

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

ALLEN, TROY L'OVERTURE

BOARD MEMBERS' FUNCTIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS: AN
EXAMINATION OF A SAMPLE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES
INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTERS' BOARD MEMBERS WITHIN THE STATE
OF MICHIGAN

Michigan State University

PH.D. 1981

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1981

by

Allen, Troy L'Overture

All Rights Reserved

BOARD MEMBERS' FUNCTIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS: AN
EXAMINATION OF A SAMPLE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES
INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTERS' BOARD MEMBERS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

By

Troy L'Overture Allen

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1981

ABSTRACT

BOARD MEMBERS' FUNCTIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS: AN EXAMINATION OF A SAMPLE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTERS' BOARD MEMBERS WITHIN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

By

Troy L'Overture Allen

This research project studied the Board members of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OIC) within the State of Michigan. The study was conducted to: (1) identify the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess; (2) identify the functions that local OIC Board members are expected to perform; (3) identify the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members; (4) identify the degree to which local OIC Board members possess the Executive Directors' designated observable personal characteristics; (5) identify the degree to which local OIC Board members have made contributions to their local OIC by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions; (6) examine the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics; (7) examine the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members; and (8) identify the interval scale socioeconomic characteristics that are acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions of local OIC Board members.

The first phase of the study employed a version of the Delphi Technique using a three-round questionnaire and a panel of seven experts to agree on the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess and the functions that these Board members should perform. Eighteen observable personal characteristics were identified as desirable for local OIC Board members to possess, and nineteen functions were identified as desirable for local OIC Board members to perform.

During the second phase of the study, a sample of OIC Board members within the State of Michigan was surveyed to gather information of their socioeconomic status and either their degree of possession of the observable personal characteristics or their degree of contributions to their Board by performing the designated Board functions.

The study developed a socioeconomic profile of OIC Board members within the State of Michigan and an instrument that can be used to identify effective Board members. The study found that: (1) there is a mild relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics; and (2) there are some socioeconomic characteristics that can aid in forecasting how a potential Board member will perform the designated Board functions that local OIC Board members should perform.

DEDICATED

TO MY CHILDREN

Eric, Troy, Jr., and Tara

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to God and the following persons who assisted me in completing this dissertation:

The late Professor Russell Kleis, former chairman of my committee; Dr. Melvin C. Buschman, committee chairman; and committee members: Dr. Richard L. Featherstone, Dr. S. Levine, and Dr. Mary L. Schneider, for their guidance in this research project. I am especially grateful to Dr. Buschman for accepting the responsibility of committee chairmanship during the middle of the research project.

The entire OIC family--The Reverend Leon Sullivan for his endorsement to study the local OIC organizations; Mr. James Brewer for his technical assistance in developing the research instruments; and the Executive Directors and Board members within the State of Michigan for completing the questionnaires.

Mrs. Ann McCalpin for typing the research instruments, and Mrs. Shirley Tinsley for editing the dissertation.

Mrs. Ordarean Newson Allen, my wife, for her moral support and encouragement to complete the doctoral program and her assistance in editing and typing the first draft of the dissertation.

The late Mrs. Eva Kidd Allen, my mother; the Reverend Roy A. Allen, Sr., my father; and the late Mrs. Nola White Brumsey, my grandmother; for their influence in my life and their continuous educational support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introductory Statement	1
Importance of Citizen Boards	1
Citizen Boards in the Black Community	2
Black-Controlled Voluntary Organizations	3
OIC Background	3
Why OIC Was Chosen for This Study	3
The Need for OIC/Social Context	4
The Precursor to OIC	5
The Birth of OIC	6
The Function of OIC	7
The Local OIC Organization	7
Statement of the Problem	8
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Tasks	10
Phase I	10
Phase II	11
Definition of Terms	12
Importance of the Study	12
Overview of the Dissertation	13
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
Leadership Theory	15
Trait Theory	15
Group Theory	16
Situation Theory	17
Combination Theory	17
Community Leadership	18
Formal and Informal Leadership	18
Social Characteristics	19
Boardsmanship	19
Educational Institutions	20
Non-Profit Voluntary Organizations	22
Summary	23

CHAPTER	Page
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	24
Description of Methodology	24
Phase I--Delphi Technique	25
Delphi Instrument and Procedure	27
Time Frame and Data Collection	29
Phase II--Survey Design	29
Population Studied	29
Sample Population	30
Random Selection	31
Research Instrument and Procedures	32
Time Frame and Data Collection	33
Statistical Analysis	33
Research Hypotheses	36
Limitations of the Study	37
IV. FINDINGS: ANALYSES AND RESULTS	38
Research Questions 1 and 2	39
Findings: First Round Delphi Questionnaire . . .	39
Findings: Second Round Delphi Questionnaire . . .	41
Findings: Third Round Delphi Questionnaire . . .	45
Research Question 3	48
Formal Education	48
Occupation	51
Income	52
Growing Up As Child/Rural or Urban	53
Ethnic Origin	53
Sex	54
Age	55
Place of Birth	55
Growing Up As Child/State	56
Marital Status	57
Residence in Community	57
Years As Local OIC Board Member	58
Leadership Positions in Organizations	59
Research Questions 4 and 5	60
Saginaw OIC	60
Muskegon OIC	61
Flint OIC	62
Detroit OIC	64
Research Question 6	66
Research Question 7	68
Null Hypothesis H_0	68
F Test of Significance	69
Degree(s) Earned	70
Occupation	70

CHAPTER	Page
Place of Birth	72
Place of Growing Up/State	73
Place of Growing Up/Rural or Urban	74
Ethnic Origin	75
Sex	76
Research Question 8	77
Summary	80
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	81
Summary of Project and Procedures	81
Research Questions	84
Discussion of Findings	89
Conclusions	93
Recommendations for Future Research	94
APPENDIX	
A. DELPHI INSTRUMENTS	95
B. DELPHI PARTICIPANTS	115
C. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	116
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Summary of Questionnaire Returns	31
5.1 First Round Observable Personal Characteristics	40
5.2 First Round Board Functions	42
5.3 Second Round Rating of Observable Personal Characteristics	44
5.4 Second Round Rating of Board Members' Functions	46
5.5 Observable Personal Characteristics--Disagreement from Group Consensus	47
5.6 Board Members' Functions--Disagreement from Group Consensus	49
5.7 Local OIC Board Members' Number of Years of Formal Education	50
5.8 Local OIC Board Members' Earned Degree(s)	50
5.9 Local OIC Board Members' Principal Occupations	51
5.10 Local OIC Board Members' Years in Principal Occupations	52
5.11 Local OIC Board Members' Three Year (1977-1979) Average Income	52
5.12 Local OIC Board Members' Community Growing Up/Rural or Urban	53
5.13 Local OIC Board Members' Ethnic Origin	54
5.14 Local OIC Board Members' Sex	54
5.15 Local OIC Board Members' Age	55
5.16 Local OIC Board Members' Place of Birth	56

Table	Page
5.17 Local OIC Board Members' Place of Growing Up/State	56
5.18 Local OIC Board Members' Marital Status	57
5.19 Local OIC Board Members' Length of Residence in Present Community	58
5.20 Local OIC Board Members' Years of Service to OIC	58
5.21 Local OIC Board Members' Positions Held in Community-Based Organizations	59
5.22 Saginaw OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions	61
5.23 Muskegon OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions	62
5.24 Flint OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions	63
5.25 Detroit OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions	65
5.26 Local OIC Board Members' Ratings for Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions	66
5.27 The Correlation Between Performance of Designated Board Functions and Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics	67
5.28 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and Degree(s) Earned by Local OIC Board Members	71
5.29 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and Principal Occupations of Local OIC Board Members	72
5.30 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Place of Birth of Local OIC Board Members	73

Table		Page
5.31	Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Place of Growing Up/State of Local OIC Board Members	74
5.32	Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Place of Growing Up/Rural or Urban of Local OIC Board Members	75
5.33	Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Ethnic Origin of Local OIC Board Functions	76
5.34	Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Sex of Local OIC Board Members . .	77
5.35	Multiple Regression: Socioeconomic Characteristics as Predictors of Performance of Designated Board Functions of Local OIC Board Members	79

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Good boards do not just happen any more than do good staffs, program, and financing. The full potentialities of boards may not be achieved because we have not invested as much time and effort in them as we have in other phases of agency operations.

Louis H. Blumenthal

Introductory Statement

Importance of Citizen Boards

The use of citizen boards is a part of the democratic process in this country. Citizens' participation as Board members is a tradition that enhances voluntarism throughout each local community.

Trecker explains why he feels these boards are important:

The citizen board is one of society's most important instruments. It is used to determine social policy and is charged with the responsibility for providing all kinds of community service.¹

Houle agrees with Trecker on the importance of citizen boards and gives the following analysis of the impact of boards on our daily living:

Consider the ordinary citizen, living anywhere in the United States. If he works for a private corporation or for any of a number of public services, his conditions of employment and his chances for advancement are governed

¹Harleigh B. Trecker, Citizen Boards at Work (New York: Association Press, 1970), p. 17.

by a board. His children are educated in schools, colleges, and universities whose policies are controlled by boards. The church at which he worships, the organized efforts to improve society in which he plays a part, and the institutions in which he seeks knowledge and enlightenment are usually guided by boards. If he belongs to a union or to a professional or trade association, the conditions of his membership and the services he receives will be influenced by a board. If he gives to charity, his money is spent by a board, and if he receives private charity, the terms under which he receives it are established by a board. If he is ill or if he needs other kinds of special care, he usually goes to an institution which is operated by a board. Many of the services of the government which he supports with his taxes are directed by boards. Boards' influence is, in fact, so much a part of his life and environment that, like the air he breathes, he scarcely knows that it is there.²

There can be little doubt that citizen boards have great impact on our lives.

Citizen Boards in the Black Community

Within the Black community, citizen boards began to take on a new look during the 1960s. Black organizations began to turn to the Black community to recruit leadership in the form of Board members as Caucasians were no longer expected to perform this function. These organizations were attempting to eliminate Board members who had no immediate connections with the Black community. Zald has stated the undesirability of leadership from outside of the immediate community as related to Board participation.

The Jacksonian emphasis of democratic participation in our society suggests that such a situation (leadership from outside of the immediate community) is bad since dependence on "outside" leadership leads to a devitalization of local

²Cyril O. Houle, The Effective Board (New York: Association Press, 1960), pp. 1-2.

institutions: "social absenteeism" leads either to an absence of leadership or to a leadership without commitment and involvement.³

Black-Controlled Voluntary Organizations

In addition to this new emphasis on Board leadership from within the Black community, "there also emerged in the mid 1960s a new group of black organized and black-controlled voluntary organizations."⁴ One of the organizations that emerged during that period was the Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC).

OIC Background

Why OIC Was Chosen for This Study

There are several reasons why OIC was chosen for this study. First, the OIC story is one that is worth sharing, because it is truly American, only in America could a Black Baptist minister, with extremely limited resources, armed with unlimited faith in God and dedicated workers, create a manpower training program that is revolutionary in that it screens the trainees "in" rather than "out"; thus giving millions of people (Black, Spanish-speaking, as well as poor Caucasians) new hope, a sense of being and self-respect, and, possibly, a new image and sense of appreciation for the Black Church.

³Mayer N. Zald, "Urban Differentiation, Characteristics of Board of Directors, and Organizational Effectiveness," The American Journal of Sociology 73 (November 1967): 261-262.

⁴David M. Austin, The Black Civic Volunteer Leader: A New Era in Voluntarism (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, 1970), pp. 3-4.

Second, as a Black Baptist minister, the writer feels that the study of OIC Board members can assist the organization in its continuing effort to make a significant impact in the development of human resources.

The Need for OIC/Social Context

During the late 1950s and the early 1960s job discrimination against Blacks was prevalent, as it had been for many years, throughout the United States. The Reverend Leon Sullivan, founder of OIC, explicates these discriminatory labor conditions as they existed in the city of Philadelphia:

Up to 1958 in Philadelphia, although the black population comprised one-fourth of the city's population, less than one percent of the sensitive clerical, and public contact jobs were held by black people. The jobs blacks held fell mostly into the service field and into the most menial work categories. . . . Everywhere you went where the jobs were poor, you saw blacks. And even these black jobs had white bosses, for the most part.⁵

Not only was there long-standing racial job discrimination but also there was, during that particular period, widespread unemployment throughout the nation in the midst of economic prosperity. This unemployment problem was present during the Eisenhower and Kennedy-Johnson administrations. The U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower conducted hearings during 1963 to address this issue. The following statements summarize Black unemployment and conditions of poverty which were presented as findings of the Subcommittee:

⁵Leon H. Sullivan, Build Brother Build (Philadelphia: Macrae Smith Company, 1969), p. 67.

The labor markets of the United States have been plagued since 1953 with a persistent upward trend in unemployment which has averaged about 6 percent for the past 6 years. Despite a high level of personal income expansion, unemployment has remained about 5.5 percent during all of 1963. This unemployment has been concentrated among youth for whom the rate tends to be triple the national average, minority groups whose unemployment experiences is double the average, older workers, the uneducated and the unskilled. . . .

. . . One half of all Negro families are poor by the \$3,000.00 annual income definition. They and other minority groups are concentrated in depressed rural and central city slums. Their educational backgrounds and opportunities are deficient. The jobs open to them due to tradition, discrimination, prejudice, and inadequate preparation are among those vulnerable to technological change.⁶

The Johnson administration reacted to these and related conditions by declaring a "war against poverty" and committing the federal government to fund programs which were designed to assist in the area of social reform. This commitment by the federal government was evident in the 1965 budget, as expressed by Ginzberg:

In 1965, the combined expenditures for education (including manpower training), community development and housing, health, and welfare (i.e., public assistance and services to the poor) totalled 7.6 billion, or 6.4 percent of the federal budget.⁷

The Precursor to OIC

The precursor to OIC was an economic withdrawal campaign⁸ conducted in the City of Philadelphia against businesses that were

⁶Garth Mangum, ed., The Manpower Revolution (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965), pp. 235 and 265.

⁷Eli Ginzberg and Robert M. Solow, eds., The Great Society (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1974), p. 9.

⁸This campaign was formally called the Selective Patronage Program.

loath to discontinue racially discriminatory job practices. Over a period of four years (1959-1963), there had been a total of twenty-nine economic withdrawal campaigns which had resulted in the opening of many job opportunities. The openings of these job opportunities exposed another serious problem in the quest to assist Blacks. It was that many Blacks were unprepared to take advantage of the new job opportunities. The Reverend Sullivan saw the need for an aggressive manpower training program deeply rooted in the concept of self help.

The Birth of OIC

As manpower development was becoming a priority of the federal government, the climate was right for the birth of OIC.⁹ The Reverend Sullivan formally introduced this new manpower training program on Sunday, January 24, 1964.

After listening to the many business executives who had neither the time nor the commitment to initiate needed manpower training programs, the Reverend Sullivan proclaimed, "If we are not prepared, then we will make ourselves prepared! We will help ourselves."¹⁰ With this as its central purpose, OIC was founded. In reporting the founding, the Reverend Sullivan explained, "A skelton key was chosen as our symbol, meaning that OIC could unlock any door, and our slogan was 'we help ourselves.'"¹¹

⁹OIC was founded and initially operated without government financial support.

¹⁰ Sullivan, p. 89.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 95.

The Function of OIC

OIC functions as a linkage agency between the business/industrial community and disadvantaged workers, predominantly within the Black community.¹² This linkage relationship with the business/industrial community did not happen by chance, as the Reverend Sullivan early recognized the importance of industry to the success of OIC. However, he did not see the OIC-industry relationship as beneficial only to OIC. Indeed, this relationship was viewed by the Reverend Sullivan as "a partnership . . . a reciprocal relationship" between OIC and industry:

We knew that a successful OIC operation would benefit no one more than industry. Industry needed OIC as much as OIC needed industry, for no industry can exist in a community without the resources of skilled workmen to do its work. We were tied by reciprocal needs; our people needed jobs, and industry needed good people.¹³

The Local OIC Organization

Each local OIC organization is an autonomous job training center that is affiliated with the National OIC. The relationship between the local center and the National OIC is governed by an Affiliate Agreement. Anderson summarizes the purpose of the agreement:

In addition to making a public commitment to the overall goals of OIC, local officials must agree to certain operational procedures as a condition for using the OIC name. A modest annual fee is imposed on each center for affiliate

¹²OIC does not restrict its services to Blacks. However, it is primarily a Black service-oriented organization. OIC organizations have been developed in areas that serve poor Whites as well as Spanish-surnamed minorities.

¹³Sullivan, p. 90.

status, and the national organization retains the right to revoke affiliation for failure to comply with the terms of membership. The affiliate agreement does not abrogate the autonomy of local centers; it merely ensures greater commitment to a common purpose and a similarity of organizational form.¹⁴

The local center is responsible for the administration of the training program. The board of directors is the policy-making unit of each local OIC organization, and is usually composed of indigenous and other community leaders who serve on the board voluntarily.

Anderson summarizes the board composition and duties:

The board of directors is the policy-making unit of each center. Although other units, such as the Industrial Advisory Council, may influence the policy-making process, major decision-making authority and accountability remain with the board.

Typically, the board of directors will be drawn from a wide spectrum of persons in the community who have shown interest and prior activity in community efforts to assist the disadvantaged. Board members are drawn heavily from religious, social, and professional organizations. . . . Usually the board chairman will be a community leader with strong interest in the problems of minorities. . . . Perhaps reflecting OIC's origin and developmental history, a large number of board chairmen are black ministers.¹⁵

Statement of the Problem

Each local OIC within the State of Michigan--Benton Harbor, Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Muskegon, Pontiac, and Saginaw--is affiliated with the National OIC which is located in Philadelphia,

¹⁴ Bernard E. Anderson, The Opportunities Industrialization Centers: A Decade of Community-Based Manpower Service (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1976), p. 52.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 45-46.

Pennsylvania. The success or failure of each local OIC depends on many factors, a key one being the effectiveness of its Board members. Like all effective organizations, each local OIC must recruit and maintain effective Board members. To aid in the process of recruiting and maintaining effective OIC Board members, this research project: (1) identifies the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess and the function that local OIC Board members should perform; (2) assesses the effectiveness of a sample of local OIC Board members; and (3) develops a socioeconomic profile of a sample of local OIC Board members.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to achieve the following research objectives:

1. To identify the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors.
2. To identify the functions that local OIC Board members are expected to perform, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors.
3. To identify the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members, as reported by the Board members themselves.
4. To identify the degree to which local OIC Board members possess the Executive Directors' designated observable personal characteristics, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC.

5. To identify the degree to which local OIC Board members have made contributions to their local OIC by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC.
6. To examine the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics of local OIC Board members.
7. To examine the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members.
8. To identify the interval scale socioeconomic characteristics that are acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions of local OIC Board members.

Research Tasks

The tasks that were achieved during the investigation were divided into two phases:

Phase I

By use of the Delphi Technique, the local OIC Executive Directors were asked to designate the following:

1. The observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess.
2. The functions that local OIC Board members should perform.

Phase II

By use of a self-made questionnaire, local OIC Board members were asked to:

1. Identify their own socioeconomic characteristics. (Part A of the instrument contained questions relating to socioeconomic characteristics; each Board member was asked to complete this section of the research instrument.)
2. Identify the degree to which Board members of each local Board possess the Executive Directors' designated observable personal characteristics. (Part B of the instrument contained questions relating to observable personal characteristics and one-half of the Board members at each local OIC received this Part B with instructions to rate all Board members [except self] at that given center in the area of possession of observable personal characteristics.)
3. Identify the degree to which Board members of each local Board have made contributions to their local OIC by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions. (Part BB of the instrument contained questions relating to performance of designated functions. The other one-half of the Board members at each local OIC received this Part BB with instructions to rate all Board members [except self] at that given center in the area of performance of designated functions.)

Definition of Terms

Board: Citizen boards, controlling boards, and board of directors are used interchangeably. A Board is a group of persons who have the legal authority and responsibility for the operation of an institution or organization.

Delphi Technique: A method used to gain group consensus on a subject matter, without assembling the group together in one specific place.

Effective Local OIC Board Member: The Board member who has made significant contributions to the local OIC by performing the designated Board functions.

Functions: The duties that local OIC Board members are expected to perform.

Local OIC: One of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers within the State of Michigan.

OIC: The Opportunities Industrialization Center of America which is the national organization with which local OIC's are affiliated.

Panel of Experts: The local OIC Executive Directors who assisted in carrying out the Delphi Technique.

Personal Characteristics: Those attributes that are related to personality traits and are desirable for local OIC Board members to possess.

Socioeconomic Characteristics: The demographic factors of and social participation in community organizations by local OIC Board members.

Importance of the Study

The study of controlling boards has been done in higher education, school systems, and non-profit voluntary organizations; however, research in the area is extremely limited. Additionally, research of controlling boards of alternative educational programs (such as OIC) that are not run by the school systems is also limited.

This research project makes a contribution to non-profit voluntary organizations by providing an instrument that will assist

in the identification of effective Board members. The procedure for identifying the effective Board members can be adapted to assess the members of other controlling boards on non-profit voluntary organizations. Furthermore, this research project makes a contribution to the field of Adult and Continuing Education by contributing to the body of research knowledge--the study has implications for further research in the areas of (1) the recruitment of community leaders to serve as Board members of non-profit voluntary organizations; and (2) the study of boards as individual units rather than individual Board members.

Then too, this research project will assist OIC personnel by providing: (1) a State profile of local OIC Board members; and (2) an instrument to assess Board members' effectiveness in other states where there are OIC affiliates.

Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter I provides an introduction to the importance of citizen boards as a part of the democratic process in the United States and the birth of the Opportunities Industrialization Center movement; a statement of the problem to be investigated in the study; the purpose of the study; the research tasks; and the importance of the study. Definitions of selected terms used in the dissertation are also presented.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature and related research on the study of leadership and controlling boards of educational and non-profit voluntary organizations.

Chapter III contains a description of the research methodology. The investigation was divided into two phases and a detailed discussion of the tasks completed in each phase is presented in this chapter. Also presented are the specific research questions and hypotheses.

The raw data and the analysis of the data are presented in Chapter IV.

Chapter V contains a summary of the results of the study, and conclusions and recommendations for future investigation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This research project deals with the functions and characteristics of Board members. Board members are generally recognized as persons who provide leadership within the community. As such, the study of Board members involves leadership in general and community leadership in particular. In reviewing the literature of controlling boards and their members, the literature falls into one of the following areas: (1) leadership theory; (2) community leadership; and (3) boardsmanship as related to controlling boards of non-profit organizations.

Leadership Theory

Trait Theory

This theory of leadership places emphasis on physical and personality characteristics that are possessed by the individual. Deeply embedded in this theory is the assumption that "leadership is something that resides in an individual, something that he brings to a group, and something presumably that is capable, under almost any

circumstances of producing the same results in different groups and in different situations."¹

Group Theory

This theory places more emphasis on the blend between group expectations and the personality of the individual who leads the group.

Russ and Hendry state:

There can be little doubt that to perform leadership functions a person must bring with him, as part of his personality and character structure, qualities of being and capacities for doing that connect with what others bring to the group and to the situation. The importance of what a person is and does is not denied. What is crucial in operative terms is whether what he brings meshes with what others bring to the group, whether if in fact the psychological gears mesh and in meshing produce the leadership energy required for the group.²

For Gribb, the leader's personality can only be viewed in terms of the personalities of those whom he is leading. He concludes:

The leader inevitably embodies many of the qualities of the followers. Any individual's personality at a given point in time reflects the field forces with which it is interacting. The personality which most adequately reflects those forces is the one most likely to be propelled to leadership.³

¹Murray G. Russ and Charles E. Hendry, Leadership Theory: Theories of Leadership, reprinted in Leadership in Voluntary Enterprises, ed. Charles W. Merrifield (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1961), pp. 101-102.

²Ibid.

³Cecil A. Gribb, The Principles and Traits of Leadership, reprinted in The Study of Leadership, ed. C. G. Browne and Thomas S. Cohn (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1958), p. 73.

Situation Theory

With this theory, consideration is given to the "times" in which a person lives or the "situations" in which he finds himself. Thus, leadership is viewed as "a function of the situation, the cultural context, and customs of a group or organization. . . ." ⁴ With emphasis placed more on the situation than the individual, this theory focuses on environmental conditions in which the individual finds himself. Knickerbocker has also emphasized the importance of the situation in which the group finds itself. Thus, for him the leader is the one who "emerges as a consequence of the needs of a group of people and the nature of the situation within which that group is attempting to operate." ⁵

Combination Theory

Leadership can vary contingent upon the situation in which the group finds itself and the repertoire of each individual within the group. The situation, personal attributes, and group requirements all come together at some point and time in the dynamics of leadership. Russ and Hendry conclude:

Leadership is a function of a combination of very dynamic elements--the individual, the group, and the situation. . . . Perhaps the best we can say at this point is that any comprehensive theory of leadership must take into account the fact that roles in groups tend to be

⁴Russ and Henry, p. 104.

⁵Irving Knickerbocker, Leadership: A Conception and Some Implications, reprinted in The Study of Leadership, ed. C. G. Browne and Thomas S. Cohn (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1958), p. 3.

structured, and that the leadership role is probably related to personality factors, to the attitudes and needs of "followers" at a particular time, to the structure of the group, and the situation. . . .⁶

Community Leadership

Persons who serve on board of directors for non-profit organizations are usually considered community leaders and often give credibility to the organizations which they serve.

Formal and Informal Leadership

Etzioni has defined leadership in terms of "official leader," "informal leader," and "formal leader." An official leader is an individual whose power is chiefly derived from organizational position; an informal leader is an individual whose ability to control others is chiefly personal; and a formal leader is one who commands both positional and personal power.⁷

White has studied leadership in terms of informal (personal influence) and formal (positional power) leaders in a New York rural community. He was interested in the association between informal and formal leadership. He specifically wanted to know if there was (between informal and formal leadership) a sufficiently close correlation that would permit one to predict that he has a high ranking formal leader when he selects a high ranking informal leader and vice versa. He concluded that:

⁶Russ and Hendry, p. 108.

⁷Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 61.

Informal and formal leadership are not closely related to each other, they are simply different. Informal leadership occurs in a social process not significantly conditioned by the holding of formal leadership positions.⁸

Social Characteristics

There have been many studies dealing with the social characteristics of community leaders. Included in these characteristics are usually race, sex, age, occupation, rearing site, education, income, length of residence, and political and religious preferences. Studies that have addressed this matter are Stewart (1947), Jennings (1964), Freeman (1968), Hunt (1953), and Merton (1957).

In the Freeman study,⁹ one of the research objectives was to identify the factors that might affect differential rates of leadership. Freeman concluded that social level (education, occupation prestige, income, politics, father's education) was the best predictor of participation as a community leader.

Boardsmanship

Little research dealing with the study of controlling boards of educational and non-profit voluntary organizations has been completed. Trecker's statement gives us a clear picture of the research status in this area:

⁸James E. White, "Theory and Method for Research in Community Leadership," American Sociological Review 15 (February 1950): 50-60.

⁹Linton C. Freeman, Patterns of Local Community Leadership (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1968), p. 69.

In spite of the fact that boards are historically well established instruments and architects of community policy and programs in this country and abroad, there is not an extensive body of literature about them. . . . Research efforts have been relatively few and rigorous studies of their organization and functioning are likewise scarce.¹⁰

Educational Institutions

Counts (1927) studied the boards of public education in terms of social characteristics. He studied 473 boards and described them in terms of Board members' occupations, time committed to board work, age, sex, level of formal education, and length of time in office. Rauh studied trustees of higher education on similar factors as did Counts. Rauh also identified three characteristics and nine qualities that trustees felt were either "very important" or "important." The three characteristics of successful trustees identified by Rauh were as follows:

1. Has an analytic mind: Given a competent presentation of an issue, even though it might be quite foreign to his professional experience, he can extract the essential components of the problem and react constructively.
2. Asks discerning questions: Without being contentious or aggressive, he asks questions which have the quality of leading discussions to central policy issues and not operational details.
3. Is a sounding board: He listens and reacts creatively. frequently with imagination and sometimes with intuition. The quality of his reaction had the effect of influencing administrative decisions.¹¹

¹⁰ Trecker, p. 12.

¹¹ Morton A. Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 87.

The nine qualifications¹² of successful trustees also identified by Rauh were as follows:

	<u>Percentage Points Received</u>
1. Stature in the community	92
2. Stature in vocation	90
3. Generally known to other trustees	28
4. Has sufficient time for duties	94
5. Possesses a middle-of-the-road viewpoint .	33
6. Alumnus of the institution	13
7. Holds strong views about most matters . .	46
8. Potential for financial contribution . . .	45
9. Impatient with status quo, likes new ideas	67

Burns' study of trustees in higher education concluded that the most desirable qualifications of trustees are: (1) a college education; (2) an active interest in the institution; (3) a genuine interest in higher education; (4) the ability to attend meetings and work on behalf of the institution; (5) a reasonable economic stability; (6) a good reputation in the community and sound character and moral judgment.¹³ Russell and Reeves reached a different conclusion than Burns. They studied institutional excellence and board factors that influenced institutional excellence. They found that the following factors had no significant relationship to institutional excellence: (1) number of members on the board; (2) method of selecting Board members; (3) number and kind of committees; (4) frequency of regular

¹² Ibid., p. 185.

¹³ Gerald P. Burns, Trustees in Higher Education, Independent College Funds of America, Inc., 1966, pp. 65-66.

meetings; (5) attendance at board meetings; (6) residence of Board members; and (7) age of members.¹⁴

Non-Profit Voluntary Organizations

Zald studied Young Men's Christian Associations (YMCA's) of Metropolitan Chicago. Zald looked at Board members socioeconomic characteristics (business leaders, middle management, professionals, religious leaders/ministers, labor leaders, and others), residency, and location of employment as related to branch YMCA's organizational effectiveness. He found that, in terms of its contribution to organizational effectiveness, the socioeconomic composition of a Board member is more important than his/her work-residence pattern.¹⁵

Hartugs and Weber studied 296 hospitals, health and welfare organizations of the Greater New York Fund. Questionnaires were sent to Board members, as well as to the Board presidents and executive directors of each organization. The overall findings of this study were: "Most Board members are men . . . outnumbering women two to one; . . . the majority of them ranging in ages from 25-65 . . . most Board members are employed primarily as bankers, lawyers and business people, and most of them hold demanding executive positions."¹⁶ This

¹⁴ John D. Russell and Floyd W. Reeves, The Evaluation of Higher Institutions (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 35.

¹⁵ Mayber N. Zald, "Urban Differentiation, Characteristics of Board of Directors, and Organizational Effectiveness," The American Journal of Sociology 73 (November 1967): 261-272.

¹⁶ Nelly Hartugs and Joseph Weber, Board of Directors: A Study of Current Practices in Board Management and Board Operations in Voluntary Hospital, Health and Welfare Organizations (Dubbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1967), p. 19.

study identified the following qualifications for Board members: (1) someone with a position in the community; (2) someone with a willingness to serve; (3) someone with important connections and access to funding; and (4) someone who has some expertise in the field of service in which the organization is engaged.¹⁷

Summary

The review of the literature revealed that: (1) there is no one acceptable theory of leadership; (2) there is no significant relationship between informal and formal leaders; (3) there are several socioeconomic characteristics that are acceptable predictors of participation as a community leader; and (4) there are studies of boardsmanship of educational institutions and non-profit organizations which describe Board members in terms of their socioeconomic characteristics.

¹⁷ Ibid.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the research methodology of the study is presented. The research design, including variables and research questions and hypotheses, is described. Also described are the research instrument used in data collection and the method used to analyze the data.

Description of Methodology

This is a descriptive study which: (1) identifies the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors; (2) identifies the functions that local OIC Board members are expected to perform, as judged by the local OIC Executive Directors; (3) identifies the socio-economic characteristics of local OIC Board members, as reported by the Board members themselves; (4) identifies the degree to which local Board members possess the Executive Directors' designated observable personal characteristics, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC; (5) identifies the degree to which local OIC Board members have made contributions to their local OIC by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC; (6) examines the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal

characteristics of local OIC Board members; (7) examines the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members; and (8) identifies the interval scale socioeconomic characteristics that are acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions of local OIC Board members.

This is a cross-sectional survey design; that is, data were collected at one point in time from a random sample selected to describe the larger population at that time. The research was done in two phases.

Phase I--Delphi Technique

By use of the Delphi Technique, local OIC Executive Directors were asked to designate the following: (1) the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess; and (2) the functions that local OIC Board members should perform.

The Delphi Technique was developed by Helmer and others at the RAND Corporation during the early 1950s. It is a method which permits the systematic collecting and organizing of data from informed persons (often referred to as "experts") on a particular topic. This technique enables one to procure group opinion on topics without bringing members of the group together in any kind of a face-to-face confrontation. While there is variation in administering the Delphi Technique, the general procedure is as follows:

1. By use of mail, a panel of experts receive a questionnaire that is designed to obtain information regarding a topic or

- problem area. The experts independently answer the questionnaire and return it to the researcher.
2. The responses are summarized into a feedback report and sent back to the panel of experts with a second questionnaire that is designed to ascertain more detailed information that was generated from the first questionnaire. Again, the experts independently answer the questionnaire and return it to the researcher.
 3. This process continues, usually from two to four rounds of questionnaire-feedback reports, between the panel of experts and the researcher.
 4. Finally, the panel members are requested to agree with the majority opinion of the group or to state in narrative form their position of disagreement.

In conducting the research, the researcher used, with some adaptation, the Delphi Technique that was used in a study by Rossman and Bunning.¹ The Delphi Technique conducted by this writer involved a series of three-round questionnaires; the panel of experts consisted of the seven local OIC Executive Directors. The names of these persons are listed in Appendix B.

¹Mark H. Rossman and Richard L. Bunning, "Knowledge and Skills for the Adult Educator: A Delphi Study," Adult Education 28 (No. 3, 1978): 139-155.

Delphi Instrument and Procedure

The first-round questionnaire was developed by the writer in consultation with the Executive Director² of the Greater Detroit Opportunities Industrialization Center during the spring of 1979. This was a two-part questionnaire and the first part contained eighteen observable personal characteristics (along with a definition for each characteristic) that are associated with leadership. The panel of experts was asked to respond (with a yes or no answer) as to whether or not each observable personal characteristic should or should not be possessed by local OIC Board members. Space was provided for the listing of additional personal characteristics that panel members felt should be included on the list. The second part of the first-round questionnaire contained a list of twenty-four functions that are associated with local OIC boardsmanship. Again, the panel of experts was asked to respond (with a yes or no answer) as to whether or not each function should or should not be performed by local OIC Board members. Space was provided for the listing of additional functions that panel members felt should be included on the list.

The second-round questionnaire was a two-part questionnaire along with feedback from the first-round questionnaire. Based on responses by the panel, two observable personal characteristics (egotistical and dominance) were deleted from the list, and two

²This Executive Director is no longer employed by the Detroit OIC. However, he was one of the most distinguished and respected OIC Executive Directors, having served as an Executive Director for fifteen years in the cities of Philadelphia, New York, and Detroit.

observable personal characteristics (dedication and generosity) were added to the list in the first part of the questionnaire. In the second part, the list of functions was reduced from twenty-four to nineteen. The following functions were deleted from the list: (1) functions in the area of salary negotiations; (2) functions of the area of staff evaluation; (3) functions in the area of staff selection; (4) functions in the area of budget preparation; (5) functions in the area of vocational/technical program development; and (6) functions in the area of general basic education program development. The following function was added to the list: when needed, makes professional service available to the local OIC on a free or modest basis. For the first and second parts of the second-round questionnaire, the panel of experts was asked to prioritize the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess and to prioritize the functions that local OIC Board members should perform.

The third-round questionnaire was designed to produce a convergence of group consensus. For both the first part (observable personal characteristics) and the second part (functions that should be performed) panel members were asked to respond to items where their individual rating of a particular item was different from the group consensus by one or more points. They were asked to either join the group consensus in rating a particular item, or to defend their dissent with a narrative statement. Each panel member also received a summary statement of each respondent's responses in the second-round questionnaire and a copy of the second-round questionnaire. The questionnaires and instructions for each round are given in Appendix A.

Time Frame and Data Collection

The first-round questionnaire was mailed to the panel of experts in October 1979, and all responses were returned by December 1979. The second-round questionnaire was mailed to the panel of experts in January 1980, and all responses were returned by April 1980. The third-round questionnaire was mailed to the panel of experts in May 1980, and all responses were returned by June 1980. All seven panel members responded in each of the three-round questionnaires.

Phase II--Survey Design

Population Studied

The target population was identified as OIC Board members within the State of Michigan. At the time that the research was conducted, local OIC organizations were operating in the following cities: Benton Harbor, Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Muskegon, Pontiac, and Saginaw. Three of these centers (Benton Harbor, Grand Rapids, and Pontiac) were not included in the study. The reasons for the exclusion of these centers are:

1. Benton Harbor: Although the request for the mailing lists of Board members from all local OIC organizations was made in May 1980, the list from this city was not received until mid-August 1980--too late to be included in this study.
2. Grand Rapids: Only two Board members responded to the initial questionnaire. Because of the nature of the research design, requiring a minimum of four respondents, these two respondents could not be used in the study.

3. Pontiac: The mailing list of Board members was never received by the investigator. Several requests, via telephone, proved unsuccessful in procuring the mailing list.

The target population was re-identified as OIC Board members in four cities within the State of Michigan--Detroit, Flint, Muskegon, and Saginaw.

Sampled Population

Because of the nature of the research design, Board members were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their socioeconomic status and to rate other Board members at their respective centers in the area of personal characteristics possessed or Board functions performed. The potential task of each research subject was enormous. For example, with a Board consisting of thirty members, each research subject would be asked to complete a two-page questionnaire regarding his/her socioeconomic status and to rate twenty-nine other Board members in the area of personal characteristics possessed or Board functions performed. Not only would this require a considerable amount of time on the part of each research subject, it also would require an enormous amount of paper, thereby increasing mailing costs.

Because of the above-stated reasons, the decision was made to sample the re-identified target population. It was arbitrarily decided to randomly select one-half of the Board members at each local OIC organization as subjects for this research project. Table 3.1 displays: (1) the local OIC organization; (2) the total number of Board members listed on the mailing list; (3) the total number selected for this

Table 3.1 Summary of Questionnaire Returns

Local OIC's	Total Number of Board Members	Total Number Included in Study and Received Questionnaires	Total Number of Completed and Returned Questionnaires	Percentage Rate of Completed and Returned Questionnaires
Detroit	31	15	12	80.0
Flint	20	10	7	70.0
Muskegon	18	9	7	78.0
Saginaw	20	10	6	60.0
	<u>89</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>72.0</u>

study and received questionnaires; (4) the total number of completed and returned questionnaires; and (5) the percentage rate of the completed and returned questionnaires.

Random Selection

Random selection was the procedure used to insure that each member of the population (excluding the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each local OIC) had an equal chance of being chosen for this study. It was arbitrarily decided that because of their positions, each local OIC Board Chairman and Vice-Chairman should automatically be included in the study. For each local OIC (excluding the Board Chairman and Vice-Chairman) each Board members' name was placed on a slip of paper and placed in a container for drawing or selection. After the name was selected, it was placed on the side (for no re-entry into the container), the remaining names shaken in the container, and another selection made. The process was repeated separately for each local OIC organization until the selection process was completed.

Research Instrument and Procedures

The research instrument used for this study (developed by the investigator) was a two-part questionnaire designed to gather information of local OIC Board members on their socioeconomic status and either their degree of possession of observable personal characteristics, or their degree of contribution to the local OIC Board by performing the designated Board functions.

In the first part of the questionnaire, local OIC Board members were asked to identify their own socioeconomic characteristics. Each Board member was asked to complete this section of the instrument.

In the second part of the questionnaire, local OIC Board members were asked either: (1) to identify the degree to which Board members at each local Board possess the Executive Directors' designated observable personal characteristics; or (2) to identify the degree to which Board members at each local Board have made contributions to their Board by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions. Board members were randomly assigned to rate all other Board members of their respective local OIC in the area of personal characteristics or performance of functions. Thus at each local OIC, one-half of the Board members rated all other Board members (that were randomly selected for the study) in the area of performance of functions; and one-half of the Board members rated all other Board members in the area of possession of observable personal characteristics. However, Board members did not rate themselves on observable personal characteristics or performance of functions.

The instructions to subjects and the two-part questionnaires are given in Appendix C.

Time Frame and Data Collection

The questionnaires were mailed to the subjects in July 1980. A follow-up letter and telephone calls were made in late August 1980; and all questionnaires that are included in this study were returned by early October 1980. Each subject received the following (initial mailing).

1. A cover letter which introduced the investigator and instructions regarding the questionnaire.
2. The socioeconomic portion of the questionnaire and either personal characteristics rating sheets with the names of all subjects at his/her local OIC, or performance of functions rating sheets with the names of all subjects at his/her local OIC.
3. A large, self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the questionnaire to the investigator.

Statistical Analysis

Multiple Regression was used to analyze the data for a portion of the study. Multiple Regression is used to find out which variable (attendance at committee meetings, number of committees where service is rendered, number of years in principal occupation, number of years of formal education, age, number of community organizations where membership is held, number of years as community resident, attendance

at Board meetings, and number of years as OIC Board member) is an acceptable predictor of performance. The predictor of independent variables are interval scale, i.e., within each category there can be a numerical increase in the value of each variable. In order to obtain a predictor of performance of functions, the dependent variable is correlated with the independent variables. The Multiple Regression model equation is as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \dots \beta_9 X_9$$

Analysis of variance was used to analyze the data for a portion of the study. Analysis of variance is used to determine or identify the relationship between the dependent variables (performance of functions of OIC Board members) and the following independent variables: degree(s) earned, occupation, place of birth, place of growing up (state), place of growing up (rural or urban), ethnic origin, and sex. These are independent variables that are nominal scales, i.e., each category is mutually exclusive and exhaustive without a numerical increase in the value of each variable.

To determine the relationship between performance of functions and possession of observable person characteristics, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used. This procedure permits one to tell about the tendency of the occurrence of one event from another event. However, one cannot say that the one event causes the other event to occur.

To achieve the purpose of the study, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What generally observable personal characteristics, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors, should local OIC Board members possess?
2. What functions, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors, are local OIC Board members expected to perform?
3. What, as self reported by each, are the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members?
4. To what degree, as rated by fellow Board members, do local OIC Board members possess the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess?
5. To what degree, as rated by fellow Board members, do local OIC Board members perform the designated Board functions that local OIC Board members should perform?
6. Is there a general relationship between performance of functions and possession of personal characteristics?
7. Is there a relationship between performance of functions and the following nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics:
 - a. Degree(s) earned,
 - b. Occupation,
 - c. Place of birth,
 - d. Place of growing up (state),
 - e. Place of growing up (rural or urban),
 - f. Ethnic origin, and
 - g. Sex?

8. Can the following interval scale socioeconomic characteristics be used as predictors of performance of functions:
- a. Attendance at committee meetings,
 - b. Number of committees where service is rendered,
 - c. Number of years in principal occupation,
 - d. Number of years of formal education,
 - e. Age,
 - f. Number of community organizations where leadership positions are held,
 - g. Number of years as community resident,
 - h. Attendance at Board meetings, and
 - i. Number of years as OIC Board member?

Research Hypotheses

The null hypothesis will be used to analyze the relationship between performance of designated functions and the nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics. The research null hypotheses are:

Null Hypothesis 1:

There is no difference between the degree(s) earned by local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 2:

There is no difference between the occupations of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 3:

There is no difference in the places of birth of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 4:

There is no difference in the places where local OIC Board members grew up (state) and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 5:

There is no difference in the places where local OIC Board members grew up (rural or urban) and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 6:

There is no difference between the ethnic origin of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 7:

There is no difference between the sex of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Limitations of the Study

There was no treatment (manipulation of variables) applied to the subjects. This lack of control is a weakness of causal-comparative research, and because of this weakness, causality of outcomes can only be tentatively identified. Also, the findings of the study may not be widely generalizable, because three of the local OIC organizations within the State of Michigan were not included in the study.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: ANALYSES AND RESULTS

In this chapter, the data collected through the Delphi Technique and the data collected through the questionnaire from local OIC Board members are reported and analyzed. The major findings, produced from answering the research questions and testing the research hypotheses, are reported and summarized.

The research methodology of this study focuses on identifying: (1) the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess; (2) the functions that local OIC Board members should perform; and (3) the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members. Most studies of controlling boards of non-profit organizations fail to go beyond this identification of socioeconomic characteristics level. This study goes to the next level in attempting to: (1) identify the degree to which local OIC Board members possess the observable personal characteristics; (2) identify the degree to which local OIC Board members have made contributions to their local OIC by performing the designated Board functions; (3) examine the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics of local OIC Board members; (4) examine the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics of local

OIC Board members; and (5) identify the interval scale socioeconomic characteristics that are acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions of local OIC Board members.

Research Questions 1 and 2

1. What generally observable personal characteristics, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors, should local OIC Board members possess?
2. What functions, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors, are local OIC Board members expected to perform?

Findings: First Round of Delhi Questionnaire

There were eighteen observable personal characteristics that were identified as being associated with leadership. This list of characteristics (a definition followed each characteristic) was mailed to the panel of experts with instructions to place an "X" next to "yes" or "no" in stating their preference as to whether or not the personal characteristic should or should not be possessed by local OIC Board members. This first round list of observable personal characteristics and instructions to the panel of experts are located in Appendix A. Table 5.1 gives a summary of the first round findings that relate to observable personal characteristics. Based on the findings reported in Table 5.1, "egotistical" and "dominance" were dropped from the list of observable characteristics; and based on suggestions made during the first round comments, "dedication" and "generosity" were added to the list of observable personal characteristics. This resulted in a final

Table 5.1 First Round Observable Personal Characteristics

Observable Personal Characteristics	Response		
	"Yes"	"No"	Not Given
Aggressive	7	--	--
Self confidence	7	--	--
Egotistical	--	7	--
Ambitious	5	2	--
Dependability	7	--	--
Emotional maturity	7	--	--
Decisive	7	--	--
Dominance	--	6	1
Persuasive	4	2	1
Perceptive	7	--	--
Integrity	7	--	--
Courage	7	--	--
Perserverance	7	--	--
Realism	7	--	--
Innovation	7	--	--
Flexibility	7	--	--
Sociability	6	1	--
Stamina	7	--	--

list of eighteen observable personal characteristics. Other comments that were made by the panel of experts during the first round are reported in Appendix A.

There were twenty-four functions that were identified as being associated with OIC Board members. This list of Board functions was a part of the first round mailing to the panel of experts with instructions to place an "X" next to "yes" or "no" in stating their preference as to whether or not the function should or should not be performed by local OIC Board members. The first round list of Board functions and instructions to the panel of experts are located in Appendix A. Table 5.2 gives a summary of the first round findings that relate to functions of Board members. Based on the findings reported in Table 5.2, the following functions were dropped from the list of functions that local OIC Board members should perform: (1) salary negotiation; (2) staff evaluation; (3) staff selection; (4) budget preparation; (5) vocational/technical program development; and (6) basic education program development. Based on suggestions made during the first round comments, "professional service available to local OIC" was added to the list of functions. This resulted in a final list of nineteen functions. Other comments that were made by the panel of experts during the first round are reported in Appendix A.

Findings: Second Round Delphi Questionnaire

During the second round of the Delphi procedure, the panel of experts was asked to prioritize the eighteen personal characteristics

Table 5.2 First Round Board Functions

Board Functions	Response		
	"Yes"	"No"	Not Given
<u>Policy:</u>			
Policy making	7	--	--
Policy interpretation	5	2	--
<u>Personnel Affairs:</u>			
Salary negotiation	2	5	--
Staff evaluation	2	5	--
Staff selection	2	5	--
<u>Budget:</u>			
Budget preparation	2	5	--
Budget review and approval	7	--	--
<u>Fund Raising:</u>			
Securing funds	7	--	--
Personal financial support	7	--	--
<u>Program Development:</u>			
Vocational/technical program development	2	5	--
Basic education/program development	1	5	1
Overall program development	6	1	--
<u>Planning:</u>			
Short-range planning	7	--	--
Long-range planning	7	--	--
<u>Trainee Affairs:</u>			
Trainee recruitment	4	3	--
Job placement of graduates	6	1	--
<u>Public Relations:</u>			
In the religious community	7	--	--
In organized labor	7	--	--
In educational institutions	7	--	--
In other community-based organizations	7	--	--
In governmental agencies	7	--	--
In business and industry	7	--	--
<u>Attendance:</u>			
Regular attendance/Board meetings	7	--	--
Regular attendance/committee meetings	7	--	--

that local OIC Board members should possess. Each observable personal characteristic was rated as follows:

- 5 Absolutely Essential
- 4 Strongly Desirable
- 3 Desirable
- 2 Slightly Desirable
- 1 Undesirable

Table 5.3 gives a summary of the second round findings that relate to personal characteristics. The personal characteristics are listed (highest to lowest) according to the total points received. Based on the findings reported in Table 5.3, the panel of experts rated "dependability" as the most important observable personal characteristic that local OIC Board members should possess. Three personal characteristics--"emotional maturity," "perseverance," and "dedication"--all tied for second as rated by the panel of experts; and "integrity" and "generosity" both tied as the next most important observable personal characteristic. Thus, the six observable characteristics that were rated as most important by the panel of experts all received a total of thirty-one points or higher with a mean rating of 4.42 or higher. For a complete summary of the findings of the second round questionnaire, see Appendix A.

Also, during the second round of the Delphi procedure, the panel of experts was asked to prioritize the nineteen functions that local OIC Board members should perform. Each function was rated as follows:

- 5 Absolutely Essential
- 4 Strongly Desirable
- 3 Desirable
- 2 Slightly Desirable
- 1 Undesirable

Table 5.3 Second Round Rating of Observable Personal Characteristics

Observable Personal Characteristics	Total Points	Mean Rating
Dependability	34	4.85
Emotional maturity	32	4.57
Perseverance	32	4.57
Dedication	32	4.57
Integrity	31	4.42
Generosity	31	4.42
Decisive	29	4.14
Realism	29	4.14
Flexibility	29	4.14
Perceptive	28	4.00
Self-confidence	27	3.85
Courage	27	3.85
Persuasive	26	3.71
Aggressive	25	3.57
Sociability	24	3.42
Stamina	24	3.42
Ambitious	22	3.14
Innovative	22	3.14

Table 5.4 gives a summary of the second round findings that relate to Board members' functions. The functions are listed (highest to lowest) according to the total points received. Based on the findings reported in Table 5.4, the panel of experts rated "public relations/governmental agencies" as the most important function that local OIC Board members should perform. This was followed by "fund raising/securing funds," "policy/making," and "public relations/business and industry"--all sharing the number two spot in the rating. The next highest rated functions were "planning/long range OIC goals," "attendance/board meetings," and "public relations/organized labor"--all sharing the number three spot in the rating. Thus, the seven Board members' functions that were rated as most important by the panel of experts all received a total of thirty-one points or higher with a mean rating value of 4.42 or higher. For a complete summary of the findings of the second round questionnaire, see Appendix A.

Findings: Third Round Delphi Questionnaire

The third and final round of the Delphi procedure produced a convergence of group consensus from the panel of experts. The panel of experts received feedback of the consensus of the group as well as their individual responses generated in round two on both personal characteristics and functions. The panel was instructed to review their response on items where their individual ratings were different from the group consensus¹ by one or more points, panel members were

¹The group consensus is the mean group rating for each personal characteristic or function.

Table 5.4 Second Round Rating of Board Members' Functions

Board Functions	Total Points	Mean Rating
Public relations/governmental agencies	34	4.85
Fund raising/securing funds	33	4.71
Policy/making	32	4.57
Public relations/business and industry	32	4.57
Planning/long range OIC goals	31	4.42
Attendance/board meetings	31	4.42
Public relations/organized labor	31	4.42
Budget/review and approval	30	4.28
Public relations/religious community	30	4.28
Attendance/committee meetings	30	4.28
Professionalism/service to OIC	29	4.14
Planning/short range OIC goals	29	4.14
Public relations/educational institutions	29	4.14
Public relations/community-based organizations	29	4.14
Policy/interpretation	25	3.57
Fund raising/personal financial support	25	3.57
Program development/overall	21	3.00
Trainee affairs/recruitment	20	2.85
Trainee affairs/job placement	17	2.42

then instructed either to join the group consensus or to defend their dissent with individual statements.

Table 5.5 gives a summary of those observable personal characteristics where the individual responses of the panel members differed from the group consensus by one or more points. Of the eighteen observable personal characteristics, fourteen are presented in Table 5.5. Group consensus was obtained on each of the fourteen observable personal characteristics listed except four--"ambitious," "persuasive," "generosity," and "dedication." The statements made by panel members who did not join the group consensus in rating a particular personal characteristic are listed in Appendix A.

Table 5.5 Observable Personal Characteristics--Disagreement from Group Consensus

Observable Personal Characteristics	Number of Disagreements	Of the Disagreements, Number Joining Group Consensus
Ambitious	4	2
Persuasive	4	2
Self confidence*	2	2
Perceptive*	2	2
Courage*	2	2
Innovative*	1	1
Sociability*	2	2
Dedication	2	1
Generosity	1	--
Realism*	1	1
Flexibility*	1	1
Decisive*	1	1
Integrity*	1	1
Stamina*	2	2

*Complete agreement achieved.

Table 5.6 gives a summary of those Board members' functions where the individual responses of the panel members differed from the group consensus by one or more points. Of the nineteen Board members' functions, twelve are presented in Table 5.6. Group consensus was obtained on each of the twelve Board members' functions listed except five--"policy/interpretation," "program development/overall," "budget/review and approval," "trainee affairs/job placement," and "fund raising/personal financial support." The statements that were made by the panel members who did not join the group consensus in rating a particular function are listed in Appendix A.

Research Question 3

3. What, as reported by each, are the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members?

Formal Education

Table 5.7 shows that local OIC Board members have a total of 494 years of formal education and the mean years of formal education is 15.4. Muskegon Board members have the highest mean years of formal education with 17.7 years while Saginaw Board members have the lowest mean years of formal education with 13.0.

In addition to the number of years of formal education, some local OIC Board members have earned degrees. Table 5.8 shows that of the thirty-two local OIC Board members, 34.4 percent are non-degree holders while 65.6 percent have earned degrees.

Table 5.6 Board Members' Functions--Disagreement from Group Consensus

Board Functions	Number of Disagreements	Of the Disagreements, Number Joining Group Consensus
Policy/interpretation	4	1
Professional/service available to OIC*	1	1
Program development/overall	3	2
Trainee affairs/recruitment*	1	1
Public relations/government agencies*	1	1
Budget/review and approval	1	--
Public relations/educational institutions*	1	1
Policy/making*	1	1
Planning/short range OIC goals*	1	1
Planning/long range OIC goals*	1	1
Trainee affairs/job placement	2	1
Fund raising/personal financial support	2	1

*Complete agreement achieved.

Table 5.7 Local OIC Board Members' Number of Years of Formal Education

Area	N	Sum.	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Detroit	12	175	14.6	3.42	11.71
Flint	7	117	16.7	1.79	3.23
Muskegon	7	124	17.7	1.70	2.90
Saginaw	<u>6</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>3.22</u>	<u>10.40</u>
Total	32	494	15.4	3.16	9.99

Table 5.8 Local OIC Board Members' Earned Degree(s)

Area	Non-Degree	Bachelor Degree	Master Degree	Doctoral Degree	Total
Detroit	4	4	4	--	12
Flint	2	2	2	1	7
Muskegon	1	2	2	2	7
Saginaw	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	11	10	8	3	32
Percent	34.4	31.3	25.0	9.4	100

Occupation

Local OIC Board members have varying occupations. However, 62.6 percent of the Board members list Clergy or Business-Industry as their principal occupations. Table 5.9 gives a summary of these findings.

Table 5.9 Local OIC Board Members' Principal Occupations

Area	Education	Clergy	Business- Industry	Other	Total
Detroit	2	6	3	1	12
Flint	--	3	3	1	7
Muskegon	3	1	3	--	7
Saginaw	<u>1</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	6	10	10	6	32
Percent	18.8	31.1	31.1	18.8	100

Local OIC Board members have a total of 606 years in their principal occupations with a mean of 18.9 years. Detroit Board members have the highest mean years in their principal occupations with 22.5, while the Flint Board members have the lowest mean years at 12.6. Table 5.10 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.10 Local OIC Board Members' Years in Principal Occupations

Area	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Detroit	12	270	22.5	13.20	174.45
Flint	7	88	12.6	8.22	67.62
Muskegon	7	129	18.4	10.22	104.62
Saginaw	<u>6</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>19.8</u>	<u>10.00</u>	<u>100.17</u>
Total	32	606	18.9	11.21	125.67

Income

Of the OIC Board members, 71.9 percent have had, for the past three years (1977-1979), an average income of at least \$15,000, but less than \$40,000. Table 5.11 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.11 Local OIC Board Members' Three Year (1977-1979) Average Income

Area	Less than 10,000	10,000- 14,999	15,000- 19,999	20,000- 24,999	25,000- 29,999	30,000- 39,999	40,000 49,999	Total
Detroit	1	2	1	2	4	--	2	12
Flint	--	1	2	1	1	2	--	7
Muskegon	--	--	3	1	1	2	--	7
Saginaw	<u>1</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	2	3	8	4	6	5	4	32
Percent	7.3	9.4	25.0	12.5	18.8	15.6	12.5	100

Growing Up As Child/Rural or Urban

Local OIC Board members are, for the most part, products of an urban community with 65.6 percent of the Board members having grown up in an urban setting. Table 5.12 gives a summary of the findings in this area.

Table 5.12 - Local OIC Board Members' Community Growing Up/Rural or Urban

Area	Rural	Urban	Total
Detroit	6	6	12
Flint	1	6	7
Muskegon	2	5	7
Saginaw	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	11	21	32
Percentage	34.4	65.5	100

Ethnic Origin

Local OIC Board members are predominantly Black. There are three Board members who are in the "other" category--their ethnic origin is Mexican (2) and Lebanese (1). Table 5.13 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.13 Local OIC Board Members' Ethnic Origin

Area	Black	White	Other	Total
Detroit	11	1	--	12
Flint	6	--	1	7
Muskegon	5	2	--	7
Saginaw	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	25	4	3	32
Percentage	78.1	12.5	9.4	100

Sex

Although male dominated, females make up 31.3 percent of the local Board membership. There is a substantial representation of females at the Detroit and Flint OIC Boards. Table 5.14 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.14 Local OIC Board Members' Sex

Area	Female	Male	Total
Detroit	4	8	12
Flint	4	3	7
Muskegon	--	7	7
Saginaw	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	10	22	32
Percent	31.3	68.8	100

Age

Local OIC Board members have lived a total of 1,616 years with 50.5 as the mean age. The mean ages at the Saginaw (54.8) and Detroit (53.4) Boards are the highest. Table 5.15 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.15 Local OIC Board Members' Age

Area	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Detroit	12	641	53.4	9.87	97.53
Flint	7	314	44.8	8.97	80.47
Muskegon	7	332	47.4	9.37	87.95
Saginaw	<u>6</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>54.8</u>	<u>7.60</u>	<u>57.76</u>
Total	32	1,616	50.5	9.63	92.77

Place of Birth

Of the local OIC Board members, 62.5 percent were born in the South. Table 5.16 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.16 Local OIC Board Members' Place of Birth

Area	North	South	Total
Detroit	4	8	12
Flint	--	7	7
Muskegon	4	3	7
Saginaw	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	12	20	32
Percent	37.5	62.5	100

Growing Up As Child/State

Even though a majority of local OIC Board members were born in the South, 50 percent of these Board members grew up in northern states. One Board member grew up in a western state (Kansas).

Table 5.17 gives a summary of these findings.

Table 5.17 Local OIC Board Members' Place of Growing Up/State

Area	North	South	Other	Total
Detroit	5	7	--	12
Flint	2	5	--	7
Muskegon	5	2	--	7
Saginaw	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	16	15	1	32
Percent	50.0	46.9	3.1	100

Marital Status

The majority of local OIC Board members are married (77.1 percent). Table 5.18 gives a summary of the findings in this area.

Table 5.18 Local OIC Board Members' Marital Status

Area	Single	Married	Married or Divorced	Widow or Widower	Total
Detroit	1	9	--	2	12
Flint	1	5	1	--	7
Muskegon	--	7	--	--	7
Saginaw	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	3	23	3	3	32
Percent	9.4	71.9	9.4	9.4	100

Residence in Community

Local OIC Board members have lived in their present communities for a total of 783 years with a mean of 24.5 years. The Saginaw Board has the highest mean with 37.0 years. A summary of the findings is presented in Table 5.19

Table 5.19 Local OIC Board Members' Length of Residence in Present Community

Area	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Detroit	12	280	23.3	9.80	96.06
Flint	7	166	23.7	8.44	71.23
Muskegon	7	115	16.4	10.45	109.28
Saginaw	<u>6</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>37.0</u>	<u>12.08</u>	<u>146.00</u>
Total	32	783	24.5	11.75	138.19

Years As Local OIC Board Member

Local OIC Board members have a total of 210 years of board service with a mean of 6.6 years. Table 5.20 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.20 Local OIC Board Members' Years of Service to OIC

Area	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Detroit	12	93	7.75	3.05	9.29
Flint	7	42	6.00	4.58	21.00
Muskegon	7	27	3.85	2.26	5.15
Saginaw	<u>6</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>8.00</u>	<u>3.94</u>	<u>15.60</u>
Total	32	210	6.60	3.68	13.54

Leadership Positions in Organizations

Local OIC Board members are quite active as community leaders. Not only do they serve as Board members, but they are also members and office-holders in community-based organizations. Members of the Saginaw Board hold positions in an average of 4.3 community-based organizations, while members of the Flint Board hold positions in an average of 4.0 community-based organizations. A summary of the findings is presented in Table 5.21.

Table 5.21 Local OIC Board Members' Positions Held in Community-Based Organizations

Area	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Detroit	12	44	3.7	1.82	3.33
Flint	7	28	4.0	1.63	2.66
Muskegon	7	27	3.9	2.19	4.80
Saginaw	<u>6</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>2.73</u>	<u>7.46</u>
Total	32	125	4.0	1.97	3.89

Research Questions 4 and 5

4. To what degree, as rated by fellow Board members, do local OIC Board members possess the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess?
5. To what degree, as rated by fellow Board members, do local OIC Board members perform the designated Board functions that OIC Board members should perform?

Saginaw OIC

For the Saginaw Board, the mean rating of possession of observable personal characteristics was 3.9, and there were four cases at or above the mean. The mean rating for performance of designated functions was 3.7, and there were four cases at or above the mean. Three cases were at or above the mean in ratings of observable personal characteristics and performance designated Board functions. One case was at or above the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but was below the mean in rating of performance of designated Board functions. There was also one case below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but it was at or above the mean in rating of performance of designated Board functions. Finally, there was one case below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions. Table 5.22 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5.22 Saginaw OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions

Case	Mean Rating of Personal Characteristics	Mean Rating of Performance of Functions
1	2.2	3.7*
2	4.5*	4.6*
3	4.4*	4.1*
4	4.7*	3.8*
5	4.0*	3.2
6	3.5	2.8
Total 6	23.3	22.9
Percent	3.9	3.7

*Rating at or above the mean.

Muskegon OIC

For the Muskegon Board, the mean rating for possession of observable personal characteristics was 3.6, and there were four cases at or above the mean. The mean rating for performance of designated Board functions was also 3.6, and there were four cases at or above the mean. Three cases were at or above the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions. One case was at or above the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but it was below the mean in rating of performance of designated Board functions. Also, one case was below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but it was at or above the mean in rating of performance of designated Board functions. Two

cases were below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions.

Table 5.23 gives a summary of the data.

Table 5.23 Muskegon OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions

Case	Mean Rating of Personal Characteristics	Mean Rating of Performance of Functions
7	3.0	3.4
8	3.6*	4.1*
9	3.1	3.6*
10	4.3*	3.7*
11	4.0*	4.0*
12	3.7*	3.4
<u>13</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.2</u>
Total 7	25.2	25.4
Percent	3.6	3.6

*Rating at or above the mean.

Flint OIC

The mean rating for possession of observable personal characteristics was 4.0 for the Flint Board; there were four cases at or above the mean. The mean rating for performance of designated Board functions was 3.5; there were three cases at or above the mean. There were only two cases at or above the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions. There were two

cases at or above the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but they were below the mean rating of performance of designated Board functions. There was one case below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but it was at or above the mean in rating of performance of designated Board functions. There were two cases below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions. A summary of the findings is presented in Table 5.24.

Table 5.24 Flint OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions

Case	Mean Rating of Personal Characteristics	Mean Rating of Performance of Functions
14	4.1*	3.9*
15	3.9	4.4*
16	3.6	2.8
17	3.9	3.4
18	4.1*	4.1*
19	4.2*	3.2
<u>20</u>	<u>4.0*</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Total 7	27.8	24.7
Percent	4.0	3.5

*Rating at or above the mean.

Detroit OIC

For the Detroit Board, the mean rating for possession of observable personal characteristics was 3.9; there were seven cases at or above the mean. The mean rating for performance of designated Board functions was 3.7; there were six cases at or above the mean. There were four cases at or above the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions. There were three cases at or above the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but they were below the mean in rating of performance of designated Board functions. Two cases were below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics, but they were at or above the mean in rating of performance of designated Board functions. There were three cases below the mean in rating of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions. Table 5.25 presents a summary of the findings.

Table 5.26 presents a summary of Tables 5.22 through 5.25. "P.C./P.F. High" indicated that 37.5 percent of the local OIC Board members received a mean rating (at their respective OIC organizations) at or above the mean for both observable personal characteristics (P.C.) and performance of designated Board functions (P.F.); "P.C. High/P. F. Low" indicates that 21.8 percent of the local OIC Board members received a mean rating at or above the mean for observable personal characteristics and below the mean rating for performance of designated Board functions; "P.C. Low/P.F. High" indicates 15.6 percent of the local OIC Board members received a mean rating below the mean for observable

Table 5.25 Detroit OIC: Ratings of Board Members' Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions

Case		Mean Rating of Personal Characteristics	Mean Rating of Performance of Functions
	21	4.5*	4.2*
	22	4.7*	4.2*
	23	3.4	3.5
	24	3.8	3.7*
	25	4.6*	4.7*
	26	4.0*	3.0
	27	2.6	3.3
	28	3.7	3.8*
	29	4.0*	3.9*
	30	4.4*	3.4
	31	3.3	3.2
	<u>32</u>	<u>4.1*</u>	<u>3.2</u>
Total	12	47.1	44.1
Percent		3.9	3.7

*Rating at or above the mean.

personal characteristics and at or above the mean for performance of designated functions; and "P.C. Low/P.F. Low" indicates that 25.0 percent of the local OIC Board members received a mean rating below the mean for both observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions.

Table 5.26 Local OIC Board Members' Ratings for Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics and Performance of Designated Board Functions

Area	P.C./P.F. High	P.C. High/ P.F. Low	P.C. Low/ P.F. High	P.C./P.F. Low	Total
Detroit	4	3	2	3	12
Flint	2	2	1	2	7
Muskegon	3	1	1	2	1
Saginaw	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	12	7	5	8	32
Percent	37.5	21.8	15.6	25.0	100

Research Question 6

6. Is there a general relationship between performance of designated Board functions and possession of observable personal characteristics?

To measure the degree of relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used. Table 5.27 displays the findings. The symbol "r" is used to

Table 5.27 The Correlation Between Performance of Designated Board Functions and Possession of Observable Personal Characteristics

C	r	r ²	P
Predictor variable	.481	.231	.003

measure the degree to which the relationship between two variables can be represented by a straight line. It is the absolute size of "r" that indicates the degree of strength or closeness of the relationship. Table 5.27 shows that there is a low or mild positive correlation (.231) between the dependent variable (performance of designated Board functions) and the predictor variable (possession of observable personal characteristics). The data show that .231 or 23 percent of the variation in P (performance of designated Board functions) can be explained by knowing C (possession of observable personal characteristics). P is significant at the .003 level; that is, in repeated random sampling of the local OIC Board population within the State of Michigan, it is not very probable that the sample means between the two variables (performance of Board designated functions and possession of observable personal characteristics) will have a correlation of zero. The researcher thus concludes that there is a .231 positive correlation between the two variables, and there is the risk of being wrong about .003 (three thousandths) percent of the time in making this conclusion.

Research Question 7

7. Is there a relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the following nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics:
- a. Degree(s) earned,
 - b. Occupation,
 - c. Place of birth,
 - d. Place of growing up/state,
 - e. Place of growing up/rural or urban,
 - f. Ethnic origin, and
 - g. Sex?

Analysis of variance was used to analyze the data related to this research question. Analysis of variance permits the researcher to test to see if the separate means of several groups differ significantly from each other. Variance is the square of the standard deviations. The basic question asked in analysis of variance is, "Is the variation between groups great enough in relation to the variation within groups to reject the null hypothesis that the groups are samples of a common population?" Two important concepts that are used in the analysis of variance procedures are the null hypothesis and the F test of significance; these concepts will be briefly discussed.

Null Hypothesis H_0

The null hypothesis states that no difference exists between a sample statistic and a population value. A sample statistic, often called θ , is an estimate of the population value, often referred to

as θ_{pop} . These sample statistics vary around the population value with a variability equal to the standard error--the standard error of the mean is an estimate of the variation of the means based on the same size N --of the statistic. The null hypothesis implies that observed difference between $\theta_{\text{pop}} - \theta$ is a chance occurrence, and that the sample statistic and the population value are the same. When comparing two or more sample statistics, $\theta_1, \theta_2 \dots \theta_n$, the researcher is estimating two or more population means, $\theta_{\text{pop}_1}, \theta_{\text{pop}_2} \dots \theta_{\text{pop}_n}$. The null hypothesis states that the difference between the population means is zero; that is, the population means are equal. If, in fact, $\theta_{\text{pop}_1}, \theta_{\text{pop}_2} \dots \theta_{\text{pop}_n}$ are equal, any difference between $\theta_1 \theta_2 \dots \theta_n$ can be attributed to sampling error. However, if the two populations are not equal, the difference can be attributed to something other than sampling error. The null hypothesis, that a particular deviation occurred by chance, is thus rejected when the probability of the event is five times in one hundred ($p = 0.05$) or smaller.

F Test of Significance

The F test of significance gives the ratio of the between group variance to the within group variance and makes it possible to determine the probability that observed differences among three or more sample means occurred by chance. The ratio is obtained by dividing the between variance by the within variance. The greater the variation between groups as compared with the variation within groups, the greater will be the size of the F ratio.

Factors that are important in the F test of significance are: (1) degrees of freedom (df); (2) sum of the squares; (3) within group variation; and (4) between group variation. The df refers to the number of scores or frequencies permitted to vary around some parameter; when scores vary around a single parameter one df is lost. The sum of the squares is the sum of the squared deviation of each score around the grand mean. Within group variation is the mean variation within a group; thus, one takes the group variances and derives a mean of the variances. Between group variation is the measure of variation of mean from several different groups; thus, one takes the group means and derives a variance.

Degree(s) Earned

There is no significant relationship between performance of designated Board functions and the degree(s) earned by local OIC Board members. The research null hypothesis one, that there is no difference between the degree earned by local OIC Board members and the performance of designated functions, is not rejected. Table 5.28 presents the findings.

Occupation

There is a significant relationship between performance of designated Board functions and the principal occupation of local OIC Board members. The research null hypothesis two, that there is no difference between the occupations of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions, is rejected at the .007 level of significance. The findings are summarized in Table 5.29. There is a

Table 5.28 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and Degree(s) Earned by Local OIC Board Members

Degree Earned	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Sum of Squares
Bachelor	10	34.41	3.44	.593	.353	3.17
Master	8	31.46	3.93	.380	.144	1.01
Doctoral	3	11.00	3.66	.440	.194	0.388
Non-degree	<u>11</u>	<u>38.42</u>	<u>3.49</u>	<u>.691</u>	<u>.477</u>	<u>4.77</u>
Total	32	115.30	3.60	.585	.343	10.62

F Test of Significance						
	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance	
Between groups	1.28	3	.427	1.28	.301	
Within groups	<u>9.34</u>	<u>28</u>	.334			
Total	10.62	31				

significant difference between the mean rating of performance of designated Board functions of other occupations¹ (2.96) and education (3.86); there is a significant difference between the mean rating on performance of designated Board functions of "other" occupations (2.96) and clergy (3.87). There is no significant difference between the mean rating on performance of designated Board functions of clergy (3.87), education (3.86), and business-industry (3.55).

¹Included in this category are the following principal occupations of local OIC Board members: (1) union leader; (2) social worker; (3) counselor; (4) relief man/General Motors; (5) retired/General Motors; and (6) retired/sales.

Table 5.29 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and Principal Occupations of Local OIC Board Members

Occupations	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Sum of Squares
Education	6	23.17	3.86	.372	.138	0.693
Clergy	10	38.79	3.87	.536	.287	2.58
Business-Industry	10	35.55	3.55	.499	.249	2.24
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>17.78</u>	<u>2.96</u>	<u>.540</u>	<u>.291</u>	<u>1.45</u>
Total	32	115.30	3.60	.585	.342	10.62

F Test of Significance					
	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	3.64	3	1.21	4.86	.007
Within groups	<u>6.98</u>	<u>28</u>	0.249		
Total	10.62	31			

Place of Birth

There is no significant relationship between performance of designated Board functions and the place of birth of local OIC Board members. The research null hypothesis three, that there is no difference in the place of birth of local OIC Board members on the performance of designated Board functions, is not rejected. Table 5.30 presents a summary of the findings.

Table 5.30 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Place of Birth of Local OIC Board Members

Place of Birth	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Sum of Squares
North	12	44.23	3.68	.490	.240	2.64
South	<u>20</u>	<u>71.07</u>	<u>3.55</u>	<u>.642</u>	<u>.413</u>	<u>7.84</u>
Total	32	115.30	3.60	.585	.342	10.62

F Test of Significance					
	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	.131	1	.131	.375	.541
Within groups	<u>10.49</u>	<u>30</u>	.349		
Total	10.62	31			

Place of Growing Up/State

The data presented in Table 5.31 suggests that there is no significant relationship between performance of designated Board functions and the place of growing up/state as a child of local OIC Board members. The research null hypothesis four, that there is no difference in the place where local OIC Board members grew up (North or South) on the performance of designated Board functions, is not rejected.

Table 5.31 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Place of Growing Up/State of Local OIC Board Members

Place of Growing Up	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Sum of Squares
North	16	56.76	3.54	.493	.243	3.65
South	15	54.41	3.62	.688	.473	6.63
Other*	<u>1</u>	<u>4.13</u>	<u>4.13</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>
Total	32	115.30	3.60	.585	.342	10.62

F Test of Significance					
	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	.337	2	.168	.168	.626
Within groups	<u>10.28</u>	<u>29</u>	.354		
Total	10.62	31			

*Kansas.

Place of Growing Up/Rural or Urban

There is no significant relationship between performance of designated Board functions and the place of growing up/rural or urban as a child of local OIC Board members. The research null hypothesis five, that there is no difference in the place where local OIC Board members grew up (rural or urban) on the performance of designated Board functions, is not rejected. Table 5.32 gives a summary of the data.

Table 5.32 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Place of Growing Up/Rural or Urban of Local OIC Board Members

Place of Growing Up	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Sum of Squares
Rural	11	40.93	3.72	.412	.169	1.69
Urban	<u>21</u>	<u>74.37</u>	<u>3.54</u>	<u>.659</u>	<u>.434</u>	<u>8.69</u>
Total	32	115.30	3.60	.585	.342	10.62

F Test of Significance					
	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	.232	1	.232	.671	.419
Within groups	<u>10.39</u>	<u>30</u>	.346		
Total	10.62	32			

Ethnic Origin

There is no significant relationship between performance of designated Board functions and the ethnic origin of local OIC Board members. The research null hypothesis 6, that there is no difference among the ethnic origin of local OIC Board members on the performance of designated Board functions, is not rejected. A summary of the findings is presented in Table 5.33.

Table 5.33 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Ethnic Origin of Local OIC Board Members

Ethnic Origin	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Sum of Squares
Black	25	90.12	3.60	.599	.359	8.63
White	4	15.36	3.84	.536	.288	0.864
Other*	<u>3</u>	<u>9.81</u>	<u>3.27</u>	<u>.531</u>	<u>.282</u>	<u>0.565</u>
Total	32	115.30	3.60	.585	.342	10.62

F Test of Significance					
	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	.557	2	.278	.803	.457
Within groups	<u>10.06</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>.347</u>		
Total	10.62	31			

*Includes 2 Mexicans and 1 Lebanese.

Sex

There is no significant relationship between performance of designated Board functions and the sex of local OIC Board members. The research null hypothesis seven, that there is no difference among the sex of local OIC Board members on the performance of designated Board functions, is not rejected. Table 5.34 gives a summary of the data.

Table 5.34 Analysis of Variance: The Performance of Designated Board Functions and the Sex of Local OIC Board Members

Sex	N	Summation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Sum of Squares
Male	22	81.59	3.70	.534	.285	6.00
Female	<u>10</u>	<u>33.71</u>	<u>3.37</u>	<u>.653</u>	<u>.426</u>	<u>3.83</u>
Total	32	115.30	3.60	.585	.342	10.62

F Test of Significance					
	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	.784	1	.784	2.39	1.32
Within groups	<u>9.84</u>	<u>30</u>	.328		
Total	10.62	31			

Research Question 8

8. Can the following interval scale socioeconomic characteristics be used as predictors of performance of designated Board functions:

- a. Attendance at Board meetings,
- b. Attendance at committee meetings,
- c. Number of committees where service is rendered,
- d. Number of years in principal occupation,
- e. Number of years of formal education,
- f. Age,
- g. Number of positions held in community organizations,
- h. Number of years as community resident, and
- i. Number of years as OIC Board member?

When an investigator uses two or more variables in combination to predict a single variable, the Multiple Correlation procedure is used; this procedure is more accurate than a one predictor variable. Each predictor variable is weighted in accordance with its contribution to the criterion variable (in this study the criterion variable is performance of designated functions). The Multiple Regression equation is the model whereby the predictor of the criterion measure is maximized involving the differential weighting of the predictors. These optimal weights are called "beta weights" and are derived such that prediction errors are minimized. This procedure of using two (or more) predictor variables is involved with Multiple R. The Multiple R is the correlation between a criterion variable and the sum of two weighted predictors. Table 5.35 gives a summary of the data. The following four variables are acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions of local OIC Board members: (1) number of years of formal education-- .004 significant level; (2) attendance at committee meetings-- .018 significant level; (3) number of years as OIC Board member-- .021 significant level; and (4) number of years in principal occupation-- .049 significant level.

Table 5.35 Multiple Regression: Socioeconomic Characteristics as Predictors of Performance of Designated Board Functions of Local OIC Board Members

Predictor Variable	B	F to Enter or Remove	Significance	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Attendance at board meetings	.020	.704	.410	.746	.557	.013
Attendance at committee meetings	.015	6.27	.018*	.415	.172	.172
Number of years in principal occupation	.021	4.23	.049*	.560	.313	.103
Number of committees served on	.079	1.37	.252	.458	.210	.037
Number of years of formal education	.108	10.06	.004*	.707	.500	.186
Age	.012	0.002	.960	.707	.500	.000
Number of positions held in community organizations	.005	1.09	.305	.721	.521	.021
Number of years as community resident	.331	1.20	.283	.737	.544	.022
Number of years as OIC Board member	.078	6.16	.021*	.809	.654	.096

*Significant at the .05 level.

Summary

In this chapter the findings of the study were presented and analyzed to test hypotheses related to the research questions. Analysis of Variance, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, and Multiple Regression were used to answer the research questions and to test the statistical hypotheses. In answering the three research questions and seven hypotheses that required statistical analyses, the .05 level of significance was used.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the research project, followed by a discussion of the findings and some conclusions to be drawn from the results. Additionally, this chapter offers recommendations for possible areas of future research.

Summary of Project and Procedures

The use of citizen boards is a part of the democratic process in this country. Within the Black community, citizen boards began to take on a new look during the 1960s as Caucasians were no longer expected to provide leadership as Board members within the Black community. These Black organizations began to turn more to the Black community for persons to provide leadership as Board members.

One of the Black organizations that emerged during the 1960s was the Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC). OIC functions as a linkage agency between the business/industrial community and disadvantaged workers, predominantly within the Black community. There are seven local OIC's within the State of Michigan. Each local OIC is an autonomous job training center that is affiliated with the National OIC. The board of directors is the policy-making unit of each OIC, and, like all effective organizations, each local OIC must recruit and maintain effective Board members. To aid in the

process of recruiting and maintaining effective local OIC Board members, this research project: (1) identified the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess and the functions that local OIC Board members should perform; (2) assessed the effectiveness of a sample of local OIC Board members; and (3) developed a socioeconomic profile of a sample of local OIC Board members.

In reviewing the literature, the studies relating to this research project fell into the following areas: (1) leadership theory; (2) community leadership; and (3) boardsmanship as related to controlling boards of non-profit organizations.

This is a descriptive study which: (1) identified the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors; (2) identified the functions that local OIC Board members are expected to perform, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors; (3) identified the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members, as reported by the Board members themselves; (4) identified the degree to which local OIC Board members possess the Executive Directors' designated observable personal characteristics, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC; (5) identified the degree to which local OIC Board members have made contributions to their local OIC by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC; (6) examined the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions

and the possession of observable personal characteristics of local OIC Board members; (7) examined the relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members; and (8) identified the interval scale socioeconomic characteristics that are acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions of local OIC Board members.

This is a cross-sectional survey design, that is, data were collected at one point in time from a random sample selected to describe the larger population at that time. The research was done in two phases.

During Phase I, a three-round Delphi questionnaire was used to identify the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess and the functions that local OIC Board members should perform.

During Phase II, a sample of local OIC Board members from the target population received a two-part questionnaire that was designed to gather information of local OIC Board members on their socioeconomic status and either their degree of possession of observable personal characteristics or their degree of contributions to the local OIC Board by performing the designated Board functions. In the first part of the questionnaire, local OIC Board members were asked to identify their own socioeconomic characteristics; each Board member was asked to complete this section of the instrument. In the second part of the questionnaire local OIC Board members were asked either: (1) to identify the degree to which Board members at each local Board possess the Executive

Directors' designated observable personal characteristics; or (2) to identify the degree to which Board members at each local Board have made contributions to their Board by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions. Thus at each local OIC, one-half of the Board members rated all other Board members in the area of possession of observable personal characteristics; and one-half of the Board members rated all other Board members in the area of performance of functions. Board members did not rate themselves on observable personal characteristics or performance of functions.

Research Questions

Question 1:

What generally observable personal characteristics, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors, should local OIC Board members possess?

Answer: Local OIC Executive Directors identified eighteen observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess. Four observable personal characteristics were rated as being the most important to possess; they are: (1) "dependability"; (2) "emotional maturity"; (3) "perseverance"; and (4) "dedication."

Question 2:

What functions, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors, are local OIC Board members expected to perform?

Answer: Local OIC Board members are expected to perform nineteen functions, as identified by the local OIC Executive Directors. The four most important functions that were identified are: (1) "public relations/governmental agencies"; (2) "fund raising/securing funds"; (3) "policy/making"; and (4) "public relations/business and industry."

Question 3:

What, as reported by each, are the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members?

Answer: The socioeconomic characteristics that were used to develop the local OIC Board members' profile were: (1) formal education; (2) earned degree(s); (3) principal occupation; (4) years in principal occupation; (5) income; (6) place of birth; (7) place of growing up as child/state; (8) place of growing up as child/rural or urban; (9) ethnic origin; (10) sex; (11) age; (12) marital status; (13) length of residence in community; (14) years as local OIC Board member; and (15) leadership positions in community organizations.

Accordingly, the typical local OIC Board member is a Black, married male about fifty years of age. He has approximately fifteen-and-a-half years of formal education with a bachelor's degree or less. He is usually in one of three principal occupations--clergy, business-industry, or education, and he has worked in his principal occupation for almost nineteen years. For the past three years, the average income for the typical local OIC Board member has been at least \$10,000, but less than \$30,000 per year. The typical OIC Board member was born in the South, and approximately half of the members grew up in the South--the other half in the North. The majority of the Board members grew up in urban areas. Finally, the typical local OIC Board member has lived in his respective community for almost twenty-five years and maintains leadership positions in four community organizations.

Question 4:

To what degree, as rated by fellow Board members, do local OIC Board members possess the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess?

Answer: The mean rating for possession of the observable personal characteristics at the Saginaw OIC was 3.9; there were four cases (out of six) at or above the mean rating. The mean rating for the Muskegon OIC was 3.6; there were four cases (out of seven) at or above the mean rating. The mean rating for the Flint OIC was 4.0; there were four cases (out of seven) at or above the mean rating. The mean rating for Detroit OIC was 3.9, and there were seven cases (out of twelve) at or above the mean rating.

Question 5:

To what degree, as rated by fellow Board members, do local OIC Board members perform the designated Board functions that local OIC Board members should perform?

Answer: At the Saginaw OIC, the mean rating for performance of designated functions was 3.7; out of a total of six cases, there were four cases at or above the mean rating. For the Muskegon OIC, the mean rating for performance of designated functions was 3.6; out of a total of seven cases, there were four cases at or above the mean rating. The mean rating for the Flint OIC was 3.5; out of a total of a total of seven cases, there were three cases at or above the mean rating. At the Detroit OIC, the mean rating for performance of designated functions was 3.7; out of a total of twelve cases, there were six cases at or above the mean rating.

Question 6:

Is there a general relationship between performance of designated Board functions and possession of observable personal characteristics?

Answer: Using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation

Coefficient, the study found a low or mild positive correlation (.23) between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics.

Question 7:

Is there a relationship between the performance of designated Board functions and the following nominal scale socioeconomic characteristics:

- a. Degree(s) earned,
- b. Occupation,
- c. Place of birth,
- d. Place of growing up (state),
- e. Place of growing up (rural or urban),
- f. ethnic origin, and
- g. sex?

Answer: Analysis of variance, the null hypothesis, and the F test of significance are the statistical procedures that were used to answer this question. There was no significant relationship found between performance of designated Board functions and the following socioeconomic characteristics: (1) degree(s) earned; (2) place of birth; (3) place of growing up/state; (4) place of growing up/rural or urban; (5) ethnic origin; and (6) sex. Therefore, the following research null hypotheses were not rejected:

Null hypothesis 1:

There is no difference between the degree(s) earned by local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 3:

There is no difference in the places of birth of OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 4:

There is no difference in the places where local OIC Board members grew up (state) and the performance of designated functions.

Null Hypothesis 5:

There is no difference in the places where local OIC Board members grew up (rural or urban) and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 6:

There is no difference between the ethnic origin of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

Null Hypothesis 7:

There is no difference between the sex of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions.

There was a significant relationship found between performance of designated Board functions and the occupations of local OIC Board members, thus the research Null Hypothesis 2 "There is no difference between the occupations of local OIC Board members and the performance of designated Board functions" was rejected.

Question 8:

Can the following interval scale socioeconomic characteristics be used as predictors of performance of designated Board functions:

- a. Attendance at board meetings,
- b. Attendance at committee meetings,
- c. Number of committees where service is rendered,
- d. Number of years in principal occupation,
- e. Number of years in formal education,
- f. Number of positions held in community organizations,
- g. Number of years as community resident, and
- i. Number of years as OIC Board member?

Answer: By using the Multiple Regression equation, the following interval scale socioeconomic characteristics were identified as unacceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions: (1) attendance at Board meetings; (2) number of committees where service is rendered; (3) age; (4) number of positions held in community organizations; and (5) number of years as community resident. However, the following interval scale socioeconomic characteristics were identified as acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions: (1) attendance at committee meetings; (2) number of years in principal occupation; (3) number of years of formal education; and (4) number of years as OIC Board member.

Discussion of Findings

Four observable personal characteristics were identified as being the most important characteristics that Board members should possess. These characteristics are "dependability" (can be counted on to do what he/she agreed to do), "emotional maturity" (has self control and is free from childish behavior), "perseverance" (does not give up when things are not going right), and "dedication" (committed to the goals of OIC). Board members' possession of these characteristics are important to the survival of most organizations--particularly new organizations such as OIC which is less than twenty years old, and still relatively young for a national organization. The observable personal characteristics that were identified as being the most important are consistent with the needs of a young organization.

The four most important functions that local OIC Board members are expected to perform are: (1) "public relations/governmental agencies"; (2) "fund raising/securing funds"; (3) "policy/making"; and (4) "public relations/business and industry." In addition to performing the more traditional Board functions of policy making and fund raising, local OIC organizations need Board members who have good relationships with governmental agencies and business-industry. Local OIC organizations depend tremendously on operating funds from governmental agencies and business-industry hold the keys that unlock the doors to many job opportunities. Because of these factors, one can easily see why the above-stated Board functions were identified as the most important. Also, the emphasis on fund raising and funding as functions that local OIC Board members should perform is consistent with the findings of Hartugs and Weger (1967).

Counts (1927) described Board members of public education and Zald (1967) described Board members of YMCA's in terms of their socio-economic characteristics. Local OIC Board members differ from Board members of the Counts and Zald studies in terms of ethnic origin and sex. Local OIC Board members are predominantly Black while Board members of the Counts and Zald studies were predominantly White; and females represent 31.3 percent of local OIC Board members while in the Counts' study, females represented 14.3 percent of the Board members. In terms of occupations, formal education, age, marital status, and residency in the community, local OIC Board members are similar to the Board members described by Counts and Zald.

The data revealed that the majority of local OIC Board members were at or above the mean rating for possession of observable personal characteristics and performance of designated Board functions. However, some Board members who were at or above the mean for the possession of observable personal characteristics were below the mean for the performance of designated Board functions. Furthermore, some Board members who were at or above the mean for performance of designated Board functions were below the mean for possession of observable personal characteristics. Thus, there was shifting of Board members from at or above the mean in one area to below the mean in the other area. Because of this shifting factor, only 37.5 percent of the Board members were at or above the mean for both the possession of observable personal characteristics and the performance of designated Board functions; and a mild (.23) positive relationship was found to exist between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics.

In addition to 37.5 percent of the Board members being at or above the mean of both the possession of observable personal characteristics and the performance of designated Board functions, the data also revealed that 25 percent of the Board members were below the mean for both the possession of observable personal characteristics and the performance of designated Board functions. Thus, 52.5 percent of all Board members were either at or above the mean for both observable personal characteristics and performance of functions (37.5 percent) or below the mean for both observable personal characteristics and

performance and functions (25 percent). This factor has implications for the recruitment of Board members. In recruiting local OIC Board members, local OIC Executive Directors can assess the potential Board members' possession of observable personal characteristics and use this as an aid in forecasting whether or not the potential Board members will adequately perform the designated Board functions.

Rating the performance of designated Board functions of local OIC Board members also served as a means of assessing the effectiveness of Board members in terms of significant contributions made to local OIC organizations. This factor has implications for maintaining effective local OIC Board members. The matter of evaluating the effectiveness of Board members is sensitive. However, for those organizations that would like to assess the effectiveness of their Board members, this study developed an instrument that can aid in identifying effective Board members.

A significant relationship was found to exist between the performance of designated Board functions and the following occupations: clergy, business-industry, and education. Because OIC has its roots in the Black church, it is not surprising that many of the local OIC Board members are clergymen and that a significant relationship exists between the performance of functions and this occupation. Attendance at committee meetings, the number of years in principal occupation, the number of years of formal education, and the number of years as an OIC Board member were identified as acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions. Attendance at committee meetings (as

opposed to attendance at Board meetings) was not anticipated by the researcher as an acceptable predictor. Perhaps the increased responsibilities and interaction of committee meetings (in comparison with Board meetings) account for this finding.

The socioeconomic characteristics that were identified in this study as either having a significant relationship between the performance of designated Board functions or being acceptable predictors of performance of designated Board functions are similar to some of the socioeconomic characteristics (education and occupation) that the Freeman (1968) study identified as being important. Finally, the local OIC Executive Directors can use these socioeconomic characteristics to aid in assessing whether a potential Board member will adequately perform the designated Board functions.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Board members who have good relationships with governmental agencies and business-industry are extremely valuable to local OIC organizations.
2. Local OIC organizations should continue to recruit emotionally-mature Board members who are dependable, who do not give up easily in difficult situations, and who are committed to the goals of OIC.

3. The socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members are similar to Board members who were studied in public education during 1927 and in YMCA's in 1967.
4. The identification of a potential Board member's observable personal characteristics can aid in forecasting how the person will perform the designated Board functions.
5. The majority of local OIC Board members are effective Board members.
6. There are socioeconomic characteristics that can aid in forecasting how a potential Board member will perform the designated Board functions as local OIC Board member.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research project has implications for several areas of future research. First, there are implications in the area of recruitment of Board members. Even though a general positive relationship was identified as existing between the performance of designated Board functions and the possession of observable personal characteristics, future research may be able to identify and isolate specific characteristics or a cluster of characteristics that are closely associated with the performance of functions. Second, there are implications in the area of the study of boards as units. This research project studied individual Board members and not boards as a unit. Certainly additional research is needed in the study of boards as units; i.e., their structure and operating procedures as related to organizational effectiveness.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DELPHI INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX A
DELPHI INSTRUMENTS

2535 West Boston Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan 48206
October 5, 1979

I am a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University, and I am seeking your assistance in my dissertation project. This project will study the OIC Board members within the State of Michigan. The tentative title of the dissertation is "Board Members' Performance: An Analysis of the Personal and Socioeconomic Characteristics That May Be Associated With Performance of OIC Board Members Within the State of Michigan." The objectives of this research project are:

1. To identify the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors.
2. To identify the functions that local OIC Board members are expected to perform, as judged by local OIC Executive Directors.
3. To identify the socioeconomic characteristics of local OIC Board members, as reported by the Board members themselves.
4. To identify the degree to which local Board members possess the Executive Directors' designated observable personal characteristics, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC.
5. To identify the degree to which local Board members have made contributions to OIC by performing the Executive Directors' designated Board functions, as judged by fellow Board members at each local OIC.

You will receive a series of questionnaires in which you will be asked to:

1. Identify the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess.
2. Identify the functions that local OIC Board members should perform.

In order to achieve the above-stated objectives, the Delphi Technique will be used. An explanation of this technique is enclosed along with the first-round questionnaire.

I have worked closely with Mr. James Brewer in developing this research project. This project has been endorsed by Dr. Leon Sullivan, Mrs. Mannie Ham, and the Reverend Roy A. Allen. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance in this research project.

Respectfully,

Rev. Troy L. Allen

EXPLANATION: DELPHI TECHNIQUE

The Delphi Technique is a method of obtaining group opinion on matters without bringing members of the group together in any kind of face-to-face confrontation. The technique is basically a method of collecting and organizing data comprised of expert opinion. An effort to produce a convergence of group consensus will be accomplished through a series of three questionnaires:

1. In Round I, you are asked to identify the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess and identify the functions that local OIC Board members should perform.
2. In Round II, you will be asked to prioritize the personal characteristics and functions which were generated by Questionnaire I.
3. In Round III, you will receive feedback of the consensus of the group and your individual responses generated in Questionnaire II; you will be given an opportunity to change your responses to agree with the consensus of the group or to refrain from changing your responses.

Please return Questionnaire I to me within two weeks after you receive it.

QUESTIONNAIRE/PANEL OF EXPERTS

ROUND I

Part A: Observable Personal Characteristics

Listed are some observable personal characteristics that are associated with leadership; a definition follows each characteristic. Your task is to identify the principal observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess. For each observable personal characteristic, please place an "X" next to "Yes" if you believe that the observable personal characteristic should be possessed by local OIC Board members; or place an "X" next to "No" if you believe that the observable personal characteristic should not be possessed by local OIC Board members.

1. Aggressive: A "self-starter" who has driving, forceful energy to get things done.
___ Yes or ___ No
2. Self-confidence: Belief in self and his/her ability to get things done.
___ Yes or ___ No
3. Egotistical: Identifies organizational welfare with self interest.
___ Yes or ___ No
4. Ambitious: Has the desire to achieve goals and receive the recognition that accompanies achievement(s).
___ Yes or ___ No
5. Dependability: Can be counted on to do what he/she has agreed to do.
___ Yes or ___ No
6. Emotional maturity: Has self control and is free from childish behavior.
___ Yes or ___ No
7. Decisive: Makes decisions and stands behind the decisions that are made.
___ Yes or ___ No
8. Dominance: Shows persistence in making his/her point.
___ Yes or ___ No

9. Persuasive: Influences others to think as he/she is thinking.
___ Yes or ___ No
10. Perceptive: Identifies the central as opposed to peripheral problems; has insight into clouded issues.
___ Yes or ___ No
11. Integrity: Is honest and adheres to a code of moral values.
___ Yes or ___ No
12. Courage: Faces difficult issues with confidence.
___ Yes or ___ No
13. Perseverance: Does not give up when things are not going right.
___ Yes or ___ No
14. Realism: Has good common sense; a basic understanding of "what life is" and "what life is not."
___ Yes or ___ No
15. Innovative: Introduce new ideas.
___ Yes or ___ No
16. Flexibility: Considers alternative solutions for difficult issues; does not foreclose options.
___ Yes or ___ No
17. Sociability: Fits in well with group; has ease of establishing social contact.
___ Yes or ___ No
18. Stamina: Exhibits resistance to fatigue and illness.
___ Yes or ___ No

Please use the space below to list additional observable personal characteristics that you believe should be possessed by local OIC Board members; please define each characteristic that you list.

Part B: Functions

Listed below are some functions that are associated with local OIC Board members. Your task is to identify the principal functions that local OIC Board members should perform. For each function, please place an "X" next to "Yes" if you believe that the function should be performed by the local OIC Board members; or place an "X" next to "No" if you believe that the function should not be performed by local OIC Board members.

A. Policy Making

1. Functions in the area of organizational policy making.
___ Yes or ___ No
2. Functions in the area of interpretation of policy statements.
___ Yes or ___ No

B. Personal Affairs

3. Functions in the area of salary negotiations.
___ Yes or ___ No
4. Functions in the area of staff evaluation.
___ Yes or ___ No
5. Functions in the area of staff selection.
___ Yes or ___ No

C. Budget

6. Functions in the area of budget preparation.
___ Yes or ___ No
7. Functions in the area of budget review and approval.
___ Yes or ___ No

D. Fund Raising

8. Functions in the area of securing funds.
___ Yes or ___ No
9. Functions in the area of giving personal financial support.
___ Yes or ___ No

E. Program

10. Functions in the area of vocational/technical program development.
___ Yes or ___ No
11. Functions in the area of general basic education development.
___ Yes or ___ No
12. Functions in the area of overall program development.
___ Yes or ___ No

F. Planning

13. Functions in the area of short-range planning.
___ Yes or ___ No
14. Functions in the area of long-range planning.
___ Yes or ___ No

G. Trainee Affairs

15. Functions in the area of trainee recruitment.
___ Yes or ___ No
16. Functions in the area of job placement of graduates.
___ Yes or ___ No

H. Public Relations

17. Improves the relationship between OIC and the religious community.
___ Yes or ___ No
18. Improves the relationship between OIC and organized labor.
___ Yes or ___ No
19. Improves the relationship between OIC and educational institutions.
___ Yes or ___ No
20. Improves the relationship between OIC and other community-based organizations.
___ Yes or ___ No
21. Improves the relationship between OIC and governmental agencies.
___ Yes or ___ No

22. Improves the relationship between OIC and business and industry.
___ Yes or ___ No

I. Attendance

23. Attends Board meetings on a regular basis.
___ Yes or ___ No
24. Attends committee meetings on a regular basis.
___ Yes or ___ No

Please use the space below to list additional functions that you believe should be performed by local OIC Board members.

2535 West Boston Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan 48206
January 19, 1980

Thank you for completing and returning the first-round of the OIC Board questionnaire. As you will notice on the enclosed second-round questionnaire, there have been a few changes in the wording of some statements and some statements have been eliminated. These changes are the results of comments made by respondents in the first-round of the questionnaire.

In cases where the majority of the respondents felt that either an observable personal characteristic should not be possessed or a function should not be performed by the local OIC Board member, the statement was eliminated. Also, there were a few observable personal characteristics and functions (not included in the original listing) that were suggested by respondents. These suggestions have been included in the second-round questionnaire.

If possible, please complete and return the second-round questionnaire to me within two weeks. Many thanks for your assistance.

Respectfully,

Rev. Troy L. Allen

QUESTIONNAIRE/PANEL OF EXPERTS

ROUND II

Part A: Observable Personal Characteristics

Listed are some observable personal characteristics that are associated with local OIC Board leadership which were identified in Round I; a definition follows each characteristic. Your task in Round II is to prioritize the observable personal characteristics that local OIC Board members should possess. Please rate each observable personal characteristic as follows:

- 5 Absolutely Essential
- 4 Strongly Desirable
- 3 Desirable
- 2 Slightly Desirable
- 1 Undesirable.

1. Aggressive: A "self-starter" who has driving forceful energy to get things done.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
2. Self-confidence: Belief in self and his/her ability to get things done.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
3. Ambitious: Has the desire to achieve goals and receive the recognition that accompanies achievement(s).
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
4. Dependability: Can be counted on to do what he/she has agreed to do.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
5. Emotional maturity: Has self control and is free from childish behavior.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
6. Decisive: Makes decisions and stands behind the decisions that are made.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
7. Persuasive: Influences others to think as he/she is thinking.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

- 5 Absolutely Essential
- 4 Strongly Desirable
- 3 Desirable
- 2 Slightly Desirable
- 1 Undesirable

8. Perceptive: Identifies the central as opposed to peripheral problems; has insight into clouded issues.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
9. Integrity: Is honest and adheres to a code of moral values.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
10. Courage: Faces difficult issues with confidence.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
11. Perseverance: Does not give up when things are not going right.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
12. Realism: Has good common sense; a basic understanding of "what life is" and "what life is not."
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
13. Innovative: Introduces new ideas.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
14. Flexibility: Considers alternative solutions for difficult issues; does not foreclose options.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
15. Sociability: Fits in well with group; has ease of establishing social contact.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
16. Stamina: Exhibits resistance to fatigue and illness.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
17. Dedication: Is committed to the goals of OIC.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
18. Generosity: Gives willingly of his/her time, talents, and money to achieve OIC goals.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

Part B: Functions

Listed below are some functions identified in Round I that are associated with local OIC Board members. Your task in Round II is to prioritize the functions that local OIC Board members should perform. Please rate each function as follows:

- 5 Absolutely Essential
- 4 Strongly Desirable
- 3 Desirable
- 2 Slightly Desirable
- 1 Undesirable

A. Policy Making

1. Functions in the area of organizational policy making.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
2. Functions in the area of interpretation of policy statements.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

B. Professionalism

3. When needed, makes professional service available to OIC on a free or modest basis.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

C. Budget

4. Functions in the area of budget review and approval.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

D. Fund Raising

5. Functions in the area of securing funds from outside sources.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
6. Functions in the area of giving personal financial support.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

E. Program Development

7. Functions in the area of overall program development.
___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

F. Planning

8. Functions in the area of planning for short-range OIC goals.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

9. Functions in the area of planning for long-range OIC goals.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

G. Trainee Affairs

10. Functions in the area of trainee recruitment.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

11. Functions in the area of job placements of graduates.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

H. Public Relations

12. Improves the relationship between OIC and the religious community.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

13. Improves the relationship between OIC and organized labor.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

14. Improves the relationship between OIC and educational institutions.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

15. Improves the relationship between OIC and other community-based organizations.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

16. Improves the relationship between OIC and governmental agencies; provides access into the political process.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

17. Improves the relationship between OIC and business and industry.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

I. Attendance

18. Attends Board meetings on a regular basis.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

19. Attends committee meetings on a regular basis.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

OIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF MICHIGAN
SURVEY SUMMARY--ROUND II

Part A: Observable Personal Characteristics

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Respondents</u>							<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
	<u>#1</u>	<u>#2</u>	<u>#3</u>	<u>#4</u>	<u>#5</u>	<u>#6</u>	<u>#7</u>		
1	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	25	3.57
2	3	3	5	3	4	5	4	27	3.85
3	2	4	1	2	4	5	4	22	3.14
4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	34	4.85
5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	32	4.57
6	5	3	4	4	4	4	5	29	4.14
7	2	3	5	5	4	5	2	26	3.71
8	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	28	4.00
9	5	3	5	4	4	5	5	31	4.42
10	4	4	4	4	4	5	2	27	3.85
11	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	32	4.57
12	5	4	4	4	4	5	3	29	4.14
13	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	22	3.14
14	4	4	5	4	4	5	3	29	4.14
15	3	4	3	3	4	5	2	24	3.42
16	3	2	5	3	4	3	4	24	3.42
17	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	32	4.57
18	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>4.42</u>
Total	78	70	76	67	72	80	77	504	4.00
Mean rating	4.33	3.88	4.22	3.72	4.00	4.44	3.66	4.00	

OIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF MICHIGAN

SURVEY SUMMARY--ROUND II

Part B: Functions

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Respondents</u>							<u>Total</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
	<u>#1</u>	<u>#2</u>	<u>#3</u>	<u>#4</u>	<u>#5</u>	<u>#6</u>	<u>#7</u>		
1	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	32	4.57
2	2	5	5	4	4	1	4	25	3.57
3	5	4	3	4	4	5	4	29	4.14
4	5	5	4	4	4	5	3	30	4.28
5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	33	4.71
6	5	3	3	4	4	3	3	25	3.57
7	3	3	1	4	4	3	3	21	3.00
8	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	29	4.14
9	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	31	4.42
10	3	2	3	3	4	2	3	20	2.85
11	3	3	1	2	4	2	2	17	2.42
12	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	30	4.28
13	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	31	4.42
14	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	29	4.14
15	5	4	3	4	4	5	4	29	4.14
16	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	34	4.85
17	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	32	4.57
18	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	31	4.42
19	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>4.28</u>
Total	83	80	74	73	76	77	75	538	3.89
Mean rating	4.36	4.21	3.89	3.84	4.00	4.05	3.94	3.89	

2534 West Boston Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan 48206
May 13, 1980

Thank you for completing and returning the second-round of the OIC Board questionnaire. The results of the second-round are enclosed along with questionnaire from the second round. These items may be retained for your use.

Also enclosed is the third-round questionnaire. The purpose of the third and final round is to produce a convergence of group consensus. If possible, please complete and return the third-round questionnaire to me within two weeks. Again, many thanks for your assistance.

Respectfully,

Rev. Troy L. Allen

QUESTIONNAIRE/PANEL OF EXPERTS

ROUND III

Part A: Observable Personal Characteristics

Listed are some observable personal characteristics that are associated with local OIC Board leadership which were identified in Round I and prioritized in Round II; a definition follows each characteristic. The task in Round III is to produce a convergence of group consensus. On items where your rating is different from the group consensus (this is the mean/average group rating for each item) by one or more points, you are asked to either join the group consensus or defend your dissent with individual statements.

Only those items where you disagreed by one or more points with the group consensus are listed for your reactions. Also, a summary statement of each respondent responses in Round II and the Round II Questionnaire are enclosed for your perusal.

Observable Personal Characteristics: Comments by panel members who did not join the group consensus.

Ambitious: Has the desire to achieve goals and receive the recognition that accompany achievement(s).

- Panel Member Comments: *There's definite conflict with any OIC Board member who is seeking recognition. Too many Board members join to get recognition rather than render a service. Ambitiousness is not a desirable trait.*
- Panel Member Comments: *Board members are volunteers and should desire to achieve goals in the interest of the organization and not for personal recognition.*

Persuasive: Influences others to think as he/she is thinking.

- Panel Member Comments: *I think that this is an excellent trait because it means the Board member will fight for that which she or he thinks is essential. If he or she has the program as primary consideration then a persuasive member is extremely beneficial.*
- Panel Member Comments: *This may be an acceptable attribute for those Board members in leadership, but for those who may lack full knowledge of program activities, this is not an acceptable attribute.*
- Panel Member Comments: *If persuasiveness is personal and not in the best interest of program, then there is a serious problem for the program and the Executive Director.*

Generosity: Gives willingly of his/her time, talents, and money to achieve OIC goals.

- Panel Member Comments: *Generosity should not mean willingness to give material things one does not have. If unable to give, a member should be able to get or raise the funds.*

Dedication: Is committed to the goals of OIC.

- Panel Member Comments: *It has been found that in some cases persons serving on OIC Boards bring in their own agenda which may or may not be dedicated to the goal of OIC.*

Part B: Functions

Listed are some functions identified by Round I and prioritized in Round II that are associated with OIC Board members. The task in Round III is to produce a convergence of group consensus. On items where your rating is different from the group consensus (this is the mean/average group rating for each item) by one or more points, you are asked to either join the group consensus or defend your dissent with individual statements.

Only those items where you disagreed by one or more points with the group consensus are listed for your reactions.

Functions: Comments by panel members who did not join the group consensus.

Policy Making: Functions in the area of interpretation of policy statements.

- Panel Member Comments: *The Board exists primarily to establish policies; it is the Board's role to state policy and interpret it for its Director who carries out that policy.*
- Panel Member Comments: *Boards have tended to stray away from policy interpretation, leaving it up to the administration to make these decisions.*
- Panel Member Comments: *The Executive Director is responsible for interpretation and implementation of Board policy.*

Program Development: Functions in the area of overall program development.

- Panel Member Comments: *Program development is an operational function that rests with the staff. If the Board members engage in Program Development they are infringing upon the staff's function.*

Trainee Affairs: Functions in the area of job placement of graduates.

- Panel Member Comments: *The Board should not engage in actual job placement but rather help to open up job opportunities through its contacts. If you mean actual placement, definitely no; however, if you mean assist thru contacts, then yes.*

Budget: Functions in the area of budget review and approval.

- Panel Member Comments: *Usually Board members are not informed as to the total needs of program although I feel that review and approval are appropriate.*

Fund Raising: Functions in the area of giving personal financial support.

- Panel Member Comments: *The Board must set the example by individual giving; We Help Ourselves!!!*

APPENDIX B

DELPHI PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX B

DELPHI PARTICIPANTS

1. Benton Harbor OIC
Mrs. Hazel Cochran
2. Detroit OIC
Mr. James Brewer
3. Flint OIC
Rev. Harry L. Redds
4. Grand Rapids OIC
Dr. David Mabunda
5. Muskegon OIC
Mr. Dan Oglesby
6. Pontiac OIC
Mr. Daniel Mitchell
7. Saginaw OIC
Mr. Frederick D. Ford

APPENDIX C

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX C

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

2535 West Boston Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan 48206
July 1, 1980

I am a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University, and I am seeking your assistance in my doctoral research project. In addition to the Board Chairman and Vice Chairman at your local OIC, you have been randomly selected to participate in this research project. As a randomly selected participant, your tasks are to complete the enclosed two-part questionnaire and return the questionnaire to me. Part A of the questionnaire is designed to gather data concerning your socioeconomic status. In Part B, you are asked to rate each Board member at your local OIC who has been randomly selected for this project; you will rate fellow Board members in the area of _____ . All reported information will be treated in a very confidential and professional manner.

The title of my dissertation is "Board Members' Performance: An Analysis of the Personal and Socioeconomic Characteristics That May be Associated With Performance of OIC Board Members Within the State of Michigan." I have worked closely with the Michigan OIC Executive Directors in developing this research project. This project has been endorsed by Dr. Leon Sullivan, Mrs. Mannie Ham, and the Rev. Roy A. Allen.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed. If possible, please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope within the next two weeks.

Many thanks in advance for your assistance.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. Troy L. Allen

QUESTIONNAIRE/OIC BOARD MEMBERS

Part A/Socioeconomic Data

Directions: This section of the questionnaire is designed to gather information regarding your socioeconomic status. Please answer each question with a precise answer or check mark when appropriate.

1. Formal Education

- a. How many years of formal education have you attained? _____
- b. Please list any degrees that you have earned. _____
- _____

2. Occupation

- a. What is your principal occupation? _____
- b. How many years have you worked in your principal occupation? _____
- c. What is your position or title? _____

3. What was your average income during the past five years? Please check one:

- () Less than \$10,000
- () \$10,000-\$14,999
- () \$15,000-\$19,999
- () \$20,000-\$24,999
- () \$25,000-\$29,999
- () \$30,000-\$39,999
- () \$40,000-\$49,999
- () \$50,000 or more

4. OIC Participation

- a. How long have you been an OIC member? _____
- b. How often does your Board meet? _____
- c. How many Board meetings have you attended during the past twelve months? _____
- d. How many committees are you on? _____
- e. How many committee meetings have you attended during the past twelve months? _____

5. Including OIC, list all community organizations that you have been affiliated with during the past five years and list appointed or elected position(s) that you previously held or currently hold.

	<u>Name of Organization</u>	<u>Years With Organization</u>	<u>Position</u>
a.	_____	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____	_____
c.	_____	_____	_____
d.	_____	_____	_____
e.	_____	_____	_____
f.	_____	_____	_____
g.	_____	_____	_____
h.	_____	_____	_____

6. Birth Place

- a. In what state were you born? _____
- b. In what state did you spend your childhood/youth? _____
- c. Did you grow up in a rural or urban area? _____

7. How long have you lived in the community (city, township, or village) where you are presently residing? _____

8. What is your present age? _____

9. What is your marital status? Please check one:

- () Single (never married)
- () Married
- () Separated or Divorced
- () Widow or Widower

10. What is your race (ethnic origin)? _____

11. What is your sex? _____

Part B/Observable Personal Characteristics

Directions: Listed below are some observable personal characteristics that OIC Executive Directors within the State of Michigan have identified as being desirable for local OIC Board members to possess. Please use this observable personal characteristics sheet to rate the degree to which the Board member whose name is listed below possesses each of the observable personal characteristics. Please rate the degree of possession as follows:

- 5 Exceptional degree
- 4 High degree
- 3 Average degree
- 2 Small degree
- 1 Not possessed

Name of Board Member _____

1. Agressive: A "self-starter" who has driving forceful energy to get things done.
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1
2. Self-Confidence: Belief in self and his/her ability to get things done.
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1
3. Ambitious: Has the desire to achieve goals and receive the recognition that accompany achievement(s).
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1
4. Dependability: Can be counted on to do what he/she has agreed to do.
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1
5. Emotional Maturity: Has self control and is free from childish behavior.
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1
6. Decisive: Makes decisions and stands behind the decision that are made.
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1
7. Persuasive: Influences others to think as he/she is thinking.
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1
8. Perceptive: Identifies the central as opposed to peripheral problems; has insight into clouded issues.
 ____ 5; ____ 4; ____ 3; ____ 2; ____ 1

- 5 Exceptional degree
- 4 High degree
- 3 Average degree
- 2 Small degree
- 1 Not possessed

9. Integrity: Is honest and adheres to a code of moral values.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
10. Courage: Faces difficult issues with confidence.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
11. Perseverance: Does not give up when things are not going right.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
12. Realism: Has good common sense; a basic understanding of "what life is" and "what life is not."
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
13. Innovative: Introduce new ideas.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
14. Flexibility: Considers alternative solutions for difficult issues; does not foreclose options.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
15. Sociability: Fits in well with group; has ease of establishing social contact.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
16. Stamina: Exhibits resistance to fatigue and illness.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
17. Dedication: Is committed to the goals of OIC.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
18. Generosity: Gives willingly of his/her time, talents, and money to achieve OIC goals.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

Part BB/Performance of Functions

Directions: Local OIC Board members' performance is defined as contributions that are made to OIC by its Board members in performing local OIC Board functions. Listed below are some functions of local OIC Board members that have been identified by OIC Executive Directors within the State of Michigan. Please use this performance of functions sheet to rate the level of performance of the local OIC Board member whose name is listed below; level of performance should be based on contributions to OIC during the past twelve months in performing the functions listed below. Please rate the level of performance as follows:

- 5 Exceptional High Level
- 4 High Level
- 3 Average Level
- 2 Small Level
- 1 No Performance Level

Name of Board Member: _____

A. Policy Making

1. Functions in the area of organizational policy making.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
2. Functions in the area of interpretation of policy statements.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

B. Professionalism

3. When needed, makes professional service available to OIC on a free to modest basis.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

C. Budget

4. Functions in the area of budget review and approval.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

D. Fund Raising

5. Functions in the area of securing funds from outside sources.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1
6. Functions in the area of giving personal financial support.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

E. Program Development

7. Functions in the area of overall program development.
 ___ 5; ___ 4; ___ 3; ___ 2; ___ 1

- 5 Exceptional High Level
- 4 High Level
- 3 Average Level
- 2 Small Level
- 1 No Performance Level

F. Planning

- 8. Functions in the area of planning for short-range OIC goals.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 9. Functions in the area of planning for long-range OIC goals.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1

G. Trainee Affairs

- 10. Functions in the area of trainee recruitment.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 11. Functions in the area of job placements of graduates.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1

H. Public Relations

- 12. Improves the relationship between OIC and the religious community.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 13. Improves the relationship between OIC and organized labor.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 14. Improves the relationship between OIC and educational institutions.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 15. Improves the relationship between OIC and other community-based organizations.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 16. Improves the relationship between OIC and governmental agencies; provides access into the political process.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 17. Improves the relationship between OIC and business and industry.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1

I. Attendance

- 18. Attends Board meetings on a regular basis.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1
- 19. Attends committee meetings on a regular basis.
 5; 4; 3; 2; 1

2535 West Boston Boulevard
 Detroit, Michigan 48206
 August 20, 1980

Several weeks ago, you should have received an OIC Board members' questionnaire from me. Perhaps your busy schedule has not permitted you to complete and return the questionnaire.

Completing this doctoral program has been a long and sometimes difficult road to travel. Since this research project is the last major hurdle in completing my Ph.D. requirements, I would be extremely grateful if you would take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire and return it to me.

As I stated in my initial correspondence with you, the information received from the questionnaire will be treated in a very confidential and professional manner. Please feel free to call me (non-residents of Detroit may call collect) at 869-7685 if you have questions regarding the questionnaire.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. Troy L. Allen

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Bernard E. The Opportunities Industrialization Centers: A Decade of Community-Based Manpower Service. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1976.
- Austin, David M. The Black Civic Volunteer Leader: A New Era in Voluntarism. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, 1970.
- Burns, Gerald P. Trustees in Higher Education. Independent College Funds of America, Inc., 1966.
- Counts, George S. "The Social Composition of Boards of Education." New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969--Supplementary Education Monographs published in conjunction with The School Review and The Elementary School Journal. Number 33. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, July 1927.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Freeman, Linton C. Patterns of Local Community Leadership. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1968.
- Ginzberg, Eli, and Solow, Robert M., eds. The Great Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1974.
- Gribb, Cecil A. The Principles and Traits of Leadership. Reprinted in The Study of Leadership. Edited by C. G. Browne and Thomas S. Cohn. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1958.
- Hartugs, Nelly, and Weber, Joseph. Board of Directors: A Study of Current Practices in Board Management and Board Operations in Voluntary Hospital, Health, and Welfare Organizations. Dubbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1967.
- Houle, Cyril O. The Effective Board. New York: Association Press, 1960.
- Hunt, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
- Jennings, Kent M. Community Influentials, The Elites of Atlanta. London: Collier-MacMillan Limited, 1964.

- Knickerbocker, Irvin. Leadership: A Conception and Some Implications. Reprinted in The Study of Leadership. Edited by C. G. Browne and Thomas S. Cohn. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1958.
- Mangum, Garth, ed. The Manpower Revolution. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.
- Rauh, Morton A. The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Rossman, Mark H., and Bunning, Richard L. "Knowledge and Skills for the Adult Educator: A Delphi Study." Adult Education 28 (No. 3, 1978): 139-155.
- Russ, Murray G., and Hendry, Charles E. Leadership Theory: Theories of Leadership. Reprinted in Leadership in Voluntary Enterprises. Edited by Charles W. Merrifield. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1961.
- Russell, John D., and Reeves, Floyd W. The Evaluation of Higher Institutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Stewart, Frank A. "A Study of Influence in Southtown II." Sociometry 10 (August 1947): 273-286.
- Sullivan, Leon H. Build Brother Build. Philadelphia: Macrae Smith Company, 1969.
- Trecker, Harleigh B. Citizen Boards at Work. New York: Association Press, 1970.
- White, James E. "Theory and Method for Research in Community Leadership." American Sociological Review 15 (February 1950): 50-60.
- Zald, Mayer N. "Urban Differentiation, Characteristics of Board of Directors and Organizational Effectiveness." The American Journal of Sociology 73 (November 1967): 261-272.