Personal style as a function of administrative behaviour in amateur sport organizations.

Dennis William Hastings
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd

Recommended Citation
https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/3060

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.
NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S’il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l’université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d’impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l’aide d’un ruban usé ou si l’université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l’objet d’un droit d’auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d’auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d’autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L’AVONS REÇUE
PERSONAL STYLE AS A FUNCTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOUR IN AMATEUR SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

BY

DENNIS WILLIAM HASTINGS
B.H.K., UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR, 1975
B.ED., UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR, 1976

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF HUMAN KINETICS IN THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR, 1985

WINDSOR, ONTARIO
Abstract

Personal Style as a Function of Administrative Behaviour
In Amateur Sport Organizations

by

Dennis William Hastings

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of
personal style concerning the administrative behaviour of
executive directors of sports governing bodies.
Of secondary importance, the study gathered descriptive data
with regard to the clustering of the subjects within style
groups.

Seventy-two executive directors from the National Sport
and Recreation Centre in Ottawa and the Ontario Sport
Administrative Centre in Toronto participated by completing
surveys designed to describe personal style (Personal Style
Inventory), administrative behaviour (Leadership Behaviour
Description Questionnaire Form XII-Modified) and Individual
Dimensions.

Discriminant function analysis and a stepwise regression
procedure were utilized and revealed that within this
particular sample there were significant differences in
behaviour based on personal style. A factor analysis was
also conducted to further verify the findings. The best
model of prediction included the behavioural variables of
V6(Representation), V7(Reconciliation), V10(Structure), V11(Tolerance of Freedom), V13(Consideration), and V15(Predictive Accuracy).

The results of this study support the hypothesis put forward by Kilmann and Herden that the behaviour of a person in a decision-making role may be a reflection of that person's personal style. The implications of these findings suggest that in the evaluation of decisions, it may be important to understand the contribution of personal style in the decision-making process. Further, the identification of personal style may be a helpful exercise in understanding administrators in many organizations, and particularly as it pertains to this study, in volunteer sport organizations.
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Chapter 1

The Problem and Its Background

Organizational effectiveness has often been described in the literature as getting the job done without being specific on how to accomplish that goal. Similarly, people in decision-making (or problem-solving) roles must complete tasks without any predetermined procedures. This type of situation relies heavily on the style of the person responsible for solving the problems. The conceptualization of organizational effectiveness criteria as a function of problem solving style was hypothesized by Kilmann and Herden (1976), who suggested that managers may have a predisposition to perceive and evaluate unstructured problems and organizational goals differentially based upon their own individual styles. If this is true, the possibility of managers making "errors of the third kind" could conceivably jeopardize the whole process of effective decision-making. Errors of the third kind were defined as resulting from solving the wrong problems (Mitroff and
Featheringham, 1974).

The possibility of managers solving or indeed perceiving the wrong problems in any organization is worthy of investigation. This study has been developed to examine this possibility in sport organizations and to add knowledge and research data for the use people who have administrative roles in those organizations.

The need for effective decision-making is of vital concern for any organization. Further, it is an important component within the overall concept of organizational effectiveness, a term referred to repeatedly in the literature, but yet to be clearly understood or defined (Steers, 1975). Indeed, the whole idea of organizational effectiveness is complicated and attempts to measure it have repeatedly encountered a number of difficulties (Steers, 1977). In summarizing a number of studies in sport, Frisby, (1983), states, "effectiveness has been most often operationalized in terms of win/loss records". The perspective here is based on outcome alone, yet standardized criteria across organizations is lacking clear definition.

Katz and Kahu (1966:150), acknowledged that, "the existence of the problem of developing satisfactory criteria of organizational performance is clear enough; its solution is much less obvious". Cognizant of these concerns, Steers
suggests:

Although differences of opinion exist regarding the utility of various specific evaluation criteria, it should prove useful to attempt to identify some of the more salient factors that have been shown to influence certain aspects of effectiveness in organizations. (Steers, 1977; 57)

In consideration of Steers' points, perhaps one of the most appropriate factors to examine with regards to effectiveness research is the role of individuals within organizations. This area offers an unending challenge to developing ways and means of examining behavior. Commenting on the role of individuals and organizations, Argyris stated that, "the incongruence between the individual and the organization can be the foundation for increasing the degree of effectiveness of both" (1964; 7). This statement appears to make the area of effectiveness research more complex, yet also invites the curious mind to examine the many possible avenues for research on an individual's behavior within organizations.

By acknowledging that incongruencies do exist between individuals and organizations, it might be appropriate to examine the effectiveness of the administrators and/or managers within the context of the hypothesis put forward by Kilmann and Herden. It would also be beneficial in
contributing new data in the area of sport administration, a discipline that examines theoretical concepts of administration in the environment of sport and physical activity.

The development of administrative theory in the area of sport and physical activity is a relatively new phenomenon. In this vein, Zeigler and Bowie (1983) suggest that any examination of the professional literature available in physical education and athletics prior to 1964 would reveal very little with regards to administrative theory that would be germane to the profession. It is then, an emerging field with many possibilities for theoretical and practical application in sport organizations. For the most part, the leaders in the development of administrative/management theory have come from the scientists in the Schools and Faculties of Management and Business Administration. Regardless,

We cannot expect the professionals in management science to seek us out. We should not expect to be able to continue successfully with our management assignments by parasitizing, so to speak, from the scholarly contributions made by other disciplines. (There is no valid reason, therefore, why a good proportion of the administrative studies carried out each year in our field cannot be of a programmatic nature.) (Zeigler and Bowie, 1983: 4)

Noting the above point, this study is intended to add to
a growing body of knowledge of administrative/management theory in a general sense, and particularly to the area of administration in sport organizations.

Purpose

Managerial effectiveness is an important component of any organization. "In many ways, it is the quality of managerial leadership that differentiates effective organizations from ineffective ones" (Steers, 1977; 155). With this in mind, the purpose of this thesis will be as follows; to examine the decision style and administrative behaviour of executive directors of amateur sport organizations at the national and provincial levels. The collection of these data was intended to contribute to an improved understanding of two variables, of the many, that contribute to managerial effectiveness.

Statement of the Problems

In order to further delineate the purpose, the problem and the sub-problem of this study will be:

1. To identify whether the personal style (or decision style) of an executive director is a variable of his/her
administrative behaviour; and

2. To identify any possible clustering with regards to personal styles for sport administrators, as identified by the Personal Style Inventory (PSI).

Definition of terms

For the purposes of clarification, the following terms will be used in this study.

Personality - the individual's internal organization of psycho-logical processes and behavioural tendencies. (Mitchell, 1978; 10b)

Manager/Administrator/Executive Director - in this study these terms will be synonymous and identify the person who fulfills the decision-making/problem-solving role as identified by the subjects in this thesis.

Personal/Cognitive/Decision/Problem-Solving Style - for the purposes of this study, all these terms connote a style based on, and measured by, some instrument of personality assessment.

Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire - LBDQ FORM XII - a questionnaire developed by the Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University for the purpose of
describing the behaviour of a leader. (Stogdill, 1963)

The sub-scales of the LDBQ - Form XII are defined as follows

1. Representation - speaks and acts as the representative of the group.
2. Demand Reconciliation - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system.
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty - is unable to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset.
4. Persuasiveness - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.
5. Initiation of Structure - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.
6. Tolerance of Freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action.
7. Role Assumption - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.
8. Consideration - regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of the followers.
10. Predictive Accuracy - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.
11. Integration - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts.
12. Superior Orientation - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (Stogdill, 1963; 3)

Personal Style Inventory (PSI) - is designed to measure a person's Jungian typology a construct first described by Jung (1921), and later elucidated by Myers (1962). This specific instrument was developed by Hogan in 1979.

The following pairs of classifications are illicited...
Dimensions of the Typology

a) Introversion - Extroversion
Persons more introverted than extroverted tend to make decisions somewhat independently of constraints and prodding from the situation, culture, people or things around them. They are quiet, diligent at working alone, and socially reserved.

Extroverted persons are attuned to the culture, people, and things around them, endeavoring to make decisions congruent with demands and expectations. The extrovert is outgoing, socially free, interested in variety and in working with people.

b) Intuition - Sensing
The intuitive person prefers possibilities, theories, gestalts, the overall, invention, and the new and becomes bored with nitty-gritty details, the concrete and actual, and facts unrelated to concepts. The intuitive person thinks and discusses in spontaneous leaps of intuition that may leave out or neglect details. Problem solving comes easily for this individual, although there may be a tendency to make errors of fact.

The sensing type prefers the concrete, real, factual, structured, tangible here-and-now, becoming impatient with theory and the abstract, mistrusting intuition. The sensing type thinks in careful, detail-by-detail accuracy, remembering real facts, making few errors of fact, but possibly missing a conception of the overall.

c) Feeling - Thinking
The feeler makes judgments about life, people, occurrences, and things based on empathy, warmth, and personal values. As a consequence, feelers are more interested in feelings than in impersonal logic, analysis, and things, and in conciliation and harmony more than in being on top or achieving impersonal goals. The feeler gets along well with people in general.

The thinker makes judgments about life, people occurrences, and things based on logic, analysis, and
evidence, avoiding the irrationality of making decisions based on feelings and values. As a result the thinker is more interested in logic, analysis, and verifiable conclusions than in empathy, values, and personal warmth. The thinker may step on others feelings and needs without realizing it, neglecting to take into consideration the values of others.

d) Perceiving - Judging

The perceiver is a gatherer, always wanting to know more before deciding, holding off decisions and judgements. As a consequence, the perceiver is open, flexible, adaptive, nonjudgmental, able to see and appreciate all sides of issues, always welcoming new perspectives and new information about issues. However, perceivers are also difficult to pin down and may be indecisive and noncommittal, becoming involved in so many tasks that do not reach closure that they become frustrated at times. Even when they finish tasks, perceivers will tend to look back at them and wonder whether they were satisfactory or could have been done another way. The perceiver wishes to roll with life rather than change it.

The judger is decisive, firm, and sure, setting goals and sticking to them. The judger wants to close books, make decisions, and get on with the next project. When a project does not yet have closure, judgers will leave it behind and go on to new tasks and not look back. (Champagne and Hogan, 1980; 96-97)

Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses are presented in order to test the problems identified.

H0: There will be no significant differences between the sub-scale categories of administrative behaviour and Individual Dimensions based on personal style.
H01 - There will be significant differences between sub-scale categories of administrative behaviour and Individual Dimensions based on personal style.

H02 - With respect to personal styles, there will be no identifiable clusters of styles for sport administrators.

H12 - With respect to personal styles, there will be identifiable clustering for sport administrators.

Limitations of the Study

The research problems herein identified are designed to add to a growing body of knowledge in sport administration. However, the author acknowledges the following limitations of this study.

1. The instruments employed are self-descriptive, which implies that the executive directors' responses are perceptions of themselves, and not necessarily what others may perceive them to be in terms of style and behaviour.

2. A total understanding of organizational behaviour requires a multi-dimensional approach. While the author intends to make some statements regarding the
administrative behaviour of managers in sport organizations, the study is limited by the random effect and understanding of all the environmental determinants.

Delimitations

The results of this study are meant to provide data for discussion and consideration towards a growing body of knowledge on the style and administrative behaviour of managers in sport organizations. However, the data is limited to the population herein defined and may not be suitable in other environments.

Need for the Study

As mentioned earlier, research in the field of administrative theory and practice as it applies to sport and physical education/human kinetics is relatively new. Also, while the review of literature provides evidence of a number of investigations involving style and behaviour, it does not seem to have any direct bearing on sport administration specifically. Therefore, the following points provide some specific needs for this project.
1. There is a need to extend testing of the Kilmann and Herden hypothesis to sport organizations and their administrators;

2. There is a need to know how the data elicited compares with the current literature; and

3. There is a need to know, as the literature will indicate, more about administrators, their styles and their behaviour.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The relationship between personal style and administrative behaviour presents many possible avenues for research in administration. In recent years numerous researchers have attempted to address some of the salient points in this regard. This review of literature is concerned with presenting a basic understanding of:

A) Managerial Effectiveness Review;
B) Personal Style - Decision Aids and Implementation; and,
C) Personal Style - The Jungian Typology

Managerial Effectiveness Review

Textbooks on administration often describe at length the many varied parameters of the management field. Stoner (1978), indicated that management involves planning, leading and controlling the efforts of organizational members and the use of organizational resources in order to achieve stated organizational goals. This definition provides a
starting point for studying management and implies lofty responsibilities for those people who are charged with implementing these management objectives. What very often is not defined is the most effective means of reaching these objectives. The advent of theoretical models has provided research frameworks, but most models cannot capture, much less control, all the variables which would lead to a theory of organizational and/or managerial effectiveness.

The goals and systems models have been most often employed in examining organizational effectiveness. Each model has its merits, but also some drawbacks. The lack of consensus on the superiority of using one model versus the other led Frisby (1983), to conclude that it is because researchers have resorted to a variety of definitions that this area of research is in such a state of chaos.

So, how can a manager be effective? Hill described what he believed to be the key to achieving effectiveness:

Effectiveness does not just happen. It takes effort. It also takes effort in the right direction. A manager must be more than busy. A manager can be busy turning out reports and churning through paperwork without being effective - being effective is being busy doing the right things. (Hill, 1979; 13)

Drucker, (1971; 11), would take this one step further and say that effectiveness is neither an ability nor a talent,
but rather a habit, or practice. In another comment concerning managerial ability and performance, he stated that intelligence, imagination and knowledge are necessary ingredients, but only effectiveness turns them into results. (Drucker, 1967; 2)

These writers suggest that effectiveness is a desired trait. However, they do not provide any “crystal ball” explanation of how to go about achieving it. Hill sheds some light on this dilemma by emphasizing that:

* Managing is tremendously difficult at every level of an organization. No single approach will work every time. People are different and situations vary, and because of this, a manager must be flexible enough to adapt appropriately. This is a big order that is not easily accomplished, but is fundamental to management success. (Hill, 1979; 163)

Hill’s reference to a concept known as situational theory * is not new. Hodgetts (1975), suggests situational theory is more commonly accepted, because some leadership styles are more effective than others, depending on the situation. This idea has been supported many times in the research literature. As early as the 1940’s writers such as Barnard (1966), Gibb (1947), Stogdill (1948), were suggesting the inclusion of situational variables in studying leadership. Prior to that time, leadership studies were mostly based on the trait theory approach.
The focus in the situational approach to leadership is on observed behaviour, not on any hypothetical inborn or acquired ability or potential for leadership. The emphasis is on the behaviour of leaders and their group members (followers) and various situations. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977)

It appears then that there are various levels of effective managing and some styles may be more effective in some situations. Argyris suggested other matters also require attention when he stated that:

...many organizational theorists have pointed out that measures of effectiveness should take into consideration numerous intervening variables such as personality, traditions, cognitive orientations, perceptions and others. (1964; 4)

Administrative behaviour and the personal qualities that might enhance a person's effectiveness would certainly appear to qualify as possible intervening variables. Hill (1979) found in his research that effective managers are concerned with both people and productivity. Drucker adds that,

...effective management requires both thinking and action. In other words, the effective manager has to be a competent theorist and competent practitioner made into one man. (1971; 11)

In addition to supporting the interrelationship of
theory and practice, Drucker hints at the control which a manager has in selecting information and ultimately making decisions. By accepting that managers do make decisions in their roles within organizations, it might be postulated that the cognitive or personal qualities used in selecting information may play a significant role in their effectiveness. Steers points out:

If we are to understand more fully the role of managerial leadership in organizational effectiveness, it is therefore necessary to examine the nature of decision making processes and the role of management in such processes. (1977; 157)

Psychologist C.G. Jung was interested in the nature of decision making processes in relation to personality types. He developed the Jungian typology which fundamentally suggests that people "process information in a way that is congruent with the perceptual component of their personalities" (Kilmann and Herden, 1976). The format of the PSI is based on Jung's typology and provides for the possible classification of sixteen different styles derived from the two possible functions of the four dimensions.

Jung is one of many scientists who has examined cognitive style. Indeed, the area of cognitive style research has received substantial attention over the last few years. While Jung's work provides the major thrust in
this thesis, other studies are worthy of notation. These studies tend to focus on various decision aids/models as they affect decision-making behaviour.

Personal Style - Decision Aids and Implementation

The development of decision aids/models based on style to assist decision making have provided ways to solve quantifiable type problems. However, in any organization problems do not always fall into a quantifiable category. Mintzberg, Kiesinghani and Theoret (1976) raised this issue by asking the question "How do organizations go about making unstructured, strategic decisions"? Their response was that:

Researchers of administrative processes have paid little attention to such decisions, preferring instead to concentrate on routine operating decisions, those more accessible to precise description and quantifiable analysis. (1976; 246)

Mintzberg and his associates are suggesting that there are other factors to be considered that may not fit the constraints of some models. One of these factors which has received considerable attention in the literature focuses on the cognitive style of the decision maker. In a summary of the studies done on individual decision making, Mintzberg
et al concluded that,

...decision processes are programmable even if they are not programmed; although the processes used are not predetermined and explicit, there is strong evidence that a basic logic or structure underlies what the decision maker does and that this structure can be described by a systematic study of his behaviour. (Mintzberg et. al., 1976; 247)

Cognitive style research was initiated in the developmental psychology field and its application has been widespread in many areas. One of the modern pioneers in this area of research was Herman Witkin (1967, p. 234), who defined cognitive styles as "the characteristic self-consistent modes of functioning found pervasively throughout an individual's cognitive, that is, perceptual and intellectual activities". Witkin found that differences in cognitive styles were related to varying socialization processes while growing up and he devised a method of examining style. In his view and that of his associates, cognitive style was based primarily on the person's ability to solve problems as field dependent (the global approach) or field independent (the analytic approach).

Huysmans (1970), designed an experiment to test the impact of cognitive style differences between the operations researcher and manager as they affected the implementation of operations research recommendations. Using similar
divisions as Witkin, Huysmans had the subjects in his experiments judged as either heuristic or analytic in their approach to problem solving. The experiment consisted of a computer simulated business game in which decisions were made with regards to the financial planning, pricing, production and purchasing decisions of a fictitious firm. Under two experimental conditions no significant differences were found between types in accepting research proposals. However, there was a lower degree of implementation advocated under one condition between identified types. This confirmed one of his experimental hypotheses which suggested that, "the lack of implementation ... follows from the difficulty in establishing the true understanding between people who differ strongly in cognitive style". (Huysman, 1970; 92)

Doktor and Hamilton (1967) examined "Cognitive Style and the Acceptance of Management Science Recommendations". Style was determined by using a modified version of the Embedded Figures Test developed by the Witkin research team, and subjects were designated as either high analytic (field independent) or low analytic (field dependent). These researchers also had two experimental groups: graduate students and practising managers. Using the Chi Square test, there were significant differences found between high
analytic and low analytic students at the .01 level. However, it was noted that there were no differences found among the managers.

DeWaele (1978), in a study dealing with the style of managers and the design of decision aids, indicated that simple mathematical formulation did not always provide adequate information for solving problems. In his view:

Only after observing the situations and managerial behaviour can the scientist begin to think about how the process of management and decision making can be enhanced (DeWaele, 1978; 5).

DeWaele's recognition of style as an important criteria to be considered in the design of decision aids supported the view of McKenney and Keen, who found differences in the manner in which persons of different style approach problem solving. In summarizing a series of studies that they carried out it was pointed out that:

People in general tend to assume that there is some "right" way of solving problems. Formal logic, for example, is regarded as a correct approach to thinking, but thinking is always a compromise between the demands of comprehensiveness, speed and accuracy. There is no best way of thinking. If the manager and the management scientist can recognize first that each has a different cognitive style, and thus a different way of solving the same problem, then their dialogue seems more likely to bear fruit. (McKenney and Keen, 1974; 90)
Mckeeney and Keen found a positive correlation between their scales of style and those of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). However, there was no correlation found between results on the MBTI and absolute performance. They proposed that cognitive style was an important factor in the design of decision aids but found no difference between performance and the type of style. However, a final study involving eighty two MBA students revealed that differences in style were consistent with choice of career paths. This might be an important finding, both in terms of subjects within this study and to examine career paths vs. style with graduates from many areas.

Not all authors agree with the view that cognitive style research has been helpful in the design of decision aids. George Huber, in a review of current research on cognitive style and Management Information Systems (MIS) / Decision Support Systems (DSS) suggested two conclusions:

1. The currently available literature on cognitive style is an unsatisfactory basis for deriving operational guidelines for MIS and DSS designs.
2. Further cognitive style research is unlikely to lead to operational guidelines for MIS and DSS designs. (1983: 567)

While Huber did indicate that cognitive style research may have merit in other areas of application, his first
conclusion is based on what he feels is; a) weak and inconclusive literature on cognitive style, weak research designs and too many unreliable instruments to measure style; and, b) the literature doesn't have enough basis from which to derive DSS design guidelines (1983; 568-569).

The second conclusion was based on the fact that cognitive style may only be one of many variables and thus difficult to deal with separately. Also, it has not been made clear whether DSS designs should complement style or conform to it. He wasn't convinced that further research in this vein would result in any operation design guidelines (1983; 57).

In response to Huber's concerns, Robey agreed that the efforts of past research have not been as helpful as they might have been for DSS design. However,

...ignoring the role of human cognitive differences in DSS design may lead to neglect of human interface issues altogether if the view becomes a popular rallying point for future researchers and designers. (1983; 580).

Robey also suggested that Huber failed to acknowledge the contributions of cognitive style research to this point however broad they may be. He concluded by pointing out that:
Cognitive style has not been terribly useful as a predictor of system use, but maybe its best role is not as a variable in the predictive equation. When knowledge of cognitive style is used as part of the design process and when research assesses its impact in that context, then we will be at a more advantageous position to assess its value in DSS design. (1983; 582)

Personal Style - Jung's Typology

Despite the difference of opinion dealing with the use cognitive style as a basis of design systems, it might still prove useful, as Kilmann and Herden (1976) suggested, to examine style as a variable of behaviour. A number of ways of classifying cognitive style are available. The Witkins Embedded Figures Test identified subjects as field dependent or field independent. It was pointed out that others used this test and developed similar type classifications. Other researchers, not yet mentioned, utilized different instruments to measure personality traits, such as Stern's Activity Index, a 300 item paper and pencil type test which yielded 30 scales of psychological needs (Saunders and Stanton, 1976). The number of different instruments used is one of Huber's main criticisms with regards to cognitive style research:

...that the multitude of measuring instruments for assessing cognitive style, in combination with the variety of behaviour and performance measures that
have been studied, caused there to be a limited number of precisely comparable studies. (1983; 568)

In spite of the existence of differing views, the use of various methods and instruments may remain necessary if there is ever going to develop a theory of cognitive style research in administration.

As mentioned previously, C.G. Jung developed a typology to classify people according to style. A number of researchers have used Jung's framework for classifying groups of managers in different situations. A review of some of these studies pointed to a number of reasons why this framework has been used so often. However, a common belief that appears to have linked the many users of this framework is that, "Jung emphasizes that no style is better than any other" (Dekaele, 1978; 7).

The Jung theory contends that within a human's psychological wake-up there are two domains of their perceptual functions, sensation and intuition. Similarly, there are two domains of their judging functions, thinking and feeling. According to psychologist Rykwan, "Jung called thinking and feeling the rational functions since they involve a process of making judgements about experiences" (1978; 68). On the other hand, "Sensation and intuition are the irrational functions because they
involve passive recording, but not evaluating or interpretive experience" (1978; 68).

One of the fundamental points of Jung's typology is that no single dimension of any function exists entirely by itself, yet one dimension is dominant. This point is clarified in looking at another aspect of Jung's work which dealt with the concepts of introversion and extroversion.

Jung points out that people are not purely introverted or extroverted. Instead, each person has both introverted and extroverted aspects to his/her nature, and both factors involve complex variations. One set of characteristics, however, is dominant (that is conscious), while the other set is inferior or unadapted (that is unconscious). (Rykman, 1978; 68)

This same explanation is necessary for Jung's 'last dimensions of judgement and perception. These dimensions, like the attitudes introversion and extroversion are general descriptors.

The judge prefers the judging over perceiving. That is, (s)he will make judgments quickly and easily without waiting for a whole lot of data. The perceiver on the other hand is more interested in collecting data, has difficulty going from data to judgement and often appears to reopen a decision whenever new data appear. (Champagne, 1983, personal correspondence)

Of all the pairs of dimensions in the typology, Jung
believed that introversion and extroversion were the most revealing.

The two types are so essentially different, presenting so striking a contrast that their existence, even to the uninitiated in psychological matters becomes an obvious fact, when once attention has been drawn to it. (Jung, 1946; 413)

Kilmann and Herden (1976), developed a model of organizational effectiveness (Fig.1) on part of Jung's framework. This conceptualization suggests that organizational effectiveness is a multiplicative function of the four components:

\[
\text{Organizational Effectiveness} = (\text{Internal Efficiency} \times \text{External Efficiency} \times \text{Internal Effectiveness} \times \text{External Effectiveness})
\]

(1976; 94)

As with other uses of Jung's work, Kilmann and Herden contend that no one component has any greater importance, "but it does imply that the components represent distinctly different perspectives which may conflict" (1976; 94).

Kilmann and Mitroff used the Jungian method to investigate managers perspectives on the ideal organization. Their study revealed that;

1. Managers of the same personality type tend to tell the same kind of story, that is, they have the same
FIGURE I

MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (KILMANN AND HERDEN, 1976)
concept of the ideal organization.

2. Managers of opposing personalities have drastically different concepts of an ideal organization. The ideal organization of one type is literally the living hell of an opposing type. (1975; 20)

The personality grouping for this study was determined using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), originally developed by Isabel Myers in 1962. This instrument...

...incorporates the sensation, thinking, intuition and feeling psychological types introduced by Carl Jung. The dimensions of introvert/extrovert and judgement/perception also derived from Jung are also included. (Robey and Taggert, 1981; 379)

As previously stated, McKenney and Keen used the MBTI but found neither a relationship between style and performance, nor that any one style was superior. They did find, however, that subjects in their final study used their dominant style exclusively (1974; 85). Mitroff and Kilman had similar results and reported most people have a preferred style and use it in decision tasks (1975; 163-174).

Henderson and Nutt (1980) also used the MBTI in looking at "The Influence of Decision Style on Decision Making Behaviour". They sought to explore the effect of decision style on the decision makers perception of risk and inclination to adopt capital expansion projects (1980; 371). Using ANOVA techniques, they found that cognitive style
was an important factor in the decision to adopt the expansion projects and the assessment of risk.

Hoy and Hellreigel (1982) employed the MBTI in a study designed to assess the model presented by Kilmann and Herden. Although their data identified a trend with regard to decision style of small business managers, it did not support the hypothesis that the conceptualization of organizational effectiveness criteria would be a function of problem solving style (1982; 308). Yet these researchers, like others who have looked at the role of style, support the use of evaluative methods for the assessment of those in administrative capacities. While their study did not find what they may have expected, the need for continued research in the area remains.

SUMMARY

The study of effectiveness in organizations has been going on for some time. Researchers have attempted to define what organizational effectiveness means, but have encountered great difficulties with the concept itself and in reaching a consensus on what the appropriate method of investigation should include.

In examining the role of administrative personnel within
organizations similar problems have been prevalent. There does not appear to be any clear-cut method of determining what effectiveness means or what qualities people may have for increasing effectiveness within the parameters of administrative behaviour. Decision aids have assisted by tailoring the process of decision making towards the style of the administrator. However, there remain unanswered questions with regards to a possible relationship between style and behaviour.

The number of people employed in sport management positions has grown very rapidly in recent years. In Canada, the growth of the sport governing bodies (SGB's) alone have generated hundreds of administrative jobs. Yet, like their counterparts in other sectors of the work force, we know very little about these decision makers with regard to personal style and administrative behaviour. There is new opportunity then to learn more information about sport administrators and to glean new information in the area of administrative theory.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly describe the study, the instruments, and the statistical procedures to examine the problems.

Description of the Study

One hundred and four executive directors of amateur sport groups were asked to complete the following survey instruments: 1) Personal Style; 2) Leadership Behaviour; and 3) Individual Dimensions. All persons holding the position of executive director at the National Sport Centre in Ottawa and the Ontario Sport Administrative Centre in Toronto were asked to participate in this study.

The role of the executive directors at both the national and provincial levels are similar, with the exception of the jurisdictional parameters. They handle the day-to-day tasks of financial and administrative decisions pertaining to their respective organizations. For the purposes of this thesis, the executive directors from both Centres were treated as the sample and not as provincial versus national
In order to eliminate any possible breach of protocol concerning the administration of the surveys, phone calls were made at both the national and provincial levels to explain the nature and type of study to be conducted. At the provincial level, the local field officer of the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation was called and at the national level, the author spoke with a senior consultant at Sport Canada. In both instances, it was found that there is no formal protocol for the distribution of surveys within the centres as each organization is considered autonomous. However, both persons contacted were helpful in providing input regarding the length of the instruments and also in the method of distribution within the centres.

The problem and sub-problem of this thesis, as indicated earlier, were to test whether personal style was reflected by behaviour as hypothesized by Kilman and Herden and to find out whether there was any clustering of personal styles for sport administrators. The survey instruments were selected based on their perceived ability to address these problems.
Survey Instruments

The three instruments used in order of presentation to the subjects were: 1) Individual Dimensions; 2) The Personal Style Inventory (PSI); and, 3) The Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire - Form XII (Modified). These can be found in Appendices B, C, and D respectively.

The Individual Dimensions instrument was developed by the author to provide some descriptive dimensions concerning the executive directors. The main thrust of this particular instrument was to provide individual information on the subjects which, when combined with the information from the PSI, would provide a clearer profile of the people who hold these positions within the Canadian amateur sport scene. The information was also included in the discriminant analysis to determine whether there was any relationship to these variables and style when combined with the sub-scales of behaviour.

The Personal Style Inventory was developed to "measure a person's Jungian typology, a construct first described by Jung (1921) and then later elucidated 'by Meyers (1962)' (Champagne and Hogan, 1980; '89). The PSI has been used as a workshop instrument to identify a person's style. In this study it was used to identify the personal styles of the
executive directors of amateur sport groups.

There are sixteen possible personal styles that can be identified using the PSI, based on the four pairs of dimensions, i.e., extroversion (E) or introversion (I), intuition (N) or sensing (S), feeling (F) or thinking (T) and perceiving (P) or judging (J). These dimensions were outlined under the heading "Definition of Terms" in Chapter I.

Every person exhibits both dimensions of each pair in thought and action, but for each person one dimension of each is used more often, is more comfortable, and has given rise to a greater number of beliefs, values, and cognitive skills congruent with it than has the other member of the pair. The stronger dimension consequently characterizes the person's outlook, personality, and thought processes. (Champagne and Hogan, 1980, p. 89)

The four letter style labels (i.e., E or I, N or S, F or T, P or J) were generated by summing the function scores of the PSI, with the letters representing the dominant function. When dominance of one function was not apparent, that is when both functions were equal in scoring; group selection was accomplished by using a discriminant classification analysis between the two groups where a subject was matched on the other three functions. This procedure was necessary in the final classification of eight subjects.

Champagne and Hogan have stated that the ideal way of
validating the PSI would be to have a trained Jungian therapist handle the administration of the instrument. However, they "elected to gather enough data to indicate that the inventory has reasonable accuracy through an analogous procedure". Further information dealing with the validation of the PSI is available through the reference to the instrument in the bibliography.

The Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LDBQ)-Form XII was developed at the Ohio State University by a number of researchers involved in the Ohio State Leadership Studies. Initiated by the work of Newphill, it was further refined by Halpin, Winer, Fleishman, Marder, Goode, Day, and Stogdill (1963). At every stage in the development of this instrument the scales were used in a variety of applications.

The LDBQ is most often used to describe the leadership behaviour of someone else with whom the respondent is affiliated. However, as Stogdill pointed out, "with proper changes in instructions, the questionnaire can also be used by a leader to describe his own behaviour". In this thesis, the LDBQ Form XII has been modified so that the executive directors have described themselves. The sub-scales provide twelve measures of leader behaviour (independent variables) which were used to examine their effect on the dependent
variable of personal style.

Survey Procedure

Each of the executive directors was provided with a package which contained a general letter of introduction requesting his/her co-operation (Appendix A), and the three survey instruments (Appendices B, C, D). The packages were taken to the sport centres by the author and on-site distribution was arranged. Offices that were not accessible during the visits were later reached through the in-house mail systems of the respective centres. Two follow-up letters (Appendices E, F) were sent, the first requesting a return of the package and the second containing a request for completion of another enclosed set of the surveys. Of the one hundred and four packages issued, seventy-two usable sets were returned, representing a return of 69%, slightly higher than Kerlinger's expectations concerning "mail questionnaires" which stated that "at best the researcher must content himself with returns as low as 50 or 60 percent" (Kerlinger, 1973; 414).
Data Analysis

The data was scored according to the procedures outlined in the manuals for each instrument and then entered into the IBM 3031 computer system via an on-line terminal. Upon completion of the data entry, several statistical manipulations were made through the software packages of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS'84) and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSSX).

As indicated under the description of the instruments, the grouping labels for personal style were determined by the scoring summary of the PSI. The identified groups and frequency distribution is set forth in Chapter 4 on Table I.

The groups identified using the PSI provided personal style groupings concerning the executive directors. However, the group distributions were not large enough for sophisticated statistical procedures such as discriminant analysis. Therefore, the groups were reclassified for further analysis by collapsing the seventy-two subjects into two groups based on their identified function in the first dimension, that is, either extraverted or introverted. This procedure is consistent with the Jungian idea that this dimension is fundamental to psychological types and also allows for the use of data on all subjects.
The analysis of the problem required the use of discriminant analysis, a procedure that is "useful in simultaneously analyzing data on two or more mutually exclusive groups" (Brown and Tinsley, 1983; 291). The stepwise method of discriminating the variables provided the ideal or best set of independent variables (or predictor variables) that have the greatest influence on the dependent variable, in this case, personal style. In addition, a factor analysis was also performed to further strengthen results found in the discriminant analysis alone. Factor analysis allowed for grouping of similar factors and subsequently enabled discrimination of the variables in another way.

The computer programs DISCRIMINANT and FACTOR were accessed through the SPSSX package and the results of these analyses are reported in Chapter 4 on Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

1) Discriminant Analysis

The discriminant analysis was done in two steps, the first utilizing the twelve sub-scales of the LDBQ as discriminator variables (Table 2), while the second included the sub-scales of the LDBQ and those of the Individual Dimensions Survey (Table 3). Statistical significance was
calculated using the Manova F ratio based on the Chi-Squared statistic, testing differences between the two groups.

The results of the stepwise procedure (Method=Wilks) is listed in Table 4. The variables were entered in order of their discriminating power among the variables. As each was removed the next variable was selected based on being the next largest contributor to the total variance. Upon completion of the sixth step the selection process was complete as no remaining variable had an F greater than 1.

2) Factor Analysis

The factor analysis was used to reduce the number of variables to common factors in the analysis. Following a discriminant analysis on the reduced number of factors, the stepwise procedure was again utilized. This ordered the factors with regard to their importance and eliminates those factors that contribute marginally to the total variance.

3) Group Classification

Discriminant analysis is also useful in predicting the groups to which a subject belongs based on the information provided by the discriminator variables (SPSSX, 1983). As
previously mentioned, this was of particular importance in finalizing group membership when it was not made clear by the PSI. An analysis of the two group classification is set forth in Table 6.
Chapter 4

Results and Hypotheses Decisions

The problem and sub-problem identified as the concern of this thesis were:

1. To identify whether an executive director's personal style is a function of his/her administrative behaviour; and

2. To identify any possible clustering of personal styles for sport administrators, as identified by the Personal Style Inventory (PSI).

The results of this study have been organized to address these problems. However, the data concerning the sub-problem (#2), identifying the various styles, is necessary for understanding the problem (#1) and therefore the results regarding these two concerns are given in reverse order.

Summary of Returns

A total of one hundred and four sets of questionnaires were distributed, sixty being distributed at the National Sport and Recreation Centre in Ottawa and forty four at the
Ontario Sport Administrative Centre in Toronto. Seventy-two usable sets of questionnaires were returned, representing a return rate of 69.2%. However, two sets of the questionnaires were returned because of position vacancies and three sets were improperly completed. A follow-up procedure was utilized for these three sets, which resulted in one reply, but it remained improperly completed. In summary, seventy-five executive directors (73.5%) sent back their packages, of which seventy-two were usable.

Personal Style Results

Table I is a summary of the style groups as identified by the Personal Style Inventory (PSI). Each letter within the group label represents the dominant function of the pairs described in Chapter I. Each style group was identified by a four-letter combination (one from each pair) based on the summary scores for each subject on the PSI. The legend for the letter labels is listed on Table I.

The results of the PSI allow for the possibility of equal scores between the functions. In other words, within each dimension, the possibility of a tie between the functions is possible. In this study, eight subjects were identified with ties in one of the pairs. In order to
identify these cases within one of the groups, group selection was accomplished by using discriminant analysis between the two groups that were the same in the other three dimensions.

The results of Table I reveal that 69.44% of the executive director positions are filled by men and 30.56% by women. Of the ten styles (out of a possible sixteen) identified in this study, three style groups (ESTJ, ESTP, ISTJ) account for 76.01% of the subjects. In addition, 68.06% were identified as being extroverted as indicated by the "E" in five of the styles, while the remaining 31.94% were identified as introverted as indicated by the "I" in the other five styles. The extroverted/introverted dimension was considered the most important facet of Jung's work as noted in Chapter 2. One other noteworthy result to be highlighted from Table I is the fourth dimension, which describes the tendency towards judging vs. perceiving. In this sample, seventy subjects (97.22%) were identified as judges.

The information gathered from the Individual Dimensions survey provides descriptive data in relation to the subjects and their personal styles. The questions concerning age, education and participation provide insights into the backgrounds of the executive directors. However, this data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL (PCT)</th>
<th>REDUCED GROUPS (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28 (38.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13 (18.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (2.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 (6.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13 (18.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22 (30.56)</td>
<td>50 (69.44)</td>
<td>72 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIMENSION**

| 1  | E= EXTROVERT OR I= INTROVERT |
| 2  | S= SENSING OR N= INTUITIVE   |
| 3  | T= THINKING OR F= FEELING    |
| 4  | J= JUDGING OR P= PERCEIVING  |

**TABLE I**

PERSONAL STYLE GROUPS AND REDUCED GROUPS
was supplemental to the problem and sub-problem and is therefore presented as appendices. This data is organized as Appendix G - Style Groups by Age; Appendix H - Style Groups by Educational Background; Appendix I - Style Groups by Prior Participation in Their Association; Appendix J - Educational Background by Participation.

Personal Style vs. Administrative Behaviour Results

The discriminant analyses were conducted using two style group classifications, introverts and extroverts. The groups were generated by collapsing the ten style groups as identified by the first dimension. Using this procedure, the group identified as extroverted had 49 subjects and those who were identified as introverted had 23 subjects. The establishment of two groups reduced the number of discriminant functions to one, as one of the rules regarding discriminant analysis is that the number of functions is one less than the number of groups.

Table 2 provides a summary of the first discriminant analysis which was completed using the twelve sub-scales of the LDBQ as discriminator variables. In this analysis, the canonical correlation, which indicates the relationship between the function variance and group differences, was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT CANONICAL CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43558</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILK'S LAMBDA  CHI-SQUARED  D.F.  SIGNIFICANCE
0.6965847  23.140  12  0.0266

STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS

FUNCTION 1

| V6 | 0.45887 | REPRESENTATION |
| V7 | 0.33398 | RECONCILIATION |
| V8 | 0.17366 | TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY |
| V9 | -0.00184 | PERSUASION |
| V10 | -0.31901 | STRUCTURE |
| V11 | 0.48060 | TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM |
| V12 | -0.10344 | ROLE ASSUMPTION |
| V13 | -0.77337 | CONSIDERATION |
| V14 | 0.06280 | PRODUCTION EMPHASIS |
| V15 | 0.51206 | PREDICTIVE ACCURACY |
| V16 | -0.24887 | INTEGRATION |
| V17 | 0.36278 | SUPERIOR ORIENTATION |

TABLE 2
DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS – TWO GROUPS VS. LDBQ
.508315. The Wilks' Lambda, which is an inverse measure of the discriminating information available in the discriminator variables was .6965847. The Chi-Square based on the Wilks' Lambda was 23.140, which was calculated to have a significance of .0266, which is significant at the .05 level of confidence. The standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients provided the following algebraic equation:

\[ Y(\text{Style}) = V_6(.45887) + V_7(.33398) + V_8(.17366) + V_9(-.00184) + V_{10}(-.31901) + V_{11}(.48060) + V_{12}(-.10344) + V_{13}(-.77377) + V_{14}(.06280) + V_{15}(.51206) + V_{16}(-.24887) + V_{17}(.36278) \]

The sum of the variables in this equation provide a predictive model for style.

Table 3 provides a summary of the second discriminant analysis which included the twelve sub-scales of the LBDQ and the variables of the Individual Dimensions Survey. In this analysis, the canonical correlation was calculated to be .5682467, the Wilks' Lambda as .6770956 and the Chi-Squared as 24.176, with a significance of .0857, greater than the allowable confidence level of .05.

A stepwise regression procedure was conducted on both analyses, the results of which are reported on Table 4. In both cases, the variables selected were the same, thus appearing to diminish the discriminating power of the
### Table 3

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS - VS ALL VARIABLES (LDO + ID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
<th>CANONICAL CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>-0.47690</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.5682467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILK'S LAMBDA</td>
<td>CHI-SQUARED</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.670956</td>
<td>24.176</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>0.01447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>-0.05609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>0.16952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>-0.24128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>0.41380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>0.31160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>0.12285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>0.00535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>-0.32090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>0.45663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>-0.11763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>-0.71138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>0.04970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15</td>
<td>0.47841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>-0.26508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17</td>
<td>0.39050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>RECONCILIATION</th>
<th>TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY</th>
<th>PERSUASION</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>ROLE ASSUMPTION</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>PRODUCTION Emphasis</th>
<th>PREDICTIVE ACCURACY</th>
<th>INTEGRATION</th>
<th>SUPERIOR ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>ACTION ENTERED</th>
<th>VARIABLES INCLUDED</th>
<th>WILK'S LAMBDA</th>
<th>SIG.</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>V7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.933934</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>RECONCILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>V13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.857322</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.805878</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>FED. ACCURACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>V11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.767258</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>TOL. OF FREEDOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.738533</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>REPRESENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>V10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.721241</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT</th>
<th>CANONICAL CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38650</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.5279762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILK'S LAMBDA: 0.721241
CHI-SQUARED D.F. SIGNIFICANCE: 21.894 6 0.0013

### STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION 1</th>
<th>V6</th>
<th>V7</th>
<th>V10</th>
<th>V11</th>
<th>V13</th>
<th>V15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.47497</td>
<td>0.38346</td>
<td>-0.34491</td>
<td>0.46238</td>
<td>-0.78262</td>
<td>0.54691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4

STEPWISE REGRESSION SUMMARY TABLE
variables of the Individual Dimensions Survey. The model which best discriminates the dependent variable of style includes the behavioural scales of reconciliation (V7), consideration (V13), predictive accuracy (V15), tolerance of freedom (V11), representation (V6), and structure (V10). The canonical correlation was calculated to be .5279762, the Wilks' Lambda as .7212412, Chi-Squared as 21.894, with a significance of .0013. Expressed mathematically, the equation would be:

\[ Y(\text{Style}) = V6(.47497) + V7(.38346) + V10(-.34491) + V11(.46238) + V13(-.78262) + V15(.54691) \]

The sum of the variables in this equation provides the best predictive model for style.

Table 5 summarizes the factor analysis, which was used to analyze the data in order to group the variables according to similar effects and reduce the number of predictor variables. The factor analysis reduced the number of variables to four from sixteen (LBDQ + Individual Dimensions). A discriminant analysis conducted on these factors yielded a canonical correlation of .418249, Wilks' Lambda of .8249206, Chi-Square of 13.088 with a significance of .0109. The contribution of the factor analysis lies mainly in supporting the findings of the discriminant analysis, which it appears to have accomplished. One
### Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action Entered</th>
<th>Variables Included</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FAF4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.912062</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FAF6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.877329</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FAF3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.857357</td>
<td>0.0145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FAF1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.824921</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canonical Discriminant Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.4186249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wilk's Lambda: 0.8249206, Chi-Squared: 13.088, D.F.: 4, Significance: 0.0109

### Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.81783</td>
<td>V12, 17, 9, 6, 16, 10, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.76934</td>
<td>V16, 10, 13, 11, 12, 17, 9, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.98660</td>
<td>V7, 15, 12, 8, 16, 17, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.77774</td>
<td>V4, 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

Factor Analysis
further point worth noting that is not apparent from Table 5 is the fact that the variables eliminated by the stepwise procedure following the factor analysis contained the variables of the Individual Dimension which further supports the results of the discriminant analysis alone.

Table 6 provides the classification results of the two groups based on their identification within a group as a result of their responses concerning the independent variables. The extroverted group (Group 1) would have been predicted 89.8% of the time, while the introverted group (Group 2) was somewhat lower at 47.8%. Overall, the percent of cases correctly classified was 77.78%.

Hypotheses Decisions

The purpose of this study was to examine the personal style and administrative behaviour of executive directors of amateur sport organizations at the national and provincial levels. In order to structure the investigation, two null hypotheses were formulated. Based on the results presented, the decisions that pertain to each hypothesis are listed as follows;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUAL GROUP</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CASES</th>
<th>PREDICTED GROUP 1</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP .2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP #1 (E)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP #2 (I)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 77.78%

TABLE 6

SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION RESULTS
Hypothesis

Ho1- There will be no significant differences between the sub-scale categories of administrative behaviour and Individual Dimensions based on style.

Ho2- With respect to personal styles, there will be no identifiable cluster of styles for sport administrators.

The first null hypothesis was rejected on the basis that a significance of p.0266 was found when the two groups (extrovert or introvert) were discriminated by the twelve sub-scales of the LBDO-Form X11 (modified). Utilization of the stepwise regression procedure further strengthened the linear model, and was further supported in the factor analysis.

Ho2 was formulated with the assumption that the style groupings as determined by the PSI would be evenly distributed. Based on the four dimensions, each with two alternative functions, there were sixteen possible styles that could have been identified. The results indicate that this sample was represented in ten categories and that
closer scrutiny reveals that three styles (ESTJ, ESFJ, ISTJ) accounted for 76.01% of the total sample size. The remaining seven styles account for only 24.99%. Based on these findings the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternate (null), which stated that there would be clustering of styles was accepted.
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Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

A number of needs were identified earlier that pertained to this study. First among these needs was to extend testing of the Kilman and Herden hypothesis to sport organizations and their administrators. Hoy and Hellreigel (1982) investigated this hypothesis and found no significant support in their data. Their sample was of one hundred and fifty small business managers and the perceptions of how they perceived organizational goals and problems transcended affiliation with any particular problem-solving style.

In this study, executive directors of sports governing bodies were placed in style groups and administered the Leader Behaviour/Description Questionnaire (modified). Using discriminant function analysis, significant differences were found among the variables of behaviour and style. These results are supportive of the hypothesis, at least concerning how the executive directors perceive their own behaviour. In both this study and that of Hoy and Hellreigel, who used a personal interview schedule on their subjects, the questions were asked of the subjects themselves. A logical extension of both projects would be
to establish a set of experiments in comparable hypothetical situations or to have behaviour evaluated by a means other than the self description method.

The results of this study support the ideas expressed by cognitive theorists who reported that cognitive style was important in understanding decision making behaviour. Although they were not able to fully substantiate their experimental hypothesis, Witkin (1967), Huysman (1970), and Doctor and Hamilton (1967) were investigating the same phenomenon, namely, the effect of cognitive style on behaviour. Mintzberg and his associates (1976), who investigated the nature of decision processes were convinced that some items concerning decision making were "programmed" even though they were not consciously perceived that way. The data from this study would suggest that the "program" is linked to personal style.

There was less consensus among those researchers who have been involved in decision design systems (DDS) based on personal style. DeWaele (1978), McKenney and Keen (1975) and Robey (1983) have all suggested that cognitive style research was important in the design of aids for decision making. Their findings have not always supported their suggestions, which fueled the argument put forward by Huber (1983), that research concerning decision aids based on
cognitive style was neither well defined nor worthy of continued effort. The findings of this research reveal differences in behaviour based on style, and while they do not "test" any decision aids, they do lend support that there may be something worth investigating with regards to decision aids based on style.

The idea of having a predisposition to perceive and evaluate problems based on style remains as an interesting, but yet to be fully substantiated problem. In this study it is clear that there are different styles, but there should be more research which investigates the possible congruencies between style and behaviour.

The Personal Style Inventory proved to be useful in grouping the executive directors according to style. It provided a concise way (32 question) in which to gather information, and, was easily scored. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) has been the usual instrument employed based on the work of Jung, Kilmann and Mitroff (1975), McKenney and Keen (1975) and Henderson and Nutt (1980) used the MBTI in their respective studies concerning style.

Two problems were encountered using the PSI which are likely attributable to the application in this study more than the instrument itself. Firstly, the scoring of the instrument allows for ties between the two functions of each
dimension. This is not a problem if the PSI is used in its traditional environment, the workshop setting, where a tie indicates a relative balance between the functions. However, in this study and with the use of discriminant analysis, which requires that subjects belong to mutually exclusive groups, the ties had to be broken, with participants placed in one group or the other. As noted in the results, this required classifying a subject into one of the two groups that they most likely belong, based on the information contained in the discriminator variables.

The second problem was related to the distribution of the subjects into groups. On six of the ten styles identified, the number of members within these styles was insufficient for the statistical procedures employed. The comparison of groups of such small sizes would distort the data and an alternate means of classification was necessary. This procedure may not have been necessary if the number of subjects in the sample had been substantially higher. The PSI was based on Jung's research, who pointed out in all his work that the first dimension was fundamental to personal style. Based on this information, the ten style groups were reduced to two for the discriminant analysis, using the dominant function of the first dimension as the style group indicator. This was not necessarily a drawback, but was an
application of the instrument in a manner other than was originally intended. Conversely, it permits another option when used outside the workshop setting when the size of the groups is not important for statistical manipulation.

The information contained in the LBDQ (modified) provided comparative differences between the two style groups, thus enabling the testing of the problem in this study. However, the LDBQ has no established norms under conventional use, let alone when used in this study as a self-descriptor, and therefore the reporting of behavioural scores alone serves no purpose other than describing the sample herein. The information would be of value in a replicated study on another sample or in a longitudinal study utilizing a similar sample at a later time.

The data collected in this study supported the research that there are differences in behaviour based on style. However, like most studies supporting either side of the argument, this study requires the further refinement of a model and/or experimental method that can be duplicated in another application. For example, if this data is to have any significant impact, the method should be transferable to other situations such as all team coaches, athletic directors, directors of education, and business executives. In this way, a base of information can be developed and
statements regarding differences, and where the differences occur, can be compared.

The last "need" concerns knowing more about administrators, their styles and their behaviour. The descriptive information gathered by the Individual Dimensions Survey revealed that of those who responded, about 70% are male, over 76% are past the age of thirty, 86.11% received post secondary education, with 73.61% being university graduates and 52.78% participated in some way in the association that they now represent. The participation level was not as high for those who had an academic background in H&PE and Business. The PSI revealed that the sample clustered around three main styles; that 68.06% of the sample were extroverted as opposed to introverted and that 97% are "judgers". These figures reveal some general descriptive details concerning the sports administrators in this particular study. Champagne had expected some strong indicators when applying the PSI to sport as cited in his correspondence with the author during the initial stages of this study. The results tend to support his expectations.
Conclusions

The results herein provide a base of information with regard to sports administrators and their behaviour. The data was evaluated by examining two hypotheses, which subsequently have provided the support for the following conclusions.

1. Within the sample used in this study, sport administrators were not a homogenous group, that is, there were different personal styles. Notwithstanding, within the spectrum of styles elicited by the PSI, sport administrators were represented by three groups, ESTJ's - 38.89%, ESFJ's - 18.06% and ISFJ's - 18.06%.

2. Within the sample used and the method employed for this study there were significant differences found between personal style and the self perception of administrative behaviour.

Recommendations

The value of any research investigation is measured not only by the results in any one study, but also by the
contribution of other information with regards to procedures, problems that were encountered and new possibilities for further research. With this in mind, the following recommendations are posited for future investigation.

1. There is a need for more research in refining a method of looking at the relationship between style and behaviour. In this way, similar studies can be designed, norms established, and comparisons made between administrators in many professions.

2. The Personal Style Inventory (PSI) provides a way of revealing possible cognitive differences in style, but has limitations when used in a study of this nature unless the sample size is considerably larger (i.e. too many possible styles with too few in each style grouping for sophisticated data manipulation.

3. The PSI could have a number of applications within the sport community, by facilitating an understanding of the styles of people involved in decision making roles. The instrument could be helpful in assisting these people in realizing the inherent strength/weakness of a style, particularly with volunteers, or volunteer boards in relation to the paid staff.

4. With proper modifications, the Leadership Behaviour
Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) can be used as self-descriptor. There were no major problems encountered with the completion and scoring of the instrument in this application.

5. The LBDQ provides a means of gaining self-descriptive information on behaviour, but requires further application in order to provide established norms for comparison.

6. A replication of this study utilizing the perceptions of the presidents or board members of the sports governing bodies as they pertain to the executive directors would be helpful in evaluating how others see the style and behaviour of these people. It would also provide a basis for testing the differences of the two groups.
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APPENDIX A

PERSONAL STYLE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOUR SURVEY

Enclosed please find a set of questionnaires designed to provide information on the personal style and behaviour of administrators. This information is being collected as data for my thesis and is NOT an examination of your success as an administrator. My intention is only to examine the style and behaviour of those involved in the sport delivery system. Furthermore, there are no right or wrong answers. My only request is that each respondent answer all questions in an honest fashion without consultation or collaboration with others.

There are three parts in this survey and I would ask that you read the instructions for EACH carefully. The whole process should take less than 1/2 hour to complete. Let me assure you that the identity of the respondents will be known only to the researcher and all data will be held in strict confidence.

Please return the completed survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. I appreciate your contribution and thank you in advance for your assistance in this project.

Dennis W. Hastings
Faculty of Human Kinetics
University of Windsor
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APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUAL DIMENSIONS INFORMATION

Instructions: Please check (X) an answer in the appropriate area within each question.

1. Gender: ______ Female ______ Male

2. Age: 
   a) ______ 20 - 29
   b) ______ 30 - 39
   c) ______ over 40

3. Educational Background (Please check highest level only)
   a) ______ High School
   b) ______ Community College (Major ______)
   c) ______ University (Major ______)

4. Were you ever an active participant in the organization for which you work?
   ______ yes ______ no

   If yes, what was your highest level of participation? (Please check only one)

   ______ minor (under 16)
   ______ junior (17-20)
   ______ senior (over 21)
   ______ provincial team
   ______ national team
   ______ other, please specify ________
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APPENDIX C

PERSONAL STYLE INVENTORY
R. Craig Hogan and David W. Champagne

Just as every person has differently shaped feet and toes from every other person, so we all have differently "shaped" personalities. Just as no person's foot shape is "right" or "wrong," so no person's personality shape is right or wrong. The purpose of this inventory is to give you a picture of the shape of your preferences, but that shape, while different from the shapes of other persons' personalities, has nothing to do with mental health or mental problems.

The following items are arranged in pairs (a and b), and each member of the pair represents a preference you may or may not hold. Rate your preference for each item by giving it a score of 0 to 5 (0 meaning you really feel negative about it or strongly about the other member of the pair, 5 meaning you strongly prefer it or do not prefer the other member of the pair). The scores for a and b must add up to 5 (0 and 5, 1 and 4, 2 and 3, etc.). Do not use fractions such as 2 1/2.

I prefer:

1a. making decisions after finding out what others think.
1b. making decisions without consulting others.

2a. being called imaginative or intuitive.
2b. being called factual and accurate.

3a. making decisions about people in organizations based on available data and systematic analysis of situations.
3b. making decisions about people in organizations based on empathy, feelings, and understanding of their needs and values.

4a. allowing commitments to occur if others want to make them.
4b. pushing for definite commitments to ensure that they are made.

5a. quiet, thoughtful time alone.
5b. active, energetic time with people.

6a. using methods I know well that are effective to get the job done.
6b. trying to think of new methods of doing tasks when confronted with them.

7a. drawing conclusions based on unemotional logic and careful step-by-step analysis.
7b. drawing conclusions based on what I feel and believe about life and people from past experiences.

Copyright © 1979 by D. W. Champagne and R. C. Hogan. Reprinted with permission of the authors from the privately published book Supervisory and Management Skills: A Competency Based Training Program for Middle Managers of Educational Systems by D. W. Champagne and R. C. Hogan. This material may be freely reproduced for educational training research purposes. There is no requirement to obtain special permission for such use. However, reproduce or distribute—of items in publications for sale—may be done only with prior written permission of the authors.
8a. ___ avoiding making deadlines.
8b. ___ setting a schedule and sticking to it.

9a. ___ talking awhile and then thinking to myself about the subject.
9b. ___ talking freely for an extended period and thinking to myself at a later time.

10a. ___ thinking about possibilities.
10b. ___ dealing with actualities.

11a. ___ being thought of as a 'thinking person.'
11b. ___ being thought of as a 'feeling person.'

12a. ___ considering every possible angle for a long time before and after making a decision.
12b. ___ getting the information I need, considering it for a while, and then making a fairly quick, firm decision.

13a. ___ inner thoughts and feelings others cannot see.
13b. ___ activities and occurrences in which others join.

14a. ___ the abstract or theoretical.
14b. ___ the concrete or real.

15a. ___ helping others explore their feelings.
15b. ___ helping others make logical decisions.

16a. ___ change and keeping options open.
16b. ___ predictability and knowing in advance.

17a. ___ communicating little of my inner thinking and feelings.
17b. ___ communicating freely my inner thinking and feelings.

18a. ___ possible views of the whole.
18b. ___ the factual details available.

19a. ___ using common sense and conviction to make decisions.
19b. ___ using data, analysis, and reason to make decisions.

20a. ___ planning ahead based on projections.
20b. ___ planning as necessities arise, just before carrying out the plans.

21a. ___ meeting new people.
21b. ___ being alone or with one person I know well.

22a. ___ ideas.
22b. ___ facts.
23a. ___ convictions.
23b. ___ verifiable conclusions.

24a. ___ keeping appointments and notes about commitments in notebooks or in
appointment books as much as possible.
24b. ___ using appointment books and notebooks as minimally as possible (although
I may use them).

25a. ___ discussing a new, unconsidered issue at length in a group.
25b. ___ puzzling out issues in my mind, then sharing the results with another
person.

26a. ___ carrying out carefully laid, detailed plans with precision.
26b. ___ designing plans and structures without necessarily carrying them out.

27a. ___ logical people.
27b. ___ feeling people.

28a. ___ being free to do things on the spur of the moment.
28b. ___ knowing well in advance what I am expected to do.

29a. ___ being the center of attention.
29b. ___ being reserved.

30a. ___ imagining the nonexistent.
30b. ___ examining details of the actual.

31a. ___ experiencing emotional situations, discussions, movies.
31b. ___ using my ability to analyze situations.

32a. ___ starting meetings at a prearranged time.
32b. ___ starting meetings when all are comfortable or ready.
APPENDIX D

MODIFIED
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—Form XII

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

Purpose of the Questionnaire

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

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

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

Published by

Bureau of Business Research
College of Commerce and Administration
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently you engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether you (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never act as described by the item.

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

A = 'Always
B = 'Often
C = 'Occasionally
D = 'Seldom
E = 'Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.
Example: I often act as described ............... A B C D E
Example: I never act as described ............... A B C D E
Example: I occasionally act as described .............. A B C D E

1. I act as the spokesman of the group .................. A B C D E
2. I wait patiently for the results of a decision ............. A B C D E
3. I make pep talks to stimulate the group .................. A B C D E
4. I let group members know what is expected of them ............ A B C D E
5. I allow the members complete freedom in their work ............ A B C D E
6. I am hesitant about taking initiative in the group ............. A B C D E
7. I am friendly and approachable ................................ A B C D E
8. I encourage overtime work ................................... A B C D E
9. I make accurate decisions ..................................... A B C D E
10. I get along well with the people above me ..................... A B C D E
11. I publicize the activities of the group ....................... A B C D E
12. I become anxious when I cannot find out what is coming next .... A B C D E
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A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

13. My arguments are convincing ........................................ A B C D E
14. I encourage the use of uniform procedures ....................... A B C D E
15. I permit the members to use their own judgement in solving problems ......................................................... A B C D E
16. I fail to take necessary action ...................................... A B C D E
17. I do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group ................................................................. A B C D E
18. I stress being ahead of competing groups ................................................................................................. A B C D E
19. I keep the group working together as a team ................. A B C D E
20. I keep the group in good standing with higher authority .... A B C D E
21. I speak as the representative of the group .................. A B C D E
22. I accept defeat in stride .............................................. A B C D E
23. I argue persuasively for my point of view ...................... A B C D E
24. I try out my ideas in the group .................................. A B C D E
25. I encourage initiative in the group members ................ A B C D E
26. I let other persons take away my leadership in the group ... A B C D E
27. I put suggestions made by the group into operation .......... A B C D E
28. I needle members for greater effort ............................. A B C D E
29. I seem able to predict what is coming next .................. A B C D E
30. I work hard for a promotion ...................................... A B C D E
31. I speak for the group when visitors are present ............ A B C D E
32. I accept delays without becoming upset ...................... A B C D E
33. I am a very persuasive talker .................................. A B C D E
34. I make my attitudes clear to the group ...................... A B C D E
35. I let the members do their work the way they think best ... A B C D E
36. I let some members take advantage of me .................... A B C D E
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. I treat all group members as my equals .......... A B C D E

38. I keep the work moving at a rapid pace .......... A B C D E

39. I settle conflicts when they occur in the group .......... A B C D E

40. My superiors act favorably on most of my suggestions .......... A B C D E

41. I represent the group at outside meetings .......... A B C D E

42. I become anxious when waiting for new developments .......... A B C D E

43. I am very skillful in an argument .......... A B C D E

44. I decide what shall be done and how it shall be done .......... A B C D E

45. I assign a task, then let the members handle it .......... A B C D E

46. I am the leader of the group in name only .......... A B C D E

47. I give advance notice of changes .......... A B C D E

48. I push for increased production .......... A B C D E

49. Things usually turn out as I predict .......... A B C D E

50. I enjoy the privileges of my position .......... A B C D E

51. I handle complex problems efficiently .......... A B C D E

52. I am able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty .......... A B C D E

53. I am not a very convincing talker .......... A B C D E

54. I assign group members to particular tasks .......... A B C D E

55. I turn the members loose on a job, and let them go to it .......... A B C D E

56. I back down when I ought to stand firm .......... A B C D E

57. I keep to myself .......... A B C D E

58. I ask the members to work harder .......... A B C D E

59. I am accurate in predicting the trend of events .......... A B C D E

60. I get my superiors to act for the welfare of the group members .......... A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

61. I get swamped by details .............................................. A B C D E
62. I can wait just so long, then blow up ........................... A B C D E
63. I speak from a strong inner conviction ........................... A B C D E
64. I make sure that my part in the group is understood by the
group members ..................................................... A B C D E
65. I am reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action .. A B C D E
66. I let some members have authority that I should keep ........ A B C D E
67. I look out for the personal welfare of group members ........ A B C D E
68. I permit the members to take it easy in their work ............. A B C D E
69. I see to it that the work of the group is coordinated .......... A B C D E
70. My word carries weight with my superiors ........................ A B C D E
71. I get things all tangled up ......................................... A B C D E
72. I remain calm when uncertain about coming events ........... A B C D E
73. I am an inspiring talker ............................................ A B C D E
74. I schedule the work to be done ................................... A B C D E
75. I allow the group a high degree of initiative .................. A B C D E
76. I take full charge when emergencies arise ..................... A B C D E
77. I am willing to make changes ..................................... A B C D E
78. I drive hard when there is a job to be done .................... A B C D E
79. I help group members settle their differences ................ A B C D E
80. I get what I ask for from my superiors .......................... A B C D E
81. I can reduce a madhouse to system and order .................. A B C D E
82. I am able to delay action until the proper time occurs ....... A B C D E
83. I persuade others that my ideas are to their advantage ....... A B C D E
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Always  
B = Often  
C = Occasionally  
D = Seldom  
E = Never

84. I maintain definite standards of performance ............ A B C D E
85. I trust the members to exercise good judgment .......... A B C D E
86. I overcome attempts made to challenge my leadership ........ A B C D E
87. I refuse to explain my actions ................................ A B C D E
88. I urge the group to beat its previous record ............ A B C D E
89. I anticipate problems and plan for them ................. A B C D E
90. I am working my way to the top ............................. A B C D E
91. I get confused when too many demands are made of me .... A B C D E
92. I worry about the outcome of any new procedure .......... A B C D E
93. I can inspire enthusiasm for a project .................... A B C D E
94. I ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations A B C D E
95. I permit the group to set its own pace ..................... A B C D E
96. I am easily recognized as the leader of the group .......... A B C D E
97. I act without consulting the group .......................... A B C D E
98. I keep the group working up to capacity ................... A B C D E
99. I maintain a closely knit group ............................ A B C D E
100. I maintain cordial relations with superiors .............. A B C D E
APPENDIX E

August 28, 1984

Dear Sir/Madam

On August 13, 1984, a group of three questionnaires collectively entitled, PERSONAL STYLE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOUR SURVEY was delivered to your office. The response has been fairly good, yet I would like to obtain the remaining few surveys to complete my data collection.

If you have already returned these instruments, please disregard this request and accept my gratitude for assisting in this project. If you still have the survey instruments, it would be appreciated if you would take a few moments to fill out the required information and return them by September 15th.

Thank you very much for your help in this endeavour.

Sincerely,

Dennis W. Hastings
APPENDIX F

PERSONAL STYLE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOUR SURVEY

OCT. 12, 1984

On July 23rd I visited the Sport Center and distributed the enclosed information. The response to my request has been most satisfying, yet it is important that I obtain a response from as many executive and managing directors as possible. As of this date, I have not received a reply from your office. In the event that the first package was misplaced, I have enclosed another set, which I would ask you to consider filling out. I realize that this is a busy time and certainly appreciate you, taking time for this request.

There are three parts in this survey, and I would ask that you read the instructions for each carefully. The whole process should take less than 1/2 hour to complete. Let us assure you that the identity of the respondents will be kept only to the researcher and all data will be held in strict confidence.

Please return the completed survey in the self addressed stamped envelope provided. I appreciate your contribution and thank you in advance for your assistance in this project.

Dennis W. Hastings
Faculty of Human Kinetics
University of Windsor
### APPENDIX G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CHAR PCT</th>
<th>20 TO 39</th>
<th>30 TO 39</th>
<th>OVER 40</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>72.11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STYLE GROUPS BY AGE**
### APPENDIX H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY PERCENT</th>
<th>RAW PCT</th>
<th>COL. PCT</th>
<th>HIGH SCH.</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>HN/FE</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>UNIV-OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTJ</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESFJ</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENFJ</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENFP</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENTJ</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTJ</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESFJ</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTJ</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFJ</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISTP</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STYLE GROUPS BY EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**
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APPENDIX I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>COL PCT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESFJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENFJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENFP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENTJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISTJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISFJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISTP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.78</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Style groups by prior participation in their association.
## APPENDIX J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>COL PCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV - OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>23.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.78</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational background cross-tabulated with prior participation in their association.
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