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A Leadership Analysis of the 1989-90 Class of Governors in Circle K International (CKI) studied the leadership effectiveness of college students in an international service organization. 10 Governors (leaders) were administered Fiedler's LPC scales and Situational Control scales. Governors' LPCs were correlated with District Board Members' (subordinates) rating of satisfaction. Due to an insufficient database, statistical significance was not obtained, however, a strong correlation was found between Low LPC's and the Low Situational Control area which correlate with Fiedler's theory. As a result of the findings presented, shortcomings of the Contingency Model are discussed, as well as, directions for future leadership research.

I. Introduction

Despite intense controversy, Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness has persisted in becoming the most widely known of contingency theories (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977). Since its conception in 1964, the Contingency Model has been modified little in form and has been the focus of over 400 published works (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987).

The Contingency Model addresses leadership as an interaction between leader personality and control of a situation. These interacting variables are then commonly correlated with some measure of subordinate satisfaction or productivity which determines leader effectiveness. Leader personality is measured through the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale or LPC. The LPC is modeled after the semantic differential (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) and presently contains 18 adjective pairs placed in a bipolar fashion with 8 degrees interspaced between (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Unkind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LPC identifies primarily two types of leaders: relationship-oriented (High LPC) and task-oriented (Low LPC). A relationship-oriented leader is more concerned with successful interpersonal relations, whereas, a task-oriented leader is more concerned with
successful task completion (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987). A Middle LPC leader has also been identified by Fiedler. This leader is considered socio-independent and is described as flexible and generally unaffected by successful subordinate relations or task completion (Kennedy, 1982). Fiedler has been criticized by researchers for his ambiguity of, and absence of research towards, the Middle LPC leader.

Fiedler has also been criticized for his ambiguity regarding the behavior or trait measured by LPC. Fiedler describes understanding LPC as a "...maddening and frustrating odyssey" and describes LPC analyses as "...uniformly fruitless" (Schreisheim & Kerr, 1977). However, behaviors or traits have been proposed which include: "...a measure of emotional reaction to difficult people to work with, ...a measure of cognitive complexity..., [and] ...a measure of underlying motivational hierarchies" (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977).

The second component of the Contingency Model, Situational Control, has been divided into three areas: Leader-Member Relations (LMR), Task Structure (TS), and Position Power (PP). The LMR scale contains eight questions focusing on subordinate relations and productivity, for example, "My subordinates give me a good deal of help and support in getting the job done." Fiedler contends that Leader-Member Relations are the most important component of situational control. The TS scale contains ten questions that identify a task as structurally high, moderate, or low, for example, "Is there a blueprint, model or detailed description available of the finished product or service?" Finally, the PP scale indicates a leader’s authority as a result of his/her position, for example, "Can the leader directly or by recommendation administer rewards or punishments to subordinates?" (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987)

The three areas of situational control are represented in the Situational Control Scale. This scale was constructed by dividing group samples of LMR, TS, and PP into two equal parts: high and low. Arbitrary weighting measures based on a 4:2:1 ratio were added to the scale composing eight degrees or octants of situational control (See Figure 1). Octant 1 provides the greatest degree of situational control because Leader-Member Relations, Task Structure, and Position Power are highest, conversely. Octant 8 provides the lowest degree of situational control because Leader-Member Relations, Task
Structure, and Position Power are lowest.

When the two variables of leadership interact (LPC and Situational Control), Fiedler contends that the High LPC leader is most effective in a moderate control situation while the Low LPC leader is most effective in a low or high control situation. The Middle LPC leader has been hypothesized to be moderately effective across all situations. (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987). Furthermore, Fiedler proposes that a leader can improve effectiveness by matching situational control with LPC (Fiedler, 1976).

The following study was designed to test the Contingency Model in an international collegiate service organization, Circle K International. Circle K International was chosen for three reasons: 1) the membership is diverse and broad, 2) the membership is voluntary with leadership positions obtained through an elections process, and 3) the membership undergoes formal leadership training. Such membership characteristics are unique in leadership research and can offer several implications for the Contingency Model. Strube and Garcia, in their 1981 Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Contingency Model, cite several implications regarding the usefulness of research on training groups. This study will also address criticisms regarding the model, as well as, directions for future leadership research. The subjects or leaders analyzed in this study held the position of District Governor for the year 1989-90. A brief description of the organization and its structure is presented here.

II. Circle K International

Circle K International (CKI) is an international collegiate service organization sponsored by Kiwanis International, an adult business and professional organization which provides service to the local community. CKI’s main focuses are serving the campus and community, developing leadership, and providing a bond of fellowship for college students. CKI’s membership consists of 600 clubs throughout the United States, Canada, and six other foreign countries.

At the basic level of CKI’s organizational structure is the club which is located on college campuses. Clubs constitute Divisions and divisions constitute Districts. The 30
districts generally comprise one state, but many comprise two or more. Districts are governed by district boards which include a Governor, Secretary, Treasurer, (sometimes this position is combined—Secretary/Treasurer), Bulletin Editor, Lieutenant Governors, who preside over divisions, and the District Administrator, who is the Kiwanis District representative and provides board counseling. The district officers serve for one year and are elected at annual District Conventions. The Governor is considered the chairperson of the district board and is the district’s official representative. The highest level of CKI’s structure is the International Board of Trustees which consists of 11 members and is elected at the annual International Convention (For more information on Circle K International, consult the Circle K International Member Handbook—Appendix 1—or contact the Circle K International Office at the following address: 3636 Woodview Trace, Indianapolis, Indiana, 46268. 1-800-879-4769).

III. Method

Subjects

30 Governors and Secretaries (Secretaries/Treasurers), and 53 Lieutenant Governors were sent (via first class mail) leadership questionnaires. Only 43.3% or 36 participants responded. Those responding included: 13 Governors, 10 Secretaries (Secretary/Treasurers), and 23 Lieutenant Governors. Complete data was available for only 10 Governors, the primary subjects or leaders.

Tests and Measures

The 30 Governors received six questionnaires: (a) a Demographic Information Form, (b) Fiedler’s LPC Scale, (c) Fiedler’s Situational Control Scales: Leader-Member Relations, Task Structure, and Position Power with slight modifications in word choice to be more suited to participants, and (d) a Performance Questionnaire.

The 30 Secretaries and 52 Lieutenant Governors or subordinates received two questionnaires: (a) a Demographic Information Form, and (b) the Leader-Member Relations scale. Both forms were slightly altered in word choice for purposes of suitability to the participants. The Lieutenant Governors also received the Position Power scale (See
Appendix 2 for Measures Utilized).

**Procedure**

In calculating Governor or leader effectiveness, the Governors were first divided into three sections: Low, Moderate, or High based upon their Situational Control scores. Low Situational Control Scores ranged from 38 to 40 with an N of 3; Moderate Situational Control Scores ranged from 43 to 47 with an N of 4; and High Situational Control Scores ranged from 49 to 62 with an N of 3 (See Figure 2).*

For each of the three Situational Control Sections, each Governor’s LPC score was correlated with a mean measure of satisfaction of his/her subordinates (Subordinates=Secretary, Secretary/Treasurers and Lieutenant Governors). Subordinate satisfaction was measured through the Demographic Information Form Questionnaire.

**IV. Results**

Pearson $r$ correlations were computed for each of the three areas of Situational Control. Only the Low Situational Control area corresponded with Fiedler’s Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. For the Low Situational Control area, a negative correlation of -0.912 was obtained. For the Moderate Situational Control area, a negative correlation was also obtained: -0.76. Finally, for the High Situational Control area, no relationship was obtained: .005. Although none of the correlations were significant at the .05 or .01 levels (primarily due to an insufficient database), the results do partially correspond with Fiedler’s overall theory. Like the Contingency Model, Low LPC leaders are suggested (due to strong correlation measures) to be most effective in low control situations, however, High LPC leaders show no effectiveness while Low LPC leaders are suggested to be most effective in moderate control situations. Middle LPC leaders may arbitrarily be classified as moderately effective across all situations (See Figures 3, 4, and 5).

*Due to the low database, the three sections of Situational Control presented here are not
representative of most studies. The three sections do, however, indicate an interesting characteristic of Circle K International. It is quite likely that Low Control Situations (as broad as Fiedler indicates) do not exist in this particular organization. Fiedler (1976) has presented the following generalized scale for Situational Control: High Control=51-70, Moderate Control=31-50, and Low Control =10-30.

V. Discussion

The preceding study tested Fiedler’s Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness in an international collegiate service organization. Although the small sample precluded obtaining the customary level of statistical significance, the results obtained correspond partially with Fiedler’s theory. As the Contingency Model predicts, task-oriented leaders were found to be most effective in low control situations. However, task-oriented leaders were also found to be most effective in moderate--not high--control situations, whereas, there was no relationship at all between LPC score and leader effectiveness in high control situations. Since Fiedler has yet to establish empirical criteria regarding Socio-independent leaders, they were arbitrarily classified as moderately effective across all situations.

Results of this study, as well as, a review of current leadership research, reveals several shortcomings of the Contingency Model. Schriesheim and Kerr, in their treatise: Theories and Measures of Leadership: A Critical Appraisal of Current and Future Directions (1977), state some of the following: (a) incompleteness regarding the situational control variable, (b) lack of statistical significance across studies, (c) arbitrary weighting of the situational control scale, (d) lack of emphasis on subordinate satisfaction and influence, and (e) lack of research regarding the Middle LPC leader.

a) Incompleteness regarding situational control

As stated, the Contingency Model separates situational control into three areas: LMR, TS, and PP. Although these variables have shown strong predictability of
leadership effectiveness when matched with LPC, it is wise to assume that other variables: stress, leader intelligence and experience, and culture may also have significant impact (Schreisheim & Kerr, 1977). Fiedler has admitted to the generality of situational control and has cited studies in which situational control was measured through digraph theory or zones (as opposed to octants) to measure stress, religion, and cultural heterogeneity effects on the leader. However, Fiedler has yet to incorporate these designs into his theory and maintains that the present generality regarding situational control is best suited for the Contingency Model (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987).

b) Lack of statistical significance

Schriesheim and Kerr (1977) cite eight studies in which the Contingency Model was supported, but not statistically significant. This study is no exception. Only one experimental control group, the Low Situational Control group, came even moderately close to the .05 significance level: -.912 as compared to .997. Fiedler contends that although many studies are not statistically significant, they do consistently produce high correlations between LPC and Situational Control. In Strube and Garcia’s (1981) meta-analytic investigation, they found overwhelming support for the statistical validity of the Contingency Model. Seven of the eight situational control octants produced results consistent with the contingency model’s predictions. Despite this support, Strube and Garcia (1981) call for a greater variety of research samples and suggest “…that new research be directed toward a better understanding of situational control as well as of leader and member dynamics through the study of training and co-acting groups.”

c) Arbitrary weighting of the situational control scale

Fiedler’s weighting of the situational control scale consists of a 4:2:1 ratio: Leader-Member Relations: Task Structure: Position Power. Fiedler states in New Approaches to Effective Leadership: Cognitive Resources and Organizational Performance (1987): “... this weighting scheme [4:2:1 ratio] was proposed before a sufficient number of groups were available to base the weights on empirical evidence. It was, therefore, a considerable surprise that a number of studies have found these weights to be reasonably close to the mark.” With no initial empirical basis for this ratio (!), Fiedler has indeed been fortunate that subsequent results have supported the model’s predictions.
Schriesheim and Kerr (1977) indicate a degree of rigidity within the situational control scale as well. The Contingency Model assumes that the higher the variables of situational control, the more favorable the situation. Another contingency model, Path Goal Theory, argues that in certain situations, high task structure can hinder leader effectiveness because it restricts leader influence.

d) Lack of emphasis on subordinate satisfaction and influence

An area of neglect regards subordinate satisfaction and influence. Fiedler does acknowledge some importance of subordinates with the LMR scale, but this scale fails to address subordinate influence on future leader behavior, and the degree to which subordinates are satisfied. Studies (Katz & Farris, 1976; Muller, 1970) have hypothesized that “...subordinate task performance can significantly affect leader LPC, and ...LPC is also influenced by leader-member relations” (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977). An actual connection between LPC and subordinate influence remains to be seen and should be a focal point of future research.

e) Lack of research regarding the Middle LPC leader

Finally, Fiedler also neglects the Middle LPC leader. Fiedler has arbitrarily generalized Middle LPCs to be moderately effective in all situations. Kennedy, in his 1982 study of Middle LPC leaders, predicted that Middle LPC leaders would be more effective than High or Low LPC leaders and more stable across control situations. Kennedy’s findings supported his predictions. In five of the eight situational control octants, Middle LPC leaders rated higher in performance than Low or High LPC’s and were found to perform consistently higher across all control situations. As a result of his findings, Kennedy calls for further research on the Middle LPC leader and characterizes the leader as: “...able to perform the appropriate leadership behaviors without becoming overly concerned with the manner in which others perceive him.”

Having reviewed some of the shortcomings of the Contingency Model, future directions for leadership theory will be discussed. Hollander and Offermann in Power and Leadership in Organizations: Relationships in Transition (1990) offer a review of current leadership theories and directions for future research. These include: a) greater involvement of followers, b) broader classifications of leaders, and c) greater longitudinal
As a result of Japanese management influences, as well as, developments in organizational psychology, the influence and importance of the follower is gaining greater significance. Hollander and Offermann define leadership as: "...a system of relationships with constraints as well as opportunities" and list "...expectations and commitments of followers" as a primary constraint. In addition, Hollander and Offermann stress viewing the follower as an active--not passive--participant and as an individual that can strongly influence a leader's performance.

The scope of leadership theory must be broadened. At present, leadership theories do not classify types of leaders, i.e. supervisors, vs. middle managers, vs. executives. Each type of leader has different demands and responsibilities, as well as, different needs. In order for these leaders to be most effective, their differences deserve individual attention and consideration. In addition to broadening leadership theory, leadership research must become longitudinal in scope. Most theories study leadership at one given point in time and fail to chart the progress and changes of leadership. Studying leadership longitudinally may uncover definitive patterns of leadership style or behavior and offer a greater understanding of leadership as a whole (Hollander & Offermann, 1990).

The Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness has withstood many years of intense criticism. Despite this criticism, it has been statistically supported, as well as, successfully replicated across a wide variety of studies. As a result of the study conducted here, the Contingency Model's shortcomings need to be further addressed, and the Contingency Model's predictions must be further tested as leadership theory continues to change and grow.
Figure 1: The Contingency Model Situational Control Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMR</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
High control Moderate Control Low Control

Figure 2: Low, Moderate, and High Situational Control Scores for 10 District Governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=3 N=4 N=3
Figure 3: Contingency Model
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Figure 4: Correlations of LPC & Subordinate Satisfaction
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Figure 5: Pearson r Correlations for 10 Governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Control Group</th>
<th>Gov. LPC</th>
<th>Dist. Off. Satisfaction</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>r value</th>
<th>r score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Control N=3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Control N=4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Control N=3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendixes

Appendix 1: *Circle K International Member Handbook*

Appendix 2: Measures Utilized

**Governors**
- Consent Forms
- Demographic Information Form (Copy 1)
- LPC Scale (Questionnaire #1)
- Leader-Member Relations Scale (Questionnaire #2, Copy 1)
- Task-Structure Scale (Questionnaire #3)
- Position Power Scale (Questionnaire #4)
- Governor Effectiveness Scale (Questionnaire #5, Copy 1)

**International Trustees’**
- Consent Forms
- Demographic Information Form (Copy 2)
- Leader-Member Relations Scale (Copy 2)
- Task-Structure Scale
- Position Power Scale
- Governor Effectiveness Scale (Copy 5)

**District Officers’ (Secretaries or Secretary/Treasurers, Lieutenant Governors)**
- Consent Forms
- Demographic Information Form (Copy 3)
- Leader-Member Relations Scale (Copy 3)
- Position Power Scale
Dear Participant:

As a member of Circle K International, you have been chosen to participate in a research study conducted by International Trustee Angela Salm. This research study is independent of Circle K International and is being conducted by Trustee Angela Salm to fulfill her requirements for graduation from Ball State University. Approval has been granted for this study by Circle K Administrator Gayle Beyers and International President Wendy Schrick. A comprehensive report including the final results will be presented to the International Office for its own reference and use. The study is entitled: "A Leadership Analysis of the 1989-90 Class of Governors in Circle K International." This study will require the completion of a series of questionnaires which will concern the role of your 1989-90 district governor. It will take you approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

You will not write your name on any of the questionnaires and all data will be kept strictly confidential.

There are no risks or ill effects from participating in this study, however, there are several benefits to be expected from your participation. You will learn about psychological research and will help Circle K International in evaluating its leadership training.

You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time without prejudice from the investigator, Angela Salm.

Please feel free to ask any questions before signing the consent form and beginning the study, and at any time during the study. You may reach the Investigator at the following number: (317) 286-4590. DO NOT call the International Office, Administrator Gayle Beyers or President Wendy Schrick. This study is the complete and total responsibility of Trustee Angela Salm and does not necessarily represent the views of the aforementioned individuals. After completing the series of questionnaires, please return the questionnaires and Informed Consent Statement with the envelopes provided. Your speedy response will be much appreciated.

Informed Consent Statement

I, ____________________________, agree to participate in this psychological profile study entitled, "A Leadership Analysis of the 1989-90 Class of Governors in Circle K International." I have had the study clearly explained to me and any questions I have had were answered to my satisfaction. I have read this description of the study and give my consent to participate. I understand that a consent form has been provided to me for future reference.

____________________________
Participant's Signature

Thank you for your cooperation in this project!
Informed Consent Statement

I, ________________________________, agree to participate in this psychological profile study entitled, "A Leadership Analysis of the 1989-90 Class of Governors in Circle K International." I have had the study clearly explained to me and any questions I have had were answered to my satisfaction. I have read the description of the study and give my consent to participate. I understand that a consent form has been provided to me for future reference.

__________________________________________
Participant's Signature

Please return this copy of the consent form with your questionnaires. Thank you.
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please provide the following information:

1) Male __ _ Female __ 

2) Current G.P.A. (include scale)________________

3) Did you work with a full district board? Yes____ No____

4) Please indicate the number of district officers you worked with during your term________

5) How many years have you been a member of Circle K?________

6) Were you a member of Key Club? Yes____ No____

7) If you answered yes to #6, how many years were you a member of Key Club?________

Please circle the appropriate answer:

8) How supportive was your District Administrator during your term as Governor?

   Very supportive  Quite supportive  Somewhat supportive  Unsupportive  Very unsupportive

9) How supportive was your District Kiwanis?

   Very supportive  Quite supportive  Somewhat supportive  Unsupportive  Very unsupportive

10) How supportive was your immediate family?

   Very supportive  Quite supportive  Somewhat supportive  Unsupportive  Very unsupportive

11) How supportive was your Circle K family (the International Board and Office, your fellow Governors, your counseling International Trustee)?

   Very supportive  Quite supportive  Somewhat supportive  Unsupportive  Very unsupportive

12) How supportive were your fellow district board members?

   Very supportive  Quite supportive  Somewhat supportive  Unsupportive  Very unsupportive

13) How satisfied are you with the support you received?

   Very satisfied  Quite satisfied  Somewhat satisfied  Unsatisfied  Very unsatisfied
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please provide the following information:

1) Male____ Female____
2) How many years have you been a member of Circle K?____
3) Were you a member of Key Club? Yes___ No___
4) If you answered yes to #3, how many years were you a member of Key Club?____

Please list your counseled districts in the space provided:

1)_________________________
2)_________________________
3)_________________________

The following questions concern the degree of support your 1989-90 district boards received from various sources. Please circle the correct response for each district in each question. Then place the number corresponding to that district in the space below. For example:

How supportive was the District Key Club Governor to the Circle K district board?

Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

Let's say you listed the Michigan District as #1, the Utah-Idaho District as #2, and the Kansas District as #3. You would circle the appropriate response for the Michigan District and place a 1 in the blank provided:

If you feel two or more of your district's received the same degree of support, you would answer like this:

Very supportive

2, 3

5) How supportive was the District Administrator to the 1989-90 District Board?

Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

6) How supportive was the District Kiwanis?

Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

7) How supportive was the Circle K family (the International Board and Office, fellow Governors and other district officers, the counseling International Trustee)?

Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

8) How satisfied are you with the support that was received?

Very satisfied   Quite satisfied   Somewhat satisfied   Unsatisfied   Very unsatisfied
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please provide the following information:

1) Male _____ Female _____

2) How many years have you been a member of Circle K? ________

3) Were you a member of Key Club? Yes _____ No _____

4) If you answered yes to #3, how many years were you a member of Key Club? ________

Please circle the appropriate answer:

5) How supportive was your District Administrator to the district board during your term of office?
   Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

6) How supportive was your District Kiwanis?
   Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

7) How supportive was your Circle K family (the International Board and Office, your fellow district officers, your counseling International Trustee)?
   Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

8) How supportive was your District Governor?
   Very supportive   Quite supportive   Somewhat supportive   Unsupportive   Very unsupportive

9) How satisfied are you with the support you received?
   Very satisfied   Quite satisfied   Somewhat satisfied   Unsatisfied   Very unsatisfied
QUESTIONNAIRE #1

Throughout your life you have worked in many groups with a wide variety of different people--on your job, in social clubs, in church organizations, in volunteer groups, on athletic teams, and many others. You probably found working with most of your coworkers quite easy, but working with others may have been very difficult or all but impossible.

Now, think of all the people with whom you have ever worked. Next, think of the one person in your life with whom you could work least well. This individual may or may not be the person you also disliked most. It must be the one person with whom you had the most difficulty getting a job done, the one single individual with whom you would least want to work. This person is called your "Least Preferred Coworker" (LPC).

On the scale below, describe this person by placing an "X" in the appropriate space. The scale consists of pairs of words which are opposite in meaning, such as Very Neat and Very Untidy. Between each pair of words are eight spaces which form the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Neat</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very Untidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Untidy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Think of those eight spaces as steps which range from one extreme to the other. Thus, if you ordinarily think that this least preferred coworker is quite neat you would write an "X" in the space marked 7, like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Neat</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very Untidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Untidy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, if you think of this person as being only slightly neat, you would put your "X" in space 5. If you think of this person as very untidy (not neat), you would put your "X" in space 1.

Sometimes the scale will run in the other direction, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frustrating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you mark your "X," look at the words at both ends of the line. There are no right or wrong answers. Work rapidly; your first answer is likely to be the best. Do not omit any items, and mark each item only once. Think of a real person in your experience, not an imaginary character. Remember, it is not necessarily the person whom you liked least, but the person with whom it is (or was) most difficult to work. Ignore the scoring column on the right margin of the page for now.

Now use the scale to describe the person with whom you can work least well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pleasant</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unpleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unfriendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rejecting</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Relaxed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cold</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Warm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrelsome</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backbiting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insincere</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire #2

**Circle the number which best represents your response to each item.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My district officers have trouble getting along with each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My district officers are reliable and trustworthy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There seems to be a friendly atmosphere among my district officers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My district officers always cooperate with me in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is friction between my district officers and myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My district officers give me a good deal of help and support in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My district officers work well together in getting the job done.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have good relations with my district officers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score**
### QUESTIONNAIRE #2

Circle the number which best represents your response to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The district board has trouble getting along with each other.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The district board is reliable and trustworthy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There seems to be a friendly atmosphere among the district board.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The governor always cooperates with the district officers in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is friction between the district officers and governor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The governor gives the district officers a good deal of help and support in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The district board officers work well together in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The district officers have a good relationship with the governor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score**


**QUESTIONNAIRE #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle the number which best represents your response to each item.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The district board has trouble getting along with each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The district board is reliable and trustworthy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There seems to be a friendly atmosphere among the district board.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The governor always cooperates with the district officers in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is friction between the district officers and governor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The governor gives the district officers a good deal of help and support in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The district board officers work well together in getting the job done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The district officers have a good relationship with the governor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score**
### QUESTIONNAIRE #3

Circle the number in the appropriate column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle the number in the appropriate column</th>
<th>Usually True</th>
<th>Sometimes True</th>
<th>Seldom True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Is the role of Governor clearly stated or known?**

1. Is there a blueprint, model or detailed description available of the Governor's role?  
   - 2
2. Is there a person available to advise and give a description of the role or how the duties should be done?  
   - 2

**Is there only one way to fulfill the responsibilities of Governor?**

3. Is there a step-by-step procedure, or a standard operating procedure which indicates how these responsibilities should be fulfilled?  
   - 2
4. Is there a specific way to subdivide the duties of Governor into separate parts or steps?  
   - 2
5. Are there some ways which are clearly recognized as better than others for performing your duties as Governor?  
   - 2

**Is there only one correct way?**

6. Is it obvious when the responsibilities of Governor are complete?  
   - 2
7. Is there a book, manual, or job description which indicates the best way to fulfill the Governor's responsibilities?  
   - 2

**Is it easy to check whether your responsibilities were fulfilled?**

8. Is there a generally agreed upon understanding about the standards the Governor's role has to meet to be considered acceptable?  
   - 2
9. Is the evaluation of the role of Governor generally made on some quantitative basis?  
   - 2
10. Can the Governor and district board find out how well the governor performs in enough time to improve future performance?  
    - 2
**QUESTIONNAIRE #4**

Circle the number which best represents your answer.

1. Can the Governor directly or by recommendation administer rewards and punishments to district officers?
   - 2: Can act directly or can recommend with high effectiveness
   - 1: Can recommend but with mixed results
   - 0: No

2. Can the Governor directly or by recommendation affect the promotion, demotion, or removal of a district officer?
   - 2: Can act directly or can recommend with high effectiveness
   - 1: Can recommend but with mixed results
   - 0: No

3. Does the Governor have the knowledge necessary to assign tasks to district officers and instruct them in task completion?
   - 2: Yes
   - 1: Sometimes or in some aspects
   - 0: No

4. Is it the Governor's job to evaluate the performance of district officers?
   - 2: Yes
   - 1: Sometimes or in some aspects
   - 0: No

Total
QUESTIONNAIRE #5

1) Please check the following attended:
   a) 1989 District Convention____
   b) 1990 District Convention____
   c) 1989 International Convention____
   d) 1989 or 1990 Kiwanis District Convention____
   e) 1989 or 1990 Key Club District Convention____
   f) Scheduled board meetings (circle one): 1-2 3-4 5+

   Please circle the appropriate answer:

2) How many new clubs were built during your term as governor?:
   0 1-2 3-4 5+

3) How many clubs moved from either active-pending, delinquent, or non-meeting status to active status?
   0 1-2 3-4 5+

4) Leadership training for members was provided through:
   Workshops at conferences  Club and district officer training  District Leadership Committee

5) Service project opportunities were provided through:
   District Governor's Project  District Service Committee  District Theme and Emphasis Committee

6) Has membership in the district reached the 1989 year-end total?
   Yes  No

7) If you answered yes to #6, how many new members does the district have?:
   0 1-25 25-50 50-100 100+

8) How many active district committees are there?
   0 1-3 4-6 7+

9) Please list the number of clubs in your district:___________

10) What percentage of the clubs in your district did you visit?
    0 10 25 50 75 100

11) How many monthly reports have you submitted?
    1-3 4-6 7-9 All

12) How often were you in contact with your district officers?
    Every 3 months  Once a month  Bi-weekly  Every week  2-3 times a week
13) How often were you in contact with your International Trustee?
   Every 3 months  Once a month  Bi-weekly  Weekly  2-3 times a week

14) What percentage of district officers submitted timely monthly reports?
   0  10  25  50  75  100

15) Did you pass on a set of files to your successor?
   Yes  No

16) Will you or have you attended the district officer training conference for your successor?
   Yes  No

17) How many newsletters did you publish?
   0  1-2  3-4  5+

18) Were there any adverse situations or conditions that did not allow you to be as effective a Governor as you would have liked? (For example, You did not have a full board, You received a new administrator, etc.)

19) In what ways could Circle K International have made you a better governor?

*If you have any additional comments or explanations, please feel free to attach an extra sheet. The information you provide would be very valuable and held in strict confidence.
QUESTIONNAIRE #5

District of: ____________________________

1) Please check the following that the governor attended:
   a) 1989 District Convention ___
   b) 1990 District Convention ___
   c) 1989 International Convention ___
   d) 1989 or 1990 Kiwanis District Convention ___
   e) 1989 or 1990 Key Club District Convention ___
   f) Scheduled board meetings (circle one): 1-2 3-4 5+

Please circle the appropriate answer:

2) How many new clubs were built during the governor's term?:
   0 1-2 3-4 5+

3) How many clubs moved from either active-pending, delinquent, or non-meeting status to active status?
   0 1-2 3-4 5+

4) Leadership training for members was provided through:
   Workshops at conferences Club and district officer training District Leadership Committee

5) Service project opportunities were provided through:
   District Governor's Project District Service Committee District Theme and Emphasis Committee

6) Has membership in the district reached the 1989 year-end total?
   Yes No

7) If you answered yes to #6, how many new members does the district have?:
   0 1-25 25-50 50-100 100+

8) How many active district committees are there?
   0 1-3 4-6 7+

9) Please list the number of clubs in the district:

10) What percentage of the clubs in the district did the governor visit?
    0 10 25 50 75 100

11) How many monthly reports did the governor submit?
    1-3 4-6 7-9 All

12) How often did the governor contact his/her district officers?
    Every 3 months Once a month Bi-weekly Every week 2-3 times a week
13) How often was the governor in contact with you?
   Every 3 months  Once a month  Bi-weekly  Weekly  2-3 times a week

14) What percentage of district officers submitted timely monthly reports?
   0  10  25  50  75  100

15) Did the governor pass on a set of files to his/her successor?
   Yes  No

16) Will the governor, or has the governor, attended the district officer training conference for his/her successor?
   Yes  No

17) How many newsletters did the governor publish?
   0  1-2  3-4  5+

18) Were there any adverse situations or conditions that did not allow the Governor to be as effective as s/he would have liked? (For example, The governor did not have a full board, The governor received a new administrator, etc.)

19) In what ways can Circle K International assist governors in being more effective?

*If you have any additional comments or explanations, please feel free to attach an extra sheet. The information you provide would be very valuable and held in strict confidence.
ANALYZING AND BUILDING EFFECTIVENESS IN CKI GOVERNORS: AN INSIDE PERSPECTIVE

Angela M. Salm, 1989-90 Circle K International Trustee and Dr. David V. Perkins, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Ball State University

I. Premise

Analyzing and Building Effectiveness in CKI Governors: An Inside Perspective discusses research obtained from A Leadership Analysis of the 1989-90 Class of Governors in Circle K International, a psychological study testing The Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness by Fred E. Fiedler. In regards to Circle K International, this report aims to provide an analysis of the 1989-90 District Governor's effectiveness and ways in which this effectiveness may be improved.

II. Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness

In order to clearly understand the study under discussion, an explanation of the Contingency Model is necessary and will be provided here.

Despite intense controversy, Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness has persisted in becoming one of the most widely known leadership theories. Since its conception in 1964, the Contingency Model has been the focus of over 400 published works and has been utilized by many business and professional organizations in understanding and producing effective leaders (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987).

The Contingency Model addresses leadership as an interaction between leader personality and control of a situation. Leader personality and situational control are then commonly correlated with some measure of subordinate satisfaction or productivity that together determine leader effectiveness. Leader personality is measured through the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale or LPC. The Least Preferred Co-worker is defined as: "...the one person with whom you had the most difficulty getting a job done, the one single individual with whom you would least want to
work.” This person is not necessarily the one you disliked most, but the one you least want to work with. The LPC Scale contains 18 adjective pairs placed in a bipolar fashion with eight degrees between each pair (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987):

```
Kind: Kind Kind Kind Kind Kind Kind Kind Unkind
  8  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
```

The LPC Scale identifies primarily two types of leaders: relationship-oriented (High LPC) and task-oriented (Low LPC). A relationship-oriented leader is more concerned with successful subordinate interpersonal relations, whereas, a task-oriented leader is more concerned with successful task completion (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987). A Middle LPC leader has also been identified by Fiedler. This leader is considered socio-independent and is described as flexible and generally unaffected by either successful subordinate relations or task completion (Kennedy, 1982). At the present time, further research needs to be conducted on the Middle LPC leader in order to determine his/her exact areas of effectiveness.

The second component of the Contingency Model is Situational Control. Situational Control refers to “...the extent to which leaders can determine what their group is going to do, and what the outcomes of their actions and decisions are going to be” (Fiedler, 1976). Situational Control can be divided into three areas: Leader-Member Relations (LMR), Task Structure (TS), and Position Power (PP). LMR refers to the “...amount of loyalty, dependability, and support you, as the leader, get from those with whom you work.” LMR is measured through an eight-item questionnaire. TS refers to “...the structure of the task. How clearly is it spelled out, are the goals known, is there a clear and accepted procedure for performing the job?” TS is measured through a ten-item questionnaire. Finally, PP refers to “...the power which the organization vests in your leadership position for the purpose of directing subordinates.” The PP questionnaire contains five items. The higher the three areas of situational control, the greater the opportunity for effective leadership (Fiedler, 1976).

When the two components of leadership interact (LPC and Situational Control), the High LPC leader is predicted to be most effective in situations involving moderate control, whereas, the Low LPC leader is predicted to be most effective in situations involving high or low control.
Fiedler hypothesizes that a leader can improve effectiveness by matching situational control with LPC (Fiedler, 1976).

III. A Leadership Analysis of the 1989-90 Class of Governors in Circle K International

Subjects

30 Governors, Secretaries (Secretary/Treasurers), 53 Lieutenant Governors, and 9 International Board Members were sent (via first class mail) leadership questionnaires. Only 44.5% or 41 participants responded. Those responding included: 13 Governors, 10 Secretaries (Secretary/Treasurers), 23 Lieutenant Governors, and 5 Trustees.

Tests and Measures

The 30 Governors (leaders) received six questionnaires: (a) Demographic Information Form, (b) Fiedler's LPC Scale, (c) Fiedler's Situational Control Scales: Leader-Member Relations, Task Structure, and Position Power with slight alterations in word choice to be more suited to participants, and (d) a Performance Questionnaire.

The 30 Secretaries and 52 Lieutenant Governors (subordinates) received two questionnaires: (a) Demographic Information Form, and (b) the Leader-Member Relations Scale. Both forms were slightly altered in word choice for purposes of suitability to the participants. The Lieutenant Governors also received the Position Power Scale.

The 9 International Board Members received five questionnaires: (a) Demographic Information Form, (b) Fiedler's Situational Control Scales, and (c) a Performance Questionnaire, slightly altered in word choice from the Governors.

The Demographic Information Form and Performance Questionnaire were constructed by the authors. The Demographic Information Form contains two parts. Part one focuses on information regarding the participant: gender, years in Circle K International, years in the K-Family, and for the Governors only, G.P.A. Part two contains 5 questions regarding support in these areas: District Administrator, District Kiwanis, Circle K Family (International Board and Office, fellow district officers, counseling International Trustee), District Board (as in the Governor's case) or District Governor (as in the District Board Members' case), and a satisfaction
rating of the support received. The Governors had an additional question: “How supportive was your immediate family?” The Performance Questionnaire contained 17 questions that were developed from the District Governor’s Service Agreement found in the District Officers’ Resource Manual (DORM). This questionnaire also contained 3 short answer questions which provided participants with the opportunity to voice their opinions, or to further clarify their answers (See Appendix 1 for Measures Utilized).

Results*

The results obtained offered partial support for Fiedler’s Contingency Model. In the Low Situational Control area, task-oriented (Low LPC) leaders were found to be most effective. However, task-oriented leaders were also found to be most effective in moderate—not high—control situations, whereas relationship-oriented (High LPC) leaders were found to be not effective overall. None of the results obtained were statistically significant, due primarily to the low number of respondents. Middle LPC leaders can arbitrarily be classified as moderately effective across all situations (See Figure 1). According to this study’s analysis of the 10 Governors, 2 are effective, 3 are moderately effective, and 5 are not effective. Effective Governors are classified as those who were able to maintain district officer satisfaction by adapting their control of a situation to their leadership style.

*Trustee questionnaires were not utilized in figuring Governor effectiveness.

IV. Discussion

Limitations of the study

The results obtained in this study should be taken with some skepticism. For one, the pool of subjects for this study was extremely low. Although 10 District Governors (30%) might constitute an adequate sample, not enough information was received from district board officers (subordinates) to objectively rate an individual Governor’s performance. Secondly, there is a high degree of internal inconsistency across districts regarding the Governor’s role. Each district varies in territory, membership, Kiwanis support, district board size, etc. These factors could affect Governor performance to a high degree. Finally, and most importantly, these results are not statistically significant and cannot be interpreted with much confidence. However, suggestions for improving Governor effectiveness will be made as if the results were significant.
Governor responses of support

As stated above (III.-Tests and Measures), Governor's were asked to rate 6 support areas and to give a satisfaction rating. 14 Governors responded to each question in one of six ways: “Very supportive or satisfied (VS),” “Quite supportive (QS),” “Somewhat supportive (SS),” “Unsupportive (US),” and “Very unsupportive. (VUS)” The results received are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VS</th>
<th>QS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>VUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen from this chart, Governors on the whole were overwhelmingly very to quite satisfied with the support they received from Circle K International. Equally encouraging are the support ratings for the District Administrator and District Kiwanis. A bit discouraging are those ratings for fellow board members: only “Somewhat Supportive.” Overall, Circle K International seems to provide good support for its Governors.

Governor responses for improvement

On the Performance Questionnaire, Governors were given the opportunity to express ways in which Circle K International could have made them a better Governor. 8 of the 14 Governors that responded listed the following: a) stricter adherence to deadlines (regarding International Mailings, primarily), b) more contact with district officers, c) provide more practical information for club officers, d) more interaction with other governors, d) better counseling, e) re-direct the scope of the International Board--concentrate on troubleshooting for districts, f) provide information geared toward the individual member regarding service, leadership development, and professional living, g) better description of duties, h) specialize RTC’s in regards to experienced vs. inexperienced leaders, and i) emphasize continual goal-setting.

In addition, Governors were asked to list those situations or conditions that did not allow them to be as effective as they would have liked. These responses included: a) lack of a full district board or ineffective, non-productive board (This was, by far, the most common listed
situation/condition.), b) lack of finances, c) new administrators or conflicts with the administrator and/or District Kiwanis.

**Recommendations for future leadership effectiveness**

This discussion, as well as this study, would not be complete without recommendations for improving Governor effectiveness in Circle K International.

According to Fiedler, leaders (Governors) may become more effective by matching their situational control with their LPC score. In review, situational control is composed of LMR (Leader-Member Relations), TS (Task Structure), and PP (Position Power). By modifying one, two or even all three of these areas, a leader is hypothesized to become more effective. In dealing with LMR, the most important area, leaders need to establish "...a climate of goodwill and trust with their subordinates [district board officers] and develop close and lasting friendships with them.” The leader needs to be concerned with subordinates’ problems, to provide timely and accurate information regarding subordinate responsibilities, and to be socially accessible as well. This can be done through social functions, “gripe sessions,” and personal messages of encouragement or praise (Fiedler, 1976). To modify task structure, a leader can increase clarity of the task for more structure and decrease clarity (allow for vagueness, individual interpretation) for less structure. For example, a leader can institute more structure by:

(a) “...preparing a detailed plan for performing the job, and getting additional instruction and expert guidance...”

(b) “breaking the job down into smaller subtasks which can be more highly structured...”

(c) “obtain further training,” or “develop procedures, guidelines, diagrams, or outlines complete with examples of previous jobs where possible” (Fiedler, 1976).

Finally, PP can be modified through the degree in which a leader exercises power. To increase PP, a leader can:

(a) control the channels of communication--all information is through the leader

(b) become as knowledgeable as possible about the position--then, others will not be relied upon

To decrease PP, a leader can:

(a) become more social and allow for more democratic decision-making
(b) increase subordinate autonomy and allow for open communication channels (Fiedler, 1976)

Circle K Governors need to be aware of leadership style and how it affects performance or effectiveness in their office. This awareness may bring about a more functional and effective district board, as well as, provide some “self-help” leadership training for Governors. A workshop or special session regarding leadership at the Regional Training Conference (RTC) or International Leadership Training Conference (ILTC) is one option. Another option is the construction of a manual or a one to two page insert for the Governor’s DORM.

In addition to recommendations provided by the study, recommendations will also be made as a result of the primary author’s experience with the organization. District leadership is essential to CKI structure. It provides a unifying bond for clubs and serves as a stronghold of support. As the clubs draw support from the district, the district must draw support from the clubs. Clubs serve as the source of district leadership. Therefore, effective club leaders are essential. Leadership should be instilled in each member of Circle K International as much as possible. Clubs need to educate and train members with the assistance of campus and Kiwanis leaders. This view is also supported by the Johnny Roberts Report (1985). In this report, Roberts and his committee recommend instituting a Leadership Development Program, a Kiwanis District Circle K Committee, and utilizing conferences and district board members for further training.

V. Concluding Remarks

As a whole, Circle K International can be satisfied with the support and guidance it gives to the District Governors. However, serious concern needs to be focused on district and club leadership structures. As shown from the results reported here, district boards are struggling from a lack of leaders, in addition to, a lack of effective leaders. In order to achieve more leaders on the district level, club level leadership—the source of district leadership—needs to be developed in a systematic, continuous process. To achieve more productive and effective district boards, leaders or Governors need to analyze their own leadership style and focus on changing their leadership
situation (primarily through Leader-Member Relations) to achieve greater effectiveness.

*I would personally like to thank my co-author, Dr. David V. Perkins for his time, patience, and support with my Honors Thesis Project, and Gayle L. Beyers, Circle K International Administrator, for all her assistance and friendship.*
Figure 1: Pearson $r$ Correlations for 10 Governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Control Group</th>
<th>Gov. LPC</th>
<th>Dist. Off. Satisfaction</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$r$ value</th>
<th>$r$ score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Control</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Control</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Control</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix

Appendix 1: Measures Utilized

Governors
Consent Forms
Demographic Information Form (Copy 1)
LPC Scale (Questionnaire #1)
Leader-Member Relations Scale (Questionnaire #2, Copy 1)
Task-Structure Scale (Questionnaire #3)
Position Power Scale (Questionnaire #4)
Governor Effectiveness Scale (Questionnaire #5, Copy 1)

International Trustees’
Consent Forms
Demographic Information Form (Copy 2)
Leader-Member Relations Scale (Copy 2)
Task-Structure Scale
Position Power Scale
Governor Effectiveness Scale (Copy 5)

District Officers’ (Secretaries or Secretary/Treasurers, Lieutenant Governors)
Consent Forms
Demographic Information Form (Copy 3)
Leader-Member Relations Scale (Copy 3)
Position Power Scale