SMALL GROUP SHARED LEADERSHIP: A CASE STUDY OF
THE P.E.I. LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

BEVERLEY J. HOWELL

© Copyright

A Thesis submitted as partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Master of Arts in Education
at Saint Mary's University

May 1978

ABSTRACT

This case study examines both theoretical and realistic models
for shared leadership in small group situations, and it focuses
specifically on the practices of a leadership institute in Prince
Edward Island, Canada. As well as assessing literature relevant to
the field, this study seeks to contribute useful resource material to
those who are exploring the viability of shared leadership in the
working world.

Through a review of leadership definitions, a multidimensional
view emerges from an emphasis on the interaction process among group
participants. This perspective includes task orientation and member
satisfaction, and places the responsibility for the leadership function
on all group members. The literature examined includes aspects of
McGregor's Theory Y, Third Force Psychology, theories developed from
Theory Y, and small group shared leadership. These theories suggest
that a general approach to effective leadership can only be determined
by the specific factors of an individual leader-group situation.
Moreover, a sharing approach is considered superior in all but team-
oriented task groups.

The present research was conducted as a case study of a small
group who were attempting to share leadership, who were genuinely moti-
vated and satisfied, and who displayed significant elements of McGregor's

Theory Y leadership. It is a static study, using unsystematic control.
Data from participant observation assisted in the design of a question-
naire, and individual taped interviews were used as a direct means of
research. The questions functioned as a starting point for discussion.
The findings are analyzed through condensed description as well as
tables.

The staff members have a common view of the function, goals,
objectives, roles, and philosophy of the Institute. Improvement of
their program, however, is not necessarily related to stated goals.
Leadership profiles present a diverse group of individuals who view
themselves positively and are aware of some of their limitations. Most
of these people are very satisfied with their work. The usual practice
of sharing leadership appeared to function well. All staff held the
conviction that their philosophy could be applied to other educational
institutions, but the implications of applying their philosophy were
vague. The staff agreed that the researcher's participation did not
influence research results, and both the interview and the researcher's
contributions to discussion were viewed positively.

The review of leadership literature combined with the research
on the Leadership Institute imply the following:

(1) Effective leadership can only be determined by the
factors involved in a particular situation.

(2) Further definition of the Institute's philosophy should take place, and the leadership problems related to this need further examination and resolution.

(3) The team should explore the reasons behind their perceptions of implications, and examine these with a view to the validity of their goals and objectives.

(4) Idealism about their capabilities was also noted.

The researcher has been unable to determine what extent the self-evaluation aspect of this research has been useful to the Institute. However, the researcher concludes that it is the review and resolution of problems contained here that could make a long term impact on both the programs and the staff of the Institute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Cont'd.)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are as many perspectives from which to study leadership as there are reasons for examining it. Despite extensive and disparate research in this field for several decades, researchers are still faced with the realization that local application is the ultimate test of theory.

The object of this study was to examine a practical leadership situation, to describe the various forms of leadership which affect it, and to evaluate it on its own consensual terms. Chapter I provides a brief description and history of the group studied, as well as a description of working guidelines for the Leadership Institute.

Chapter II examines literature relevant to leadership and small group processes in order to provide a framework for examining the practical findings. Chapter III informs the reader of the methodology followed in the course of the study. Research findings are presented factually in Chapter IV with minimal analysis. The chapter is comprised of an integration of various statements and responses, as well as a self-evaluation of the Leadership Institute by its staff, in discussions with the researcher. These interviews are considered by the researcher to be central to the purpose and design of this study.

The Leadership Institute

The Leadership Institute of Holland College, P. E. I. was established in the Fall of 1969 under the Provincial Department of Development. It is part of a 15-year jointly administered and funded federal-provincial program for social and economic advancement on P. E. I. Officially, the aim of the Development Plan is:

> (to) further the social, economic and institutional improvement of the Area, through the development of physical and human resources, social services, resource supporting and commercial services, and through the setting up of an effective intergovernmental structure for the co-ordinated implementation of the Plan (Canada Department of Regional Economic Expansion, 1970, p. 7).

Designed to assist implementation of the Plan, the Leadership Institute was seen as a means

> to achieve a new level and type of public involvement in the shaping of society in the Province. It is the people of the Province who will make the development goal a reality. Effective public participation and involvement arise from the quality of leadership in non-governmental organizations, aided by enlightened and broadened perspectives among the public at large. Accordingly, the projects under the program are designed to assist in the widening of perspectives and the development of leadership and organizational capacity in citizens' groups (Canada Department of Regional Economic Expansion, 1970, p. 74).

Originally set up with one instructor, the Leadership Institute increased staff to three by December, 1969. As stated in their Annual Report, 1970-71, (see Appendix A) the Leadership Institute continues to aim

> to develop and intensify leadership at all levels of
> society in P.E.I. through training in related skills of
> communications, leadership, group dynamics and group
> decision making. The Institute program also includes
> short courses on basic management and other training
> courses that may be requested by residents of the
> Island. The program is intended to serve present and
> future leaders of all community, farm and governmental
> organizations in the Province of P. E. I. Training
> is conducted in local communities or through residential
> facilities if requested (p. 1).

The program offered by the Leadership Institute is part-time,
adult education, and is based on direct requests for training. Sessions
vary in length from a half a day to a week, and are held during working
hours or in residence programs specifically designed to meet the needs
of participants. Seminars and short courses are also offered.
January, 1977, saw the beginning of an individualized Instructional
Methods Program available on a part-time basis. Aside from the latter
program, all participants are members of occupational or volunteer
groups. (See Appendix B for more detailed information presented in
Leadership Institute Annual Report, 1975-76).

Justification

Early in the researcher's investigation of the practical realm
of leadership it appeared to be essential, in terms of a worthwhile
contribution to the field, to choose a small but unique group in the
Atlantic educational community. The Leadership Institute was chosen
for its accessible location, its leadership development function, and
its shared leadership style. Observing and evaluating leadership

practice and group process allowed broad scope for research. In addition, there seemed to be a potential advantage for the Institute. Members, upon request, decided they could benefit from external analysis, and a study of their program might prove useful to other educators as well.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore a particular view of the leadership practices of the Leadership Institute. It seemed reasonable to assume that a small group, whose major stated objective and function is leadership development, would have a good understanding of leadership theory. Also, it appeared that they should perhaps stand out from other less informed groups as a possible alternative model of modern effective leadership practices.

The researcher observed and discussed many aspects of leadership practices and theory with the group. This was an attempt to gather and understand the stated and practiced leadership views of group members. It increased informal communication with team members and allowed for team involvement in a self-evaluation process. This process, central to the study, hopefully provided a learning process for the group itself.

Limitations

As in most lines of inquiry, the present study must be qualified by a series of limitations. Observation of the group, for example, was limited mainly to scheduled meetings. Although these were quite frequent and at times lengthy, an extensive amount of time was unavailable for the observation of day to day interaction.

Time was a general limitation. In addition to that noted above, the familiarization process was often rushed and sometimes cut short. This limitation affected the potential areas for individual discussion in self-evaluation. Had time allowed, the self-evaluation process might have been better informed, defined, and re-examined. Also, the group discussion following individual interviews was brief and could not be rescheduled. The only alternative was that concerns brought up in the interviews were discussed again by group members at a later date. It would be difficult to determine whether or not this has been satisfactory, but one can assume that the original focus of the individuals concerned has been altered. Unfortunately, this process cannot be reported in this study.

A further limitation which altered the original intent of the study was in the wording of and response to some questions in the interview. It was only after the first two interviews had been conducted that it was realized that a few questions might have been revised. However, it did not seem appropriate to alter the questions

once the study had commenced, as the results achieved might not be consistent with the original design.

Another limitation was the lack of a comprehensive leadership model, in order to focus the study. Hence, comparisons are limited to select aspects of the study which relate reasonably to existing models.

Further limitations were inherent in the design and methodology of the study. These limitations will be noted in context.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The mass of leadership literature published during this
century has presented many varied theories about the nature of
leadership and the behavior of leaders. The tendency is often to
think that more recent findings carry more weight, and we often
ignore or forget the importance of earlier contributions.

> Concern with leadership is as old as recorded history.
> Plato's Republic, to give but one early example,
> speculates about the proper education and training of
> political leaders, and most political philosophers
> since that time have attempted to deal with this
> problem. Leadership has been a particular concern in
> democracies, which, by definition, cannot rely upon
> the accident of birth for the recruitment of leaders.
> Where there is no hereditary aristocracy, every man is
> potentially a leader, and society has to give thought
> to the identification and proper training of men who
> will be able to guide its institutions (Fiedler, 1967,
> p. 3).

Once hereditary aristocracy is dismissed as a viable option.
the identification, training, and qualification of leaders quickly
becomes paramount. The process by which this notion has been carried
out is as enlightening as it is eclectic.

> Interest in the phenomenon of leadership is universal
> and permeates all levels of society. Analysis of the
> phenomenon range all the way from almost supernatural
> explanations on one hand, in which leadership is viewed
> as a particular kind of 'gift' over which man has little
> or no control, being something he is born with, a unique
> combination of elements and powers that enables him to

influence others, to the other end of the continuum,
which holds that leadership can be reduced to a small
number of identifiable and perhaps even quantifiable
elements that are discrete, available for investi-
gation, and can be acquired or developed in some
systematic way. The research, however, is not quite
so clear and one's own casual observation finds
effective leaders behaving in quite different ways
and possessing very different personal characteristics
(Alfonso, Firth and Neville, 1975, p. 46).

Identifying the leaders through selected characteristics

attributable to successful leadership is one limited approach.

Sixteen authors, publishing between 1915 and 1951
recognized most frequently the following types of
leadership: authoritative (dominator), persuasive
(crowd arouser), democratic (group developer),
intellectual (eminent man), executive (administrator),
and representative (spokesman) (Stogdill, 1960, p. 61).

Many writers have taken the approach that the very concept

of leadership must be examined before any attempt is made to identify

leaders.

Leadership Defined

Leadership itself has been explored by researchers for

decades and those quoted below represent a diverse but useful selection

of definitions that specifically describe leadership as a process.

Leadership is a process of mutual stimulation which, by
successful interplay of relevant differences, controls
human energy in pursuit of a common cause (Pigors, 1935,
p. 196).

Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of
an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and
goal achievement (Stogdill, 1950, p. 196).

> To lead is to engage in an act that initiates a structure-in-interaction as part of the process of solving a mutual problem (Hemphill, 1954, p. 98).

These definitions share a focus on leadership as the process of influencing individuals toward goal achievement. Fiedler (1967) presents a definitional review and expands the notion of leadership process with a further examination of leader and task. The leader is

> the individual in the group given the task of directing and co-ordinating task-relevant group activities or who, in the absence of a designated leader, carries the primary responsibility for performing these functions in the group (p. 8).

Fiedler (1967) further suggests that member morale and satisfaction are interesting by-products, rather than measures of group task performance. This distinction excludes the dimension of group maintenance as part of the process of leadership. However, Sergeovanni and Carver (1973) suggest that the leader has some responsibility for both task accomplishment and group maintenance activities. This acknowledgement brings the process of leadership closer to a two dimensional view as stated by Alfonso, et al. (1975)

> Leadership is often defined as behavior that causes individuals to move toward goals they find to be important and that create in the followers a feeling of well being (p. 45).

This definition is interesting in that the leadership function is not limited to one role. Significantly, it includes the participation by all group members in goal setting. When considering these elements, Adair (198) describes his concept of leadership very briefly and inclusively. He stresses that leadership is an interaction

among leader, group members, and situation. This description, although
not cited, could serve as the basis for Downey's (1970) definition of
organizational leadership.

> An interactive process of influencing social units (human
> groupings) to set operative goals and to develop the
> motivation and means to attain them (p. 40).

Leadership, as an interactive process of influence among group
participants, includes the two dimensions of task orientation and
member satisfaction, as well as placing leadership functions and
responsibility on all group participants. This serves as a working
definition of modern participative leadership, which is the immediate
focus of this research.

For the purpose of this study, neither the above review of
definitions nor the following theoretical developments should be
considered as a comprehensive review of all aspects of the mass of
available leadership literature. Essential, however, to our current
endeavor is a specialized outline of the leadership literature which
relates to McGregor's theory Y, Third Force pschology, and some
aspects of small group shared leadership. Such an outline will serve
as a backdrop for the task at hand.

Theory Y

McGregor (1960) developed a now classic theory based on two
sets of propositions which typify contrasting beliefs behind styles of

management. Theory X encompasses these traditional assumptions:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike
    of work and will avoid it if he can.

2. Because of this human characteristic dislike of
    work, most popele must be coerced, controlled,
    directed, threatened with punishment to get
    them to put forth adequate effort toward the
    achievement of organizational behavior.

3. The average human being prefers to be
    directed, wishes to avoid responsibility,
    has relatively little ambition, wants security
    above all (pp. 33-35).

When viewed as a rationale, these assumptions are reflected
in the traditional structures, policies, practices, and programs
of conventional organizations. Traditional managerial philosophy
bases leadership on the principles of control, direction, and
planning. The organization displays either one of two main
approaches: authoritarian and coercive leadership; or democratic,
paternal administration. The difficulties which have arisen from
these approaches are many, and can be seen as a lack of
perception regarding the nature of man, as well as the nature of
organizations. However, the traditional approach continues to
function when managers see their subordinates reacting according
to Theory X assumptions, and are unable to distinguish between
cause and effect.

Theory Y, on the other hand, appears to be a more human approach to management. McGregor describes the underlying assumptions as:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.

4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems are widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.

6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized (pp. 47-48).

These assumptions alter the whole concept of management practices from a reliance on external control of human behavior to a system based on self-control and self-direction. Management

becomes responsible for arranging organizational conditions where motivation, responsibility and the direction of behavior toward organizational goals is possible. Subordinates are then in a position to meet some of their own needs and goals, as well as those of the organization. Theory Y assumptions place the problem for utilization of human resources on the ingenuity of management. These assumptions have recently been developed into practical theories or working approaches to management such as the following.

Third Force Psychology

Abraham Maslow is often considered a major spokesman for this development in the psychology of motivation. Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs theory is now considered to be a classic in the field. Expressions of needs such as air, water, food, protection, love, control, sex, respect, to do good, influence, and so on are incorporated into a five level taxonomy. The need levels, described as physiological, security, social, esteem, and self-actualization are arranged in a hierarchical order of prepotency. As the needs at one level are satisfied, a new level of needs emerges. Also, a satisfied need is not considered to be a motivator of behavior.

This hierarchy was used by McGregor as a major justification for his Theory Y assumptions. He, like Maslow, rejected the two dominating schools of psychological thought regarding human motivation—the behaviorists and the Freudians. Man, according to these views, is percieved as passive and reactive. Third Force psychology does not deny these tendencies; it combines them with a proactive tendency based on the need to grow and develop. Man, perhaps primarily, is assumed to be moved by visions, hopes, goals, and aspirations-not by fears, doubts, and hates.

Herzberg (1966) also describes human motivation in terms of two independent drives - avoidance and approach. Here we are motivated by an approach drive - not to avoid the unpleasant, but to seek benefits and satisfactions at a higher level. Herzberg's motivational theory of management, based on this approach drive, allows for differing need levels in employees.

Maslow (1965) moved on from his hierarchy of needs to develop a theory of Eupsychian management. He states that there is increasing empirical evidence to support Theory Y, which should, therefore, be referred to as Fact Y. Eupsychian management is based on the unity of positive values where, "Ideal management policies are best under good conditions, in a good world for the management of good people (p. 145)." "Eupsychia" means moving toward psychological health; Eupsychian management aims to bring optimum growth and development to all involved in organization. This theory, based on a series of positive assumptions,

can hardly be viewed as practical or concrete. Acknowledging the
significance of a positive motivational Third Force and its emergent
theories can be considered to be the basis for a humanistic approach
to educational administration.

Developments from Theory Y

Theory Y thus influenced and was supported by Eupsychian
management. Research over the years has seen further examples of the
importance of Theory Y in the development of newer theories or
approaches to management. The key ones will be reviewed here.

Argyris (1964) provides further support for Theory Y when he
discusses the lack of congruence between the needs of healthy
individuals and the demands of the formal organization. He states
that the tough management ethic is a myth, and that most managers
would prefer Theory Y, if only they could be shown how to make
organizations more successful by focusing on the task as well as
interpersonal and group process. He does not pretend to solve this
dilemma, but submits job enlargement, employee-centered leadership,
and reality leadership as three possibilities.

Bennis (1966) gives an historical view of landmarks of leader-
ship theory in management. He states that organizations can solve
their dilemmas through a spirit of inquiry which would flourish under
certain social conditions. This spirit of inquiry would be based on
Maslow's positive "B-values" and Theory Y assumptions where, "effective

leadership depends primarily on mediating between the individual and the organization in such a way that both can obtain maximum satisfaction (p. 66)."

This perspective is exploratory and is an active development of Theory Y. It presents an overview, but no practical solutions. Likert (1961), on the other hand, summarizes research to indicate a positive new management pattern emerging, which is people centered. He focuses on a systems approach with emphasis on goals, work simplification, group morale and motivation.

This practical approach was helpful in suggesting to management ways in which they could try Theory Y type approaches.

Other than general research about leadership, Fiedler (1967, 1968, 1972) has made a significant practical contribution to leadership theory in the area of leadership effectiveness. Fiedler (1967) developed the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness which concludes that task-oriented leadership may be more effective under some conditions and employee-oriented leadership may be more effective under other conditions. His theory postulates that leadership style is determined by the needs the individual seeks to satisfy in the leadership situation. Individuals with different styles respond to different conditions in different ways. Leadership performance depends as much on the organization as upon the attributes of the leader. Therefore, Fiedler concludes that leaders are not effective or ineffective, they are effective in one situation and ineffective in other situations.

Fiedler (1969) returning to the old, traditional approach of qualification, discusses the personality traits of an effective leader, and distinguishes between the authoritarian, task-oriented type and the democratic, group-oriented type. His studies developing this show that: mixed situations require relationship-oriented leadership, while favorable and unfavorable job situations require task-oriented leaders; the organization is as responsible for the success or failure of a leader as the leader himself is; and a leader's performance can be improved by fitting the job to the leader.

Fiedler (1972) summarizes studies based on his Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. The evidence presented supports the hypothesis that a change in situational favorableness through training and experience should decrease the performance of some leaders while increasing that of others. Olsen (1967) determines that more effective leaders have more congruence with the environment. Of further interest in this area is a test of Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. Chemers' (1971) results on measures of group productivity give strong support for the validity of the Contingency Model. Primarily, however, Fiedler focuses only on the effectiveness of leaders, while it is the very process of leadership that is central to this study.

Adair's (1968) theory of functional leadership stresses that leadership is an interaction among leader, group members, and situation. The good leader is one who, by virtue of his personality, knowledge and

training, is able to provide the functions necessary to enable the group to achieve its task and to hold it together as a working team.

Halal (1974) presents an integrated theory of leadership. It can be summarized by these three propositions: 1) leadership effectiveness is positively related to congruence; 2) there is a tendency toward congruence and, 3) there is a tendency toward evolution.

Townsend (1970) discusses management theory and practice, and outlines a Theory Y type approach to management. In a practical situation, where he was placed in charge of a failing organization, he describes the process and practices he used to alter the situation. With both profit and people in mind, he employed McGregor's Theory Y to develop an effective organization which reaches its objectives and utilizes and encourages employee motivation.

Each of the above theories have carved a place in the body of knowledge about leadership. Theory Y assumptions, although strongly tied to the 'human relations' type of management, appear to have made a major impact on leadership theory and practice to date. However, after considering the various theories from Theory Y, to Contingency Model, to functional leadership, it would appear that Steinmetz (1968) might have found the most appropriate approach. His research concludes that the style of leadership to be employed most effectively must be determined in each particular situation. But Theory Y assumptions remain a sound working premise for effective leadership.

Small Group Shared Leadership

Democracy in leadership, another area of discussion and research, is basic to shared leadership. Freeman (1975a) states that democracy in a pure form is based on the assumption that no member of the group is superior to other members. However, in operation, no organization exists as a pure democracy and no leadership can exemplify pure democracy. Yet he seemed to simplify the problem when he stated that, "democracy in organizations involves a chance for everyone to develop and contribute according to his ability...aiming for the greatest good for the greatest number (1975b, p. 20)."

A first step toward change in management is to admit that there might be alternatives to what is considered traditional.

> Social conditions are forcing administrators to consider ways to involve the employee in the attainment of organizational goals. Group participation is one technique that is frequently used.... Democratic styles of organization which recognize and seek to encourage employee motivation are inevitable, in spite of the fact that most organizations still adhere to more traditional forms (Martel, 1972, p. 108).

The changes Martel considers inevitable are well supported in research literature, and some examples are to be examined presently. Under what conditions these changes might occur have been studied as well. Franklin (1975) discusses influence processes in organizations and his results indicate that downward influence is primary over upward influence, across levels of hierarchy. Looking at organizational characteristics, the research of Baldridge and Burnham (1975) supports the premise that a large complex organization with a heterogeneous

environment is more likely to adopt innovations than a small, simple
organization with a relatively stable homogeneous environment.

It is of interest to know that changes are more likely to
occur as a downward influence in large complex organizations. But
what exactly are these changes?

One change, closely examined in research, concerns involve-
ment in the decision making process. Traditionally, it has been seen
as a management function. Napier and Gershenfeld (1973) state that
today, involvement is expected by members of many types of groups.
But without training, groups can be less effective at decision making
than individuals. However, if individuals are not involved, their
power to actively support or passively resist a plan can determine
the effectiveness of decisions handed down to them. Therefore, some
group involvement in decision making is essential for effective
results from decision making.

Fisher (1974) examines views and models of group decision
making. He concludes that decisions are not so much made by a group,
as they emerge from group interaction. Group decisions achieve
concensus in a spasmodic and cumulative fashion, "in which proposals
are introduced, discussed, dropped, and reintroduced in a slightly
modified form until the proposal appears in a form which achieves group
concensus (p. 153)." This process reflects the normative interaction
patterns of group members, and therefore, influences both the group's
task and socioemotional dimensions. McGowan (1975) discusses concensus

in group decision making, and suggests that when all participants contribute resources and share in and approve the final decision, the resulting decisions are of superior quality.

According to Kane (1975), each member's participation in decision making is limited by time, interest and competence. The entire team should only participate in decisions that affect the whole group. She also states that conflict will and should occur, in that it is part of the same phenomenon as co-operation, and as necessary to arrive at an integrated group.

Group involvement in decision making should be based on concensus through interaction of members affected by the decision. This is an integral part of shared leadership. Clark and Stefurak (1975) use the term "facilitative leadership," which they describe as a "low profile style of leadership that assists, 'the people' to determine what they desire and need from their respective institutions, and then helps them assume a contributing role in meeting these desires (p. 21)." The resultant sharing of decision making provides for continuity and maximum utilization of the human potential available. However, they ignore task orientation, which takes priority in some organizations.

Fox (1974) states that a sharing approach is not as effective as a unilateral approach in team-oriented task groups, but superior in all other circumstances. This approach advocates the sharing of all managerial functions to the fullest extent which is feasible at the time.

However, it is insufficient to declare that changes need to be made to allow participation by all members in leadership. Organizational structures need to stress such adaptability and flexibility. Influencing factors of members, such as time, interest, and competence must be considered. Also, the designated leader should ideally facilitate a process that encourages direct inter-personal participation.

Summary

In this chapter a review of leadership definitions led to a multidimensional view of the process of leadership which includes task orientation and member satisfaction. Theory Y assumptions and Third Force psychology were examined. Their place in the development of a humanistic approach to educational administration were explored. Other developmental theories and consequent research was cited. These concluded that, although specific theories apply under certain circumstances, a general approach to effective leadership can only be determined by factors involved in the individual situation. Factors to be considered are the type, size, values and traditions of the organization, the group, and its members.

One cannot argue against a group process that facilitates participation according to ability and treats members with courtesy and respect. It is in this light that shared leadership has become recognized as important to organizations as well as effective

management. Current research concludes that the sharing approach is superior in all but team-oriented task groups (Fox 1974). This sharing of all management functions includes decision making, which should be based on concensus through interaction of members affected by the decision.

Generally, the most viable goal for leadership is to create conditions whereby participation, co-operation, co-ordination and support will be productive. This, perhaps, is a major step towards increased effectiveness in human organizations.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

From the beginning of this study a particular set of
circumstances arose to effect the methodology of the entire project.
The writer read the leadership literature relevant to the field.
Through discussions reading and research, a conceptual backdrop
emerged, as detailed in Chapter II. It included the following
specifications: a small group working as a team toward a goal they
mutually agreed upon and helped define; a high degree of interest,
motivation, and job satisfaction demonstrated by team members; and
an example of shared leadership based on Theory Y assumptions.

Further research and examination led to the Leadership
Institute, which was explored and appeared to meet the above specifi-
cations. In September, 1976, the researcher commenced observation of
this group. Generally speaking, the group were knowledgeable about the
researcher's intent. Following a few weeks of observation, an initial
research proposal was made to the group for their consideration. It
was explained that participant observation was the mode of research,
and any demands on their time would require further agreement. It is
important to note here that the researcher was to be a participant in
any group meetings which would take place. It was further agreed that
I would be allowed to observe and/or participate in some training

sessions. What might be lost in objectivity then, could perhaps be regained through active involvement. After discussion, the team agreed to these terms unanimously.

Thus, with increased involvement the researcher observed, discussed, and gained unique information on the informal workings of the group. Participation in planning sessions and a workshop as a co-instructor broadened the writer's perspective on the roles and activities of the staff.

During this time, the central aim of the researcher was to formulate a plan which could result in a research mode and design. To complete the study, self-evaluation by individual taped interviews was chosen as the means of data collection, and this again was agreed to by the staff.

The questionnaire (see Appendix C) for these interviews was designed about a specific series of properties. These included function, goals, objectives, roles, leadership profiles, job satisfaction, administration, and philosophy of the Leadership Institute. The questionnaire consisted of four parts. The first included questions about function, roles, leadership attributes and limitations, and administration of the Institute and its staff. The second part of the questionnaire focused more sharply on goals and objectives. It tried to establish the individual agreement found in terms of accepting and reaching goals and objectives, and probed the obstacles the team meets in working towards them. Section Three examined roles, goals,

and job satisfaction. The last part questioned group philosophy and
the implications of a broader application of it. These questions
examined each member's perceptions about the relationship between
individual and team.

The questionnaire was administered in December, 1976. Each
member of the team was scheduled to meet with the researcher
individually. Interviews were carried out using the same questions as
a starting point for discussion. Individuals were aware of the areas
to be discussed, but were not given the questionnaire prior to the
interview. Staff were asked not to discuss their interview with
others until after all the interviews were completed.

The interview tapes were transcribed, and the information was
condensed into a more useable form centred around the properties of
the questionnaire. The responses were correlated, tabled (Appendix D)
and the findings are now reported in Chapter IV. This, as a considered
compilation, is an attempt to reflect a group property by identifying
individual parts and their relationship to the whole.

Methodologically, the design of the self-evaulation questionnaire,
and the study as a whole comprise a small group case study. The single
case study is static in that it covers a limited time period. The
researcher had, because of participation in the action, unsystematic
control, and the firsthand interaction alerted group members to areas
of discussion in advance. The data gathered was new in the sense that
it was gathered exclusively according to the researcher's specifications.
Previously available data was also used to provide historical background

and an identifiable perspective from which to examine the group. In gathering the new data, questioning of group members was used for the self-evaluation reported in Chapter IV. Participant observation was used to gather other data, as well as to compare and analyze information. The findings of this study are presented in qualitative and descriptive fashion in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The seven staff members were interviewed individually to
discuss and evaluate various aspects of the Leadership Institute.
The following summarizes these interviews. (See Appendix C for the
list of questions and Appendix D for the tables of responses.)

Function

All staff members defined the major function of the Leadership
Institute (Question 1) as leadership development with groups on
Prince Edward Island. When referring to leadership development, one group
member mentioned participative leadership, and four provided examples,
such as skill development in the areas of communication, positive
self-image, and skills required in all aspects of community and business
life. One staff member explained it was an adult extension program.
The target group was further defined. Three staff explained that they
worked with groups from organizations as well as individuals within
these groups. Apparent and potential leaders was a qualifier for two.
In addition, two suggested the Institute worked mainly with Islanders,
but sometimes with groups in the Atlantic region.

Goals and Objectives

When discussing goals and objectives (Questions 8-12, 14, 17), all staff were knowledgeable of both (see Appendix E), and all with the exception of one agreed with them. That member stated that the overall objectives were too broad. In promoting the idea that the Leadership Institute can be all things to all people, this member explained, they fostered a myth which they could not live up to.

All staff stated that the Leadership Institute team works effectively and realistically toward these goals and objectives. However, one staff member was more positive, and two others qualified their statements by, "more effectively than most," or, "the majority of the time." The question of how goals and objectives are realized brought up more diversity - two thought fairly well, four said well and one very well.

Obstacles and changes were two areas that brought out the individual orientation and consideration staff had regarding goals and objectives.

Obstacles noted can be classified into eight areas:

(1) Public Relations where a significant information gap was noted. Three staff members stated that there was a lack of awareness about the Leadership Institute among the general public. Four were concerned about lack of information about the range of services available, even among those who knew about the Institute's existence.

One example was the lack of requests for follow-up
where staff thought that further training could be
offered. This general area was discussed in staff
meetings. Some conflict existed because the Leadership
Institute had maintained a low profile and relied on
word of mouth to recommend its services. Most of the
time, requests for group training were more than
sufficient for staff. However, when considering whether
they were meeting existing needs of the Prince Edward
Island public, staff were aware that in some areas they
were not. Examples of this are noted later in this
section.

(2) The residential training facility, located in a tourist
lodge and used in the off-season, was inadequate because
of poor management, according to four staff. One of these
also noted that it was not always convenient geographically
and that expense was a concern for some groups.
(Considerable time and effort had been spent by staff to
improve or replace the facility.

(3) Three staff were conscious of problems because the Leader-
ship Institute was part of a community college. One
mentioned that the administration caused some problems, but
also there were benefits. Another suggested that time and

energy were taken away from the Institute because of necessary relations with the college. The third discussed the broader problem of the need to define their role within the college.

This relation between the two was brought up by the interviewer at another point (Question 14). The two staff who were there in the Fall of 1971 were better able to discuss the direct consequences of the move from being directly attached to a government department, to being part of a community college. Others could discuss the situation only as they knew it. Overall, four saw mainly benefits, two stated it balanced out, and one felt the Institute lost on the change. The advantage mentioned by three staff was an increase in credibility that took place upon being attached to an educational institution. Two were positive about the change from a Board of Directors to an Advisory Council, which allowed for more decision making within the Leadership Institute. The positive influence of the college philosophy on the Institute was mentioned by one staff, and another suggested they had influenced one another positively. One staff felt the resources of the college were an advantage. Another commented on the new location, a third mentioned an increase in holidays, and a fourth suggested there were more benefits.

There were only three disadvantages mentioned. One staff
stated that while the Institute was not independent,
neither was it serving the college. Being left in the
middle of these two options created problems. Another
thought being part of the college created conflict with
few noticeable advantages.

(4) Two staff members expressed concern about training for
municipal personnel on Prince Edward Island. One thought
that the Leadership Institute was not yet able to be the
primary resource to meet the needs of this group. Another
discussed the background of the situation, which concerned
evaluating and defining what this group needed and how
best to meet its needs. (This topic was under group
discussion at the time.)

(5) An obstacle noted by two staff centred around the needs
of those involved in small business on the Island. The
limitation was expressed because only two instructors
had experience and interest in this area, and it was felt
that the Leadership Institute was in a poor position to
respond to the needs of this group. The other staff had
some reluctance to get involved and, therefore, group
decisions about more involvement in this direction were
complex.

(6)   Another obstacle suggested by one staff member was the
limited access to services for an individual. Unless a
person was part of a group who requested training, an
individual could not take part in leadership development
programs.

(7)   Unrealistic deadline setting was mentioned by one staff.

(8)   Another discussed the over achievement of the Institute.
The question centred on whether the Leadership Institute
had maintained government support and funding because
they had fallen short in some of the potentially
controversial areas such as political awareness and
citizens' action. (This question, while relevant and
worthwhile, is extremely difficult to evaluate, but was
considered because another group, the Rural Development
Council, started at the same time as the Leadership
Institute and responsible and respected for its
contribution to the Island had had its funding terminated.)

When asked later in the interview about what changes they
would like to make to improve the Leadership Institute (Question 17),
four discussed the office. All felt that their open office was good
for relations, but not necessarily for efficiency. Changes to create
a physical space somewhere between open and closed would be advantageous.
One of the above suggested a need for a larger office. Two staff noted
a need to improve the training facility. Two staff discussed the need

for individualized programs for students. One suggested a leadership development program should have taken priority over the recently developed Instructional Methods Program. The other thought the new program should be seen as a stepping stone to an altered staff development program, which would be available to both staff and students. Relations with other college departments could be improved, and better co-ordination with college resources was mentioned by two. One staff stated that there was a great need to spend time to develop materials and resources for programs. The establishment of two extension offices was suggested by a staff member who also realized it was not financially feasible at this time. Another person recommended greater emphasis on the business community, and low profile public promotion of the Institute and its services.

In comparing perceived obstacles and recommended changes for any individual, there was some correlation. (Person D and Person F each noted one obstacle in Question 12 that also was suggested as a recommended change in Question 17.) The resulting assumption is that improvement of the operation is not necessarily related to stated goals.

Roles

There are three major roles (Question 2) described by the staff. They include administrative, instructive, and support staff. The administrative role includes responsibility for budget, policy,

decision making, managing staff and resources, internal relations and reporting to higher authority. Planning, organizing and conducting training programs is the central focus of the instructor's role. The support role includes typing, filing, receptionist, correspondence, materials and office organization.

Parts of these roles are carried out by each individual in the team. Six of the staff are instructors. Of these, Member A is Director of the Institute, plus Director of the Business Division (of Holland College). Therefore, his overt role is mainly administrative, although he does instruct when time allows. Member B spends about one third of his time as Senior Instructor (as of November, 1976) and administratively acts as in-house manager for the team (e.g., budget, staff, purchases). Persons C, D and E are full-time instructors who, in addition, are responsible for research, equipment, and an audio-visual van, as well as overseeing the residence respectively. Person F is a part-time staff who carries out a dimension of the instructor role by co-ordinating and doing research for a new individualized program on Instructional Methods. Person G is mainly involved in the support role.

All staff are encouraged to participate in discussions of and decisions about policy, budget requests, allocation of funds, goal definition and directions of the Leadership Institute. Each seems to be involved to the extent of personal need, interest and ability.

In discussing job descriptions of staff (Question 13), no staff had seen an organizational chart and most staff stated that there

were no major differences between the description and what they actually did on the job. Two suggested that the staff in the Institute had more responsibilities than comparable colleagues in the college.

Leadership Profile

Each member of the staff was asked to describe the leadership attributes and limitations of each team member, as it related to the working of the staff team (Questions 3, 4). These descriptions have been organized as team profiles of the individuals. Unless otherwise indicated, attributes listed are from one source only.

Person A is described (by three sources) as the guardian of the Institute philosophy. He encourages, supports, and respects others opinions (two sources). Always consulting the group, he allows disagreement, shows compassion and concern for others, and keeps the team focused. He asks provocative questions, resolves complex issues and is a risk taker who is able to hold things together during a period of change. He also acts as a trouble shooter for the team in the college. He describes his main attribute as being apparently self-confident, and he sees this as part of his ability to encourage the growth and development of the Leadership Institute and its staff.

In the area of limitations, he is not always thorough enough. His listening skills can be poor (two sources), he's preoccupied (two sources), unavailable, and overextends himself (three sources) in many areas to the detriment of the Institute. He sees his main limitation

as being overextended. When describing others' attributes and limitations, he has the most encompassing and realistic view of all the staff.

Person B is seen as a level, consistent member, who has a calm, balancing effect on the team (two sources). A sensitive (two sources) and comfortable person, he is non-threatening (two sources) and non-authoritarian, with an especially great concern for people. He gives realistic feedback and is honest regarding the team's educational role. He is good at developing ideas, goal setting and philosophical development (two sources). He is a good listener, and has a positive attitude. Because of his emphasis on interpersonal relationships (two sources), he holds back to bring others out. He sees his attributes as being non-directive and placing a top priority on group development, as it will yield productivity in the long term.

On the side of limitations, he has difficulty in organizing (two sources) himself and his time. Not aggressive enough (two soures), he doesn't always level with others (two sources), nor is he a risk taker. He agrees that he has difficulty being honest and open with others as well as not always delegating enough responsibility to others. Two staff note a lack of organizational skills which he does not mention, but his lack of concern in this area may be confirmed by his lack of comment on the organizational skills of others on the team (except for one related negative comment).

Person C is full of energy, reliable (two sources), always prepared, dedicated, practical (two sources), attentive to detail, and non-threateningly aggressive (two sources). A very good organizer (four sources), she is honest and open (three sources), and interested and sensitive to people (two sources). She recognizes ambiguity in group process, and helps clarify definitions and viewpoints (three sources). Her theoretical framework is of great value to the team (two sources). She notes her organizational capacities and her value as an initiator.

Her contribution to the team is limited by overintellectualization, and too much attention to detail (three sources). At times she is too agressive, works too hard and because she doesn't socialize, other team members may be required to compensate for this and other eccentric ways. She sees herself as too serious, too organized, having narrow professional focus, and her personal philosophy creates some difficulty for the team (which one staff member mentions). In discussing other team members, she displays a good contextual overview of all other staff concerning leadership. When describing her, the team seem most consistent in their perceptions and assessments.

Person D is enthusiastic (four sources), outgoing (two sources), and humorous (five sources). Articulate and confident, he is an idea person who gets others going. He is creative, reliable, responsible, well motivated (two sources), and relates well (three sources). He helps the team in decision making and is willing to take anything on. He thinks that he is enthusiastic, humorous, optimistic and relates well.

His limitations include: diversions from the topic; too much humour; overly aggressive (two sources); talks too much and, therefore, doesn't allow others the opportunity; jumps too fast (three sources) and rushes the group; two confident; and takes on too much. He describes his main limitation as reluctance to risk suggesting contrary ideas. In his evaluations, he appears overly positive about team members (compared with others' evaluations), and sees very few limitations of others and himself.

Person E is articulate, direct, level, sensitive, and serious with a good sense of humour (two sources). He has a sharp mind, is firm in his beliefs, uncompromising and very principled. As an idea person (two sources), he is a definite thinker who is creative and innovative (two sources). He helps clarify ambiguity, shows concern for people, and is wholesome and co-operative (two sources). A good listener (two sources), he is interested and willing to learn and take things on. He also helps the team's decision making process. He describes his attributes as good listener, organized, thorough, and a good balance among members of the team.

His lack of aggressiveness is a limitation (two sources), as is his ministerial background. He has a stubborn streak which is displayed in not trusting the past experience of the team. A major limitation was lack of time and experience with the team (three sources), which also limited their ability to evaluate him (two sources). He believes lack of aggressiveness and too much

enthusiasm are his limitations. In evaluating others, he doesn't discuss much in terms of interpersonal relations.

Person F is steady, reliable, co-operative, helpful, warm, comfortable and devoted to the team. She is a definite thinker who states her opinions in her area and brings an outside dimension to the team. She is enthusiastic, moderately aggressive, and has planned and gotten staff involved in a goal they set for themselves. She describes her attributes as being a reactor and, as she is not an instructor, she can represent a lay person's view.

Her limitations include a reserved nature, a lack of self-confidence, only there part-time, and is too positive about the Institute and what it does (two sources), which can make her feedback unrealistic. She states not being an instructor is her limitation. In her evaluation she had some difficulty describing the limitations of herself and others.

Person G is described as very competent (two sources), reliable, responsible and direct. Bright and happy, she is congenial (two sources), efficient (three sources), and organized (four sources). She sees her main contribution as keeping the office running efficiently.

She is seen to be mainly limited by time and lack of experience (three sources) working with this kind of team. Being too organized can be a problem (two sources) as can her limited public relations value in the college (compared with her predecessor). At times, she

is threatened by demeaning parts of the stereotyped secretary role.
She agrees that her main limitation is that she is too organized.
Perhaps intimidated by the idea of evaluating others, she saw
limited attributes and thought the team was lacking in organizational
skills.

Job Satisfaction

The match of person with job was discussed to a limited extent
(Question 15, 16). All staff felt that the skills they had were
matched well with those required in their job. One staff noted a
lack of expertise in the area of facilitative skills, while two
mentioned a skill they had which was not well used in the job. Job
satisfaction ranged from one ideal, three very satisfied, one fairly
satisfied, and two generally satisfied with a decline in satisfaction
since they had started. Three found the money adequate, but could
use more, three noted very good, and one suggested the money was
perhaps too much. More explicit interpretations of monetary value
and individual needs would have to be explored to clarify this area.
All agreed that self-development and career development opportunities
were very good. As none of them had direct access to other jobs,
nor did they develop a lot of concrete skills, career development
opportunities may have been perceived as great because career
orientation may have been altered, as well as perceptions of
capabilities. In this vein, one staff noted that there are

opportunities, but career orientation has declined in this job because of a new orientation to broader scope in life. Another noted, not taking enough advantage of opportunities available for both self and career development.

When discussing length of job commitment, none of the staff were definite, but none saw this as a long-term job. Staff noted such things as family responsibilities, job satisfaction, direction of Institute, and other job opportunities as factors which would influence their length of stay. Past turnover would indicate that personal development is encouraged in the Leadership Institute, as is moving to related jobs when they are available.

Administration

From observation of the Institute team, the writer was surprised and interested in the manner in which an assistant director (Senior Instructor) was chosen. The usual administrative style was strongly participative with the group involved in discussion and decision making at all levels of the operation. However, when a senior instructor was designated (October, 1976), there was no prior discussion by the group. This seemed an area worth investigating, as it was reminiscent of very traditional management and perhaps indicated a variation from the general style of administration observed and perceived by team members. Questions (5, 6, 7) were asked in the interview to explore this further.

All staff agreed that the person chosen was the logical choice and had already been carrying out some of the role functions. He had seniority, and was capable of doing the job well. One staff did point out that the way this decision was made was unusual and authoritative. This staff member was not consulted and was unaware whether others were consulted. The director thought that he had discussed this with all staff individually, although only three noted this. However, five staff saw no problem with the choice or manner in which it was done, even after the interviewer mentioned their limited participation as a group in the decision. It is possible they overlooked this because it did not appear to be a major change, as this person had gradually evolved as second in command. In addition, they all saw no change caused in the Institute as a result of redistributing the administrative role. They only noted a similarity of approach between director and assistant, plus increased accessibility of the person in part of that role.

Philosophy

The philosophy of the Leadership Institute (see Appendix F) was described by most staff in a similar way. They stated (Question 18) that learning is more likely to take place when people are responsible for, and participate in, shaping and forming their learning process.

All staff agreed that the philosophy, although one primarily developed in the field of adult education, could be applied to other

educational institutions (Question 19). Two suggested that it should only be applied for some. Education, one stated, should be available in a range of methods according to the area of learning and the needs of the learner. Another recommended this philosophy as useful for part of any educational institution, but noted in the public schools it would be difficult to apply. The remaining staff implied a broad application for their philosophy. They indicated a need for a major change in attitude on the part of educators and society. One suggested this process was already taking place. Another focused on the need to convince those involved of the positive value, but suggested that change was more likely to occur from the top down, in the administrative structure of an institution. Two other staff stated that involving educators in programs using this philosophy would assist the change, and they in turn would apply it in their own teaching.

When discussing the implications of this change, (Question 20) five described positive results within society, while one specified positive results for the individual. Comments centred around individuals with more motivation and increased participation in their communities. "Captains of their own destiny" was how one staff member described it. Two described it as a slow process that would snowball. A need to change the physical set up of institutions, as well as expand resources, was mentioned by two. The fact that it was not the universal answer for all students was noted again. Two thought students would be more interested and involved. One assumed less

discipline problems. Another assumed learning would be faster and more thorough. Increasing demands on student, teacher, and administrator, as well as a change of the teacher's role (by two) to manager of learning resources, were noted. One suggested the administrator role would change little, whereas two thought it would become more a support, resource, guidance, co-ordinator role. One noted that the institution would probably become more of a resource centre. Generally, the overall change was described as, "a better motivated individual who would contribute more to society and, therefore, receive more back from it."

The writer was assuming that this group could be more explicit about implications for educational institutions, should they change to the participative philosophy. However, the above comments seemed only to relate to a generalized improvement with minor alterations. Planned and co-ordinated change was not mentioned, nor were potentially negative effects of change on the culture and people of the Island.

When asked about any changes in the group because of this writer's participation (Question 21), all agreed that there had been no change in their functioning or behaviour. Most commented positively about the addition of ideas and orientation contributed. Some felt that the interview itself had been a good opportunity for value clarification and a worthwhile opportunity to discuss so many aspects of their relationship to other staff and the Leadership Institute.

Conclusions

The findings presented in this chapter suggest the following results. All staff stated that the primary function of the Institute was leadership development with groups on Prince Edward Island. All staff were knowledgeable about the goals and objectives and thought the staff worked well towards meeting them. Most thought that they were reaching them. The main obstacles mentioned were: a lack of public awareness of the Institute and its service; the management and location of the residential training facility; the Institute's relationship with Holland College; and needs of municipal and small business training groups. Changes recommended were to improve the office facilities, to further individualize training programs, to improve relations with the college, and to find a better training facility. The findings in this section conclude that improvement of the Leadership Institute operation is not necessarily related to stated goals.

There are three roles within the Leadership Institute-- administrative, instructive and support staff. Parts of these roles are carried out by each member of the team, although each is involved mainly with one. The leadership profiles present a diverse group with an interesting balance of skills, abilities and limitations. Generally, these conclude that staff members see their team positively and are aware of some weaknesses.

Each staff member noted a good match of skills between those brought to the job, and those required by the job. When asked about job satisfaction, the mode was "very satisfied." All staff stated that career and self-development opportunities were very good.

In the section on administration, most staff were unconcerned about the appointment of an assistant director. It occurred in a traditional manner which differed from the usual participative leadership style. Either staff saw little need for their participation or they did not perceive a problem in the situation concerned.

Most staff described the Leadership Institute philosophy in a similar way. They agreed that learning is more likely to occur when people are responsible for, and participate in shaping their learning process. All thought that this philosophy could be applied to other educational institutions. They acknowledged that should this occur, it would cause both structural and methodological changes. The general result, they supposed, would be "a better motivated individual who would contribute more to society and would, therefore, receive more back." The possible implications they noted for this appeared vague.

The staff agreed that the researcher's participation did not bias the sample. The interview itself and the researcher's contributions to discussions were viewed positively.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary

This study has explored the leadership practices of the
Leadership Institute. Out of a review of leadership definitions in
Chapter II, a multidimensional view of the process emerged. Leader-
ship, for the purpose of this study is an interactive process among
group participants which include task orientation and member
satisfaction. It places leadership functions and responsibility on
all group members. Developmental theories from Theory Y concluded
that a general approach to effective leadership can only be
determined by factors involved in the individual situation. Moreover,
the sharing approach is superior in all but team-oriented task groups.

The research was conducted as a case study on a small group
who shared leadership, were motivated and satisfied, and displayed
McGregor's Theory Y type leadership. It was a static study with
unsystematic control. Existing data was used, as well as new data
in the form of self-evaluation by team members, and other data from
participant observation.

The findings presented in Chapter IV conclude a common view
of the function, goals, roles and philosophy of the Leadership

Institute. Leadership profiles display a balanced team which views itself positively. Most staff are very satisfied with their job and opportunities for career and self-development. The usual sharing approach of administration functioned well. One example of traditional decision making left most staff unconcerned. They saw no need for their participation in this decision, and did not view traditional management as a problem in that or other situations. All staff thought their philosophy could be applied to other educational institutions. They acknowledged resultant change, but the implications they noted appeared vague.

Implications

The following implications emerged from the above research.

Situation. The review of leadership literature encouraged a conclusion that, although specific theories apply under certain circumstances, a general approach to effective leadership can only be determined by factors involved in the individual situation. That is, effective leadership is a function of the task, the objectives, the organization, the priorities, and the individuals involved in a particular situation. Usual management practice can only be carried out under usual circumstances.

The findings explored the particular leadership practices in the Institute. Usual practice could have been described as the shared approach and staff were questioned about an example of more traditional

administration. The one staff member who was concerned about this
situation was not consulted. Lack of concern of others was attributed
to several factors. Most of them were consulted individually. None
saw this decision causing any change in the Institute. Either they
saw no need for more active participation in this decision, or they
did not acknowledge or view traditional management as a problem in
that or other situations.

The above example supports the conclusion that the leadership
required depends on factors in the given situation. Perhaps some of
the factors noted are those which alter usual practices. Fox (1974)
concludes that real time pressure, absence of subordinate desires to
participate, and circumstances which require the leader to impose
decisions are important constraints upon the use of consultative-
participative decision making. More detailed examination of the actual
factors involved in the specific situation might find that Fox's
limitations provide a further explanation of this situation. However,
it provides additional support of the conclusion that effective leader-
ship can only be determined by the factors involved in a particular
situation.

Philosophy. All staff described the Institute philosophy in
a similar way in Chapter IV. They stated that learning is more
likely to occur when people are responsible for and participate in
shaping their own learning. It relates closely to the initial formal
statement of philosophy in Appendix F. This statement is followed by

what the Institute considers its target group. The four segments of Island society considered to have priority are: the business community; voluntary adult and young people's organizations; all three levels of government on the Island; and educational and provincial service institutions. Staff particularly noted that they must also reach the man or woman who is not involved with these groups.

The research findings on goals and objectives in Chapter IV cite several examples which indicate that some problems might exist with reaching the target group and individuals. Training for small business and municipal groups was hampered by the Institute because of weak definition of needs and possible lack of resources to meet the possible needs. Other obstacles noted were limited access for unaligned individuals to Institute programs, and a possible avoidance of potentially controversial areas such as citizen awareness and participation in government.

None of the above comments were exclusive to the self-evaluation interview. Participant observation confirmed that these concerns were complex and discussed in more detail by the team. Although they presented problems at the time of the study, it is possible further discussion has taken place and some resolution has occurred. However, this research concludes that further definition of philosophy should take place, and the problems noted here need examination and resolution.

Implications. The team members agreed that their philosophy could be applied to other educational institutions. When discussing the possible implications of this change, five described positive results within society. Some of these implications noted were specific, but appeared only to comment on a generalized improvement in education and society. No staff noted either positive or negative effects of their own program on the culture and people of the Island. In analyzing the findings, the researcher noted this vague perception of implications. How could a group focus so much energy, belief and motivation on a task, which aimed at causing change, the implications of which appeared to be so vague? The researcher discussed this question with the Director of the Institute, who agreed that this situation was not justifiable. Moreover, none of the staff linked implications with goals and objectives. Perhaps this indicates a need for the Institute to seriously examine the validity of their goals and objectives, or at least to examine the reasons behind their vague perception of implications. A major problem with educational goals and objectives has been their subjectivity and limited methods of achievement. The Leadership Institute is not alone with this problem. Perhaps educational institutions would develop more effectively if goals and objectives were well developed and better integrated with the actual operations performed by staff.

Idealism. "Easier said than done" is a catch phrase which continues to appy to human endeavors. When discussing goals in

Chapter IV, one staff member suggested that the overall objectives of the Leadership Institute were too broad. In promoting the idea that they can be all things to all people, they have fostered a myth which they can't live up to. Is this group able to carry out what they suggest they are capable of doing? Had specific questions been asked about this in the interview, this research might have been more conclusive. However, a possible idealism about the Institute's services can be perceived here. The problems with the definition of their philosophy and their lack of perceptions of the implications resulting from the changes they recommend, reveal possible idealism.

Their formal statement of philosophy, "must be looked upon as a fluid creation (Appendix F, p. 75)." Therefore, the preceding implications of the present research could be examined and considered for future revisions.

Recommendations for Further Research

The present research was concerned with the examination of small group shared leadership in the Leadership Institute. The conclusions and implications of this research are mainly limited to the practical application of related theories and the Institute. This study does suggest further leadership research.

The similarities and discrepancies between leadership philosophy and styles within the Institute, and those of funding bodies could be researched. This area could be explored on a

theoretical level, as well as on a practical level in other
institutions.

Further research could be conducted on exactly what factors
in a situation determine what leadership style is most effective.
Fox's (1974) Normative Model explores this at a theoretical level,
but further examination and testing is required.

The traditional separation of educational administration and
politics has been questioned in the literature. As educational
institutions are subject to political decisions, it would be useful
to further explore the desirability of this separation.

The actual results of the Institutes program could be
researched. The most important aspect of this being a noticeable
increase and improvement in the participation and leadership skills
of the people on the Island. By finding out more about what they
are actually accomplishing the Institute would be in a better position
to assess and improve its program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adair, J. Training for leadership. London: MacDonald and Co., 1968.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G. R., & Nevill, R. F. Instructional supervision, a behavior system. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

American Psychological Association, Council of Editors. Publication manual of the American Psychological Association. (Rev. ed.) Washington, D.C.: APA, 1957.

Argyris, C. Personality and organization. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Argyris, C. Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Baldridge, J. V., & Burnham, R. A. Organizational innovation: Individual, organizational, and environmental impacts. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1975, 20(2), 165-176.

Bennis, W. G. Changing organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Berelson, B., & Sleiner, G. Human behavior; An inventory of scientific findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.

Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. F. Peer leadership within work groups. Personnel Administration, 1967, 30(5), 45-50.

Boles, H. W., & Davenport, J. A. Introduction to educational leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Canada Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Development plan for Prince Edward Island. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970.

Chemers, M. M., & Skrzypek, G. J. An experimental test of the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. ED057381, 1971.

Clark, P. A., & Stefurak, A. L. Leadership for change. Community Education Journal, 1975, 5(6), 18-21.

College administrators for today's non-traditional students: Managers or leaders? ED108553, 1975.

Downey, L. W. Leadership perspective: The key to designing effective leadership for organizations of higher education. Journal of Education, 1970, 153(1), 38-49.

Drewry, G. N., & Diener, T. J. Effective academic administration: A team approach. Athens, Georgia: Institute of Higher Education, 1969. (ERIC Abstracts ED028734).

Fiedler, F. E. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Fiedler, F. E. Style or circumstances: The leadership enigma. Psychology Today, 1969, 2(10), 39-43.

Fiedler, F. E. The effects of leadership training and experience: A Contingency Model interpretation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17(4), 453-470.

Fisher, B. A. Small group decision making. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Fox, W. M. Identifying and developing leadership aspects of effective management in team-oriented task groups. ED120646, 1974.

Franklin, J. L. Down the organization: Influence processes across levels of hierarchy. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1975, 20(2), 153-164.

Freeman, T. J. The democratic system of leadership. ED116271, 1975. (a)

Freeman, T. J. Leadership models. ED116270, 1975. (b)

Halal, W. E. Toward a general theory of leadership. Human Relations, 1974, 27(4), 401-416.

Halpin, A.W. Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Hemphill, J. M. Administration as problem solving. In A. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: Midwest Administrative Center, 1958.

Helwig, C. Democratic supervision and creative supervision: Are they possible misnomers? ED055324, 1968.

Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. New York: World, 1966.

Kane, R. A. The interprofessional team as a small group. Social Work in Health Care, 1975, 1(1), 19-32.

Likert, R. New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Martell, C. Administration: Which way -- Traditional practice or modern theory. College and Research Libraries, 1972, 33(2), 104-112.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

Maslow, A. H. Eupsychian management. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin -Dorsey Press, 1965.

McGowan, F. Group dynamics: Toward a study of the administrative/supervisory role within group decision-making processes. ED123704, 1975.

McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Napier, R.W., & Gershenfeld, M. K. Groups: Theory and experience. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Neuberger, O. Experimental research on leadership style. Gruppendynamik, 1972, Jun No. 2, 192-219 (Abstract)

Olson, G. F. Congruence and dissonance in the ecology of educational administrators as a basis for discriminating between patterns of leadership. ED018002, 1967.

Pigors, P. J. W. Leadership and domination. Boston: Houghton Miffin, 1935. Cited by T.J. Sergiovanni, & F.D. Carver, The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Carver, F. D. The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Steinmetz, L. L. Leadership styles and systems management: More direction. Personnel Journal, 1968, 47(9), 650-654.

Stogdill, R. Leadership, membership and organization. Psychological Bulletin, Jan. 1950, 47. Cited in T.J. Sergiovanni, & F.D. Carver, The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Stogdill, R. Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Townsend, R. Up the organization. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1970.

Van Fleet, A. A. Structure and process in collaboration: Florida's collaborative model project as a case study. ED111793, 1975.

Vujtech, J. <u>Problem of style of management of a work group.</u>
  Synteza, 1972, 5(2), 58-66. (Abstract)

APPENDIX A

Leadership Institute Annual Report, 1970-71

INTRODUCTION

The P.E.I. Leadership Institute and Centre for continuing Education aims to develop and intensify leadership at all levels of society in Prince Edward Island through training in the related skills of communications, leadership, group dynamics and group decision-making. The Institute program also includes short courses on basic management, supervision and other training courses that may be requested by the residents of the Island. The program is intended to serve present and future leaders of all community, farm and governmental organizations in the province of P.E.I.. Training is conducted in local communities or through residential facilities if requested.

The Institute was organized in the late summer and early fall of 1969 under the P.E.I. Comprehensive Development Plan. At that time a Director, Mr. Dave Garland, initiated the project and began organizing and conducting training in the above-mentioned areas. Later that same year two trainers, Mr. Allan Forbes and Mr. Paul Connolly, were added to the staff. By early 1970 the demand for Institute services increased rapidly with last year's annual report indicating a high degree of local acceptance of the Institute, its staff and the training.

APPENDIX A (Cont'd)

Two components of the training itself could point to a rationale for this acceptance:

1. Training Program content is agreed to in most cases suggested by the participants themselves.
2. Small group discussion and the participant's active engagement in the learning process is encouraged from the very beginning of the course.

Participants liked being consulted as to their needs and wishes and enjoyed their roles as actors on the learning stage and not spectators in the audience. Cursory reading of the evaluation of the participants of the Institute programs clearly point this rationale out as well.

APPENDIX B

Leadership Institute Annual Report, 1975-76

The following groups and organizations utilized the Institute's services from April 1, 1975 to March 31, 1976. (A representative sample).

(a)   In-residence programs - Seminars - Workshops

Organization	No. of Part.	Length of Program
Community School Committees	27	2 day
Community School Instructors	46	2 day
P.E.I. Amateur Basketball Association	17	2 day
P.E.I. School Athletic Association	17	2 day
United Church Youth	36	2 day
C.V.A. Adult Educators	41	2 day
Kinkora Committee Day Camp	5	1 day
Red Cross Water Safety Program	22	2 day
Red Cross Water Safety Camp	100	5 day
Dept. of Social Services	15	3 day
C.S.C. Dept. of Social Services	9	3 day
Canadian Federation of University Women	55	3 day
Area #2 High School Teachers	12	3 day
United Church Cristian Education Committee	26	3 day
Area #3 Principals	24	3 day
Red Cross Youth	32	3 day

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

Organization	No. of Part.	Length of Program
City Councillors of Charlottetown	11	1 day
Holland College Philosophy Committee	22	1 day
Holland College Student Union	27	3 day
Holland College Business Students	19	3 day
Holland College Business Students	18	3 day
Maritime Christian College	15	4 day
C.S.C. Work Simplification Seminar	15	5 day
4-H Leaders	40	2 day
Area #2 Teachers	12	3 day
Marriage Encounter Group	22	3 day
Red Cross Juniors	30	3 day
Holland College Philosophy Group	20	1 day
Colonel Gray Student Union	15	3 day
Women's Resource Centre	16	2 day
Central Christian Church	33	2 day
Credit Union League	14	2 day
Community School Instructors	35	2 day
Addiction Foundation Program	25	3 day
Diocese of Ch'town - One Parent Family Assn.	22	3 day
Co-operative Information Program	15	5 day
Beaver Leaders	24	3 day
Atlantic Cerebral Palsy Conference	121	2 day
R.N.A.N.S. (St. F.X., Antigonish)	189	2 day
Co-operative Educators (Memramcook)	38	2 day

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

Organization	No. of Part.	Length of Program
Nova Scotia Operating Room Nurses Assn.	113	2 day
MacEwen Teachers (Moncton)	24	4 day
U.P.E.I. - K. Ozmon	10	2 day
Credit Union League	15	2 day
Commodity Marketing Boards	50	2 day
United Church Youth	26	2 day
Canadian Assn. of Mentally Regarded	39	2 day

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire for Self-evaluation

IA

1. What is the primary function of the Leadership
   Institute?

2. Would you describe the roles of the Leadership
   Institute staff team.

3. Describe the major leadership attributes of each.

4. Describe the major limitations of each.

IB

5. Could you explain why and how Paul was chosen as
   Senior Instructor.

6. Do you think this will cause any changes in Leadership
   Institute?

7. Why or why not?

II

8. Are you knowledgeable of the Leadership Institute
   objectives and goals?

9. Do you personally agree with all of them?

10. Do you think the team works effectively and realis-
    tically toward these?

11. How well are they reaching them?

12. What are the obstacles that prevent the staff from
    meeting the objectives and goals?

APPENDIX C (Cont'd)

III

13. From the roles described in #2, do you see any differences among the organizational chart, job descriptions and what staff actually do?

14. When and what changes took place when Leadership Institute became a part of Holland College?

15. How closely does your job here match your needs (i.e. skills, job satisfaction, money, self-development, and career development)?

16. Do you see this as a long term job for you? What will you do next?

17. What changes could be made to improve the Leadership Institute operation?

IV

18. Describe the Leadership Institute philosophy.

19. Could this be applied to other education institutions, (e.g. schools)? If so, how?

20. What could be the implications of this change in education, (for the educational structure, for educational administration, society in general)?

21. Did my participation change or alter the Leadership Institute?

APPENDIX D

Question 1 Function

Respondent	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
leadership development	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7
groups in P.E.I.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7
participative leadership						x		1
skill development	x	x		x	x			4
adult extension program						x		1
groups and individuals	x				x	x		3
apparent and potential leaders	x	x						2
groups in Atlantic Region	x	x						2

Question 2 Roles

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
J	R	R	R	R	R	R

R describes three roles (noting individuals)

J individuals job description (noting roles)

Leadership Profiles

PERSON A

Question 3A

Attributes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
guardian of philosophy			x		x		x	3
encourages, supports		x				x		2
consults and allows disagreement						x		1
compassion, concern, focus				x				1
provocative quesions				x				1
resolves complex issues					x			1
risk taker, holds together		x						1
trouble shooter			x					1
apparently self confident	x							1
encourages development	x							1

Question 4A

Limitations	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
not thorough enough						x		1
poor listening		x			x			2
preoccupied			x		x			2
unavailable				x				1
overextends himself	x	x	x					3

PERSON B

Question 3B

Attributes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
level consistent						x		1
calm balancing effect	x			x				2
sensitive	x					x		2
comfortable						x		1
non-threatening			x			x		2
non-authoritarian	x							1
great concern for people							x	1
realistic feedback, honest				x				1
goal, philosophical development			x	x				2
good listener					x			1
positive attitude	x							1
interpesonal relations			x	x				2
holds back					x			1
non-directive		x						1
group development		x						1

Question 4B

Limitations	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
difficulty organizing	x		x					2
not aggressive enough			x	x				2
doesn't always level					x	x		2
not risk taker			x					1
difficulty being open/honest		x	x					2
difficulty delegating responsibility		x						1

PERSON C

Question 3C

Attributes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
full of energy						x		1
reliable					x	x		2
always prepared						x		1
dedicated, direct				x				1
practical	x			x				2
attentive to detail							x	1
non-threateningly aggressive	x					x	:	2
good organizer	x		x	x		x		4
honest and open		x		x	x			3
interested and sensitive						x	x	2
recognizes ambiguity						x		1
clarifies		x		x	x			3
theoretical framework	x			x				2
initiator			x					1

Question 4C

Limitations	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
overintellectualizes				x				1
too detail oriented		x			x	x		3
too aggressive	x							1
works too hard				x				1
doesn't socialize			x					1
too serious, organized			x					1
narrower focus			x					1
personal philosophy			x		x			2

PERSON D

Question 3D

Attributes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
enthusiastic				x	x	x	x	4
outgoing	x					x		2
humorous	x	x	x	x		x		5
articulate, confident		x						1
idea person, creative			x					1
reliable, responsible			x					1
well motivated					x	x		2
helps decision-making	x							1
relates well	x			x		x		3
willing	x							1
optimistic			x					1

Question 4D

Limitations	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
diversions, too humorous						x		1
overly aggressive		x			x			2
talks too much		x						1
jumps too fast		x	x		x			3
rushes group			x					1
too confident	x							1
takes on too much	x							1
contrary ideas				x				1

PERSON E

Question 3E

Attributes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
articulate	x							1
direct				x				1
level, sensitive						x		1
serious, but humorous			x			x		2
sharp mind, firm beliefs	x							1
uncompromising	x							1
very principled			x					1
idea person				x		x		2
definite thinker	x							1
creative and innovative			x	x				2
helps clarify				x				1
shows concern		x						1
wholesome				x				1
co-operative		x		x				2
good listener	x				x			2
interested, takes things on		x						1
helps decision-making			x					1
organized, thorough					x			1
good balance					x			1

Question 4E

Limitations	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
lack of aggressiveness		x			x			2
ministerial background		x						1
stubborn streak			x					1
lack of time with team				x		x	x	3
limits evaluation						x	x	2
too enthusiastic					x			1

PERSON F

Question 3F

Attributes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
steady, reliabel			x					1
co-operative, helpful		x						1
warm, comfortable	x							1
devoted to team					x			1
definite thinker	x							1
outside dimension		x						1
enthusiastic, moderately aggressive					x			1
encouraged involvement				x				1
reactor						x		1
represents lay view						x		1

Question 4F

Limitations	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
reserved		x						1
lacks self-confidence	x							1
part-time		x						1
too positive			x		x			2
not instructor						x		1

PERSON G

Question 3G

Attributes	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
very competent	x					x		2
reliable, responsible						x		1
direct			x					1
bright, happy				x				1
congenial		x				x		2
efficient					x	x	x	3
organized	x		x	x		x		4

Question 4G

Limitations	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
time and lack of experience	x			x		x		3
too organized			x				x	2
limited P. R. value		x						1
threatened by stereotype					x			1

Question 5

Choice of Senior Instructor

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
legal choice	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
seniority		x				x	x
	x	x				x	
	experience	evolved				capable	

Question 6

Changes Caused

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
No Change	No Change	No Change	More Accessible	No Change	Role More Accessible	No Change

Question 7

Why

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Same Approach	Most Changes Come Through Group	-	-	Ineffective Role	-	-

Goals and Objectives

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Question 8 Know	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Question 9 Agree	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Question 10 Work toward them	Well (majority of time)	Well	Well (more than most)	Very Well	Well	Well	Well
Question 11 Reaching them	Very Well	Well	Fairly Well	Well	Well	Well	Fairly Well
Question 12 Obstacles	TF,PR,SB RC	PR,TF	RC	PR*,IDV, RC,FF	PR,TF,MT SB	TF*,MT	DS

		# of reponses	category
DS	Unrealistic deadline setting	1	8
FF	Not fulfilling original function	1	7
IDV	Limited access for individuals	1	6
MT	Municipal training	2	4
PR	Public Relations	4	1
RC	Relations with college	3	3
SB	Small business	2	5
TF	Residential training facility	4	2
*	Correlations with Question 17		

Question 13

Differences-Organization Chart, Job Description and Job Performance

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	MR	MR

ND - no major difference
MR - more responsibility

Question 14

Joining College Changed LI

A+	B=	C-	D+	E+	F+	G=
B,D,A	B,J	I	A,B,C,H	G	E,F,D	J

Advantages		Disadvantages	
A College Philosophy	2	H Not independent	1
B Credibility	3	I Created conflict	1
C Resources	1		
D Advisory Council	2		
E New location	1		
F More holidays	1	J balances out	2
G More benifits	1		

Question 15

Job Match Needs

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
skills	Mostly Good	Good	Good	Good	Mostly Good	Very Good	Good
job satisfaction	Ideal	Generally Good	Generally Good	Very Good	Fairly Good	Very Good	Very Good
money	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good (more than enough)	Adequate	Adequate	Very Good	Adequate
self development	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good
career development	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good

Question 16

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
long term	Depends on Satisfaction	As Long as Satisfied	No	Unsure	No	No	No
next depends	Unsure	on L1 directions	on family responsi-bility	on oppor-tunities	on oppor-tunities	on oppor-tunities	on L1 directions

Question 17

Changes Recommended

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
-	EO,OF	OF,TF,RC	SE,PR*	MD,IDV	OF,TF*,RC IDV	OF

EO	Extension Offices	1
IDV	Individualized training	2
MD	Materials development	1
OF	Improve office	4
PR	Public relations	1

RC	Relations with college	2
SB	Small business	1
TF	Training facility	2
*	Correlations with Question 12	

Question 18

Philosophy	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
learning more likely	x	x						2
responsibility for what they help create		x						1
participation in planning and learning process itself	x	x	x	x	x	x		6
learning causing bahavior change		x						1
people responsible for own learning				x				1
learn and retain more	x							1

Question 19

Application

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
everywhere	some	some	yes	some	yes	yes

Question 20

Implications	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
positive results in society		x	x		x	x	x	5
positive results for individual						x		1
increase in motivation				x			x	2
increase in participation	x	x					x	3
slow process						x	x	2
change physical set up	x					x		2
expand resources					x	x		2
not universal answer				x				1
students more interested and involved	x						x	2
less discipline problems		x						1
better learning				x				1
increased role demand		x						1
teachers role change			x		x			2
administration	x		x	x				3
resource centre	x							1

Question 21

Change Noted

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
no	no	no	no	no	no	no

APPENDIX E

P.E.I. LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

OBJECTIVES For 1976-77

1. To encourage individuals to develop skills in leadership, communications, supervision, and personal growth by applications of the principles of learning as stated in the philosophy of the Leadership Institute.

2. To assist organizations, institutions and business community in identifying their needs, developing their programs, and in strengthening their skills so that their organization may accomplish purposes for which they were organized.

3. To create an awareness of the Leadership Institute's philosophy as it applies to learning and to develop programs to meet the training needs of Prince Edward Islanders.

4. To co-operate with other institutions and agencies such as U.P.E.I., Atlantic Management Institute, the Council of Maritime Premiers, Federation of Municipalities, P.E.I. Civil Service Commission and others who are interested in training programs.

GOALS:

1. To provide a residential training experience for 1500
    participants in the Atlantic region during fiscal year
    1976-77.   (Reason for maintaining rather than increasing
    is that the staff recognize the economic pressures of
    today.)

2. To provide training for 4,000 residents of the Atlantic
    area during 1976-77.

3. To respond to requests for the assistance in public
    meetings i.e. chairing, evaluating, providing guest
    speaker, for 500 participants in 1976-77.

4. To initiate, through organizations, if necessary two
    public forums dealing with vital issues of interest to
    Island residents, i.e. Preventive Health Care Centres;
    Day Care & Kindergarten; New General Hospital; Education-
    Today & the Future, Jazz Up Your Mental Health with
    Dr. Murray Banks.

5. To provide consultation and information for 75 people
    in the Atlantic area.

6. To develop materials for at least ten (10) skills of the
    Instructional Methods Chart by December 31, 1976.

7. To advertise, promote, and conduct a workshop to introduce
    the Instructional Methods Chart to leaders by November 1,
    1976.

8. To advertise, promote, screen and select and orient 10
    interested community leaders or trainers (as part-time
    students) to develop competencies from the twenty-two
    (22) identified skills by Jan. 31/77 .

9. To prepare and send promotional material to twenty-five
    (25) provincial organizations advising of our willing-
    ness to outline our purposes and services available by
    January 31, 1977. This would include the five (5)
    Regional School Boards, especially as it applies to
    school board members.

10. To advertise, promote, and conduct five (5) short courses
     for small business owners & operators during the year
     1976-77.

11. To advertise and conduct four (4) night courses in areas
     of competence of the Leadership Institute.

12. In cooperation with P.E.I. Federation of Municipalities,
     conduct training programs for each of the following:

     a) town and village clerks

     b) supervisory staff of towns so affected

     c) elected officials.

     N.B. Program might be three, four, or more hours.

APPENDIX F

Leadership Institute Annual Report 1975-76

PHILOSOPHY:

We believe that learning is a personal process involving the integration of new facts, skills and attitudes into the life of the learner. In our belief, the learning process is not complete unless a change of behaviour takes place in the learner.

To us an ideal learning climate is achieved when learners come to feel responsible for the creation of their own learning. In our programs, methods of achieving this are:
- involving participants through a representative committee when planning a program;
- individually setting learning objectives at the beginning of all programs - evaluations are based on these objectives.

The P.E.I. Leadership Institute serves its clientele through day-course, night-course, and in-residence programming. We do feel that the in-residence training, in which participants actually remain overnight for training programs, is most conducive to the creation of the ideal learning climate cited above. Our experience indicates that the in-residence program can bring with it

an atmosphere quite conducive to effective proglem solving
and to the sharing of both <u>mutual concerns</u> and <u>creative</u>
<u>ideas</u>. While we do not in any way downgrade the value of
night-course or daytime programming, we do believe that
seven years of experience in creating learning environ-
ments has given us a solid foundation in fact for our bias
towards the in-residence setting.

We also believe that although the general
public of P.E.I. is our target group, there are four seg-
ments of Island society considered to have priority. They
are:
- the business community;
- voluntary adult and young people's organizations;
- all three levels of government of P.E.I.;
- educational and provincial service institutions.

The man or woman on the street who is not in-
volved in these four segments must also be reached through
publicly advertised courses in co-operation with Holland
College and by responding to requests from communities.
While our programs could be open to all age groups, we feel
they would be primarily intended for those sixteen years of
age and over. Finally, we realize that P.E.I. cannot be
considered in isolation from the other Atlantic provinces,
nor indeed from any other part of Canada. Therefore, we
believe that where and when possible, our training programs
should be made available to those outside this province,

recognizing that special financial arrangements would have to be made in these cases.

To meet both the felt and real training needs of Island residents and organizations we believe that the Institute should continuously involve itself in assisting groups and organizations in the identification of their learning needs. In past years, the following needs have been identified by organizational representatives as not being well met on the Island and it has become our task to meet at least some of these.

1. Leadership skills

2. Supervisory knowledge and skills

3. Communication skills - including public speaking

4. Skill and knowledge in properly conducting a meeting

5. Skill and knowledge to properly manage small businesses including service stations, restaurants, motels, processing plants, amusement operations, credit unions, and co-operatives

6. Skill in effective decision-making

7. Life skills

8. Knowledge and skill in motivating others

9. Organizational development.

In conclusion, we feel that the philosophy of

the P.E.I. Leadership Institute must be looked upon as a fluid creation. It must be periodically revised and infused with the new ideas and concepts that develop from our changing experiences and new knowledge.

* * * * * * * * * * *