educators have sought to identify perceived leadership needs and satisfactions of their audiences as they develop leadership training schools. The relationship of personal and interpersonal needs to the population characteristics hold promise for increased participation in leadership training schools in the future.

It is possible that the leadership needs and leader satisfactions in the Leadership Needs Survey instrument were not inclusive and the results from the use of another instrument would yield quite different results.

Before accepting this study as definite or preceeding to take action it should be recognized that there were respondents with three months of experience serving on the CEHC and/or the CHEAC.

Finally, it should be recognized that informal and formal leadership training is a continuous process and it is difficult to separate these experiences and their effect on leadership needs, satisfactions and contributions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This researcher examined, through the use of the Leadership Needs Survey, the perceived leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions of volunteer leaders serving as officers of the CEHC and members of the CHEAC. Limited research has been done on the relationship between leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions of volunteer leaders and employment, level of education, income, office held in organizations and attendance at leadership training schools.

The following recommendations are made by the researcher as a result of the findings of this study:

1. That leadership training programs be continued as an integral part of the Extension program at both county and state levels.

2. That the Extension Service use the findings of this study to modify leadership training programs. Leadership needs as identified by the leaders were:

- a. communicating effectively;
- b. developing self-confidence;
- c. enlisting persons to help;
- d. discovering the needs and interests of others; and
- e. planning productive meetings.

3. That research be done outside Extension on the opportunities volunteer leaders have for growth and development.

4. That research be done to determine the most effective method for training volunteer leaders.

5. That research be done in other states to expand and verify these findings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett, R. S. "Performance Suitability and Role Agreement, Two Factors Related to Attitudes," Personnel Psychology, 1963, 16, 345-357 as cited by Michael Beer in Leadership, Employee Needs and Motivation. (13)
- Beer, Michael. Leadership, Employee Needs and Motivation. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Division of Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University, 1966.
- Brayfield, A. R. and W. R. Crockett. "Employee Attitudes and Performance," Psychological Bulletin, 1955, p. 396-424 as cited by Michael Beer in Leadership, Employee Needs and Motivation. (13)
- Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, 1970 - Kansas, U. S. Department of Commerce Publication, Bureau of the Census, February, 1972.
- Cohen, A. R. "Upward Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies." Human Relations Journal, 1958, 11, 41-53 as cited by Ralph M. Stogdill in Handbook of Leadership (4).
- Frazier, Leslie, Improving Leadership for Better Groups and Communities, Cooperative Extension Service, Kansas State University, Manhattan.
- Frazier, Leslie, How to Have Better Meetings, Cooperative Extension Service, Kansas State University, Manhattan.
- Glasser, Melvin. What Makes a Volunteer? Public Affairs Committee Pamphlet, No. 224, New York: Public Affairs Committee, Inc. 1955 as cited by Reginald McDonough, in Working with Volunteer Leaders in the Church (1).
- Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. New York: World Publishing Co. 1966.
- House Floor Seating, 1978. 336-H.
- Keffer, Wayne M. and Clarence J. Cunningham. Job Satisfaction of Field Staff of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division. Ohio State University: Columbus, Ohio, 1966. p. 17.
- Lawson, John D., Leslie J. Griffin, and Franklyn D. Donant. Leadership is Everybody's Business. San Luis Obispo, California: Impact Publishers, Inc. 1976.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1954.

- Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality, 2nd. ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.
- McDonough, Reginald M. Working With Volunteer Leaders in the Church. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1976.
- National Extension Homemakers Council Handbook. National Extension Homemakers Council. 1977.
- Office of Quality of Living Programs, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. 1977.
- Olson, Carolyn. "Private Support of 4-H-Youth Programs in Kansas," Kansas State University, 1976.
- Pell, Arthur R. Recruiting, Training, and Motivating Volunteer Leaders. New York: Pilot Industries, Inc., 1972.
- Redeker, Norma J. "KEHC Volunteer Service Survey," Kansas State University, 1974.
- Rothert, Lowell. "Summary of 4-H Private Support Studies in Illinois, Kansas and Michigan." Michigan State University, September 1975.
- Scott, Barbara. "Kansas Farm Women Speak Out." Kansas Farmer. September 3, 1977.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Handbook of Leadership. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- Van Dersal, William R. The Successful Supervisor in Government and Business, Rev. Ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.
- We the American Women, U.S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of Census, No. 4, 1970.

APPENDIX I-A

Appendix I-A

Leadership Needs

Need	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
Communicating effectively.	81	28.2	165	57.5	15	5.2	9	3.1	2	0.7
Developing self-confidence	66	23.0	173	60.3	21	7.3	11	3.8	2	0.7
Understanding myself.	43	15.0	174	60.6	40	13.9	11	3.8	3	1.0
Discovering the needs and interests of others.	88	30.7	146	50.9	30	10.5	7	2.4	1	0.3
Using resource materials effectively.	45	15.7	171	59.6	31	10.8	24	8.4	1	0.3
Using a variety of teaching methods.	42	14.6	178	62.0	37	12.9	12	4.2	3	1.0
Planning more effectively.	48	16.7	183	63.8	28	9.8	12	4.2	2	0.7
Knowing how to involve persons in a discussion.	77	26.8	129	44.9	52	18.1	12	4.2	3	0.3
Knowing how to deal with difficult persons.	65	22.6	114	39.7	74	25.8	16	5.6	3	1.0
Enlisting persons to help.	58	20.2	166	57.8	29	10.1	16	5.6	2	0.7
How to manage time.	54	18.8	151	52.6	41	14.3	21	7.3	1	0.3
Delegating responsibility effectively.	53	18.5	160	55.7	34	11.8	20	7.0	2	0.7
Identifying the problems.	34	11.8	148	51.6	66	23.0	18	6.3	1	0.3
Dealing with resistance to change.	28	9.8	155	54.0	69	24.0	14	4.9	1	0.3
Knowledge of the styles of leaders.	16	5.6	134	46.7	98	34.1	17	5.9	2	0.7
How to work with committees.	39	13.6	198	69.0	21	7.3	12	4.2	3	1.0
To plan and carry out productive meetings.	57	19.9	175	61.0	30	10.5	8	2.8	2	0.7
Knowledge of group member roles.	18	6.3	165	57.5	59	20.6	20	7.0	3	1.0
Evaluating results.	28	9.8	168	58.5	53	18.5	13	4.5	4	1.4

AF = Absolute Frequency (count)

RF = Relative Frequency (percent)

APPENDIX I-B

Appendix I-B

Leader Satisfactions

Satisfactions	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
I have the opportunity to work with others.	72	25.1	203	70.7	8	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Someone is capable of filling in for me when I am unable to function.	70	24.4	203	70.7	5	1.7	3	1.0	0	0.0
There is freedom to express my opinions and suggestions to County Extension Agents.	106	36.9	164	57.1	11	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
I have the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with others.	49	17.1	210	73.2	17	5.9	1	0.3	0	0.0
There is opportunity to utilize my abilities as a leader.	55	19.2	197	68.6	25	8.7	1	0.3	0	0.0
There is opportunity to develop my potential as a leader.	41	14.3	207	72.1	26	9.1	3	1.0	0	0.0
There is freedom to use my judgment as a leader.	36	12.5	211	73.5	26	9.1	1	0.3	0	0.0
Adequate information about programs for which I am responsible is available.	48	16.7	195	67.9	22	7.7	10	3.5	0	0.0
There is opportunity for personal growth in my leadership role.	48	16.7	194	67.6	30	10.5	5	1.7	0	0.0
I have knowledge of Extension programs.	48	16.7	190	66.2	30	10.5	10	3.5	0	0.0
I am given credit for doing a good job.	34	11.8	195	67.9	41	14.3	3	1.0	0	0.0
I have sufficient authority for leadership expected of me.	27	9.4	182	63.4	56	19.5	10	3.5	2	0.7

Appendix I-B (continued)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF
I am aware of what is expected of me	28	9.8	180	62.7	61	21.3	6	2.1	0	0.0
My suggestions for changes are welcomed.	27	9.4	176	61.3	60	20.9	8	2.8	0	0.0
I have the feeling of self-fulfillment from using my capabilities as a leader.	28	9.8	170	59.2	73	25.4	5	1.7	0	0.0
Others listen to what I say.	19	6.6	173	60.3	73	25.4	6	2.1	0	0.0
Other leaders in the county respect me.	27	9.4	164	57.1	164	57.1	77	26.8	2	0.7
I feel important to the organization.	27	9.4	163	56.8	75	26.1	8	2.8	0	0.0
Leadership gives me status.	12	4.2	113	39.4	101	35.2	41	14.3	2	0.7

AF = Absolute Frequency (count)

RF = Relative Frequency (percent)

APPENDIX I-C

Appendix I-C

F Probability of Leadership Needs and Satisfaction
with Benefits of Belonging to KEHC

Variables	F Probability
Leadership Needs	
Communicating Effectively	0.0018
Using a variety of teaching methods.	0.0045
Knowing how to involve persons in a discussion.	0.0074
How to work with committees.	0.0441
Developing self-confidence.	0.0552
Knowing how to deal with difficult persons.	0.0733
To plan and carry out productive meetings.	0.0983
Planning more effectively.	0.1728
Using resource materials effectively.	0.2177
Understanding myself.	0.2899
Knowledge of the styles of leaders.	0.3623
Knowledge of group member roles.	0.5428
Identifying problems.	0.5693
Dealing with resistance to change.	0.6056
How to manage time.	0.6952
Discovering the needs and interests of others.	0.7348
Enlisting persons to help.	0.7872
Evaluating results.	0.9669
Delegating responsibility effectively.	0.9931
Leader Satisfaction	
There is opportunity for personal growth in my leadership role.	0.0197
I feel important to the organization.	0.1114
I have the feeling of self-fulfillment from using my capabilities as a leader.	0.1693
I have knowledge of Extension programs.	0.1725
Other listen to what I say.	0.1900
I am aware of what is expected of me.	0.2387
There is freedom to express my opinions and suggestions to County Extension Agents.	0.3318
There is opportunity to utilize my abilities as a leader.	0.4073
Leadership gives me status.	0.5065
My suggestions for changes are welcomed.	0.5704
Other leaders in the county respect me.	0.6210
I am given credit for doing a good job.	0.6426
I have the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with others.	0.6512
I have the opportunity to work with others.	0.7163
There is freedom to use my judgment as a leader.	0.7806
I have sufficient authority for leadership expected of me.	0.8107

Appendix I-C (continued)

Variables	F Probability
Someone is capable of filling in for me when I am unable to function.	0.8242
There is opportunity to develop my potential as a leader.	0.8317
Adequate information about programs for which I am responsible is available.	0.9823

APPENDIX I-D

Appendix I-D

Leader Contributions Table

Activity	Hours Spent/ Month	Relative Frequency (percent)	Absolute Frequency (number)	Total Number	Total Calculated Dollar Value at \$3.50/hr.
Participation in local meeting and activities	2	24.0	69	138	\$ 483.00
	4	35.2	101	404	1,414.00
	6	14.3	41	246	861.00
	8	6.6	19	152	532.00
	10	3.5	10	100	350.00
	12	3.5	10	120	420.00
	14	0.3	1	14	49.00
	16	0.0	0	0	0
	18 & over	2.1	6	108	378.00+
No response	10.5	30	0	0	
TOTAL		100.0	287	1,282	\$4,487.00
Preparing for local meetings	2	58.9	169	338	1,183.00
	4	9.1	26	104	364.00
	6	4.9	14	84	294.00
	8	1.4	4	32	112.00
	10	0.0	0	0	0
	12	0.0	0	0	0
	14	0.0	0	0	0
	16	0.3	1	16	56.00
	18 & over	0.3	1	18	63.00+
No response	25.1	72	0	0	
TOTAL		100.0	287	592	\$ 2,072.00
Receiving/conducting leader training sessions.	2	34.1	98	196	686.00
	4	12.5	36	144	504.00
	6	5.2	15	90	315.00
	8	2.1	6	48	168.00
	10	1.0	3	30	105.00
	12	0.0	0	0	0
	14	0.0	0	0	0
	16	0.0	0	0	0
	18 & over	0.3	1	18	63.00+
No response	44.6	128	10	0	
TOTAL		100.0	287	526	\$ 1,841.00

+Dollar value calculated for 18 hours.

APPENDIX I-D (continued)

Activity	Hours Spent/ Month	Relative Frequency (percent)	Absolute Frequency (number)	Total Number	Total Calculated Dollar Value at \$3.50/hr.
Involved in county-	2	39.7	114	228	\$ 798.00
wide committees/	4	20.9	60	240	840.00
councils.	6	7.7	22	132	462.00
	8	2.1	6	48	168.00
	10	1.0	3	30	105.00
	12	2.4	7	134	294.00
	14	0.0	0	0	0
	16	0.3	1	16	56.00
	18 & over	0.0	0	0	0
No response		<u>25.3</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL		100.0	287	778	\$ 2,723.00
Communications:	2	41.1	118	236	826.00
reading news-	4	20.2	58	232	812.00
letters, filling	6	6.3	18	108	378.00
out reports,	8	2.8	8	64	224.00
writing letters,	10	2.4	7	70	245.00
making phone	12	0.7	2	24	84.00
calls, radio	14	1.0	3	42	147.00
programs, etc.	16	0.7	2	32	112.00
	18 & over	1.7	5	90	315.00+
No response		<u>23.0</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL		100.0	287	898	\$ 3,143.00
	/ Year				
County events:	5	16.4	47	235	\$ 822.50
achievement day,	10	17.4	50	500	1,750.00
housing tours,	15	11.8	34	510	1,785.00
fairs, work-	20	9.4	27	540	1,890.00
shops, etc.	25	7.7	22	550	1,925.00
	30	8.0	23	690	2,415.00
	35	2.8	8	280	980.00
	40	2.8	8	320	1,120.00
	45 & over	12.2	35	1,575	5,512.50++
No response		<u>11.5</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL		100.0	287	5,200	\$18,200.00

+Dollar value calculated for 18 hours.

++Dollar value calculated at 45 hours per year.

Appendix I-D (continued)

Activity	Hours Spent/Year	Relative Frequency (percent)	Absolute Frequency (number)	Total Number	Total Calculated Dollar Value at \$3.50/hr.
State events: work-shops, leaders conference, craft camp, etc.	5	22.0	63	315	\$ 1,102.50
	10	8.0	23	230	805.00
	15	4.2	12	180	630.00
	20	4.5	13	260	910.00
	25	2.4	7	175	612.50
	30	1.0	3	90	315.00
	35	0.3	1	35	122.50
	40	1.7	5	200	700.00
	45 & over	4.2	12	540	1,890.00++
No response	51.6	148	0	0	
TOTAL		100.0	287	2,025	\$ 7,087.50
State committees or council.	5	14.3	41	205	717.50
	10	2.4	7	70	245.00
	15	2.4	7	105	367.50
	20	0.7	2	40	140.00
	25	1.4	4	100	350.00
	30	1.0	3	90	315.00
	35	0.0	0	0	0
	40	0.7	2	80	280.00
	45 & over	1.0	3	135	472.50++
No response	76.0	218	0	0	
TOTAL		100.0	287	825	\$ 2,887.50
Other	5	18.1	52	260	910.00
	10	5.6	16	160	560.00
	15	1.4	4	60	210.00
	20	2.4	7	140	490.00
	25	1.0	3	75	262.50
	30	0.3	1	30	105.00
	35	0.3	1	35	122.50
	40	0.7	2	80	280.00
	45 & over	2.8	8	360	1,260.00++
No response	67.2	193	0	0	
TOTAL		100.0	287	1,200	\$ 4,200.00

++Dollar value calculated at 45 hours per year.

Appendix I-D (continued)

Activity	Per Month	Relative Frequency (percent)	Absolute Frequency (number)	Total Number	Calculated Dollar Value
Number of phone calls made per <u>MONTH</u>	3	22.0	63	189	\$ 6.90
	6	19.9	57	342	34.20
	9	8.4	24	216	21.60
	12	7.0	20	240	24.00
	15	6.6	19	285	28.50
	18	2.1	6	108	10.80
	21	1.0	3	63	6.30
	24	2.1	6	144	12.40
	27 & over	3.8	11	294	29.70+++
No response	<u>27.2</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL	Per Year	100.0	287	18,840	\$ 188.40
Dollar value of supplies other than food you furnished per year.	10	34.8	100	1,000	1,000.00
	20	7.3	21	420	420.00
	30	3.1	9	270	270.00
	40	2.1	6	240	240.00
	50	0.7	2	100	100.00
	60	0.0	0	0	0
	70	0.0	0	0	0
	80	0.0	0	0	0
	90 & over	1.7	5	450	450.00++++
No response	<u>50.2</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL		100.0	287	2,480	\$2,480.00
Number of miles driven per year on Quality of Living Program business.	50	21.3	61	3,050	396.50
	100	11.5	33	3,300	429.00
	150	7.7	22	3,300	429.00
	200	6.3	18	3,600	468.00
	250	3.8	11	2,750	357.50
	300	3.5	10	3,000	390.00
	350	1.7	5	1,750	45.00
	400	1.0	3	1,200	156.00
	450 & over	9.4	27	12,150	1,579.50+++++
No response	<u>33.8</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL		100.0	287	34,100	\$ 4,432.50

+++Dollar value calculated at 27 phone calls.

++++Dollar value calculated at 90 cents.

+++++Dollar value calculated on 450 miles.

Appendix I-D

Table 1

Refreshments Furnished Per Year by Volunteer Leaders

Number of Times Per Year Refreshments Furnished	Number of Leaders Surveyed	Average Number of People Served*	Average Estimated Cost per Serving**	Total	Average Per Leader
2	176	13	\$.35	\$ 1,601.60	\$ 9.10
4	27	13	.35	491.40	18.20
6	12	13	.35	327.60	27.30
8	1	13	.35	36.40	36.40
10	2	13	.35	91.00	45.50
12	<u>3</u>	13	.35	<u>163.80</u>	<u>54.60</u>
TOTAL	221			\$ 2,711.80	\$191.10

*The average number of people served was extrapolated from the data.

**The average cost/serving was extrapolated as the actual value fell between \$.30 and \$.40.

Appendix I-D

Table 2

Relative and Absolute Frequencies of Other Assistance
Provided for Quality of Living Programs.

Other assistance Provided For Quality of Living Programs each year.	Times Per Year																		Total Calculated Dollar Value
	One		Two		Three		Four		Five		Six		Seven		Eight		Nine		
	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	RF	AF	
Kitchen facilities	19.5	56	10.5	30	1.0	3	1.4	4	0.7	2	1.0	3	0.0	0	0.3	1	0.3	1	\$ 2,790.00*
Meeting place	36.2	104	15.7	45	2.4	7	2.4	7	1.0	3	1.0	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.0	3	4,590.00*
Sewing machine	11.8	34	2.4	7	1.0	3	0.7	2	0.0	0	1.0	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.3	1	368.00**

*Total calculated at \$15.00 per day.

**Total calculated at \$.80 per days for five days per time.

APPENDIX II

Division of Extension
Extension Staff and Program Development
Umberger Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
Phone: 913 532-5787

February 20, 1978

Dear CEHE:

Your county has been randomly selected to participate in the research project as explained by Gail in her letter to you. I am asking your cooperation in administering the questionnaire to the officers (President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and Public Relations Chairman) of the County Extension Homemakers Council and to the members of the County Home Economics Advisory Committee at their next regular meeting.

If your committees are not meeting before March 15, would you please send the questionnaires to your County Extension Homemakers Council officers and County Home Economics Advisory Committee members and ask them to return the questionnaires to you by March 15, 1978.


Should it be necessary to mail the questionnaire to any person, please record on a separate sheet of paper, the name and corresponding identification number taken from the front page of the questionnaire and forward this information to Gail Imig.

If you mail the questionnaire to the respondents, please provide a return envelope addressed to you, instruct them to fill out the questionnaire and return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided. Please return all the completed questionnaires from your county in the enclosed envelope to Gail Imig.

We would like to have all of them no later than March 20. A copy of the research findings will be sent to you upon request. The findings will be available May 15, 1978.

Thank you for your assistance in making this study possible.

Sincerely,



Linda L. Carr

Cooperative

EXTENSION SERVICE
of Kansas State University

90



"Taking the UNIVERSITY to the PEOPLE"

Division of Extension
Extension Home Economics
Umberger Hall
MANHATTAN, KANSAS 66506
Phone: 913 532 5780

February 20, 1978

Dear County Extension Home Economist:

The Quality of Living Program of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service is interested in a research project aimed at identifying leadership needs of volunteer leaders in the Extension Quality of Living Program. Two other purposes of the study are to determine the satisfaction of leaders and the contributions of time, money, and other resources expended by volunteer leaders on the County Extension Homemakers Council and County Home Economics Advisory Committee.

Your co-worker, Linda Carr, is working on this project in partial fulfillment of the requirements for her degree at Kansas State University. The findings of this research will be helpful to the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service in developing leadership training programs for volunteer leaders.

Your cooperation with Linda to complete this project will be appreciated. Thank you for your assistance in making this study possible.

Sincerely,

Gail L. Imig
Assistant Director of Extension,
Quality of Living Programs

dn

APPENDIX II

1

Respondent I.D.
 1 2 3
 4 5 6
 County

LEADERSHIP NEEDS
QUESTIONNAIRE

This study is being conducted to determine leadership needs of volunteer leaders in the Extension Quality of Living Program, formerly called Home Economics Program, in Kansas. The satisfaction of present leaders and the extent of their contributions will be assessed. Your cooperation in completing the following questionnaire is requested and will be deeply appreciated. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please read each item carefully. Check (✓) or circle the response that most nearly expresses your opinion or situation.
2. The numbered blanks on the left side of the page are for tabulation purposes to be used by the researcher, so ignore them.
3. After you have completed the questionnaire, please recheck and make sure all the items you wish to answer have been completed.
4. Please return your questionnaire in the envelope provided as soon as possible, but no later than March 15, 1978.

This survey is being conducted under guidelines established by Kansas State University. By cooperating, you will help us find answers to important questions; however, your participation is strictly voluntary. You need not answer those questions you feel are of a personal nature, unless you wish. Your responses will be kept confidential.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please make a check (✓) in the appropriate blank.

- 7 1. Do you serve on the: Home Economics Advisory Committee.
 OR
 County Extension Homemakers Council (may be called Unit Affairs
 Committee in some counties).
 OR
 Are you a member of both committees
 3
- 8 2. How long have you served on the:
 A. Home Economics Advisory Committee. 1-3 years; 4-6 years; 6-10 years; 11 or more
 9 B. County Extension Homemakers Council. 1 1-3 yrs.; 2 4-6 yrs.; 3 6-10 yrs.; 4 11 or more
 1 1 1-3 yrs.; 2 4-6 yrs.; 3 6-10 yrs.; 4 11 or more
- 10 3. What office do you hold on the:
 A. Home Economics Advisory Committee
 1 President; 2 Vice President; 3 Secretary; 4 Public Relations; 5 None
- 11 B. County Extension Homemakers Council?
 1 President; 2 Vice President; 3 Secretary; 4 Public Relations; 5 Secretary-Treasurer;
 6 None
- 12 4. How long have you held your present office on the:
 A. Home Economics Advisory Committee? 1 1 year; 2 2 years; 3 3 years; 4 4 years
- 13 B. County Extension Homemakers Council? 1 1 year; 2 2 years; 3 3 years; 4 4 years

2

- 14 5. What offices have you held in the past (but do not now hold) on the:
- 15 A. Home Economics Advisory Committee?
 1 President; 2 Vice President; 3 Secretary; 4 Public Relations
- 16 E. County Extension Homemakers Council?
 1 President; 2 Vice President; 3 Secretary; 4 Treasurer; 5 Public Relations
- 17 6. How many leadership schools have you attended in the past three years?
 18 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 or more
 1 2 3 4 5 6

LEADERSHIP NEEDS

In this section we would like to know how you feel about each of these various leadership needs. There is no right or wrong answer as only you know how you feel about these needs. Please answer every item and circle the response that best expresses your feelings. These are expressed as your leadership needs. It is not a listing of training being provided now.

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19 7. Communicating effectively.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20 8. Developing self-confidence.	SA	A	U	D	SD
21 9. Understanding myself.	SA	A	U	D	SD
22 10. Discovering the needs and interests of others.	SA	A	U	D	SD
23 11. Using resource materials effectively.	SA	A	U	D	SD
24 12. Using a variety of teaching methods.	SA	A	U	D	SD
25 13. Planning more effectively.	SA	A	U	D	SD
26 14. Knowing how to involve persons in a discussion.	SA	A	U	D	SD
27 15. Knowing how to deal with difficult persons.	SA	A	U	D	SD
28 16. Enlisting persons to help.	SA	A	U	D	SD
29 17. How to manage time.	SA	A	U	D	SD
30 18. Delegating responsibility effectively.	SA	A	U	D	SD
31 19. Identifying problems.	SA	A	U	D	SD
32 20. Dealing with resistance to change.	SA	A	U	D	SD
33 21. Knowledge of the styles of leaders.	SA	A	U	D	SD
34 22. How to work with committees.	SA	A	U	D	SD
35 23. To plan and carry out productive meetings.	SA	A	U	D	SD
36 24. Knowledge of group member roles.	SA	A	U	D	SD
37 25. Evaluating results.	SA	A	U	D	SD

LEADER SATISFACTIONS

In this section we would like to know how satisfied you are with leadership opportunities provided through the Extension Quality of Living Program. There is no right or wrong answer. Please answer every item and circle the response that best expresses your feeling.

	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unde- cided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<u>38</u>	26. There is opportunity to utilize my abilities as a leader.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>39</u>	27. I have sufficient authority for leadership expected of me.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>40</u>	28. I am given credit for doing a good job.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>41</u>	29. I have the opportunity to work with others.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>42</u>	30. I have knowledge of Extension programs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>43</u>	31. There is freedom to express my opinions and suggestions to County Extension Agents.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>44</u>	32. Other leaders in the county respect me.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>45</u>	33. Adequate information about programs for which I am responsible is available.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>46</u>	34. I feel important to the organization.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>47</u>	35. There is freedom to use my judgment as a leader.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>48</u>	36. I have the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with others.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>49</u>	37. There is opportunity to develop my potential as a leader.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>50</u>	38. I am aware of what is expected of me.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>51</u>	39. I have the feeling of self-fulfilment from using my capabilities as a leader.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>52</u>	40. There is opportunity for personal growth in my leadership role.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>53</u>	41. Leadership gives me status.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>54</u>	42. My suggestions for changes are welcomed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>55</u>	43. Others listen to what I say.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<u>56</u>	44. Someone is capable of filling in for me when I am unable to function.	SA	A	U	D	SD

LEADER CONTRIBUTIONS

In this section we are interested in the contributions you make toward the promotion and support of the Extension Quality of Living Program. Your answers to these questions will help us determine how many hours and what types of resources volunteer leaders contribute. Please circle the appropriate response.

Estimate the number of hours spent on each activity DURING THE AVERAGE MONTH. Please circle the appropriate response.

		<u>HOURS PER MONTH</u>									
<u>57</u>	45. Participation in local meeting and activities.	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	& more
<u>58</u>	46. Preparing for local meetings.	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	& more
<u>59</u>	47. Receiving/conducting leader training sessions.	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	& more
<u>60</u>	48. Involved in county-wide committees/councils.	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	& more
<u>61</u>	49. Communications: reading newsletters, filling out reports, writing letters, making phone calls, radio programs, etc.	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	& more

Estimate the number of hours ANNUALLY involved with:

		<u>HOURS PER YEAR</u>									
<u>62</u>	50. County events: achievement day, housing tours, fairs, workshops, etc.	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	& more
<u>63</u>	51. State events: workshops, leaders conference, craft camp, etc.	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	& more
<u>64</u>	52. State committees or council.	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	& more
<u>65</u>	53. Fund raising.	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	& more
<u>66</u>	54. Other	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	& more

Estimate your contributions to Quality of Living programs on each of the following and circle your response.

<u>67</u>	55. Number of phone calls made per <u>MONTH</u> .	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	24	27	& more
<u>68</u>	56. Number of times per <u>YEAR</u> you furnish refreshments.	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	& more	
<u>69</u>	57. Average number of people served per <u>MEETING</u> .	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	& more
<u>70</u>	58. Estimated cost for <u>one serving</u> (cents).	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	& more		
<u>71</u>	59. Dollar value of supplies, other than food, you furnish per <u>YEAR</u> (dollars)	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	& more
<u>72</u>	60. Number of miles driven per <u>YEAR</u> on Quality of Living Program business.	50	100	150	200	250	300	350	400	450	& more
	61. Other assistance you provide for Quality of Living Programs each year.	<u>TIMES PER YEAR</u>									
<u>73</u>	1. Kitchen facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	& more
<u>74</u>	2. Sewing machine.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	& more
<u>75</u>	3. Meeting place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	& more
<u>76</u>	4. Other. Please list, explain and indicate frequency. _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	& more

GENERAL INFORMATION

We would like to know a little about you so we can see how different people feel about the needs, satisfactions and contributions of leaders we have been examining?

- 77 62. What is your marital status? 1 Married; 2 Single, never married; 3 Divorced;
4 Separated; 6 Widowed
63. How many children do you have in the following age groups?
No. of children
78 1 Up to 5 years of age
79 2 6-12 years of age
80 3 13-18 years of age
81 4 19 and over
- 82 64. What is your age? 1 under 25; 2 26-35; 3 36-45; 4 46-55; 5 56-65; 6 66 and over
- 83 65. Where do you presently live? 1 farm; 2 rural non-farm; 3 small town; 4 city
- 84 66. Have you ever been employed outside the home? 1 yes (if YES, go to Question 67)
2 no (if NO, go to Question ⁷²65)
- 85 67. What was that occupation?
1 Teacher 6 Medical/Dental 11 Key punch operator
2 Sales Clerk 7 Executive 12 Child care
3 Secretary 8 Factory Worker 13 Restaurant-Cafeteria
4 Bookkeeper 9 Partner in farm business 14 Cosmetologist-Hairdresser
5 Accountant 10 Social Worker 15 Other, Please specify _____
- 86 68. Are you presently employed outside the home? 1 yes (if YES, go to Question 69)
2 no (if NO, go to Question 70)
- 87 69. What is your occupation?
1 Teacher 6 Medical/Dental 11 Key punch operator
88 2 Sales Clerk 7 Executive 12 Child care
3 Secretary 8 Factory Worker 13 Restaurant-Cafeteria
4 Bookkeeper 9 Partner in farm business 14 Cosmetologist-Hairdresser
5 Accountant 10 Social Worker 15 Other, Please specify _____
- 89 70. How many hours per week do you work? 1 under 10; 2 11-20; 3 21-30; 4 31-40; 5 41 or more
- 90 71. How long have you been employed at this job? 1 under 5 years; 2 6-10 years; 3 11-15 years
4 16-20 years; 5 20 or more years

6

- 91 72. What is your approximate gross family income? $\frac{\quad}{1}$ Under \$5,000; $\frac{\quad}{2}$ \$5,001-\$10,000;
 $\frac{\quad}{3}$ \$10,001-\$15,000; $\frac{\quad}{4}$ \$15,001-\$20,000; $\frac{\quad}{5}$ \$20,001-\$25,000; $\frac{\quad}{6}$ over \$25,000.
- 92 74. What is your highest educational level? $\frac{\quad}{1}$ Less than high school;
 $\frac{\quad}{2}$ High school but less than a high school diploma;
 $\frac{\quad}{3}$ High school diploma;
 $\frac{\quad}{4}$ Junior College or Vo. Tech. diploma;
 $\frac{\quad}{5}$ Attended college but did not graduate;
 $\frac{\quad}{6}$ College graduate, Bachelor's degree;
 $\frac{\quad}{7}$ Masters Degree
 $\frac{\quad}{8}$ Ph.D. Degree
 $\frac{\quad}{9}$ Other (specify) _____

KANSAS EXTENSION HOMEMAKERS COUNCIL

In this section we are interested in your familiarity with the Kansas Extension Homemakers Council (KEHC).

- 93 75. Are you a member of KEHC? $\frac{\quad}{1}$ yes; $\frac{\quad}{2}$ no
- 94 76. Does KEHC provide materials to help you develop your skills as a leader? $\frac{\quad}{\quad}$ yes; $\frac{\quad}{\quad}$ no
- 95 77. Do you feel confident with your present leadership skills when you present a lesson to your unit? $\frac{\quad}{1}$ always; $\frac{\quad}{2}$ depends on subject; $\frac{\quad}{3}$ depending on time to prepare;
 $\frac{\quad}{4}$ depends on my experience in making group presentation; $\frac{\quad}{5}$ most of the time.
- 96 78. Does the KEHC Program of Work Guide provide the information needed for an active county program in the areas of safety, family life, international, citizenship, cultural arts, and health? $\frac{\quad}{1}$ yes; $\frac{\quad}{2}$ no; $\frac{\quad}{3}$ not sure
- If NO, how could the Guide be made more useful? _____
- 97 79. What are the benefits of belonging to KEHC? You may check more than one response?
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| $\frac{\quad}{1}$ social | $\frac{\quad}{5}$ The Homemaker publication |
| $\frac{\quad}{2}$ educational | $\frac{\quad}{6}$ Other |
| $\frac{\quad}{3}$ keep busy | $\frac{\quad}{7}$ None |
| $\frac{\quad}{4}$ community service | |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND RESPONSES TO THE ABOVE STATEMENTS. PLEASE CHECK AGAIN TO SEE THAT YOU HAVE RESPONDED TO EACH ITEM. AFTER YOU HAVE DONE SO, PLACE THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE PROVIDED ENVELOPE.

PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP NEEDS, SATISFACTIONS AND
CONTRIBUTIONS OF VOLUNTEER LEADERS IN THE
KANSAS QUALITY OF LIVING
EXTENSION PROGRAM

by

LINDA L. CARR

B. S., Kansas State University, 1962

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the
requirement for a degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE
College of Education
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

1978

ABSTRACT

Statement of the Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the leadership needs of volunteer leaders for the development of a leader training program. A secondary purpose was to assess leader satisfactions. A third purpose was to determine the extent of contributions (time, money and material resources) of volunteer leaders. A fourth purpose was to determine the relationship between attendance at leadership training schools and leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions.

Methods and Procedures

The subjects selected for the study were leaders of the Extension Quality of Living Program serving as members of the County Home Economics Advisory Committee (CHEAC) and officers (President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Public Relations Chairman) of the County Extension Homemakers Council (CEHC). A random sampling procedure was used to select the counties in which the Home Economics Advisory committee members and Extension Homemakers Council officers resided. Sixty-six percent of the 434 questionnaires dispatched were returned and analyzed.

A questionnaire developed by the researcher was used to measure leadership needs, satisfactions, and level of contributions. The instrument used a 5-point Likert scale to measure leadership needs and satisfactions. It was pre-tested in five counties.

The data were analyzed through the use of the analysis of variance technique. F tests were made to measure differences between leadership needs, satisfactions, and contributions with employment,

levels of education and income, county population, office held on the County Extension Homemakers Council and County Home Economics Advisory Committee, and attendance at leadership training schools.

Findings

Volunteer leaders serving on the County Home Economics Advisory Committee and County Extension Homemakers Council represented all social-economic backgrounds. Eighty-seven percent were married, fifty-one percent lived on a farm, thirty-three percent were employed outside the home, forty percent had completed high school, twenty-six percent had attended college and eleven percent were college graduates.

The most important leadership needs identified by the respondents were (1) communicating more effectively, (2) developing self-confidence, (3) enlisting persons to help, (4) discovering the needs and interests of others and (5) learning how to plan more productive meetings. Over eighty-one percent of the respondents either "agreed" or strongly agreed" with these leadership needs.

The findings indicated a significant difference between certain leadership needs of the respondents and (1) county population, and (2) years of service on the County Extension Homemakers Council and County Home Economics Advisory Committee.

Respondents were highly satisfied with (1) opportunities to work with others, (2) that someone was capable of filling in for them when they were able to function, (3) freedom to express their opinions and suggestions to County Extension Agents, (4) opportunities to develop meaningful relationships with others, and (5) utilizing their abilities as a leader.

The findings indicated a significant difference between respondents on certain satisfactions and (1) officers and committee members on the CHEAC, (2) county population, (3) control counties and other counties.

Contributions of time, money and material resources of these volunteer leaders totaled \$226,725.10 or \$1,334.47 per leader per year. The categories analyzed were number of hours, number of telephone calls, number of people served refreshments, number of miles driven, dollar value of supplies furnished (other than food), and other materials furnished.

Recommendations

Several recommendations made by the researcher as a result of the findings were:

1. that leadership training programs be continued as an integral part of the Extension program at county and state levels;
2. that the findings be used to strengthen leadership training programs in the Extension Service;
3. that research be done outside Extension on the opportunities volunteer leaders have for growth and development; and
4. that research be done in other states to expand and verify these findings.

