

AD 661048

FR not in system

A Summary of the Final Report


**LOCAL
GOVERNING
BODIES:
THEIR
RELATION TO
CIVIL DEFENSE**



Best Available Copy

An exploratory study of definitions and performances of civil defense roles of county board members, mayors, and county-municipal civil defense directors.

Gerald E. Klonglan
George M. Beal
Joe M. Bohlen
John R. Nye



Final Report Contract No. OCD-PS-65-9.Research Subtask 4811-E
Submitted to: Office of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

Sociological Studies in Civil Defense. . . Project Co-Directors: George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen and Gerald E. Klonglan
Task Area Coordinator: John R. Nye
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY.IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
RURAL SOCIOLOGY REPORT 46
Ames, Iowa. . . March 1967

Distribution of this Document is Unlimited

Reproduced by the
CLEARINGHOUSE
for Federal Scientific & Technical
Information Springfield Va. 22151

A SUMMARY OF THE FINAL REPORT

LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES:

THEIR RELATION TO CIVIL DEFENSE

**An exploratory study of definitions and performances of
civil defense roles of county board members, mayors, and
county-municipal civil defense directors**

by

Gerald E. Klonglan

George M. Beal

Joe M. Bohlen

John R. Nye

for

Office of Civil Defense
Office of the Secretary of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20310

A Summary of the Final Report....Contract OCD-PS-65-9....Work Unit 4811-E

OCD REVIEW NOTICE

This report has been reviewed in the Office of Civil Defense and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Office of Civil Defense.

Sociological Studies in Civil Defense

Project Co-Directors: George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen and Gerald E. Klonglan
Task Area Coordinator: John R. Nye

Rural Sociology Report No. 46S
Iowa Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
March, 1967

Distribution of this document is unlimited

PREFACE

Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, is conducting a series of Sociological Studies in Civil Defense. The report summarized herein deals with one study of the series: an analysis of local government officials and their role in implementing civil defense in local communities. The local government officials studied are mayors and members of county boards. Local civil defense directors in the same local government area are also studied.

Other Iowa State University studies have focused on local civil defense directors, community power actors, adoption patterns of the general populace, formal voluntary organizations, and community wide civil defense social action programs.¹

Although there are data readily available which describe certain general civil defense aspects of local governing bodies (for example, how many communities are participating in civil defense activities) there is little information available on the roles of county board members or mayors as they relate to the implementation of civil defense.

The study summarized herein is a pilot attempt to present concepts and methods which can be used to better understand the local milieu in which civil defense programs must be implemented. The central concept of the report is role, i.e., a set of expectations applied to a position. In the study, partial definitions of civil defense roles (expectations) of board members, mayors, and local civil defense directors were obtained from various official sources. These partial role definitions were then synthesized into "ideal" role definitions to be used as criteria or standards against which to compare the definitions of the same roles as seen by the county board members, mayors, and local civil defense directors. Other important concepts related to the concept of role are also utilized in the report.

Some societal roles are quite clearly defined and there is generally a high degree of consensus regarding their definitions. The role of the local civil defense director does not appear, in general, to be as clearly defined.

¹For a complete list of reports published in Iowa State University's Sociological Studies in Civil Defense Series, see pages iii and iv.

Also, there appears to be considerable vagueness regarding the specific civil defense roles of county board members and mayors. It is to the problem of gaining knowledge about these roles that this report addresses itself.

Reports

Iowa State University's
Sociological Studies in Civil Defense

Local Civil Defense Director Studies (Studies in Complex Organizations)

1. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen, and Tim G. Shaffer. Local Civil Defense Directors' Attitudes, Opinions, Knowledge, and Actions, 1962. Rural Sociology Report No. 29. Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1964. (Base Report, 321 pages.)
2. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen, and Tim G. Shaffer. Prediction of Role Performance of Local Civil Defense Directors. Rural Sociology Report No. 36. Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1964. (Base Report, 354 pages; Separate Summary Report, 53 pages.)
3. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen and Charles L. Mulford. Data Book: Local Civil Defense Directors' Attitudes, Knowledge, and Performance - Minnesota, Georgia and Massachusetts. Rural Sociology Report No. 48. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1966. (Base Report, 341 pages.)
4. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen, and Charles L. Mulford. Prediction of Local Civil Defense Directors' Role Performance: Minnesota, Georgia, and Massachusetts. Rural Sociology Report No. 52. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1966. (Base Report, 479 pages; Separate Summary Report, 120 pages.)
5. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen, and Robert B. Schafer. Predicting Change in the Role Performance of Local Civil Defense Directors. Rural Sociology Report No. 65. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. (In process, 1967.)

Community Power Studies

6. Bohlen, Joe M., George M. Beal, Gerald E. Klonglan, and John L. Tait. Community Power Structure and Civil Defense. Rural Sociology Report No. 35. Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1964. (Base Report, 254 pages; Separate Summary Report, 18 pages.)
7. Bohlen, Joe M., George M. Beal, Gerald E. Klonglan, and John L. Tait. Community Power Actors and Civil Defense. Rural Sociology Report No. 40. Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1965. (Base Report, 181 pages, Separate Summary Report, 18 pages.)

8. Bohlen, Joe M., George M. Beal, Gerald E. Klonglan, and John L. Tait. A Comparative Analysis of Community Power Structures: a delineation and comparative analysis of power structures in five Iowa communities. Rural Sociology Report No. 50. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. (In process, 1967.)

Adoption Studies

9. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, and Joe M. Bohlen. Family Adoption of Public Fallout Shelters. Rural Sociology Report No. 30. Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1964. (Base Report, 183 pages; Separate Summary Report, 14 pages.)

10. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal and Joe M. Bohlen. Adoption of Public Fallout Shelters: A 1964 National Study. Rural Sociology Report No. 49. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1966. (Base Report, 339 pages; Separate Summary Report, 28 pages.)

11. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen and E. Walter Coward, Jr. Adoption of Public Fallout Shelters - A 1966 National Study. Rural Sociology Report No. 54. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1966. (Base Report, 38 pages.)

12. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen and E. Walter Coward, Jr. Factors Related to Adoption Progress: A 1966 National Study of Public Fallout Shelter Adoption. Rural Sociology Report No. 64. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. (In process, 1967.)

Community Formal Voluntary Organization Studies

13. Beal, George M., Gerald E. Klonglan, Paul Yarbrough, Joe M. Bohlen and Don A. Dillman. System Linkages Among Women's Organizations: an exploratory study of membership and leadership linkages among women's formal organizations in a local community. Rural Sociology Report No. 42. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1967. (Base Report, 155 pages.)

Community Social Action Studies

14. Beal, George M., Paul Yarbrough, Gerald E. Klonglan and Joe M. Bohlen. Social Action in Civil Defense. Rural Sociology Report No. 34. Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1964. (Base Report, 379 pages; Separate Summary Report, 74 pages.)

Communication Impact Studies

15. Beal, George M., Gerald E. Klonglan, Joe M. Bohlen, and Paul Yarbrough. Communication Impact. Rural Sociology Report No. 41. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1967. (Base Report, 339 pages; Separate Summary Report, 83 pages.)

Simulation of Communication and Community Processes

16. Hartman, John J. Annotated Bibliography on Simulation in the Social Sciences. Rural Sociology Report No. 53. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1966. (Base Report, 31 pages.)

Local Governing Officials

17. Klonglan, Gerald E., George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen, and John R. Nye. Local Governing Bodies: Their Relation to Civil Defense. Rural Sociology Report No. 46. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. 1967. (Base Report, 149 pages; Separate Summary Report, 22 pages.)

18. Yarbrough, Paul, ed. Teaching Materials: Seminar on Application of Social Science Research to Civil Defense Problems. Rural Sociology Report No. 66. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. (In process, 1967.)

SUMMARY

Responsibilities for Civil Defense

According to the Federal Civil Defense Act, civil defense is the joint responsibility of federal, state, and local governments. As originally enacted in 1951, the Federal Civil Defense Act stated that the "responsibility of civil defense shall be vested primarily in the States and their political subdivisions."¹ In 1958 the policy declaration was amended by Public Law 85-606 so that "the responsibility for civil defense (is) vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions."²

General Objectives of the Research Study

The general purpose of this report is to study relationships between local government officials and the implementation of local civil defense. It is not feasible to focus on all such relationships. The general objectives of the report are:

1. To develop a conceptual framework to aid in the investigation of relationships between local elected officials (county board members and mayors) and local civil defense, especially local civil defense directors. The conceptual framework focuses on role definitions (role expectations) and role performances.

2. To empirically test parts of the conceptual framework in a field study of local government officials and local civil defense.

3. To analyze the degree of consensus between two different role definitions of the same position. The three positions to be studied are those of the county board member, the mayor, and the local civil defense director. The role-definers will be the incumbents of these positions: county board members, mayors, and local civil defense directors.

¹Public Law 81-920, approved January 12, 1951, sec. 2 (64 Stat. 1246).

²Public Law 85-606, approved August 8, 1959, sec. 2 (72 Stat. 532).

4. To analyze the degree of congruence between role definitions and perceptions of role performances. The role definitions and role performances of county board members, mayors and local civil defense directors will be analyzed.

The Conceptual Framework

The following is a presentation of the conceptual framework used to study relationships between local governing bodies and the implementation of local civil defense. Four of the basic concepts used are "role," "role performance," "consensus," and "congruence."

"Role" is defined as a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a position. For example, the set of civil defense tasks the mayor expects the local civil defense director to perform.

"Role performance" is defined as the actual behavior of an incumbent of a position. For example, the actual task-behavior of the local civil defense director is his "role performance."

"Consensus" is defined as the correspondence (or agreement) between two different sets of role definitions for a given position. For example, a county board member might define the local civil defense director's role quite differently than a mayor might; if so, it would be said that there is low consensus between the two role definitions.

"Congruence" is defined as the correspondence (or agreement) between a definition of a role and a perception of the incumbent's performance of that role. For example, a county board member might say the local civil defense director should perform certain tasks. If the county board member perceives that the director has, in fact, performed those tasks, it would then be said that there is high congruence between the county board member's definition of the director's role and the county board member's perception of the director's role performance.

Figure 1 illustrates the elements and some of the relationships of the conceptual framework. The circles illustrate elements; the lines between the circles illustrate relationships between the elements; the cross-hatched areas where the circles overlap illustrate either "consensus" or "congruence."

Elements

The four circles on the left side of Figure 1 (A, B, C, and D) refer to a local elected official, his role, and his role performance:

Circle A represents a local elected official, that is, a county board member or a mayor (that is, the incumbent of a position).

Circle B represents the role performance of a local elected official. Role performance is the actual behavior of a local elected official in carrying out his civil defense role.

Circle C represents the role of a local elected official as defined by any given role-definer, such as a local civil defense director.

Circle D represents the "ideal" role of a local elected official as defined by official civil defense sources.

The four circles on the right side of Figure 1 (E, F, G, and H) refer to the local civil defense director.

Circle E represents a local civil defense director, i.e., the incumbent.

Circle F represents the civil defense role performance of a local civil defense director.


Circle G represents the civil defense role of a local civil defense director as defined by any given role-definer.

Circle H represents the "ideal" role of a local civil defense director as defined by official civil defense sources.

Relationships

Relationships between elements in Figure 1 are represented by the lines which connect the circles. The lines do not indicate all possible relationships between elements of the conceptual framework, only selected ones. The lines proceeding from Circle A represent the local elected official's perceptions of (1) the local civil defense director, (2) the local civil defense director's role, and (3) the local civil defense director's role performance. The lines proceeding from Circle E represent the local civil defense director's perceptions of: (4) the local elected official, (5) the local elected official's civil defense role, and (6) the local elected official's civil defense role performance.

Figure 1. Some elements and relationships of the conceptual framework



 = consensus
 = congruence

*"Ideal" role definitions reflect official civil defense expectations of persons in given positions.

The crosshatched areas in Figure 1 where the circles overlap represent consensus and congruence:

Consensus is the correspondence between two different sets of role definitions, as represented by the overlap between Circles C and D and Circles G and H.

Congruence is the correspondence between a definition of a role and a perception of the performance of that same role, as represented by the overlap between Circles B and C and Circles F and G.

Elaboration of relationships among elements

Figure 2 is an expansion and elaboration of Figure 1. Figure 1 is a general diagram of elements and certain relationships of the conceptual framework. Figure 2 is more specific to this report in that it focuses on county board members and mayors separately, rather than using the general term, "local elected official." There are six circles in each cell, but, for clarity, each cell shows only two relationships: one incumbent's perception of one role and his perception of the attendant role performance.


Cells 1, 2, and 3 focus upon the civil defense role and role performance of county board members, as they are, respectively, seen by: (1) county board members themselves, (2) mayors, and (3) local civil defense directors.

Thus, in Cell 1 the incumbent county board member (see Circle I) is asked what he perceives a county board member's civil defense role to be (see Circle R), and how well county board members have performed that role (see Circle P, which refers to role performance).

Cells 4, 5, and 6 focus upon the civil defense role and role performance of mayors as seen by: (4) county board members, (5) the mayors themselves, and (6) local civil defense directors.

Cells 7, 8, and 9 focus upon the role and role performance of local civil defense directors as seen by: (7) county board members, (8) mayors, and (9) the local civil defense directors themselves.

Figure 2. Elaboration of relationships among elements



I = incumbent of the position
 R = role
 P = role performance

THE STUDY POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population

The population from which the study sample was selected is composed of the counties in Iowa which had (at the time the sample was selected) Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administrations. The name "Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administration" is the Iowa equivalent of the "county civil defense supervisory committee" found in many states. Each Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administration in Iowa, as legally organized, is composed of one member of the county board and the mayor (or mayor's representative) of each municipality which has passed a resolution to participate in it.

Sampling counties

The first characteristic considered when selecting sample counties was whether or not the county had an official Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administration on record with the State Office of Civil Defense. The counties which had an official Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administration (n = 64) were then divided into two groups: those with no Program Papers (n = 26) and those with Program Papers (n = 38).¹ Those counties with Program Papers were further subdivided into two groups: those receiving Personnel and Administrative (P & A) funds (n = 25) and those not receiving P & A funds (n = 13). The counties receiving P & A funds were then divided into two groups: one where the local director received no salary (n = 0) and one where the local director received some salary (n = 25). The 25 counties were further divided into two groups: where the directors were paid full-time (n = 16) and paid part-time (n = 9).

After this categorization was completed, nine counties were selected for this pilot study. The nine counties were selected in such a way as to be a purposive, stratified sample of Iowa counties having Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administrations.

¹A Program Paper is a management document that prescribes specific tasks a local government should do to build its civil defense capability.

Sampling of local officials within counties

In each of the sample counties, persons holding three different positions were studied: county board members, mayors, and county-municipal civil defense directors.

County board members (n = 9) In each of the sample counties, one county board member was selected to be interviewed. He was chosen either because he was the county board member with specific responsibility for civil defense or, if no one had such specific responsibility, because he was the chairman of the county board.

Mayors (n = 21) In each sample county, mayors of municipalities that had passed resolutions to be part of a Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administration were listed. From this list a maximum number of three mayors per county were randomly selected for study.

County-municipal civil defense directors (n = 9) The county-municipal civil defense director in each of the nine sample counties was interviewed to obtain data needed for analytical purposes.

"Ideal" Definitions of County Board Members', Mayors' and Local Civil Defense Directors' Civil Defense Roles

One objective of the report is to delineate a set of "ideal" civil defense role expectations for the three roles being analyzed: county board members, mayors, and local civil defense directors. The research presented in this report is more complex than most "role consensus analyses" because it focuses on three different positions rather than on only one position. The study of consensus is further complicated because there are various persons who may have civil defense role definitions (expectations) of each position.

Because there are so many possible role-definers of local government officials' positions, one of the first steps in any study of role consensus is to clearly delineate the role-definers whose expectations are to be compared. In this study there are four role-definers: (1) county board members, (2) mayors, (3) local civil defense directors, and (4) an "ideal" role definition based upon official state civil defense sources.

The consensus comparisons made in this report are comparisons between (a) an "ideal" definition of a given role and (b) role-definers' definitions of that role.

One possible "role-definer" of the civil defense roles of county board members, mayors and local civil defense directors is official state civil defense sources.¹ Since the field study was conducted in Iowa, official Iowa civil defense documents and state-level Iowa civil defense officials were consulted in the preparation of "ideal" civil defense role definitions for county board members, mayors and local civil defense directors.

It is important to note that the "ideal" role definitions developed in this research project are lists of "possible responsibilities." Each list of "possible responsibilities" is composed of two types of items: "responsibilities" and "non-responsibilities." Those items which are termed "responsibilities" are defined as such by official state civil defense sources. Those items which are termed "non-responsibilities" are items not defined as responsibilities by official state civil defense sources.²

A list of possible responsibilities with task items "correctly" designated "responsibilities" or "non-responsibilities" for a given position is called an "ideal" role definition. Such a list is termed "ideal" because it reflects official civil defense expectations of incumbents of a certain position.

The "ideal" role definitions utilized in this report are presented in Figures 3, 4 and 5.

¹Information sources: Iowa Code, Chapter 28A (including the amendments in House File 417), the Iowa State Survival Plan, state civil defense officials (where specifically appropriate) and other official civil defense sources (pamphlets, etc.).

²The authors recognize that the "ideal" role definitions delineated in this report are not an exhaustive listing of the civil defense responsibilities of mayors, county board members, and local civil defense directors. The authors found that the different levels of responsibilities and the different sources stating such responsibilities make it very difficult at the present time to deal with ideal civil defense role responsibilities. Hopefully such role responsibilities will be more clearly delineated and recorded in the future.

Figure 3. "Ideal" definition of county board member's role

<u>List of possible responsibilities of county board members</u>	<u>Is it "ideally" the responsibility of county board members?</u>
(1) Prepare an annual civil defense budget	No ^a
(2) Appoint one of its members to the Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administration	Yes ^a
(3) Appropriate funds for civil defense	Yes ^a
(4) Appoint the county-municipal civil defense director	No ^a
(5) Direct the activities of the county-municipal civil defense director	No ^a
(6) Prepare for continuity of government in an emergency	Yes ^{b,c}
(7) Develop a plan for the preservation of essential records	Yes ^c
(8) Be in charge following natural disasters in the county	No ^{a,c}
(9) Coordinate efforts of fire services in the county	No ^c
(10) Promote the licensing, marking and stocking of shelter spaces in buildings	Yes ^d
(11) Establish an Emergency Operating Center for government	Yes ^b
(12) Develop a basic operational plan	No ^c

^a Iowa Code (including House File 417).

^b Iowa State Survival Plan.

^c Official of the Iowa Civil Defense Administration.

^d Implicit in civil defense literature extant at the time of the research study.

Figure 4. "Ideal" definition of mayor's role

<u>List of possible responsibilities of mayors</u>	<u>Is it "ideally" the responsibility of mayors?</u>
(1) Attend or send a representative to Joint County-Municipal Civil Defense Administration meetings (or, Attend CD planning meetings)	Yes ^a
(2) Direct the activities of the county-municipal civil defense director	No ^a
(3) Prepare for continuity of government in an emergency	Yes ^b
(4) Attend civil defense information and training programs	Yes ^c
(5) Develop and conduct civil defense training programs	Yes ^b
(6) Disseminate anti-communist literature	No
(7) Promote the licensing, marking and stocking of shelter spaces in buildings	Yes ^c

^aIowa Code (including House File 417).

^bIowa State Survival Plan.

^cImplicit in civil defense literature and programs extant at the time of the research study.

Figure 5. "Ideal" definition of county-municipal civil defense director's role

<u>List of possible responsibilities of county-municipal civil defense directors</u>	<u>Is it "ideally" the responsibility of county- municipal civil defense directors?</u>
(1) Carry out civil defense public information programs	Yes ^a
(2) Call out the National Guard in an emergency	No
(3) Establish an Emergency Operating Center . .	Yes
(4) Prepare for continuity of government in an emergency	Yes
(5) Develop and conduct civil defense training programs	Yes
(6) Develop plans to care for evacuees	Yes
(7) Be in charge of any natural disaster in your area	Yes
(8) Disseminate anti-communist literature . . .	No
(9) Carry out the existing licensing, marking and stocking shelter programs	Yes
(10) Develop a radiological monitoring capability	Yes
(11) Obtain federal surplus equipment for your county	Yes
(12) Work with volunteer organizations on civil defense	Yes

^aAll of the responses on this page are marked "yes" or "no" in accord with the responses of an official of the Iowa Civil Defense Administration.

Consensus Comparisons:

"Role-Definer" Definitions Compared to "Ideal" Role Definitions

The three "ideal" roles which are central to this study are listed on the left side of Figure 6; the three types of role-definers (respondents) considered in this study are listed across the top of Figure 6.

Figure 6. Consensus Comparisons: comparisons of role-definers' definitions of given roles and "ideal" definitions of those roles

Role-defined	Role-definers		
	(1) County Board Members' Definition of Role of	(2) Mayors' Definition of Role of	(3) Civil Defense Directors' Definition of Role of
"Ideal" Definition of Role of	1. County Board Members	2. County Board Members	3. County Board Members
"Ideal" Definition of Role of	4. Mayors	5. Mayors	6. Mayors
"Ideal" Definition of Role of	7. Civil Defense Directors	8. Civil Defense Directors	9. Civil Defense Directors

Each of the numbered cells in Figure 6 represents a "consensus comparison." Cell "1," for example, represents a comparison between the "ideal" definition of the civil defense role of county board members and the civil defense role of county board members as defined by county board members themselves. Cell "2" compares the "ideal" definition of the role of county board members and the mayors' definitions of the county board members' role. Cell "3" compares the "ideal" definition of the role of county board members and the county-municipal civil defense directors' definitions of the role of county board members. And so on, for the remaining six cells.

There are a number of reasons for studying the degree of consensus between an "ideal" definition of a given role and various role-definers' definitions of that role. Some of these reasons follow:

One of the goals of federal and state civil defense personnel is to clearly define the civil defense role responsibilities of local government officials so that national and state civil defense goals are met. If a local civil defense capability is to be developed, it is imperative that local government officials clearly understand their civil defense role responsibilities. Local officials probably will not effectively implement civil defense unless they understand what they should or should not do re civil defense.

The analysis of consensus comparisons will provide insights into the extent to which local government officials understand their own and others' civil defense role responsibilities.

Summary Highlights of Findings of Consensus Comparisons

Consensus Comparison 1: county board members' definition of the county board member's role compared with the "ideal" definition of the county board member's role

County board members seemed, in general, to understand their ideal role "responsibility" items, although some county board members were unaware of some of their role responsibilities. County board members frequently indicated that they were responsible for role items for which they actually were not responsible. There was greater consensus among county board members concerning their civil defense role "responsibilities" than when both "responsibilities" and "non-responsibilities" were considered.

Consensus Comparison 2: mayors' definition of the county board member's role compared with the "ideal" definition of the county board member's role

Mayors had a somewhat better understanding of actual role responsibilities of county board members than they did of county board members' non-responsibilities. Almost one-half of the county board members' non-responsibility items were seen by mayors to be responsibility items of county board members. There was somewhat greater consensus among mayors concerning the county board members' role responsibilities than there was when both responsibilities and non-responsibilities were considered.

Consensus Comparison 3: local civil defense directors' definition of the county board member's role compared with the "ideal" definition of the county board member's role

County-municipal civil defense directors had a better understanding of actual role responsibilities of county board members than they did of non-responsibilities. Almost one-half of the county board members' non-responsibility items were seen incorrectly by local directors to be responsibility items of county board members. There was a somewhat greater consensus among local civil defense directors concerning the county board members' role responsibilities than there was when both responsibilities and non-responsibilities were considered.

County board member's role: summary comparisons

The three groups of role-definers did not show complete consensus on their definitions of the county board members' role responsibilities. It was found that county-municipal civil defense directors had the greatest understanding of the county board members' role. When all three groups of role-definers were pooled, it was found that they correctly identified slightly over one-half of the "possible" responsibility items.

Consensus Comparison 4: county board members' definition of the mayors' civil defense role compared with the "ideal" definition of the mayor's role

County board members correctly identified most (three-fourths) of the item-decisions pertaining to the mayor's civil defense role. The county board members' responses indicated that they understood equally well the responsibility items and non-responsibility items of mayors.

Consensus Comparison 5: mayors' definition of the mayor's civil defense role compared with the "ideal" definition of the mayor's role

Approximately three-fourths of both responsibility and non-responsibility items of mayors were correctly identified by mayors, i.e., mayors had approximately the same understanding of actual responsibilities of the mayor's role as they did of the non-responsibilities of the mayor's role.

Consensus Comparison 6: local civil defense directors' definition of the mayor's civil defense role compared with the "ideal" definition of the mayor's role

County-municipal civil defense directors correctly identified most of the mayors' civil defense responsibility items, but failed to correctly identify two-fifths of the non-responsibility items of mayors. The conclusion is that county-municipal civil defense directors had a somewhat greater understanding of actual role responsibilities of mayors than they did of non-responsibilities of mayors.

Mayor's role: summary comparisons

For responsibility items, all three role-definer groups (county board members, mayors, and local civil defense directors) had about three-fourths of the item-decisions correct. When comparing non-responsibility items, it was found that county board members and mayors had a somewhat greater understanding of the non-responsibility items than did the local directors. When the three role-definers were pooled, it was found that they correctly identified about three-fourths of the non-responsibility items.

When both responsibility and non-responsibility items were analyzed, county board members distributed themselves as somewhat more knowledgeable about the mayor's role than did either mayors or county-municipal civil defense directors. Directors distributed themselves over a wider range than did the others.

Consensus Comparison 7: county board members' definition of the local civil defense director's role compared with the "ideal" definition of the local director's role

County board members correctly identified most of the possible responsibility items for county-municipal civil defense directors. They correctly identified more responsibility than non-responsibility items. County board members had a better understanding of responsibilities of county-municipal civil defense directors than they did of non-responsibilities.

Consensus Comparison 8: mayors' definition of the local civil defense director's role compared with the "ideal" definition of the local director's role

Mayors correctly identified most of the possible responsibility items of the county-municipal civil defense directors. Mayors had approximately the same understanding of actual role responsibilities of county-municipal civil defense directors as they had of non-responsibilities.

Consensus Comparison 9: local civil defense directors' definition of the local civil defense director's role compared with the "ideal" definition of the local director's role

County-municipal civil defense directors correctly identified most of the possible responsibility items of their role. County-municipal civil defense directors had a slightly better understanding of actual role responsibilities of county-municipal civil defense directors than they did of non-responsibilities. However, over three-fourths of the non-responsibility items were correctly identified by county-municipal civil defense directors.

County-municipal civil defense director's role: summary comparisons

More than three-fourths of the county board members', mayors', and county-municipal civil defense directors' item-decisions were correct. When focusing on non-responsibility items, it can be seen that mayors and county-municipal civil defense directors made somewhat more correct item-decisions than did county board members. When all three groups of role-definers are pooled, it can be seen that they identified three-fourths of the non-responsibility items. When both responsibility and non-responsibility items are combined, it can be seen that county-municipal civil defense directors had the greatest understanding of the local director's role.

Summary Highlights of Role Definers'

Knowledge of Their Own Roles

The following summarizes answers to these questions:

1. Do county board members understand their own civil defense role better than they understand the mayor's civil defense role or the local civil defense director's role?
2. Do mayors understand their own civil defense role better than they understand the county board member's civil defense role or the local civil defense director's role?
3. Do local civil defense directors understand their own civil defense role better than they understand the county board member's civil defense role or the mayor's civil defense role?

Role-definers: county board members

Responsibility items When the county board members' perceptions of the three roles were compared, it was found that the county board members understood the local civil defense director's role better than either their own role or the mayor's role. And they understood their own role better than the mayor's role.

Possible responsibility items When the county board members' perceptions of the three roles were compared (on non-responsibility as well as responsibility items), it was found that the county board members understood the local civil defense director's role better than either their own role or the mayor's role. But here they understood the mayor's role better than their own role.

Role-definers: mayors

Responsibility items When the mayors' perceptions of the three roles were compared, it was found that the mayors understood the county board member's role better than either their own role or the local civil defense director's role. And they understood the county board member's role better than the local civil defense director's role.

Possible responsibility items When the mayors' perceptions of the three roles were compared (on non-responsibility as well as responsibility items), it was found that the mayors understood the local civil defense director's role better than either the mayor's role or the county board member's role. And it was found that the mayors understood their own role better than the county board member's role.

Role-definers: local civil defense directors

Responsibility items When the local civil defense directors' perceptions of the three roles were compared, it was found that the directors understood the county board member's role better than the mayor's role or their own role.

Possible responsibility items When the local civil defense directors' perceptions of the three roles were compared (on non-responsibility as well as responsibility items), it was found that the directors understood their

own role better than either the county board member's role or the mayor's role. And the directors understood the mayor's role better than the county board member's role.

Some Implications from Consensus Comparisons

One implication of the consensus analysis is that an evaluation of methods (present and proposed) to define civil defense role definitions of local elected officials might be fruitful since role understandings vary considerably. Also, the role definition of the local civil defense director needs to be correctly communicated to relevant individuals. The clarification of role definitions might include (1) a more specific statement of what tasks are to be performed and what tasks are not to be performed in each role (that is, a "job description"), and (2) more effective communication of role definitions to relevant persons. Further, not only do county board members, mayors, and local civil defense directors need to better understand each others roles, but they also need to better understand their own role.

Another implication stems from the frequent perception of non-responsibilities as responsibilities by role-definers. Perhaps, some local officials are not performing because they think they have more tasks to perform than they actually have. These incorrect perceptions may result in role-conflict and inefficiency among local elected officials and local civil defense directors.

A number of local elected officials and local civil defense directors said they did not know whether or not certain items were responsibilities. Perhaps a person who says he does not know whether or not an item is a responsibility may be easier to inform than one who has an incorrect perception regarding the item.

Summary Highlights and Implications of
Findings of Congruence Comparisons

County board member's "possible responsibility" items

Responsibility items Most county board members said they had performed two or three of the six responsibility items of county board members. Most mayors and local civil defense directors stated that county board members had performed three or less of the six ideal county board member's role responsibility items.

There was more congruence between the county board members' evaluation of their role performance and the "ideal" definition of the county board member's role, than there was congruence between mayors' and directors' perceptions of county board members performance and the "ideal" county board member's role.

Non-responsibility items County board members said they had performed many tasks which, according to the "ideal" role definition, are actually "non-responsibility" items for county board members. Many mayors and local civil defense directors also perceived that county board members had performed tasks which according to the "ideal" role definitions are actually "non-responsibility" items for county board members.

County board members said they had performed more of the non-responsibility items than mayors or local civil defense directors perceived the county board members had performed.

Mayor's "possible responsibility" items

Responsibility items Most mayors said they had performed three or less of the five responsibility items of mayors. Most county board members and local civil defense directors stated that mayors had performed two or three of the five responsibility items of mayors.

There was slightly more congruence between the county board members' evaluation of the mayor's role and the "ideal" role than there was congruence between mayors' and directors' perceptions of the mayors' performance and the "ideal" mayor's role.

Non-responsibility items Most mayors perceived that they had not performed tasks which according to the "ideal" role definition are "non-responsibility" items for mayors. Most county board members stated that mayors had not performed any non-responsibility tasks. Most local civil defense directors said that mayors had performed one of the two non-responsibility items.

Mayors said they had performed fewer non-responsibility items than either the county board members or the local civil defense directors perceived they had performed. More local civil defense directors stated that mayors had performed non-responsibility items than either mayors or county board members stated mayors had performed.

County-municipal civil defense director's "possible responsibility" items

Responsibility items Most local civil defense directors stated that they had performed six to eight of the ten responsibility items of local civil defense directors. Most of the county board members also said that the directors had performed six to eight of the ten responsibility items. Most of the mayors indicated that the directors had performed seven or fewer of the ten responsibility items.

There was more congruence between the local civil defense directors' evaluation of their role performance and the "ideal" definition of the director's role than there was congruence between the mayors perceptions of the directors' performance and the director's "ideal" role. The county board members had about the same congruence between their perception of the performance of director's and the "ideal" director's role as the directors had.

Non-responsibility items All of the role performance evaluators (county board members, mayors, and local civil defense directors) perceived that the local civil defense directors had not performed the two non-responsibility items.

The role performance evaluators showed complete congruence in their evaluation of the local civil defense directors' performance of non-responsibility items and the "ideal" definition of non-responsibility items.

In general, it can be said that county board members, mayors, and county-municipal civil defense directors are not performing all their civil defense role responsibilities, as defined by official civil defense sources. Also, it can be said that county board members and mayors are performing tasks which are not their responsibilities, as defined by official civil defense sources.

Some implications are: If local elected officials and local civil defense directors are to perform their civil defense roles effectively, (1) they should understand and perform their tasks; and (2) they should understand which tasks are not theirs, and not perform them. Which is to say, not only do local elected officials and local civil defense directors need to understand their own civil defense roles, they need to understand the roles of others with local responsibility for civil defense.

One complaint sometimes heard from local elected officials is that the state legislature and the many government organizations are demanding that they perform more tasks than they have time or facilities to perform. The foregoing analysis shows that some county board members and mayors are performing certain tasks which are not only unnecessary but which are actually component parts of roles of incumbents of other positions.

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1 ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Department of Sociology and Anthropology Iowa State University Ames, Iowa		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
		2b. GROUP	
3 REPORT TITLE A SUMMARY OF THE FINAL REPORT LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES: THEIR RELATION TO CIVIL DEFENSE An exploratory study of definitions and performances of civil defense roles of county board members, mayors, and county-municipal civil defense directors			
4 DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) A summary of the final report			
5 AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Klonglan, Gerald E.; Beal, George M.; Bohlen, Joe M.; Nye, John R.			
6 REPORT DATE 1967		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 22	7b. NO. OF REFS
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. OCD-PS-65-9		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Rural Sociology Report Number 46S	
b. PROJECT NO. Subtask 4811E		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
c. Systems Evaluation Division			
d. OCD Research Directorate			
10 AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.			
11 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Office of Civil Defense Department of the Army Washington, D.C. 20310	
13 ABSTRACT Local government officials are key decision-makers in the implementation of civil defense programs on the local level. As local officials are given new tasks in civil defense, they understand their roles to varying degrees. The report focuses on (1) the extent to which local officials understand their own civil defense roles, (2) the extent to which they understand the civil defense roles of other local officials, (3) the local officials' evaluations of their own civil defense role performances, and (4) their evaluations of the civil defense role performances of other local officials. Findings are stated. Implications are drawn from the findings for change agents.			

KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Local governing body						
Role						
Role performance						
Role consensus						
Role performance congruence						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (*corporate author*) issuing the report.

2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:**

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.