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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research relating to leadership indicates that some persons have more and better resources for leadership than others. These resources, whatever they may be, do not appear to have a common source in all leaders. These resources fail to differentiate among potential leaders sufficiently to predict leadership with a high degree of accuracy.

Many attempts to define leadership have been made by educators, psychologists, military men and business men. All of these agree that leadership exists, but there is little agreement as to what it is. The implication derived from the concept of leadership is that there is someone that leads and someone that follows. The leader-follower relationship is the most evident and most acceptable approach to defining leadership.

Deviation from the leader-follower relationship leads to many issues, some that are resolved by research and many which are still conjecture. Gibb (5) reviews the literature and indicates that a leader may be defined as (1) a person who occupies a leader’s office; persons who occupy positions which are commonly presumed to demand leadership ability; (2) one who establishes a relationship which is characterized
by love of the members for the central person, leading to incorporation of the personality of the central person in the ego ideal of the followers; (3) a group member, chosen by a preference relationship, among the members of a human group; (4) one defined in terms of the extent of his influence within a group; (5) a person who has demonstrable influence upon group syntality as measured by the magnitude of the syntality change produced by that person; (6) one who is engaged in an act which initiates a structure in the interaction of others as part of the process of solving mutual problems. Hemphill says, "... a leadership role is a differentiation of structure-in-interaction in which the point of reference of the differentiation is frequent leadership acts" (8, p. 386).

Each of the definitions of leadership has grown from three basic theories of leadership; trait theory, situationist theory, and interaction theory. The trait theory is typical of the early impressionistic analysis of leadership. It was a natural outgrowth of the "born leader" concept. Both literary and Biblical figures call attention to inherent qualities that one either does or does not possess. This approach led Miller (12) to conclude that outstanding military leaders were characterized by traits of self-control, assiduity, common sense, faith, loyalty, tact, courage and
many others. Bogardus (2) proposed that leadership had five universal traits: imagination, foresight, flexibility, versatility and inhibition.

It has been demonstrated by the Armed Forces that leadership is more than a set of traits and characteristics. Department of the Army Field Manual 22-100 states "... orders have a different effect on individuals, and... each individual reacts differently. Thus the leader must understand the interaction of individuals and how it influences the total situation" (3, p. 8).

The trait approach to leadership has many inadequacies and has led Goulder (6) to the following conclusions concerning trait descriptions of leadership:

1. A proposed list of traits does not suggest which of the traits are most important and which least.
2. Traits are not mutually exclusive.
3. Trait studies usually do not discriminate between traits facilitating ascent to leadership and those enabling it to be maintained.
4. Most trait studies are descriptive; thereby they omit any account of how traits develop and become organized.
5. The study of personalities of leaders in terms of traits involves certain debatable assumptions regarding the nature of personality.
Theories which indicate inherent traits as a foundation for leadership state that leadership is universal, that the traits of the leader do not depend upon the situation. Situationists such as Gibb indicate that "... leadership resides not exclusively in the individual, but in his functional relationship with other members of his group" (5, p. 274). This concept implies that leadership is a function of the situation. Jenkins in a summary of leadership studies indicates that "... leadership is specific to the particular situation under investigation. Who becomes a leader of a given situation engaging in a particular activity and what the leadership characteristics are in the given case, is a function of the specific situation" (10, p. 75). Jennings, in dealing with leadership problems, indicates that "... leadership appears as a process in which one individual has a major role, but one in which relatively many share" (11, p. 214). She further indicates that leadership is an interpersonal experience in which each participant is assisted in maintaining a feeling of ease, self-respect, security, and self expression. It appears that this concept of leadership indicates that each leader should be selected on the basis of the needs of the group rather than appointed on some criterion outside the group. Horrochs (9), in considering leadership in adolescent groups, agrees with Jennings by indicating that "... the most acceptable leader
so far as adolescents are concerned is the individual who recognizes the needs of the group and the individuals who compose it, and endeavors to meet those needs without attempting undue aggressive domination" (11, p. 157).

Leadership in the military has been studied extensively from the trait theory, the situationist theory and the interaction theory. A review of the literature reveals few studies of leadership behavior in the private academy situation. In educational institutions such as the military academies, where leadership is stressed, it seems apparent that an investigation of the behavior of students would contribute to an understanding of how leadership can be more readily identified.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate the concept of ideal leadership as perceived at three different levels of leadership within the structure of a private military academy.

The primary purpose was to determine the relationship between the ideal leader as perceived by the students, the teachers and the military science faculty at a private military academy.

In addition to the primary purpose, the following constituted secondary purposes:
1. To determine if the appointed leader's concept of the ideal leader is different from the concept of the sociometrically chosen leader's ideal leader.

2. To determine if teachers' descriptions of behavior on the Personality Record rating scale will differentiate between leaders who are and those who are not in agreement with the current policies and practices of the academy.

Definition of Terms

**Appointed leaders.**—Those cadets who now occupy the leadership positions in each company. They are the leaders appointed by the military science department prior to the study.

**Sociometrically chosen leaders.**—Those cadets who were chosen by the members of the ROTC as representing the concept of ideal leader as defined on the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (hereafter referred to as the IBDQ).

**Leadership behavior.**—Behavior exhibited by an individual as he directs the group toward a goal or objective.

**Teachers.**—Members of the teaching staff other than the military science faculty, who have day-to-day interpersonal relations with the cadets.

**Initiating structure.**—Refers to that dimension of the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire defined as "... the leader behavior in delineating the relationship
between himself and the members of his group and in endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communications, and ways of getting a job done" (7, p. 387).

**Consideration.**—Refers to behavior that reflects friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the group members.

**Leader.**—One who is appointed by the military to occupy one of the thirteen leadership positions in a company, or one who is sociometrically chosen by the cadets in each company to occupy one of the thirteen leadership positions in a company.

**Hypotheses**

In order to achieve the stated purposes, the following hypotheses were tested for statistical significance:

1. There will be a significant difference between each of the three levels of leadership (student, teachers and military science faculty) in their perception of the ideal leader.

2. Appointed leaders will not be significantly different in their concept of ideal leadership from the military science faculty. This is based on the expectation that the prospective military leader conforms to the concept of ideal leadership perceived by the military science faculty.
3. Sociometrically chosen leaders will not be significantly different in their concept of ideal leader from the teachers. This hypothesis is based on the expectation that ideal leader behavior of students chosen on a sociometric leadership criterion will have needs that closely match those of the students.

4. Sociometrically chosen leaders and appointed student leaders will be significantly different in the number of rule infractions, as defined by Cadet Regulations. This hypothesis is based on the expectation that where there is a difference between the concepts of what constitutes leadership, there will be incongruence between the leaders and followers.

5. Teachers' ratings of the behavior descriptions, as measured by the Personality Record, will indicate that sociometrically chosen leaders are described as significantly different from the appointed leader on each of the eight descriptions of behavior.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are as follows:

1. This study was limited to male students in grades seven through twelve at a private military academy.

2. No attempt was made to control the variables that could cause the students' perception of the ideal leader to change.
3. The study was further limited in that the responses to the questionnaire did in fact reflect each respondents' concept of the ideal leader.

**Basic Assumptions**

1. It is assumed that the teachers' scores on the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire reflected the ideal leader of the institution.

2. It is assumed that the military science instructors' scores on the IIBDQ reflected the military ideal leader.

3. It is assumed that the students' scores on the IEBDQ reflected how each student would want his immediate supervisor to respond.

4. It is assumed that the Cadet Regulation is an example of congruence between the cadets and the administration.

**Source of Data**

Subjects for this study were from a small private military academy. The academy draws from all sections of the United States and has numerous students from outside the country. The teacher-pupil ratio is less than twenty students per teacher, allowing for much individual attention. The subjects used included the following:

1. Initiating structure and consideration mean index scores were found for three hundred twenty cadets in grades seven through twelve. These cadets were used because they
constituted the entire secondary school population. They were distributed throughout seven companies.

2. Two hundred sixty-four cadets from companies A, B, C, and D were utilized to compare the sociometrically chosen and appointed leader. A, B, C, and D companies were composed of only high school students. The other companies had a mixture of college and high school students.

3. Twenty-one teachers, all of whom teach in grades seven through twelve, rated the cadets on the Personality Record. The teachers also responded to the ILBDQ, so that a determination of the teachers' concept of ideal leader could be made.

4. All ten military science faculty members responded to the ILBDQ and rated cadets on the Personality Record. The ten military faculty members responded to the questionnaire to ascertain the military perception of the ideal leader.

Background and Significance of the Study

This study has grown out of the concept that congruence of leadership within the formal organizational structure of a social institution produces leadership which is seen as effective by both leaders and followers at every level of leadership. Argyris, in discussing the principle of congruence of leadership states, "... the disturbance within an organization will vary in proportion to the degree of..."
incongruency between the needs of the individual and the requirements of the formal organization" (1, p. 332).

Rogers says:

The greater the congruence . . . on the part of one individual, the more the ensuing relationship will evolve; a tendency toward reciprocal communication with a quality of increasing congruence; a tendency toward mutual accurate understanding of the communication; improved psychological adjustment and the functioning in both parties; mutual satisfaction in the relationship (14, p. 344).

When the concept of congruence is applied to educational institutions, it simply implies as agreement between students, faculty and administrators as to the goals and objectives of the institution. It implies that leaders at each level were aware of the objectives and were striving to obtain them.

In trying to assess the degree of congruence between leaders, Ross (15) indicated that there appears to be no foundation in the trait theory or the situationist theory which can provide an adequate measure for this concept. Within the interaction theory, where leadership is viewed as a process of inter-personal interaction, there appears to be a basis for determining the quantifiable aspects of congruence. Interaction theory, according to Jennings, reveals that leadership is "... the reaction to and the interpretation given to respective behavior exhibited by the individual and the individual's characteristic manner of reacting to and interpreting the behavior of fellow members" (11, p. 214).
With leadership viewed as the behavior of people occupying positions of leadership, research into congruence has tangible observations with which to work.

The Ohio State University has undertaken the problem of identifying behavior which is indicative of leadership. The Bureau of Business Research at the Ohio State University approached the issue by equating leadership and leadership behavior. This approach yielded the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. This questionnaire in turn yields two index scores by which leadership behavior at various levels of organizational hierarchy might be compared. These scores identify initiating structure and consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. Halpin (7) indicates that initiating structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. He further indicates that consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group.

Halpin used the IBDQ to determine effectiveness of aircraft commanders and found that "... to select a leader who is likely to satisfy both his crew and his supervisors,
we do best by choosing an aircraft commander who is above the average on both dimensions of the questionnaire" (7, p. 64). Hemphill (8), Fleishman (4), and Bass (13), had similar findings in dealing with college departmental administrators, industry leaders and salesmen.

From the original IBQ the ideal leader form was derived. It measures the same aspects as the IBQ except that the criterion to which one responds is that of what he should do. Halpin (7), in a study comparing the real behavior and the ideal behavior of aircraft commanders and school superintendents, found a low relationship between real scores and ideal scores. He concluded that personnel workers might utilize the ideal form to ascertain relationships between the concept of ideal leaders of new employees and the concept of ideal leadership of the organization.

From the studies presented on the theoretical concept of congruence (11, 13, 14, 15) it appears that the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire will adequately measure the concept when congruence is defined in terms of leadership behavior.

It was anticipated that this study would identify the concept of ideal leader of the cadets, teachers, and military science faculty. The major implications of this study were that when there is disagreement between the different levels of leaders, this disagreement would produce behavior that is
inconsistent with the policies and procedures of the academy. It was, in effect, an attempt to isolate those who were and those who were not in agreement with current policies and procedures. Second, the implications were that the source of behavior problems might be found in the failure of cadets to identify with the institution's objective.

Statistical Procedure for Treating Data

The data were treated statistically to determine the level of significance. \( P = .05 \) was used as the basis for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis I: Mean index scores on initiating structure and consideration were statistically tested for significance between the cadets, teachers and military science instructors.

Hypothesis II: Mean index scores on initiating structure and consideration were statistically tested for significance between sociometrically chosen leaders and appointed leaders.

Hypothesis III: Mean index scores on initiating structure and consideration were statistically tested for significance between sociometrically chosen leaders and teachers.

Hypothesis IV: Mean index scores on initiating structure and consideration were statistically tested for significance between appointed leaders and military science faculty.

Hypothesis V: The mean rating score on each of the behavior descriptions was computed for the sociometrically
chosen leader and appointed leaders. Each of the eight descriptions was treated separately to determine the significance between sociometrically chosen leaders and appointed leaders.

Summary

With an increasing emphasis on the development of leadership in most facets of every day living, this study attempted to focus on the most obvious of these facets—behavior exhibited in leadership. This study brought into focus leadership as it was being practiced at a small military academy. The subjects, boys in grades seven through twelve and representing ages thirteen through eighteen, were assumed to have the ability to select those students who most closely represented their concept of the ideal leader. Those students chosen by the cadets and those appointed by the military science department were measured in terms of two variables; initiating structure and consideration. The differences between the subjects on these two variables were statistically tested by an analysis of variance to support or reject the hypotheses. An explanation of terms and limitations was utilized to enhance the understanding of the purpose of the study.


CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF LITERATURE

The beginning of the differentiation of people into leaders and followers begins as soon as two or more people are gathered together. As the group becomes larger and more stable, a definite leadership hierarchy develops and the role of each member of the group is more clearly seen. Since man is a social being and much of his time is spent either leading or following, the findings of other studies on the dynamics of leadership are relevant to the present study.

When leaders of varying ability and skill are present, the determination of who becomes the actual leader is usually made through appointment or group selection. There is no doubt that appointed leaders reflect the aims and objectives of the person doing the appointing. Likewise, the person selected by a group is going to reflect the aims and objectives of the group doing the choosing. Many studies have been conducted to determine which method of leader selection was most critical to achieving the aims and objectives of both leaders and followers.

Goldman, Morton and Frass (16) attempted to determine whether varying methods of selecting a leader differentially affect the group's performance. Two hundred fifty-six
undergraduates were divided into four treatments for investigation. These treatments represented four methods of choosing a leader. The four treatments used are as follows:

1. A group where no members of the group were designated as leader.

2. A group where leaders are arbitrarily appointed. No criterion was used in selection of the leader, who was simply appointed by the experimenter.

3. A group where a leader was appointed on the basis of having demonstrated to his group a particular intellectual skill relative to the group and situation.

4. A group where leaders are chosen by group members after a period of interpersonal communication.

The investigation resulted in confirmation of the hypothesis that a particular method of selecting a leader determines to a great extent the performance of the group. Three other results pertinent for leadership selection were also found. First, a group functions more effectively with a leader. Second, followers will follow someone who has proven himself to the group. Third, the appointed-leader and non-leader conditions appear to produce, at best, an ineffective, arbitrary leadership contributing little to group performance.

Goldman in a separate study with Bolen and Martin (15) found that groups which have appointed leaders performed
more poorly than groups with no appointed leaders. This study further indicated that the usual practice of having a leader in charge is not necessarily desirable.

These two studies of Goldman seem to have contradictory findings. A closer inspection of these studies reveals that a group without an appointed leader allows one to emerge who provides the leadership that most closely represents the needs of the group. Bass' (1) research of groups without a leader has contributed to an understanding of this type of group leadership. The basic approach used in the leaderless group discussion is to ask several individuals to work as a group and to carry on a discussion. No leaders are appointed or encouraged by the investigator to take the lead. Using 1,065 ROTC cadets in twelve studies, the following conclusions were reached:

1. The leaderless group discussion is valid as a measure of successful leadership.

2. Ratings in the leaderless discussion groups are associated with ratings of success as a leader in a wide variety of situational tests.

3. Leadership performance in the leaderless discussion groups and real life performance is a function of (a) initiative, (b) social boldness, (c) esteem, (d) intelligence, and (e) verbal ability.
It appears that in choosing a leader for a group, one should be aware of the result achieved from various methods of choosing a group leader. The usual practice of appointing leaders is questionable, according to Kemp. He indicates that a large proportion of the membership with appointed leaders remain dependent and ego-centered. There is little improvement in ability to make decisions, to cooperate and learn. Progress in self-understanding and understanding of others is limited. The leader may get things done quickly, but it is he and not the group who directs and controls, although he may spuriously label the decision as a "group decision" (27, p. 230).

A person who acquires a leadership position by vote is usually referred to as a democratic leader. Leadership of this nature assumes that the individuals within the group are capable of making their own decisions. The leader only helps to facilitate an environment conducive to freedom of expression. He represents the personality of each individual and understands on a technical basis the verbal expressions of the group members. Basically, the leader becomes a resource person for the group.

The third means to leadership is through the group-centered approach. Kemp (27) indicates that the group-centered leader has two goals: (1) the ultimate development of the group's independence and self-responsibility, and (2) the release of the group's potential capacities. Growth of the individual is the primary interest of the group-centered leader.
Studies of Leadership Theory

Many studies during the past fifty years have followed the impressionistic approach to leadership identification and have resulted in hundreds of studies outlining physical, emotional, intellectual and personality traits which are assumed to characterize good leadership.

Goulder (17) concludes from his survey of studies, which take the trait approach, that traits are not mutually exclusive. Traits appear to derive their definitions from the study being conducted rather than from proven theory. Stogdill concludes that "... leadership is not a matter of passive status, or some combination of traits" (36, p. 38). He implies that it appears to be a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks to completion.

One should be very hesitant to categorically deny that leaders do not possess similar traits or characteristics. Mann (29), in reviewing the literature between 1900 and 1957, indicates that leaders tend somewhat consistently to be better adjusted, more dominant, more extroverted, more masculine, less conservative, and to have greater interpersonal sensivity than members of the group. Drake (10) attempted to show that a particular sex was a trait of leadership. He utilized twenty-one college girls and two
hundred boys to show that personality traits would distinguish between the two sexes and indicate which sex possessed leadership potential. Results indicate that sex differences were not significantly correlated with leadership and that there was a consistency of traits between the males and females which identified those leaders in each sex.

Clifford (9) hypothesized that leadership is a function of the personal attributes of the leader and that as the situation changes, personal attributes perceived as necessary for the leader's role change. This hypothesis was tested on seventy-nine boys and girls in twelve leadership groups. The results supported the hypothesis and indicated leadership can be described in terms of personality variables required in a specific situation as a function of the follower's perception.

Carter and Nixon (7) utilized high school boys to describe the relationship which existed between personality and several criteria of leadership ability. Results of this study are contradictory to those found by Mann (29), in which it was found that the best leaders are masculine. Carter and Nixon used the Allport Ascendancy-Submission Test and found that the more feminine individuals are identified by the test as the best leaders. In addition, it was found that those people who score high on the economic and political scales of the Allport-Vernon Study of Values were reacted to
negatively by members of the group. Those people scoring high on the economic and political scales tended to be bossy, power-seeking, money-oriented, and highly masculine.

Blake and Mouton (3) initiated a study to determine the personal characteristics of those preferred as a spokesmen for their peers. The study deals with the perceived personal characteristics of members who are preferred by their peers to serve as spokesman in decision-making interaction with representatives from other groups. The results show clear-cut differences and are interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that members do elect as representatives those whom they see as possessing superior procedural skills and intellectual competence. The preferred leaders were not more outstanding than members least preferred in terms of emotional characteristics such as helping, harmonizing, or making others feel at ease. Rather they were seen as personally strong, dominating, resisting conformity pressures and facing up to problems.

Stogdill (36) reports a study by Hemphill, who indicates that a person who rates a specific person as having good leadership characteristics will tend to rate high his own perception of the ideal leader. The reverse is also true. Those who would rate a particular person low on good leadership would rate low his perception of the ideal leader. It
seems from the results that leaders either tend to do what they are expected to do, or tend to be expected to do what they do.

Cattel (8) used the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire on 800 college men and correlated the results with four leadership categories. The categories—(1) problem solver leaders, (2) salient leaders, (3) sociometric chosen leaders, and (4) elected leaders—were utilized to see if the personality factors would significantly differentiate between each of the categories. The men were performing intellectual and motor tasks in each of the four groups. Results indicated that there were significant correlations between the salient leaders and sociometric leaders on the personality questionnaire. The salient leader was characterized as one that influences the group in specific situations. Sociometrically chosen leaders were those chosen by the group as leaders. In both groups the scores on the personality questionnaire seemed to differentiate these two groups of leaders from the other two groups.

Fryer (13), in studying the relationship between rated leaders and the traits assigned leaders, found that 200 undergraduate psychology majors selected a leader from a stereotype concept of the leader. He further investigated the stereotype leader concept to determine the reliability and consistency of the concept. His conclusion was that there is a high probability that one's perception of a leader (one's stereotype) influences leadership selection.
Assessment of Leadership

The descriptive approach to leadership has clarified and categorized traits and characteristics of people called leaders. This approach, however, is far from the scientific cause-and-effect desired in research. Therefore, assessing leadership has followed the trend of assessing skills of leadership and behavior exhibited in leadership situations. Assessing skills of leadership follows three general approaches. Petrullo and Bass (1) report an article by Flannagan in which he describes these approaches. First, and the most obvious, is the use of standardized situational performance tests. This approach provides a systematic and comprehensive coverage of important leadership skills in a situation which involves interaction with other people. The disadvantage is that the individual is aware of what he is being tested on, and results are often colored. Second, leadership is assessed through observation and performance of typical leadership behavior of those people in leadership positions. Assessment of behavior of leaders has been used extensively in business and governmental and educational organizations. The Ohio State University has undertaken a ten-year study of leadership behavior. It was an attempt to describe a leader by the behavior that he exhibits. Halpin (19) indicated that the approach used was to answer to basic questions: (1) What does an individual do while he operates
as a leader, and (2) How does he go about what he does? The results of this ten year study produced the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. This questionnaire was designed so that it could, by changing the wording of the questions, get either a description of the real behavior exhibited by a leader or the ideal leader behavior description of the one taking the test.

Studies have been undertaken in the military, industry, and educational institutions to show the effectiveness of this instrument. In a study conducted by Halpin (19), 670 crew members of a B-29 bomber command rated a total of eighty-seven respective aircraft commanders with the real behavior form of this questionnaire. Results of that study led Halpin to conclude that findings suggest that to "... select a leader who is likely to satisfy both his crew and his supervisors, we do best by choosing an aircraft commander who is above average on both of the leader behavior dimensions of the questionnaire" (8, p. 64).

Hemphill (21) studied the campus reputation of twenty-two college departments for being well administered. The questionnaire was administered to members of the faculty of a liberal arts college.

Reputation for being well administered is related to the leadership behavior of department chairmen as their behavior is described by department members. Those departments with best reputations for good administration have chairmen who are described
as above the average on both dimensions of the questionnaire and more nearly meet the behavior expected of an ideal chairman (21, p. 84).

A third approach to assessing leadership is through the "product" of the group. When speaking of a "product" of leadership, it could be some final outcome, resolution, or decision. The "product" could be an on-going process. The obvious limit to such an approach is the lack of comparability. The process might have contributed to personal growth and understanding without any manifest changes in the group.

Leadership in Secondary School

Through their curricular and extra-curricular activities, the secondary schools constitute a rich field for the selection and training of leaders and potential leaders in the art and technique of responsible leadership. Once educational leadership can associate successful leadership in the high school environment with certain characteristics and traits, and have reasonable assurance that they carry over into adult life, schools should be more successful in discovering leaders and potential leaders. The location of leaders in the secondary school aids society to a great extent by providing a vast storehouse for democratic leadership.

The detection and location of leaders and potential leaders has greatly increased through the means of assessing interpersonal relationship with the sociometric technique.
Sociometric testing aids one in getting at feeling within a group. Bonney indicates that "... sociometric testing is designed to measure interpersonal preferences among the members of a group" (4, p. 262). He further indicates that a person's status in a group is affected if he fails to possess the kinds of skills and values important in that particular group. Relating this concept of interpersonal preferences to leadership opens channels for locating leaders and potential leaders.

Peer nominations or peer ratings have also been used extensively in school groups to determine interpersonal preferences. Sociometric testing and peer nominations have many of the same characteristics, but differ in content, intent and procedure. In the pure sociometric device, as used by Moreno, the aim is to determine the choice pattern of a group, and to locate the internal structure of the group. The peer nomination is designed to rank individuals in terms of some consistent observable criterion measure. Crisswell indicates that "... whatever similarities between the traditional sociograms as a focus of study and the peer nominations, the significant features lie in how data are subsequently treated, and toward what end" (37, p. 89).

Bratton (5) used the peer nomination technique to study the relationship between leadership and status in a laboratory high school. His findings indicate that
1. Students do not select their officers solely on the basis of popularity.

2. Elected officers as a group tend to rank higher than non-officers as a group.

3. Elected officers do not have more or fewer close friends than non-officers.

4. Student officers are not considered by their peers to be the only students who can exercise the skills of leadership. This can be interpreted to mean essentially what Bonney meant when he said that "... high sociometric status in a given population is not due simply to what one has to offer, but also to what his associates perceive to be their needs, i.e., their needs which they believe can be fulfilled through personal or leadership channels" (4, p. 266).

5. Students appear to recognize that different situations require different leadership qualification. Bonney stated that the "... adequate and secure direct all of their choices to those whom they believe will represent their group to the best advantage of all" (4, p. 267).

Remmlin (31) also used a peer rating technique on 783 high school seniors to ascertain differences between leaders and non-leaders. He compared students who had accumulated a certain number of leadership points with those who had not and found the following:
1. Office holding is not in itself an indication of leadership. Within the structure of this group, the students seem to differentiate between those who possess leadership skills and those who could more effectively utilize their skills socially to represent the group. It was apparent from the study that people are put into official places, but are controlled by the "hidden leadership" within the group. Speroff (34) talked about the location of hidden leaders in industry. He indicated that the identification of cliques and informal group leaders can be an industry's greatest source of leadership. These people control a great many people within an organization and if management can work through these people, many of the problems of morale can be attacked before they arise.

2. Office holders are likely to be more intelligent, more scholarly, slightly higher in socio-economic status, more dominant yet younger than non-office holders.

3. Office holders are more homogeneous in characteristics than non-officer holders.

4. The findings indicate great overlapping among types of offices held by students, especially those high in leadership. Approximately three-fourths of the group had held offices in two or three of these fields, while only 14 percent held offices in only one field. This distribution shows a rather normal distribution and indicates that some common
characteristics must run throughout the group of students holding offices in several fields.

Reinhard (30) used several techniques, one of which was peer nomination, for selecting student leaders in a secondary level naval academy. The measurement technique was designed to enable those charged with responsibility of assigning and working with cadet leaders to select the most effective device for the location of leaders and potential leaders. The study was an attempt to devise new and more effective ways to assign cadets to leadership positions. He found

1. The actual leadership position cannot be predicted to a high degree of accuracy by peer nominations.

2. Intelligence test scores and Kuder Inventory scores did not relate significantly to leader position.

3. Leadership is better predicted in terms of relative degree of responsibility of position than in terms of assignment to definite positions.

4. Those selected as leaders were older, taller, heavier, in higher grades and had higher intelligence test scores than the entire sample.

The literature reveals that peer nominations are very effective in the general selection of leaders. Ratings by teachers of students have also been very effective in selecting leaders. Teachers in the Tulsa, Oklahoma, school system
were asked by Reynolds (32) to rate character traits of 437 leaders and 431 non-leaders. His purpose was to determine if teachers could detect leadership traits in the students. The results show that when there is a great difference between the leadership traits of leaders and non-leaders, there is a consistent increase in the teacher's ability to identify leaders. Teachers more easily detect leadership traits in leaders than in non-leaders. These findings indicate that leadership might be defined by the mental set of the teacher, causing one to see in leaders qualities which are stereotyped. Seeman (33) found results in his study to support the stereotype interpretation. In a study of leadership ideologies among teachers and administrators in the public school, he found clear evidence of major splits in opinion among these people on the degree to which the ideal superintendent should hold himself aloof from his teachers. Teachers who approved of wide status differences among themselves and students in communication in general also tended to approve of the leader who held himself aloof from the teachers. Consequently, teachers may identify in student leaders traits and characteristics which reflect their own concept of leadership.

Research as to the validity of peer nominations for leadership positions on the secondary level has yet to offer conclusive techniques for this approach. Through the knowledge
which has been gained in interpersonal assessment, it is evident that the roots of effective leadership are in the intrinsic personal relations of group members and more immediately in interpersonal group-oriented social relations shared by all members.

Leadership in the Military

Self-contained units within the military have been the source of much research in leadership. The approaches and definitions of leadership have been multiple in trying to identify leaders and potential leaders. For the purpose of the present study, it would appear that a survey of leadership studies built around peer nomination would contribute to a total understanding of the leader selection process in the military.

The significance of good leadership in the military is seen in the article "How Soldiers Rate Officers" (25). This article explains how thousands of soldiers responded to a questionnaire about the significance of leadership. The results indicate that leadership is the single most important determinant of morale and performance. A leader's proficiency in required skills and interest in the welfare of his men were more important than food, entertainment and belief about war.

It would appear that with leadership of such importance, selection methods should be refined to an extent where
identification of leaders should be made as soon as possible. As pointed out earlier, the military has rejected, to a great extent, the idea that leaders can be identified by measuring for traits. The current effort to identify leaders is through the peer nomination technique. This approach within the military is referred to as "buddy ratings" and will be used synonymously with peer nominations throughout this portion of the survey.

Eaton, in 1947, conducted one of the first experiments in testing buddy ratings for leadership potential. The conclusion was, "... the evidence thus far presented points strongly to the conclusion that the men themselves are more capable of picking their own leaders than are instructors and training officers" (11, p. 523).

Gordon and Midland (16) conducted a study in 1965 to determine the validity of peer ratings in the military. Peer ratings were obtained at the end of the fourth and eighth week of basic training in an Army situation. In two of four companies involved, the squads were reconstituted after the first ratings so that each person was with a new group. The results of this study agree with the 1947 study of Eaton in that they support the value of peer ratings of leadership potential. It was specifically shown that peer ratings of leadership potential identify the potential leader when the groups remain the same or are reconstituted.
Further evidence in support of this technique for leadership selection is provided by two Navy psychologists who conducted buddy ratings at the Marine Corp Officer Candidate School. Williams and Leavett (37) attempted to predict field performance in combat with leadership in Officer Candidate School. They concluded that "...sociometric group opinion was a more valid predictor both of success in Officer Candidate School and combat performance, than several objective tests" (37, p. 291). Further findings were as follows:

1. Buddy ratings were significantly better than superiors' ratings in predicting success in Officer Candidate School.

2. Buddy ratings have greater validity than other standardized measure because group members have more time to observe each other than do superior officers.

3. Buddy ratings are the result of seeing members of the group in a realistic context, and are the reaction to each other's social behavior.

Hollander (23) studied the reliability of peer nominations under various conditions of administration. His intent was to determine at what time sequence in the training of 700 naval officers could a peer rating be administered and still be consistent. He approached the study by utilizing three groups for measurement. He measured one group at the end of the first week, a second group at the end of the third
week, and a third group at the end of the sixth week. It was found that the corrected split-half reliability of scales from forms administered very early in the training, after the groups had been together for four or five days, was a reasonable approximation of the reliability obtained with the same forms and the same groups at later points in training. He concluded that peer nominations administered very early revealed essentially the same data at a later administration.

Much controversy has permeated the literature concerning the difference between leadership and friendship. The allegation is that peers choose friends for positions of leadership. Adherents to this concept indicate that leadership by nomination is a popularity poll as opposed to selection due to demands of the leadership position. Of course one should understand that popularity is tied very closely with having not only interpersonal skills, but intellectual skills which form a basis for leadership selection. The development of many skills in personal, social and intellectual areas helps an individual to be a source of need fulfillment for others. Bonney indicates that "... why one person is attracted to another is that there is a fulfillment of some kind of need ... the person with the most diversified capacities for meeting needs in others should receive the greatest number of choices on sociometric measures" (4, p. 265).
Hollander and Webb (24) attacked the popularity problem by conducting a study to show the interrelationship of leaders, followers and friends. A sociometric device was used on 187 naval aviation cadets going through officer candidate school. During the last week of training, eight sections of cadets were asked to complete three sociometric nominations. The first two were on leadership and followership while the third was on friendship. The nomination forms were designed to answer two general questions:

1. In what way, and to what degree, is followership related to leadership?

2. In what way, and to what degree, is friendship related to leadership, and how does this compare with the relationship, if any, between friendship and followership?

An analysis of the sociometric nominations revealed the following:

1. Leadership and followership nominations are independent of the friendship choice of the nominator. This substantiates the fact that peer nominations are not mere popularity contests. Peer nominations are an evaluation of an individual's potential for performance.

2. Leadership and followership nominations are intimately related in a positive direction. The implications of these findings are that the more desired followers tend to be at the upper extreme of the leadership distribution. Those low
on leadership are likely to be low on followership. An analysis of the followership nominations was made to determine whether individuals chosen high on leadership differed essentially in their choice of followers from individuals chosen low on leadership. Webb says that "... by correlating the followership scores derived from nominations made by individuals in the top half of the leadership continuum with followership scores derived from nominations made by individuals in the lower half, it was found that leadership status factors made little difference in the selection of followers" (27, p. 166). The findings that good leaders are also judged as good followers is essential because an institutional leader is called upon to lead the group in assigned tasks. This study shows conclusively that peer nominations within the military structure may reasonably be effective in choosing leaders.

Halpin (19) used a sociometric rating scale along with the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to determine the relationship between rated leadership and the descriptions of leader behavior as measured by the LBDQ. The ratings were completed by the crews of eighty-nine B-29 aircraft and the supervisors of the aircraft commanders. It was found that the results of the supervisor's rating of aircraft commanders correlated highly with the initiation score on the LBDQ. Also, the rating by crews of the aircraft commanders was
correlated highly with the consideration scores on the LBDQ. Halpin suggested that "... to select a leader who is likely to satisfy both his crew and supervisors, we do best by choosing an aircraft commander who is above average on both behavior dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire" (19, p. 64).

Carter (7) investigated the actual behavior of group members under conditions of appointed and emergent leaders. Forty Navy ROTC students were rated as individuals working in a group on reasoning, mechanical assembly and discussion tasks. In each of the tasks, the behavior of the leader was compared with that of all the other group members. The behavior of the leader for all situations and tasks was concerned with analyzing the situation and initiating action required. In the discussion tasks, and to some extent in the emergent situation, the leaders who emerged were more authoritarian than were the leaders who were appointed. This study emphasized that the behavior of group members is considerably determined by situational and task-dictated requirements.

The studies presented have shown that peer nomination and behavior description of leaders are valid techniques in the selection of leaders. The methodological development has much to be desired, but presently the emphasis of interpersonal assessment within groups seem to be the most fruitful approach.
Leadership in Industry

Leaders in industry are often trying to solve morale problems which have evolved through ineffective leadership. Solutions to these problems are usually much more extensive and expensive than regular day-to-day preventive measures. Leadership problems in industry must be viewed as the same dynamic process which operates in the military and educational situations. Need satisfactions are met through relationship with other individuals or groups of individuals. Since man spends most of his time working, his job usually is selected to satisfy some need. The job selected might not be the most effective way to meet the need, but nevertheless does so. Leadership in industry seems to have many means of obtaining desired standards of production, but leadership can be generally described in the following ways:

1. Leaders may direct and order. Force and punishment are major factors.

2. Leaders may attempt to control by "paternalism" or "do what I say because I am good to you."

3. Leaders may direct as a result of bargaining. Labor and management agreements made at periodic intervals produce effective leadership.

4. Knickerbacker (28) indicates that the leader may create conditions such that the objectives he seeks and the objectives his subordinates seek have something in common.
This last approach allows the fulfillment of the worker's needs for achievement to accomplish the objectives the leader desires.

Hollander (22) indicates that this mutual need satisfaction can be found through the acceptance of company policies and acceptance of appointed leaders. He further indicates that peer ratings or nominations of group members on a specific quality yield an index of the individual's status within his work group. It has long been recognized that morale is closely bound to the cohesiveness, solidarity and perception of the group leader. Hamblin (20) tested the hypothesis that organizational morale varies directly with relative competence of the leader. His investigation of male college students shows that the perceived competence of the leader is a major contributor to group morale.

Kahn (26) made an analysis of supervisory practices and components of morale. He hypothesized that when the foreman perceived the expectation of the men as being that of management, he would see his role being congruent with their expectation. The analysis of a seventy-item questionnaire suggested that satisfaction with immediate supervision may be differentiated quite sharply from satisfaction with the organization as a system, and that the men distinguished between the human relations skill and the technical competence of the supervisor.
Fleishman and Harris (12) utilized the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire to focus on the relationship between leader behavior and indices of group behavior: labor grievances and employee turnover. The study was conducted using fifty-seven foremen in a manufacturing plant. Plant employees were asked to rate the foremen with the Questionnaire. The questionnaire yielded an index score for consideration and one for initiation in each of the supervisors. The following conclusions were drawn from the data:

1. There are significant relationships between the leader behavior of foremen and the labor grievances and employee turnover in their work group. Low consideration scores and high structure scores were found to be related to high grievances and turnover.

2. There appear to be certain critical levels beyond which increased consideration or decreased structure have no effect on grievances or turnover.

3. Grievances and turnover were highest in groups having low-consideration foremen, regardless of the degree of structuring behavior shown by the same foremen.

4. High-consideration foremen could increase structure with very little increase in grievances and no increase in turnovers. High-consideration foremen had relatively low grievances and turnover regardless of the amount of structuring engaged in.
Thus, with regard to grievances and turnovers, leaders behavior characterized by low consideration is more critical than behavior characterized by high structure. Apparently, foremen can compensate for high structure by increased consideration, but low consideration foremen cannot compensate by decreasing their structuring behavior (12, p. 53).

Summary

Although this survey has not touched on all of the relevant data pertinent to leadership, it does give definite findings that pertain to the present study. The findings of studies (1, 14, 15, 24) support the concept that the method of choosing a leader for a group is important. Studies (8, 9, 26, 32, 34) support the conclusion that leadership cannot be defined as traits inherent in an individual. They do indicate, though, that leaders do seem to have a certain set of characteristics which set them apart in specific situations.

The implications for the location of leaders and leadership potential found in interpersonal assessment (4, 7, 18, 28, 26) lead one to conclude that sociometric techniques (17, 21, 36), peer nominations (27, and peer ratings (20, 28, 30) or buddy ratings (16, 33) have value that exceeds the situational or trait approach to leadership.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

In trying to determine the relationship between sociometrically chosen students and appointed student leaders, the students in grades seven through twelve at a private military academy were used. The school receives students from all sections of the United States as well as from other countries. A majority of the students are from the state of Texas.

Student life is built around the objective of helping each student develop his potential for leadership. A major portion of this is accomplished through the military training the student receives. This training in military leadership is a continuous process that begins when the student enters the academy. It may continue through junior college if the student elects to begin his college work at the academy.

Subjects

The 320 students utilized were drawn from the secondary school level at a private military academy. The length of time for each student at the academy varied from one to six years. A student in the twelfth grade could have been there from one to six years. The students ages ranged from thirteen years in grade seven to nineteen in the twelfth grade.
All of the subjects, except the seventh and eighth graders, were assigned to a military science class. The level of the class was closely connected to the grade level and age of the cadet. Often there were situations in which one military science class had more than one level of instruction. All of the cadets used in this study were assigned to military science classes on the secondary school level. Those cadets in grades seven and eight did not receive regular classroom instruction in military subjects. These cadets were given one hour of drill four afternoons a week to instruct them in basic marching and manual-of-arms procedures. Each day an informal inspection was made of the cadets' living area. This inspection, a Saturday morning drill and inspection, plus observation of cadet officers, were the source of military leadership from which seventh and eighth graders derived their concept of military leadership.

The cadets were required to meet five regularly scheduled formations each day. The cadets marched to all of their meals and to class twice a day. These required formations were a part of the regulations and standards of conduct used to teach disciplined leadership. The Cadet Regulations provided the student with accepted rules for conduct and specific disciplinary action in the event of flagrant disregard for rules.
The entire ROTC program consisted of seven lettered companies. Companies A, B, C, and D consisted of cadets who were in the secondary school program only. Of the other companies, one was the band, one was for junior college students, and the third was for students who resided in the community, but attended the academy during the day. Table I is an analysis of the grade distribution by companies of students who participated in the study. There were more students in the upper grade level in each company. Twenty-three per cent were in grade twelve, 19 per cent in grade eleven, 21 per cent in grade ten, 18 per cent in grade nine, 13 per cent in grade eight, and 6 per cent in grade seven.

TABLE I
COMPANY AND ACADEMIC GRADE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Instruments

Measurements were secured with three different instruments: (1) the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, (2) the Personality Record, and (3) a sociometric criterion. The Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire provides a technique whereby the members of a group may describe the behavior of the ideal leader. It consists of forty items which yield two index scores. One score is a measure of "initiating structure" and the other a measure of "consideration."

The ILBDQ use the multiple alternative answer technique to score the forty responses on the questionnaire. Of the forty items, fifteen are scored to get an index of one's "consideration" and fifteen are scored to get an index of one's "initiating structure." Ten of the items are used as fillers and are not scored. Halpin (1) indicated that "initiating structure" was the behavior exhibited in defining the relationship between the leader and the members of the group. It was also characterized by a striving to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and techniques of getting a job done. "Consideration" was defined as behavior that reflects friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the group members.

The ILBDQ was developed by the staff of the Personnel Research Board of the Ohio State University. Estimated
reliability by the split-half method is .83 for "initiating structure" and .92 for "consideration." Studies by Hemphill (2) and Halpin (1) provided evidence of the validity of this instrument. In making validity studies, it was found that those salesmen, aircraft commanders, college department chairmen, and foremen chosen on the basis of high scores on the IIBDQ were rated by both supervisors and subordinates as good leaders.

The score for each dimension is the sum of the weights assigned to responses marked on each of the items. The scores range from zero to six on each of the two dimensions. The multiple alternatives for answering the questions are (1) always, (2) often, (3) occasionally, (4) seldom, and (5) never. For scoring purposes, the values assigned are four for always, three for often, two for occasionally, one for seldom and zero for never. This pattern is maintained throughout the questionnaire with the exception of three scorable items which have the values reversed.

The Personality Record consists of eight descriptions of behavior on which a person can be rated. It is constructed so that ratings on a continuum can be marked by making a check mark for each of the eight behavior descriptions. For the purpose of this study, each of the five points on the description continuum was weighted. The lowest value of one was assigned to the least desirable description, and
five was assigned to the most desirable description. An individual's score on each of the eight descriptions was the sum of the ratings given by four teachers and one military science instructor. The following is an example of the scoring of each of the behavior descriptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This cadet's score would be eighteen.

The Personality Record was the product of a study by the National Association of Secondary School Principals to standardize ratings to describe the behavior of an individual. It was used extensively by high schools to rate the behavior of students being considered for scholarships on a national basis. The eight descriptions of behavior are (1) motivation, (2) industry, (3) initiative, (4) concern for others, (5) responsibility, (6) integrity, (7) emotional stability, and (8) influence and leadership.

The sociometric criterion was designed to elicit the concept of the ideal leader of each student for three different leadership positions. The sociometric criterion was administered along with the ILBDQ. The criterion was read to the cadets to insure an understanding of the desired results.

A first, second, and third choice for company commander, platoon leader and squad leader was made. To determine those
selected as the "sociometrically chosen," a value of three was assigned to the first choice, two to a second choice and one to a third choice. The cadet with the greatest numerical value was assumed to be the "sociometrically chosen" leader.

In order to have an equal number of appointed and sociometrically chosen leaders, one chosen leader was matched with an appointed leader. There were thirteen appointed positions in each company; therefore thirteen "sociometrically chosen" leaders were selected.

After the matching was completed, four teachers and one military science instructor rated both types of leaders on the Personality Record. None of the raters were informed as to which students were appointed or "sociometrically chosen." Several students were in both categories, making it difficult for raters to know which they were rating.

Procedure for Collecting Data

Before any testing was begun, the instruments to be used were collected and stapled together to form a compact booklet. In this group of instruments were the following: (1) a set of instructions for completing the questionnaire and the sociometric criterion, (2) the ILBDQ, (3) the sociometric questionnaire, and (4) a roster of the cadets in the particular company being tested. A cadet in B Company would have a roster of the cadets in his company only. The administration of these instruments was accomplished by the
investigator and the military science instructors over a period of four days. The military science classes operated on a cycle whereby each cadet met class twice a week. Those cadets who met on Monday also met on Thursday and those who met on Tuesday also met on Friday. The four days were utilized for a regular administration and a make-up administration.

The actual administration was accomplished in the military science classes. Those cadets in grades seven and eight were tested together during their first period class. This group of students did not have formal military science classes; so they were tested in the library. The instructors of both military and academic classes assisted in the administration of the instruments.

Before the instructions of the test were read to the cadets, it was determined which company the cadets were in. This was necessary in order to give each cadet a roster of his company. The verbal instructions were "If you are not in Company A, B, C, or D, turn to the last page of the booklet and put an "X" through the page. This will help me to know which company you are in." The last page of the booklet was the sociometric criterion, which was not administered to those in Companies E, F, and G because those companies consisted of college students and secondary level students.
All of the instructions on both the IIEBDQ and the sociometric criterion were read to the group. Each cadet was given an opportunity to ask questions concerning procedures. The actual testing time varied from forty minutes for cadets in grades seven and eight to twenty minutes for those in grade twelve.

When the questionnaire and sociometric criterion had been completed, the following instructions were given: "On the top of the front sheet of the booklet please write the following: (1) name, (2) grade, (3) military science class number, (4) leadership position held in the company (it was indicated that leadership positions were squad leader, platoon leader and company commander), and (5) company."

The sociometric criterion was designed so that each cadet who marked the questionnaire would have an opportunity to choose from his company those cadets who more closely approximated his concept of an ideal leader. Each cadet had a chance to rank his first, second and third choice for each of the following leadership positions: (1) company commander, (2) platoon leader, and (3) squad leader.

From this type of sociometric device, the choices were utilized to locate those cadets defined as the "sociometrically chosen leader." This was done by assigning a value of three to a first choice, two to a second choice and one to a third choice. The cadets with the most points
were designated as the "sociometrically chosen" leaders for specific leadership position.

After the process of identifying the "sociometrically chosen" and appointed leaders was completed, a survey of the number of demerits assessed each type of leader was made. From a list of demerits assessed each day since the beginning of the spring semester, the five most frequently committed offenses were tabulated. This list is published each day and contains the names of cadets assessed demerits for the previous twenty-four hours. The list also contains the names of those who assessed the demerits and the number given. These lists had been kept since the beginning of the spring semester, making it possible to get the exact number of demerits assessed each cadet throughout the semester. This survey revealed the five following rules as being the most frequently broken:

1. Being unprepared for class or inspection.
2. Absent from the night study hall.
3. Absent from any formation.
4. Late to any class or formation.
5. Disrespect to a cadet officer or teacher.

When the determination of the most frequently committed offenses was completed, a sample of twenty daily demerit sheets was drawn from a total of forty-two. This sample was used to obtain the number of demerits assessed those cadets defined as appointed and sociometrically chosen.
Statistical Procedure

Using a simple analysis of variance procedure, each hypothesis was tested for statistical significance. An F-test had to reach a $P = 0.5$ to reject the null hypothesis. Hypotheses were tested in the following designs:

Hypothesis I: An analysis of variance in a $2 \times 3$ design was used to test for statistical significant differences between the students, teachers and military science instructors concept of ideal leadership. Leadership was defined in terms of consideration and initiating structure.

Hypothesis II: A $2 \times 2$ analysis of variance design was used to determine if appointed leaders and military science instructors differed significantly in their concept of the ideal leader.

Hypothesis III: A $2 \times 2$ analysis of variance design was used to determine if the sociometrically chosen student leaders differed significantly from the teacher in their concept of the ideal leader.

Hypothesis IV: A $2 \times 5$ analysis of variance design was used to determine if the sociometrically chosen student leader differed significantly from the appointed leader in the number of "most frequently committed" rule infractions.

Hypothesis V: A $2 \times 8$ analysis of variance design was used to determine if teacher's ratings of appointed and sociometrically chosen student leaders differed significantly on the eight behavior descriptions listed on the Personlity Record.
Summary

Subjects used for this study were from the secondary school program of a private military academy. Each of the cadets completed the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire during his military science class. The cadets were then asked to rate on the basis of a first, second and third choice those cadets within their own company who more closely approximated their own perception of (1) the ideal company commander, (2) the ideal platoon leader, and (3) the ideal squad leader. On the basis of the students' selection, four teachers and one military science instructor rated both the appointed and student chosen leaders on the eight descriptions of behavior as defined by the Personality Record. These two types of leaders (appointed and sociometrically chosen) were compared to ascertain significant differences between the two groups on five rule infractions.

The simple analysis of variance design was used to test the hypotheses. An F-ratio of $P = 0.5$ was required to reject the null hypothesis.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

An analysis of the data was made to determine if the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire could differentiate between the students', teachers', and military science instructors' concept of the ideal leader. The major investigation was to determine significant differences in ideal leadership among four groups: (1) teachers who taught on the secondary level in a private military academy, (2) students who occupied leadership positions due to appointment by the military department, (3) students who were chosen by their peers as one who more closely approximated their concept of the ideal leader, and (4) military science instructors.

For the purpose of this study, leadership was defined in terms of initiating structures and consideration. These two dimensions were incorporated into the IIBDQ, which gave an index score for each dimension which was used as a basis for the statistical analysis of leadership. These two index scores made it possible to compare the concepts of ideal leadership held by students, teachers, and military science instructors. When the mean index scores for consideration and initiating structure were computed for students, teachers, and military science instructors, they were utilized in
various analysis of variance designs to determine significant differences. Acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis was based on obtaining an F-ratio which corresponded to the 0.5 level of significance.

Hypothesis I

Mean scores of teachers, students, and military science instructors were used to test the hypothesis that there were no significant differences among the three groups (teachers, students, and military science instructors) perception of the ideal leader. These mean scores were derived from the two dimensions of the IIBUQ. An F-ratio which exceeded that required for the 0.5 level of significance was the criterion ratio. Table II is an analysis of the teachers', students', and military science instructors' concept of the ideal leader. It can be seen that neither consideration nor initiating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Variable</th>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Variance</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Estimated Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiating structure</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>10225.31</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>29.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10232.62</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>72.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>11752.46</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>33.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11825.14</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND MILITARY SCIENCE INSTRUCTORS
structure reached the required level to be considered significant. The null hypothesis was accepted. There appeared to be no significant difference in the students', teachers', and military science instructors' concept of the ideal leader as measured by the ILBDQ.

Even though the statistical analysis did not reach the significant level, the trend of means had a definite direction. Teachers and students perceived behavior which reflects friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth to be more indicative of the ideal leader than did the military science instructors. This trend can be seen in the consideration mean scores in Table III. In trying to differentiate between students with equal ability, the student with the highest consideration mean scores would be more acceptable to teachers and students.

**TABLE III**

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS', STUDENTS', AND MILITARY SCIENCE INSTRUCTORS' CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Military Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.S. Cons.</td>
<td>I.S. Cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students N = 320</td>
<td>49.40 44.58</td>
<td>48.00 45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Instructors N = 10</td>
<td>4.25 4.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis II

The hypothesis that there would be no difference between the appointed student leaders' and military science instructors' concept of the ideal leader was tested for significance. Mean index scores for students designated as the appointed student leaders were compared with the mean index scores of the military science instructors.

It was found that initiating structure and consideration mean scores did not significantly differentiate at the 5 percent level between appointed student leaders and military science instructors. The F-ratios in Table IV did not reach the level required to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, it was assumed that the behavior of the ideal leader as seen by appointed student leaders and military science instructors was described in the same way.

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN APPOINTED LEADERS AND MILITARY SCIENCE INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Variable</th>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Estimated Variance</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>1.4004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>905.78</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>927.65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>.9623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1650.88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1674.40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An investigation of the means for both appointed student leaders and military science instructors indicated that there was the same trend in the consideration scores as was found in the previous hypothesis. This would indicate that teachers, students and appointed student leaders saw the behavior of the ideal leader as more friendly, more truthful, and warmer than did the military science instructors. The consideration means of Table V indicated that the entire student body saw the ideal leader in much the same way as the teacher. However, the difference is not large enough to select a leader on the basis of a mean score on consideration.

**TABLE V**

CONSIDERATION MEAN SCORES FOR TEACHERS, ALL STUDENTS, APPOINTED LEADERS, AND MILITARY SCIENCE INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimension</th>
<th>Teachers N = 21</th>
<th>All Students N = 320</th>
<th>Appointed Leaders N = 50</th>
<th>Military Instructors N = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration means</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>44.58</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis III**

The third hypothesis specified that there would not be a significant difference between the teachers' concept of the ideal leader and the sociometrically chosen student leaders' concept of the ideal leader. The analysis of variance
ratios in Table VI did not reach the required level to reject the null hypothesis. This failure to find significant differences indicated that teachers' and sociometrically chosen student leaders' concept of the ideal leader are similar.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN SOCIOMETRICALLY CHOSEN LEADERS AND ACADEMIC TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimension</th>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Estimated Variance</th>
<th>f Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>3.2651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1330.91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1395.77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.0346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1452.24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1452.99</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the F-ratios did not reach the level of significance required for rejection of the hypothesis, an investigation of the mean scores indicated an F-ratio which was very close to that level. A t-test on the mean index score of initiating structures indicated that teachers and sociometrically chosen student leaders were different at the 7 per cent level. This differentiation indicates that sociometrically chosen student leaders see the behavior of the ideal leader as (1) providing more definite patterns of organization, (2) establishing channels of communication, and (3) being technique oriented in getting a job done.
Hypothesis IV

To determine if sociometrically chosen student leaders differed significantly from appointed student leaders in disciplinary action required, five of the most frequently committed rule infractions were tabulated. An analysis of variance was used to determine if the F-ratios reached the required level of significance. An analysis of the F-ratios and t-test in Table VII leads one to conclude that infractions of the five most frequently violated rules failed to differentiate between sociometrically chosen student leaders and appointed student leaders.

When the means for the sociometrically chosen and appointed student leaders were profiled (see Chart I), it was clear that

CHART I

PROFILE OF THE MOST FREQUENTLY COMMITTED OFFENSES
FOR TWO TYPES OF LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late to class or formation</th>
<th>Sociometrically chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared for class or inspection</td>
<td>- Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent night study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent class or inspection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect to a teacher or cadet officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the actual number of violations was very small. Also evident was the fact that the most frequently violated rule was the
### TABLE VII

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF FIVE FREQUENTLY COMMITTED OFFENSES FOR APPOINTED AND SOCIOMETRICALLY CHOSEN STUDENT LEADERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infractions</th>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Estimated Variance</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared for class or inspection</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.7327</td>
<td>.3194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>548.67</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>558.68</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent night study hall</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.2598</td>
<td>.5097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>332.38</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>333.50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent class or formation</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>.0151</td>
<td>.1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>8322.22</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8344.99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late to class or formation</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>163.479</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163.50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect to a teacher or cadet officer</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.0466</td>
<td>.0231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>349.24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>353.09</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
same for both types of leader. Absent from class or required formation was shown to be the most frequently violated rule among both types of leaders. Unprepared for class or inspection was the most frequently violated rule within the total student body.

Hypothesis V

To determine if different types of student leaders could be differentiated by behavior description, four academic teachers and one military science instructor rated the two types of leaders on the Personality Record. It was found that rating students on the eight behavior descriptions of the Personality Record did not disclose any differences which were significant at the 5 per cent level. The F-ratios and t-tests in Table VIII supported the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicated that the sociometrically chosen and appointed student leaders were not seen by the teachers and military science instructors as exhibiting behavior which would cause either type of leader to be differentiated from the total group of leaders.

The profile of the means for the sociometrically chosen and appointed student leaders is shown in Chart II. Although there were no significant differences between each of the eight descriptions, the means shown in Chart II indicated that on each description the sociometrically chosen student
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variables</th>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Variance</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for others</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence and</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII --Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variables</th>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Variance</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Variance</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>.9354</td>
<td>.9671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>831.29</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>839.48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.6663</td>
<td>.8162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>6671.33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>676.04</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leader had a higher mean score than did the appointed student leader. Teachers and military science instructors saw the sociometrically chosen student as having more of the positive qualities that were rated on the Personality Record.

CHART II

PROFILE OF EIGHT BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS OF APPOINTED AND SOCIOMETRICALLY CHOSEN STUDENT LEADERS

Motivation
Industry
Initiative
Leadership
Concern
Responsibility
Integrity
Emotional stability

Summary

The data clearly indicated that the ILBDQ did not differentiate significantly between the concepts of ideal leader held by teachers, student leaders, and military science instructors. Even though the differences between the leader types were not significant, there were trends that were consistent throughout the data. It was noted from the results of the present study that the sociometrically chosen student leader had a higher mean score than the appointed leader for
consideration and lower mean scores for initiating structure. The entire student body followed the trend of the socio-metrically chosen in that consideration is higher in the student body than in the appointed leaders. Also, initiating structure was higher in the appointed leaders than in the student body. None of the subjects in the student category scored higher on both dimensions than on any other student category. The appointed student leaders had higher means on both dimensions than the military science instructors. This was the only case where one group of subjects was higher on both dimensions than any other group.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the concept of ideal leadership as perceived at three different levels of leadership within the structure of a private military academy. The investigation was designed to determine the relationship between students', teachers', and military science instructors' concept of the ideal leader. Secondary purposes were (1) to determine if appointed student leaders differed significantly from sociometrically chosen student leaders in their concept of ideal leadership, and (2) to determine if teachers' description of behavior on the Personality Record rating scale would differentiate between leaders who were and those who were not in agreement with current policies and practices of the academy.

The subjects of this study were (1) students in the secondary school level of a private military academy, (2) academic teachers of those cadets in grades seven through twelve, and (3) all of the military personnel assigned to the academy. Three hundred twenty students were utilized to determine the concept of ideal leadership held by the cadets. These cadets were members of seven different military companies.
Companies A, B, C, and D were used in determining if the appointed student leader differed significantly from the sociometrically chosen student. The sociometrically chosen leaders were those chosen by classmates on a leadership criterion of ideal leadership. Companies A, B, C, and D were used because each had approximately the same number of students and all of the students were in the secondary school program. Companies E, F, and G consisted of secondary and college level students.

To get the teachers' concept of the ideal leader, twenty-one teachers, all of whom taught in grades seven through twelve, responded to the IIBDQ. The military science instructors' concept of the ideal leader was determined by having each of them respond to the IIBDQ.

The IIBDQ was designed to get two mean scores which are purported to measure one's concept of the ideal leader. This instrument is a forty-item, multiple-alternative questionnaire which provides a mean index score for initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure and consideration are descriptions of behavior which can be utilized to identify those who are considered to be good leaders by both supervisors and subordinates.

The Ohio State University Research Personnel Board established the validity and reliability of these two measures. Studies by Hemphill (2) and Halpin (1) on aircraft commanders,
salesmen and college departmental administrators indicate that leaders can be differentiated with the instrument.

When the ILBDQ was administered, each cadet in companies A, B, C, and D was given the opportunity to nominate on a first, second and third choice basis those cadets within his own company who most closely approximated his concept of the ideal company commander, ideal platoon leader and ideal squad leader.

These nominations were utilized to determine which of the cadets were perceived to be the best leaders for a specific leadership position. This nomination technique was used to identify those students who were defined as the sociometrically chosen. Mean index scores for initiating structure and consideration were obtained for the sociometrically chosen students and those appointed to leadership positions by the military department. The mean index scores were compared to ascertain differences which might be useful in selecting cadets for leadership positions in the future.

Teachers were asked to rate both types of student leaders on the Personality Record. The Personality Record is a rating sheet whereby the teachers could rate each of the cadets on eight descriptions of behavior. Differences on the descriptions of behavior between the appointed student leader and sociometrically chosen student leaders were tested for statistical significance.
Several different analysis of variance designs were used to determine $F$-ratios. An $F$-ration which equaled or exceeded that required for the 5 per cent level of significance was specified as the criterion ratio. The results of the tested hypotheses were presented in tables and charts.

**Findings**

The following hypotheses were proposed and tested at an 0.05 level of significance.

**Hypothesis I:** There will be a significant difference between each of the three levels of leadership (students, teachers, and military science instructors) in the perception of the ideal leader.

Initiating structure and consideration, the two criterion measures of the ideal leader, did not differentiate among the three groups at a significant level. The null hypothesis was accepted.

**Hypothesis II:** Appointed leaders will not be significantly different in their concept of the ideal leader from the military science instructors.

Initiating structure and consideration did not differentiate between the appointed student leader and the military science instructors at a significant level. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis III: Sociometrically chosen student leaders will not be significantly different in their concept of the ideal leader from the academic teachers.

Initiating structure and consideration did not significantly differentiate between sociometrically chosen student leaders and teachers. The proposed hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis IV: Sociometrically chosen student leaders and appointed student leaders will be significantly different in the number of rule infractions which are outlined in the Cadet Regulation.

An analysis was made of the daily demerit list which had been published each school day since the beginning of the spring semester. This analysis indicated that there were no significant differences between sociometrically chosen student leaders and appointed student leaders in the number of rule infractions. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis V: Teachers' ratings of the eight behavior description, as measured by the Personality Record, will indicate that sociometrically chosen student leaders are described as significantly different from the appointed student leader on each of the eight descriptions of behavior.

Teachers' ratings of the sociometrically chosen student leader and the appointed student leader on each of the eight descriptions of behavior did not significantly differentiate
between the two types of leaders. However, the sociometrically chosen student had a higher mean score on each of the eight behavior descriptions. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from this study must be considered in the light of leadership as defined by the IIIBDQ. By defining leadership as a descriptive dimension of behavior, the generalizations and conclusions reached have applicability to similar military-educational situations. When "ideal leader" is the criterion for peer nominations, those students who are perceived as being able to satisfy choosers' needs will be nominated.

In view of the findings of this investigation, the following conclusions are presented:

1. Ideal leaders were viewed differently by students, teachers, and military science instructors, though not at a significant level. Initiating structure mean index scores supported the conclusion that military science instructors and appointed student leaders require more delineation of the relationship between themselves and members of the group than do teachers and sociometrically chosen student leaders. The trend of the mean index scores for consideration supports the conclusion that teachers and sociometrically chosen student leaders require more warmth in the relationship between the
leader and the group members than do military science instructors and appointed student leaders.

2. Student leaders who were appointed reflected a concept of the ideal leader which is similar to that concept held by those who made the appointment.

3. Student leaders who were selected by peer nominations reflect the concept of the ideal leader held by the peers who made the nominations.

4. The findings of no difference between the teachers', students', and military science instructors' mean index score on the IIBwQ support the conclusion that morale at the academy is at an optimum level.

5. Students who were either appointed or sociometrically chosen were not frequent violators of institutional policies and procedures. Lack of significance between the two types of leaders was probably due to the small number of rule infractions found among leaders.

6. Since the sociometrically chosen student leader was higher on each of the eight descriptions of behavior on the Personality Record it was concluded that a more sensitive instrument would significantly differentiate between the two types of leaders.

7. The major conclusion was that the IIBwQ and the Personality Record were not adequate to select specific individuals for specific leadership positions.
Recommendations

In view of the conclusions of this study the following recommendations are made:

1. That further studies be made with the ILBDQ, the leadership criterion and the Personality Record to determine which groups of students (the upper 10 per cent, 20 per cent, 30 per cent, etc.) should be selected to receive additional training in developing potential leadership ability.

2. That more opportunity to participate in leader selection be given to the teachers and students.

3. That further study in an experimental and control situation be conducted to see if the leaders of a particular company who are selected on a peer nomination basis would be significantly different in performance than the appointed leaders.
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APPENDIX

IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR (what you expect of your leader)

Developed by staff members of The
Ohio State Leadership Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used
to describe the behavior of a leader, as you think he SHOULD
act. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to
describe what an Ideal Leader OUGHT to do in leading his
group.

The term "group", as used in the following items, refers
to a squad, platoon or company to which you belong.

The term "member" refers to the people in the squad,
platoon or company which is supervised by a leader.
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DIRECTIONS

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the act.

c. DECIDE whether he SHOULD always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

*i=Always
*E=Often
*C=Occasionally
*D=Seldom
*E=Never

What the IDEAL leader SHOULD do.

1. Do personal favors for group members.______ A B C D E
2. Make his attitudes clear to the group.______ A B C D E
3. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. _________________ A B C D E
4. Try out his new ideas with the group.______ A B C D E
5. Act as the real leader of the group.______ A B C D E
6. Be easy to understand. _________________ A B C D E
7. Rule with an iron hand. _________________ A B C D E
8. Find time to listen to group members.______ A B C D E
9. Criticize poor work.____________________ A B C D E
10. Give advance notice of change.___________ A B C D E
11. Speak in a manner not to be questioned.____ A B C D E
12. Keep to himself. ______________________ A B C D E
13. Look out for the personal welfare of the individual members. _________________ A B C D E
14. Assign group members to particular tasks. _ A B C D E
15. Be the spokesman of the group. __________ A B C D E
16. Schedule the work to be done._____________ A B C D E
17. Maintain definite standards of performance.- A B C D E
18. Refuse to explain his actions. ____________ A B C D E
19. Keep the group informed. ____________ A B C D E
20. Act without consulting the group. ______ A B C D E
21. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines. ______ A B C D E
22. Back up the members in their actions. ______ A B C D E
23. Treat all group members as his equal. ______ A B C D E
24. Encourage the use of uniform procedures. ______ A B C D E
25. Get what he asks for from his superiors. ______ A B C D E
26. Be willing to make changes. ____________ A B C D E
27. Make sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. ______ A B C D E
28. Be friendly and approachable. ____________ A B C D E
29. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulation. ____________ A B C D E
30. Fail to take necessary action. ____________ A B C D E
31. Make group members feel at ease when talking to them. ______ A B C D E
32. Let group members know what is expected of them. ______ A B C D E
33. Speak as the representative of the group. ______ A B C D E
34. Put suggestions made by the group into operation. ____________ A B C D E
35. See to it that group members are working up to capacity. ____________ A B C D E
36. Let other people take away his leadership in the group. ______ A B C D E
37. Get his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members. ______ A B C D E
38. Get group approval in important matters before going ahead. ____________ A B C D E
39. See to it that the work of group members is coordinated. ____________ A B C D E
40. Keep the group working together as a team. ____________ A B C D E
LEADERSHIP CRITERION

The questions you have marked tell what you think the Ideal Leader SHOULD DO. On the next page is a list of the cadets in your company. Some of these cadets might fit your idea of the Ideal Leader and some probably do not. Some might be close, but not perfectly.

In the spaces below, write the names of any three boys in your company who most closely fit your idea of the Ideal Company Commander.

1. First Choice of Ideal Company Commander. ____________________
2. Second Choice of Ideal Company Commander. ____________________
3. Third Choice of Ideal Company Commander. ____________________

Now write the names of any three boys in your company who most closely fit your idea of the Ideal Platoon Leader.

1. First Choice of Ideal Platoon Leader. ____________________
2. Second Choice of Ideal Platoon Leader. ____________________
3. Third Choice of Ideal Platoon Leader. ____________________

Now write the names of any three boys in your company who most closely fit your idea of the Ideal Squad Leader.

1. First Choice of Ideal Squad Leader. ____________________
2. Second Choice of Ideal Squad Leader. ____________________
3. Third Choice of Ideal Squad Leader. ____________________
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF

hool

The following characterizations are descriptions of behavior. It is recommended that where possible the judgments of a number of the pupil’s sent teachers be indicated by the use of the following method or by checks:

Example: MOTIVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposeless</th>
<th>Vacillating</th>
<th>Usually Purposeful</th>
<th>Effectively motivated</th>
<th>Highly motivated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M (5) indicates the most common or modal behavior of the pupil as shown by the agreement of five of the eight teachers reporting. The location of the numerals to the left and right indicates that one teacher considers the pupil vacillating and that two teachers consider him highly motivated, preferred, the subject fields or other areas of relationship with the pupil may be used to replace the numerals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seldom works even under pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merely conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFLUENCE AND LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERN FOR OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMOTIONAL STABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyperemotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant school activities and special interests or abilities. List membership and offices held in school activities.

Significant limitations (physical, social, mental):

Additional information which may be helpful, such as probable financial needs or work experience:

Principal’s Comments and Recommendations

1. Specific statement concerning the applicant’s fitness for acceptance by this college or employer:

2. Principal’s estimate of applicant’s future success, based on the purpose of this application.

   Little success
   May encounter some difficulty
   Average
   Above average
   Superior

3. Specific recommendation

   Recommended
   Not recommended for this college or position
   Prefer not to make recommendation

Date
Signature
Title

The Standardized Form prepared and recommended for national use by the Joint Committee on School-College Relations of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).
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