

SOME TRAITS OF CERTAIN STUDENT-ELECTED COLLEGE LEADERS

by

JOSEPHINE EUGENIA RAEPPEL

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

June 1955

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor-- Higher Education

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor--Higher Education

In Charge of Major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of School of Education and Chairman of
School Graduate Committee

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented August 11, 1954

Typed by Grace Ballou

ACKNOWLEDMENTS

The writer of this thesis is greatly indebted to the late Dr. Herbert R. Laslett for thoughtful planning, gracious counseling, and sustaining encouragement to make this study possible; and to Dr. J. Kenneth Munford and Prof. Delmer M. Good, Major professors, and Dean Franklin R. Zeran, Mr. William H. Carlson, Dr. Robert R. Reichart, Dr. Herbert E. Childs, and Dean Henry P. Hansen, who gave freely of their time, for their valuable advice, helpful criticisms, beneficial suggestions, and stimulating support in bringing it to completion.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. Purposes and Plan of the Study	1
II. What is Leadership?	5
Definition of Leadership	6
Qualities of Leadership	8
Types of Leadership	11
Developing Leadership	16
III. Selected Studies in Leadership	22
Qualities of Leadership.....	22
Types of Leadership	25
Training in Leadership	25
Persistence in Leadership	26
IV. Original Study	29
Inventory of Factors STDOR	29
Heston Personality Adjustment Inventory	36
Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory	40
Positions of Leadership	45
V. Findings and Conclusions	48
Findings	48
Conclusions	53
Bibliography	56

SOME TRAITS OF CERTAIN STUDENT-ELECTED COLLEGE LEADERS

CHAPTER I

PURPOSES AND PLAN OF STUDY

The purposes of this study are (a) to determine certain traits of personality by means of fairly well-standardized tests in certain students who have been elected to office by their fellows, and (b) to determine whether any of those traits are associated with leadership as shown by these groups. If the study should demonstrate that leaders possess certain personality traits which are lacking in non-leaders, it may be possible or desirable for students to watch for such traits in selecting those who would be best qualified to lead in their organizations.

For this study, a "leader" is defined as a student who is an office-holder elected by his or her fellow students or who has been shown preferment by being placed in a position of leadership in some other way by them. These individuals had acquired positions of leadership although there is no way of knowing, at the present time, whether those chosen as leaders were as capable in those positions as were others in their groups who were probably equally available but were not chosen at least at that time.

A "trait" has been defined by Webster as a "distinguishing quality of character, mind, etc; a characteristic; a peculiarity" (40, p.1059)

The material used in this study consists of the "Inventory of

Factors STDCR" by J. P. Guilford; the "Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory" by Joseph C. Heston; the "Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory" by S. R. Hathaway and J. C. McKinley; and a record of offices or other positions of leadership held by each of the so-called leaders.

The people tested include three groups: (1) fifteen leaders from the graduating class of 1952 of Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania; (2) fifteen non-leaders from the same class at the same institution; and (3) eighteen leaders from Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon, who were members of the student senate or held other positions of prominence on that campus during the academic year 1952-53.

The method used in this study consisted of giving the three inventories both at Albright College and at Oregon State College, under the loosely standardized conditions pertinent to them. Since the taking of these inventories was very time-consuming, some persuasion was required to get these students to agree to fill in the inventories. It is believed however, that having agreed to fill them in carefully and honestly the students did so whether under the eye of the writer of this thesis or her assistant or working alone, as some of them did on the Heston Inventory.

Reports of their own accomplishments on these inventories and the meanings of these were given each student in the study. This not only assured interest among these volunteers but helped, at least to assure honesty.

Setting. Albright College is a liberal arts co-educational, church-related college, in Reading, Pennsylvania, an industrial city with a population of 109,320, located fifty-three miles from Philadelphia. Ninety per cent of the people in Reading are native white, and eighty-eight per cent were born in the State of Pennsylvania. They are chiefly "Pennsylvania Germans," whose ancestors came from the German Palatinate before the Revolutionary War. In metropolitan Reading, which includes the suburbs and has a total population of 255,740, there are 688 industrial plants manufacturing chiefly the following products; hosiery (silk, rayon, cotton, and wool); machinery and parts; automobile parts; iron and steel bars; underwear; iron and steel castings; confectionery; and stoves, heaters, and ranges. Reading leads the nation in the manufacture of hosiery. The surrounding area is chiefly farm land.

In 1952, there were 555 students at Albright College, of whom eighty-one per cent were from Pennsylvania, twelve per cent from New Jersey, and five per cent from New York State. About fifty per cent were from the city of Reading. The student body at Albright College has always been very homogeneous.

Oregon State College, located in Corvallis, Oregon, is the federal land-grant college of Oregon, state supported, coeducational, organized on university plan with liberal arts and sciences (lower division, school of science), professional schools of agriculture, business and technology, education, engineering

and industrial arts, forestry, home economics, and pharmacy, divisions of physical education and of defense education (air, army, navy), and a graduate school; divisions of research and extension. Enrollment in 1952 totaled 5,002, of whom eighty-one per cent were from Oregon, fifteen per cent from thirty-nine other states, one and one-half per cent from four United States territories, and one and one-half per cent from thirty-nine foreign countries. Twenty per cent were from the county in which the college is located. Corvallis (population 16,207) is eighty-two miles south of Portland at the heart of the Willamette Valley. The leading occupations are farming, lumber products, poultry raising, dairy products, and engineering.

CHAPTER II

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

As each new freshman class arrives on the college campus, one wonders who the leaders will be and what qualities they possess which will cause their fellow classmates to believe that they can assume leadership with promise of doing well. In looking at the list of seniors, one tries to recall whether the leaders in that group are the same people who were leaders during their freshman year. Will the leaders among the students later assume positions of leadership in their communities? Are any special qualities related to leadership and, if so, what are they? Is the current leadership constructive or destructive or merely idle? Although almost endless material has been written about leaders and leadership over many centuries, one wonders about its worth. Has any of it arrived at the essence of leadership or even near it? Is there any agreement as to what leadership is?

After reading 1360 articles on the subject of leadership the writer has selected a few excerpts as a sampling of others' attempts to clarify the meaning of leadership and has made abstracts of some of the studies which appeared in the literature. Among those omitted were articles about certain ecclesiastical, political, and military leaders; studies of people whose names appeared in such biographical books, as Who's Who in America, which, in the opinion of the writer, state what the individuals have achieved but not the effects of their accomplishments;

advice on how to train leaders for specific sports; articles which are repetitious of what others have said or very similar to them; and studies which are vague or do not seem to be of any value to the present study.

Definition of Leadership

Among the many definitions of leadership are those which imply that the individual directs the way, goes ahead of, exerts influence over the group, or is first in rank. Leadership determines the "social weal or woe" by establishing "the direction and extent of social events" (29, p. 575)

Leadership is the ability to keep "in advance of the crowd" without becoming detached from it; but influencing it so that it will see, feel, and desire what the leader desires (7, p.13)

Leadership is the process of producing "changes in attitudes and in the overt behavior of those lead in such a way that they find the views and activities of the leader desirable" (16, p.454)

Leadership consists of "a state of being first, as found in such cases as the leading brand of soap, leading inventors, leading discoverers, and leaders in scientific thought, etc." (35, p.248)

* Sanderson states that there can be "no such thing as leadership in general. There are certain abilities and attributes and knowledges that made for leadership in one group or situation are different from those applicable to others. Leadership is a relation, and it must always be specific; that is, one is always

a leader for a particular situation" (36, p.51)

Chevalier, in the following, is somewhat but not wholly pessimistic about leaders. "Too often, what passes for leadership is nothing more than the cheapest opportunism. The fact that a man may achieve preferment or position in business, in organization work, or in politics does not mean that he is a leader. That depends wholly on how he uses the influence that may attach to his position. Nowhere is the term 'leadership' more abused than in politics... Leadership is not merely sensing the trend of the crowd in order to run with it. Yet, too often, that is what passes for leadership in politics...

"But sooner or later, in peace or in war, comes an emergency. Then we must look to our would-be leaders for something more than expedient opportunism of normal times. Then true leadership means leading with the chin. It means necks stuck out, even at the risk of the axe. Then the politician must give way to the statesman if the people are not to perish" (11, p.99)

These definitions define acts or situations of leadership but do not designate its characteristics or qualities, nor specify the various types of leadership. (In its simplest form, leadership is the act of preceding and being followed by one or more persons. A group which is obliged to choose someone as its leader is likely to select anyone who will be expected to go ahead of or influence the group to the best of his ability; but when the individuals are known, certain qualities may be fully consciously or barely

consciously taken into consideration by the group as it selects its leader.

Qualities of Leadership

There is a great deal of duplication in lists of qualities of leadership. Many such lists seem rather idealistic. Excerpts from some which appear to be more practical have been selected. According to Tead the qualities of leadership are "(1) Physical and nervous energy, (2) a sense of purpose and direction, (3) enthusiasm, (4) friendliness and affection, (5) integrity, (6) technical mastery, (7) decisiveness, (8) intelligence, (9) teaching skill, and (10) faith" (38, p.83)

Sanderson suggests certain innate qualities of leadership. "I presume we would agree that there are certain personal qualities that we commonly recognize as innate that qualify for leadership and whose possession brings those so endowed into positions of leadership: (1) A good physique, strength, stature, and physical qualities that have always commanded respect and are advantageous, other things being equal... (2) Self-assertiveness and self-confidence are qualities that seem to be inborn in some individuals... (3) Superior mental ability is undoubtedly innate and makes it easier for individuals so endowed to become leaders providing they are willing to assume the responsibilities involved. (4) Amiability, friendliness, and sympathy..." (36, pp.47-48)

McCuen, on the other hand, believes that the qualities are the same for leaders and non-leaders but that those of leaders are more pronounced than those of the non-leaders. "There is probably no doubt but what the leader and the common man possess the same qualities or characteristics. The difference between the leader and the common man lies in the fact that the former possesses the necessary qualities to a greater degree and in different combinations. The combinations of qualities and the degree of each will depend on the type of leader and on the position or situation in which he finds himself.

"Some of the qualities or characteristics which seem to underlie leadership ability are personality, perseverance, tact, courage, initiative, decision, and intelligence...

"The inference must not be made that all leaders have a high degree of intelligence. The assumption must not be made that all leaders possess the seven qualities mentioned to the same degree. Some of the qualities may even be passive in leaders in certain positions. At all events the prospective leader must have such a combination of qualities that he may sell himself to the group which he aspires to lead" (32, pp.89-90)

A group of five hundred members in supervision of workers with diesel engines submitted the following list of leadership qualities: "dependability, honesty, initiative, adaptability, ambition, fairness, character, loyalty, judgment, salesmanship, courage, sincerity, self-confidence, resourcefulness, self-control,

courtesy, observation, tact, imagination and sense of humor"
(30, p.30)

The feminine point of view or at least the viewpoint of a part of the women is shown in an essay contest held by the Ladies Home Journal. "The six qualities most frequently mentioned in a hundred of these essays were courage, love and understanding of humanity, self-sacrifice, sincerity and tenacity of purpose, personality, and vision" (19, p.44)

Cabot has placed one quality above all others. "The most impressive quality of the great executive is a sort of charm which draws men after him, the magnetic attraction of powerful personality. This is the essential feature of all leadership, whether of the military, educational, or industrial type. All great war captains have had it, all true prophets and teachers and all great captains of industry" (10, p.94)

Delinquency has its leaders just as much as socially acceptable activities. The underworld is just as real as any other part of society although it may be unknown to us. Judge Van Waters, long a juvenile court judge in Los Angeles, wrote: "What is the secret of attraction, the significance of personality, that leads young people to follow undesirable leaders and embark on anti-social courses?...

"Leadership is always mysterious. We do not know the physical and mental forces that lie back of the personality that becomes a dynamic center. But we are beginning to understand some of the

conditions under which it manifests itself in anti-social ways. The delinquent girl has tremendous vitality." She has vigor, boldness, pleasing manners as well as rudeness. She knows much about the adult world regarding drinking, smoking, and swearing, and she is skilled in repartee. "One thing may be said for these delinquent leaders. Their leadership is careless, nonchalant and unpremeditated" (39, pp.498-501)

Behnke's words might be used as a summary of most of that which has preceded, namely, "The quality of leadership, in its broadest sense, can mean the ability to master things or the power to influence people toward the good or the bad, in a realm as limited as the back room of a pool hall or as vast as the world" (4, p.397)

Types of Leadership

Attempts have been made to classify leadership according to types, kinds, or varieties, such as that of the headman, the autocrat, the dictator; the paternalistic type; or the democratic type. A headman is usually defined as a chief or director, who is in the place of command or of leadership. Cowley does not consider every headman a leader despite the fact that he may occupy a position of leadership. "Many a man who holds a position of leadership fails to lead. He is therefore a headman but not a leader. For example, Lincoln was a great leader, but in the face of an impending national crisis his predecessor, Buchanan, merely

marked time" (14, p. 548)

Autocratic leadership is domineering, despotic, absolute. Examples of this type are Alexander the Great and Napoleon. "The autocratic leader 'keeps his followers in line'. He cajoles, flatters and frightens his army of docile servants" (21, p.33)

The leadership of the dictator may be more compelling than that of the autocrat. It may emphasize force. Examples are the leadership of Hitler and Stalin. "The Dictator, knowing well that his greatest peril lies in the emergence of a rival, takes vigorous measures to prevent any such challenger from making himself heard. Censorship, suppression, exile, prison--these are the armor of dictatorship" (5, p.93)

The effects of dictatorship are expressed by Bluemel. "Mental misrepresentation is at its worst when a people is ruled by a dictator.

The dictator reaches his position of dominance by reason of his aggressive personality, and he must necessarily possess in a marked degree that militant spirit that sets him apart psychologically from the people whom he governs" (6, p.235)

The paternalistic type of leadership is that of the parent, clergyman, teacher, and case-worker, who take a special interest in the individual, try to arouse in him new attitudes which will be beneficial to him, and teach him to assume responsibilities and develop satisfying experiences.

The democratic type of leadership is that in which the leader

of a group works with the members in developing their ideals or purposes, planning their program, or planning for a specific cause outside the group. The leader draws the members into participation, stimulates them to express themselves, teaches them how to think, draws out ideas from them, makes suggestions, inspires the followers to carry out suggestions which will benefit the group, and guides the group in specific situations.

In a democracy the "leader is serving not merely his own immediate end, but the general welfare too. He is willing to serve within the group, doing his individual task as creatively as possible. He does not wish to dominate but to talk things out. He is the leader because he can get people's participation, because he can see and act most clearly, and because he is willing to be responsible. He is a great leader in proportion to the number of people he speaks for and his ability to get them to think in terms of the larger good" (27, p.22)

Mort distinguishes between two types of leadership. The one is what Cowley would call headmanship, for it is that of one who assumes a position of leadership but does not concentrate on influencing the people. "On the one hand, any individual who excels or ranks high in some field (e.g., in the sciences and the arts), but his leadership may not take the form of devotion to others; he may concentrate on the achievement of objectives in his own field. For example, he may be a 'leading' scientist or mathematician.

"On the other hand, an individual who uses his influence more directly with people in clarifying and directing their group purpose, decision, and action is a leader of another sort. As contrasted with the other type of leader mentioned, this type is conscious of his influence on people's conduct; he is intentionally bent upon achievement in his field and not upon leading people.

"Examples of the two types of leader would be Einstein-- a 'leading' physicist--and Lincoln, one who influenced intentionally a people's judgments of what to think and do" (34, p.562)

Harding suggests twenty-one varieties of leadership. The writer believes he is factual as well as facetious. The twenty-one varieties of educational leadership are: "1. The Autocrat. This variety takes a serious view of its responsibilities. Issues and proposals are faced squarely as they are presented. The first question asked is, 'Will this work?' It throws the burden of proof on the one making the proposal. 2. The Cooperative Variety. Self-effacing in a deliberate way. 3. The Elder Statesman. Few individuals have the temerity to make proposals to one who has seen so much in his time. 4. The Boyishly Eager Variety. Each problem is met with a fresh flow of enthusiasm. 5. The Pontifical Variety. Proposals are heard with a solemn mien. 6. The Honestly Muddled. It used to be easy to

know what to do. Nowadays, with so many ideas and proposals, it is harder to see the right direction. 7. The Loyal Line-and-Staff Variety. The keynote is loyalty... All issues are referred to the 'next-in-line.' 8. The Educational Prophet.

In the foreseeable future there are predicated changes of such a sweeping nature and great magnitude that the present proposal is seen as insignificant. 9. The Scientific Variety. No move is

made without a thorough study. 10. The Mystic. Proposals are examined in the light of the Ultimate Good. 11. The Dogmatic Variety. As soon as a proposal is made, preferably before it is explained, a few choice platitudes are stated firmly ... 'I don't want to be dogmatic about this, but---! The suggestion is

'batted over' for keeps. 12. The Open-Minded. Each proposal is swept away by new ideas coming later. 13. The Philosophic Variety.

This type sees the need to examine all points of view. 14. The Business Expert. He reduces everything to its simplest terms--time, staff, money--and points out that there is not enough time for present activities. 15. The Benevolent Despot. He agrees

that the proposal is probably a good idea, but says he must protect his staff. 16. The Child Protector. Our children are too precious to be experimented with. 17. The Laissez-Faire Variety.

Indicating that those making proposals are responsible for them.

18. The Community-Minded. Is the Community ready for this step?

19. The Blasé Cynic. Sees all--knows all, even before it is

explained. 20. The Optimist. Cheery, ebullient members of this

variety--confident--everything is going fine. 21. The Democratic Variety... hears all evidence, using an efficient parliamentary procedure" (25, pp.299-302)

Developing Leadership

There are various ways in which one may assume leadership, namely, by taking charge because no one else cares to do so, by taking charge before there is an opportunity to select a leader, or by being placed in a position of leadership without thought of whether one possesses any special ability to lead. Fate also may play an important role in the selection of one who must assume leadership. In some instances a person assumes a position of leadership by being the next in line when a vacancy occurs.

"Theodore Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge first became presidents of the United States because they were vice-presidents at a time when a president in office passed away. The initial opportunity to occupy this high post came about through forces quite outside themselves.

"Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in an hour of the country's need when a strong affirmative attack upon the demoralizing inroads of the worst depression in American history was popularly demanded. An opportunity for constructive leadership was urgently presented. The times were with him.

"The careers of Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler and Gandhi are all hard to dissociate from the circumstances of time and place in

which they functioned.

"These are, of course, instances of leaders of large affairs. But it can be shown to be generally true that every leader is as much a product of the setting of his life and times as of his own will to power. How great a leader one becomes may be greatly conditioned by personal factors. But the opportunity to lead is furnished by the total environment. It is always related to specific situations and needs. Only partially does the leader by virtue of innate powers wrest the right to lead from reluctant surroundings. The surroundings must be ripe for cohesive and energizing action" (38, p.22)

Numerous articles can be found in literature which refer to leadership as being inborn, that it can be detected early, that it will appear without any special effect on the part of the individual, and that it cannot be learned. Bryant gives an example of a born leader whose ability to lead did not appear early. "The idea that talent will always find its own level or be properly utilized is not borne out by the records of human experience. Even the career of a natural and born leader like Winston Churchill is anything but inevitable. Though born into the purple, gifted by the gods with a dominant intellect, a poet's intuition and an imperial will, and presented while still in his thirties with one of the greatest opportunities in history, he still looked at the age of sixty-four as if he was going to pass from the political scene" (8, p.825)

In contrast with the attitude of those who affirm that leadership is inborn is the attitude that leadership ability can be enhanced by teaching. No one, however, as far as this writer knows, goes so far as to deny that unspecified amounts of certain inborn traits must be present before effective training in leadership can take place.

"Plato believed strongly in differences of hereditary endowment, but relied, it will be recalled, on a selective and very careful training-program to determine the leaders of the State" (1, p.83)

That developing leadership takes time is brought out in several excerpts. "Plato recognized the existence of individual differences in natural endowments; he also recognized that the discovery of these differences must be made early and continuously through childhood, youth, and manhood... With special reference to the selection of the future leaders he insisted equally on an early start, for 'apparently it will belong to us to choose out, if we can, that special order of natural endowments which qualifies its possessors for the guardianship of a state'" (31, p.566)

"The basic course in leadership is the neighborhood playground. Every gang of 'kids' at a school has a leader. The next step is during high school years, on the athletic field, in school politics or in the Boy Scouts. Finally, the acid test of a man's leadership comes when he is thrust upon the world with only

his own abilities to guide him to success. If his qualities for leadership have been developed properly, he becomes a leader in his church, in his fraternal organization, in civic affairs, or business.

"My contention is that the seed of leadership must be planted early in life and nursed into maturity" (41, p.64)

Places in which opportunity to assume responsibility might be offered to students are in student government, school clubs, assemblies, and social functions. In any of these the students would find a variety of programs in which on-the-job training could be given.

Bavelas suggests varying the training program in accordance with the setting. "The uniqueness of a particular organization is partly due to the way in which the life space of the leader and his group is structural. Therefore, if a leadership training program is intended to help a leader perform his designated function, it must be appropriate to his setting. In other words, the ideas and techniques which are being taught should be in harmony with the aims, traditions, regulations, etc., of the organization in which the leader is working" (2, p.426)

Williamson stresses training lay leadership in the rural community. "Leadership is acquired rather than innate. It is a result of the functional processes of group action. The true lay leader is a member of his group, whether he has created the group or it has drafted him. Leadership itself is a function, and one

individual may be the leader of the group for one function while another is a leader for a second and altogether different function on the same occasion. Leadership often best develops under the stimulus of a definite need created by a changing environment" (43, p.81)

According to White, society forces certain individuals to assume positions of responsibility. "Although the personal qualities of the leader himself are certainly not to be underestimated, he is never in any real sense a self-made man. Leaders are to a great extent forced to the surface by the society in which they live... There can be no leader who is not supported by the led. Therefore the problem of producing a desirable leadership in our society is essentially a problem of popular education. It is not enough to select young men and women of brilliance, to give them the best possible training, and then to place them in positions of responsibility. It is far more important to develop in the great mass of our people a discriminating taste in leadership so that the millions who will never themselves be leaders may recognize clearly the type of leadership which they wish and may support intelligently the individuals who embody it" (42, p.656)

From the foregoing excerpts it will be seen that no definition of leadership has been arrived at which satisfies everyone, there is no agreement in the number and qualities of leadership, there is disagreement in regard to the types of

leadership, and whether or not leadership can be taught is disputed. The relations of leadership to other human characteristics such as force, diplomacy, strength, endurance, cunning, ruthlessness, and even deceit are yet to be answered. The age at which leadership appears in one's life and any early indications of its presence have not yet, as far as this writer knows, been studied systematically. Whether leadership and its potentialities are born in one person to a larger extent than in another person, apart from intelligence and other possibly related traits, are questions whose answers await further study. Some selected studies on various aspects of leadership are briefly summarized in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

SELECTED STUDIES IN LEADERSHIP

Experiments in leadership which were not related to the present study, those which were only remotely related, and those which would not lend any specific value to it have not been included in this study. From the studies which remained a few were selected as a sampling of attempts to answer through experiment some of the questions on leadership regarding its qualities, types, training, and persistence.

Qualities of Leadership

Middleton limited his study to thirty leaders, at De Pauw University, who were presidents of some organization on the college campus. Selecting 156 students to rate these leaders, he found that the six characteristics which they rated highest were "character, intelligence, persistence, accuracy, sociability, and judgment" (33, pp.199-201)

Dexter asked 209 girls at Agnes Scott College, a small college for women near Atlanta, Georgia, to name the ten most popular girls on the campus and to list the qualities which made them popular. The highest votes were for friendliness, good disposition, vivacity, wit, and pleasing personality (17, pp.758-60)

Flemming selected seventy-one Horace Mann School girls from

the ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades and asked each of them to check from a list of forty-six traits the ones which they would attribute to each girl, then he asked them to check on a scale of ten the intensity of their feelings toward each girl. The teachers were asked to do the same. The results showed that four traits were significant in their association with leadership, namely, "liveliness, wide interest, intelligence, and being a 'good sport'" (20, pp.596-605)

Hanawalt and Richardson compared the responses, on the 125-item Bernreuter Inventory, of ninety supervisors with those of eighty-eight non-supervisors, and fifty-seven office-holders with seventy non-office-holders. The results of the analyses seemed to indicate that the leaders (the supervisors and office-holders) were better adjusted, more dominant, and more self-sufficient than the non-leaders (the non-supervisors and non-office-holders). The leaders and non-leaders did not differ in sociability (23, pp.397-411)

Burnett made a study of college campus leaders to determine the qualities associated with leadership. He made up a sociometric test which he gave to 464 sophomores and which contained such questions as: "Whom would you prefer as social chairman of an all-campus dance?" These students had 906 sophomores from whom to select their leaders. The thirty-nine students who received thirty or more votes each represented only five per cent of the sophomore class. One hundred sixty-three

eligible students did not receive any votes. The two who received the highest number of notes had already received campus recognition by being mentioned in the college paper forty-eight times during the year. He then drew up a list of twenty-six personality traits in the form of a Guess Who test and the same group of sophomores were asked to try to match the questions with the ones whom they had selected as potential leaders or non-leaders. "The greatest numbers of votes were cast for the items pleasing personality, outstanding athlete, happy disposition, (and) feminine attractiveness." Ninety-five of the sophomores were then examined for further study. The result showed that "when the sophomores voted for leaders on the sociometric test they tended to vote for students who had been leaders in high school and who had already become leaders in college" (9, pp.35-41)

Clemmer studied leadership among fourteen prisoners, by means of interviews, questionnaires, and prison records, with respect to the following data; "(1) the personality traits of prison leaders, (2) the methods of gaining leader status, (3) the tenure of the leader and, (4) the general nature of leadership among prisoners and its effect in the prison community." He found that none of the leaders among the prisoners had been leaders in an organization before their incarceration"other than those which were held together by criminal activities.

"While the social experiences which the leaders have had have

been important in conditioning them for the status they hold as leaders, there seemed to be no situation common to all unless it has reference to having engaged in delinquency at an early age." The leaders were chiefly the younger, more intelligent men with worse criminal records than those who did not assume leadership (12, pp.861-72)

Types of Leadership

Spaulding asked two hundred fifty junior college students to vote on those students whom they considered to be the leaders in the college. The sixteen who received the greatest number of votes were interviewed and judgments on each student were collected from teachers and students. The data suggested five types of leaders; "the social climber, the intellectual success, the good fellow, the big athlete, and the athletic-activity type." The 'big athlete' was interest chiefly in athletics, whereas the 'athletic-activity type' was interested in athletics plus other activities (37, pp.164-68)

Training in Leadership

Eichler selected nine traits of leadership on which he secured ratings for 181 students in the eleventh and twelfth grades. The traits were established in the following order: "Individuality, persistence, height, self-control, social adaptability, scholarship, vitality, social intelligence and

intelligence." Four experiments were conducted in which groups were paired, one receiving training in leadership and the other not being trained. The result was that the groups which were trained rated higher in ability to lead than those which were not trained (18, pp.169, 198)

Bavelas selected six mediocre leaders between the ages of thirty-five and forty-five and trained three of them for three weeks in democratic procedures of leadership, using the other three as a control group. The result was that there was no change in procedures among the non-trained group, but there was change from authoritarian to group participation among the trained leaders. The morale in the trained leaders was raised and this in turn raised the morale of the children in the groups under their supervision. The children in the groups of the trained leaders cooperated with one another and with their leaders; they and their leaders became much more enthusiastic; and an increase in self-discipline was noted among them (3, pp.115-19)

Persistence in Leadership

Crowley made a study to determine whether student leaders excel after graduation. From 485 who had been graduated from high-school between the years 1927 and 1936, he selected forty-eight men and fifty-nine women, who were named by three out of four judges as being leaders in their classes. The leaders went farther in their schooling and found better paying positions than

the rest of the graduates. The results of the study show "that those who take part in student leadership activities are the ones who are most likely to succeed later, whichever is the cause and which the effect" (15, pp.167-70)

To determine whether or not leadership persists after graduation from high school, Courtenay selected a group of one hundred women who had been leaders in high school and had been graduated between the years 1922 and 1934. A group of one hundred non-leaders was selected as a control group. The groups "were paired on the bases of socio-economic background, ethnic heritage, scholarship rating, and age of graduation." The result was that leadership persisted; but as the years advanced there was a steady decline in leadership among those who had led during their high school days, and a steady ascent in leadership among those who had not led in their high school days (13, pp.97-107)

Each of the foregoing experiments answers in part some of the questions raised concerning leadership. Each of the six experiments on qualities of leadership contains one or more qualities which is the same or similar to the qualities in one or more of the others; but no special quality appears in all six experiments. Even among the prisoners there is one quality--intelligence--which is found among the prominent qualities in another experiment.

The leaders in the Spaulding experiment do not suggest their

type of leadership, unless one might imply that theirs is headmanship--that they are "there" and the rest of the group is behind.

The two experiments on training show that it is possible to improve leadership through training.

In response to the question of whether leadership is lasting, the two experiments give an affirmative answer.

The next chapter contains the writer's own study which is similar to the above experiments.

CHAPTER IV

ORIGINAL STUDY

Data were obtained from fifteen leaders and fifteen non-leaders of Albright College students, and eighteen leaders of the Oregon State College student body. The criteria established for selection of subjects necessarily limited the number: (1) All those selected for the study had been in college four consecutive years; (2) the key office holders were a comparatively small group of students; (3) some of the students who would have been desirable subjects could not find time to take the personality inventories because they were taking final examinations in preparation for graduation. As a control group, the non-leaders at Albright College were kept at the same number as the leader group. The group of leaders to be tested at Oregon State College was kept close in number to the number at Albright College.

Inventory of Factors STD CR

The first inventory to be given was the "Inventory of Factors STD CR" by J. P. Guilford (22) The factors STD CR encompass the introversion-extraversion area of personality. The inventory consists of 175 questions answered by encircling either "yes" or "no" or a "?" if the person cannot decide or has no preference between the two. When completed the inventory was scored with the use of the scoring keys which were furnished by the publishers and

the C-scores were found on the Guilford-Martin Temperament Profile Chart (23).

The chart consists of C-scores (scaled scores) in an eleven-point scale for each of the Factors STDCR. C-score 5 represents the population mean of college students tested by the authors. The scores are interpreted as follows:

S.- Social Introversion-Extraversion. A person with a high C-score is sociable and enjoys the company of others. One with a low C-score is shy and withdraws from the company of others.

T.- Thinking Introversion-Extraversion. A person with a high C-score is an extrovert. One with a low C-score is an introvert, inclined to meditative thinking and analyzing himself.

D.- Depression. A person with a high C-score is free from depression and is cheerful. One with a low C-score is depressed and may have a feeling of guilt.

C.- Cycloid Disposition. A person with a high C-score may be free of cycloid tendencies. He has stable emotional reactions. One with a low C-score may be strongly emotional and tend toward instability.

R.-Rhythymia. The person with a high C-score is happy-go-lucky and lively. One with a low C-score has an inhibited disposition.

Extremes in either direction of any of these factors may indicate maladjustment.

The range of raw scores and their corresponding C-scores for

each of the Factors STDCR were found for the three groups: (1) Leaders of Albright College, (2) non-leaders of Albright College, and (3) Leaders of Oregon State College. These are shown in Table I below.

According to Table I the C-score range for each factor in each of the groups tested extends above and below normal. In Factor S(Social Introversion-Extraversion) the C-score range of the Albright College leaders and the Albright College non-leaders are identical with tendency toward introversion. The C-score range of the Oregon State College leaders is close to normal at the introversion end but extends into the very maladjustment score at the extraversion end.

In Factor T (Thinking Introversion-Extraversion) the C-score ranges of the Albright College leaders and the Oregon State College leaders are identical. All three groups are identical in C-score on the introversion end; but the Albright College non-leaders are closer to normal on the extraversion end of the range.

In Factor D (Depression) the C-score range of the Oregon State College leaders is from close to normal on the depression end to the highest score on the cheerful end, which indicates some maladjustment at that end. The Albright College non-leaders reach a lower C-score on the depression end of the range than either of the leader groups.

In Factor C (Cycloid Disposition) the Albright College leaders and Albright College non-leaders are identical, ranging quite far

TABLE I

Range of Raw Scores on the Guilford Inventory for Factors STDCR and of Their Corresponding C-scores on the Guilford-Martin Temperament Profile Chart for the Albright College Leaders, the Albright College Non-leaders, and the Oregon State College Leaders

Raw Score range	ACL	4-38	22-50	2-36	7-42	19-60
	ACNL	4-39	27-48	8-43	8-44	22-61
	OSCL	0-26	21-50	1-27	5-32	28-67
C-score range	ACL	8-2	7-2	9-3	9-3	2-8
	ACNL	8-2	6-2	8-2	9-3	2-8
	OSCL	10-4	7-2	10-4	10-4	3-9
C-scores	S	T	D	C	R	
10	0	0 10	0 1	0 5		70 +
9	1 3	11 14	2 5	6 9		69 64
8	4 6	15 19	6 9	10 13		63 58
7	7 11	20 25	10 13	14 18		57 51
6	12 17	26 31	14 18	19 24		50 44
5	18 23	32 37	19 25	25 31		43 38
4	24 28	38 42	26 31	32 38		37 30
3	29 33	43 47	32 38	39 46		29 23
2	34 39	48 53	39 46	47 52		22 16
1	40 46	54 61	47 52	53 58		15 10
0	47 +	62 +	54 +	59 +		9 0

above normal on the stability end. The Oregon State College leaders reach the extreme on the stability end, which may indicate some maladjustment there, and are close to normal at the other end.

In Factor R (Rhathymia) the profile chart has the raw scores in reverse order. The Albright College groups are identical in C-score range. They go just as far on the happy-go-lucky end of the scale as they go on the inhibited end, that is, two scores above normal on one end and two scores below normal on the other end. The Oregon State College leaders reach a higher C-score on the happy-go-lucky end and do not go down so far on the inhibited end.

Since the score of one or several individuals could distort a range to such an extent that a false picture of the entire group might result, the medians have been computed of the raw scores of the three groups, which is the score above which are half the cases and below which are the other half, and the corresponding C-scores have been taken from the profile chart. These medians and their corresponding C-scores are shown in Table II below.

TABLE II

Medians of the Raw Scores on the Guilford Inventory for Factors STDCR and Their Corresponding C-scores on the Guilford-Martin Temperament Profile Chart for the Albright College Leaders, the Albright College Non-leaders, and the Oregon State College Leaders.

Test	AC leaders		AC non-leaders		OSC leaders	
	Med.	C-score	Med.	C-score	Med.	C-score
S	13	6	16	6	6.5	8
T	36	3	34	3	34.5	3
D	13	7	18	6	9.5	8
C	21	6	24	6	16.5	7
R	39	5	38	5	40	5

According to Table II the C-scores of the medians of the three groups tested are identical in Factors T (Thinking Introversion-Extraversion) and R (Rhythymia). The Albright College leaders and the Albright College non-leaders are identical in S (Social Introversion-Extraversion), T and R. The Oregon State College leaders have a higher C-score than either of the Albright College groups in S, D, and C, the interpretation of which suggests that according to the C-scores of the medians the Oregon State College leaders rank high in sociability, cheerfulness,

emotional stability than either of the Albright College groups. The Albright College non-leaders rank lowest of the three groups tested on the D (Depression) scale, which suggests that they are not so cheerful as the two leaders groups.

The means of the raw scores on the Guilford Inventory for Factors STDOR have been computed, which indicate the average score in each factor; and the corresponding C-scores have been taken from the Guilford-Martin Temperament Profile Chart. These appear in Table III below.

TABLE III

Means of the Raw Scores on the Guilford Inventory for Factors STDOR and Their Corresponding C-scores on the Guilford-Martin Temperament Profile Chart for the Leaders and Non-leaders of Albright College and the Leaders of Oregon State College.

Test Variable	AC leaders		AC non-leaders		OSC leaders	
	Mean	C-score	Mean	C-score	Mean	C-score
S	16.47	6	18.13	5	9.33	7
T	38.13	4	35.47	5	34.61	5
D	16.0	6	19.0	5	10.89	7
C	21.87	6	23.87	6	16.67	7
R	38.6	5	38.47	4	43.06	5

According to Table III the Oregon State College leaders have a higher C-score than either of the Albright College groups in S (Social Introversion-Extraversion), D (Depression), and C (Cycloid Disposition), the interpretation of which suggests that they are higher in sociability, in cheerfulness, and in emotional stability.

They have the same C-score as the Albright College non-leaders in T (Thinking Introversion-Extraversion), and the same as the Albright College leaders in R (Rhathymia) the happy-go-lucky scale. The Albright College leaders are less than either of the other groups tested in the T scale, which indicates that they are more introvertive in their thinking. The Albright College non-leaders are the least happy-go-lucky of the three groups tested. The Albright College non-leaders are equal to the population mean in three of the five factors, one score above the population mean in one factor, and one score below it in the other factor. The Oregon State College leaders are equal to the population mean in two factors. According to the C-scores of the means the Albright non-leaders are the most normal.

Heston Personality Adjustment Inventory

The second inventory to be used was the Heston Personality Adjustment Inventory, "which does not purport to give a final or irrevocable solution to the assessment of personality, but it does provide in convenient, accessible form a significant preliminary summarization of certain traits, thus giving the counselor or teacher a basis for further personalized evaluation of the individual" (28, p.1) It consists of 270 questions to which the individual answers "yes" or "no". The six traits of personal adjustment which it measures are analytical thinking, sociability, emotional stability, confidence, personal relations, and home

satisfaction. These are designated by the letters ASECPH. High scores represent good adjustment. The results were scored with the keys provided by the publisher.

The Range of the raw scores of the leaders and non-leaders of Albright College and the leaders of Oregon State College on the Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory were computed and appear in Table IV below.

TABLE IV

Range of the Raw Scores of the Leaders and Non-leaders of Albright College and the Leaders of Oregon State College on Traits ASECPH on the Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory

Test variable	AC leaders Range	AC non-leaders Range	OSC leaders Range
A	20-36	11-32	12-32
S	7-37	10-37	17-41
E	15-48	19-43	17-43
C	17-36	12-36	18-40
P	15-35	16-34	20-38
H	12-54	9-54	20-49

According to Table IV the Albright College leaders reach a higher range score than either of the other groups tested in A (analytical thinking) and E (emotional stability). The Oregon State College leaders reach higher range score than either of the other groups tested in S (sociability), C (confidence), and P (personal relations). On the other extreme of the range the

Albright College leaders have a range score lower than either of the other groups tested in S (sociability), E (emotional stability, and P (personal relations). The Albright College non-leaders have a range score lower than either of the other groups tested in A (analytical thinking), C (confidence), and H (home satisfaction).

In order to make allowance for extremes of individual cases, the medians were found for each group. They appear in Table V below.

TABLE V

Medians for the Traits ASECPH on the Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory for Albright College Leaders, Albright College Non-leaders, and Oregon State College Leaders

Test variable	AC leaders Medians	AC non-leaders Medians	OSC leaders Medians
A	26	25	29
S	28	25	36
E	35	36	33.5
C	26	39	33
P	28	25	27.5
H	45	40	41.5

According to Table V the Albright College leaders are highest in P (personal relations) and H (home satisfaction); the Albright College non-leaders are highest in E (emotional stability); and the Oregon State College leaders are highest in A (analytical thinking), S (sociability), and C (confidence). The Albright College leaders

are lowest in C (confidence); the Albright College non-leaders are lowest of the three groups in A (analytical thinking), S (sociability), P (personal relations), and H (home satisfaction). The Oregon State College leaders are lowest in E (emotional stability).

The means of the raw scores on the Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory appear in Table VI below.

TABLE VI

Means of the Raw Scores for the Traits ASECPH on the Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory for Albright College Leaders, the Albright College Non-leaders, and the Oregon State College Leaders

Test variable	AC Leaders Means	AC non-leaders Means	OSC-leaders Means
A	26.07	23.60	26.88
S	26.47	23.93	32.83
E	34.67	35.13	32.89
C	26.60	26.26	31.22
P	26.67	26.07	29.11
H	41.35	39.80	40.94

According to Table VI the Albright College leaders rank higher than either of the other groups tested in H (home satisfaction); the Albright College non-leaders rank highest of the three groups tested in E (emotional stability); and the Oregon State College leaders rank highest of the three groups in A (analytical thinking), S (sociability), C (confidence), P (personal relations), and H

(home satisfaction). The Oregon State College leaders rank lowest of the three groups in E (emotional stability).

Minnesota Multiphasic Personal Inventory

The third inventory to be given was "The Minnesota Multiphasic Personal Inventory", by Starke Hathaway and J. Chamley McKinley. It "is a psychometric instrument designed ultimately to provide, in a single test, scores on all the more important phases of personality" (26, p.5) It consists of 550 statements which the individual answers "true" or "false" about himself, or "cannot say" if he cannot decide between them. It is based on the scores of nine clinical scales; hypochondriasis (Hs), depression (D), hysteria (hy), psychopathic deviate (Pd), masculinity-femininity (Mf), paranoia (Pa), psychasthenia (Pt), schizophrenia (Sc), and hypomania (Ma). The keys furnished by the publisher were used to determine the raw scores and to convert them into T scores for analysis.

The range of the T scores was found for each group, namely, the Albright College leaders, the Albright College non-leaders, and the Oregon State College leaders. They are shown in Table VII below. High scores in these variables are not so favorable as lower scores. It is possible for the scales to change or show variability if the individual is retested due to a change in his personality.

TABLE VII

Range of T Scores on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory for the Albright College Leaders, the Albright College Non-leaders, and the Oregon State College Leaders

Test variable	AC leaders Range	AC Non-leaders Range	OSC leaders Range
Hs	39-62	44-70	44-67
D	38-67	38-80	34-60
Hy	45-67	44-67	45-82
Pd	32-86	34-69	39-74
Mf	41-100	34-71	32-80
Pa	50-65	44-62	41-76
Pt	43-64	42-77	33-73
Sc	43-84	34-101	37-78
Ma	40-83	40-75	38-81

According to Table VII the Albright College leaders reach a higher range score than either of the other groups tested in the following scales; psychopathic deviate, masculinity-femininity, and hypomania. At the other end of the range they are lower than the other groups tested in the hypochondriasis and psychopathic deviate scales. The Albright College non-leaders reach a higher range score than either of the other groups tested in the following scales: hypochondriasis, depression, psychasthenia, and schizophrenia. They are lower than the others at the other end of the range in hysteria and schizophrenia. The Oregon State College

leaders reach a higher range score than either of the other groups tested in the following scales: hysteria and paranoia. They reach a lower score than either of the other groups in depression, masculinity-femininity, paranoia, and hypomania. It is interesting to note that each of the groups tested has the highest as well as the lowest range score in one of the scales. Among the Albright College leaders it is psychopathic deviate; among the Albright College non-leaders it is schizophrenia; and among the Oregon State College leaders it is paranoia. It is also interesting to note that there are no ranges in any of the groups where the scores are very close together. The widest range is in the schizophrenia scale of the non-leaders with its difference of sixty-seven points from the lowest to the highest score.

The medians of the T scores were found and appear in Table VIII below.

In Table VIII the Albright College leaders have the highest median of the groups tested in masculinity-femininity; the Albright College non-leaders have a higher median than the other three groups in depression, psychopathic deviate, and hypomania; and the Oregon State College leaders are higher than the others in hypochondriasis, hysteria, paranoia, and psychasthenia. Since high scores in this inventory are not so favorable as low scores those are the scales in which each is less normal than the others.

TABLE VIII

Medians of the T Scores on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory for the Leaders and Non-leaders of Albright College and the Leaders of Oregon State College

Test Variable	AC leaders Medians	AC non-leaders Medians	OSC leaders Medians
Hs	48	52	53
D	48	49	48
Ry	56	56	60.5
Pd	50	60	58.5
Mf	63	57	59
Pa	56	50	59
Pt	52	50	57
Sc	52	50	55.5
Ma	55	57	56.5

According to the low or more favorable scores the Albright College leaders are better adjusted than either of the other groups tested in the following scales: hypochondriasis, psychopathic deviate, and hypomania. They are equal to the Oregon State College leaders in depression and equal to the Albright College non-leaders in hysteria. The Oregon State College leaders do not have a median in any scale which is lower (more favorable) than the medians in the same scales of the other groups tested.

The means of the T scores on the nine multiphasic scales were found and are shown in Table IX below.

TABLE IX

Means of the T scores for the Albright College Leaders and Non-leaders and the Oregon State College Leaders for each of the Nine Multiphasic Scales

Test variable	AC leaders Means	AC non-leaders Means	OSC leaders Means
Hs	50.13	53.87	54.28
D	50.93	51.73	49.0
Hy	56.20	56.67	60.67
Pd	56.27	56.13	58.11
Mf	63.40	56.67	59.67
Pa	55.80	51.00	59.5
Pt	53.13	51.60	56.72
Sc	57.00	57.40	55.56
Ma	56.60	54.73	58.61

According to the means in Table IX the Albright College leaders have a more unfavorable score than either of the other two groups in masculinity-femininity, and have a more favorable score than either of them in hypochondriasis and hysteria. The Albright College non-leaders have a more unfavorable score than either of the other groups in depression and schizophrenia, and have a more favorable score than either of the groups in psychopathic deviate, masculinity-femininity, paranoia, psychasthenia, and hypomania. The Oregon State College leaders have more unfavorable scores than either of the Albright groups

in six of the nine scales, namely, hypochondriasis, hysteria, psychopathic deviate, paranoia, psychasthenia, and hypomania. They have more favorable scores than the other two groups in depression and schizophrenia. According to the mean scores in this inventory the Albright College non-leaders are the most normal of the three groups tested.

Positions of Leadership

The writer drew up a scale of points for positions of leadership held by the leaders of Albright College and Oregon State College. These are listed in Table X below.

The greatest number of points have been allotted to the two highest officers on campus, namely, student body organization president and editor-in-chief of a school publication. Committee chairmen and committee members have been limited to committees which are active all year rather than a temporary committee for one event. Cabinet and board members have been included because not only do they have to attend the cabinet and board meetings but they have to make reports to the groups which they represent, which ordinarily requires the taking of notes. A committee member is included because he has to take active part in the work. A mere member of an activity is not an officer.

TABLE X
Student Officer Evaluation List

Position	Points
Student body organization president.....	100
Editor-in-chief of school publication	100
Editor, director, captain, manager, president (not of student body).....	75
Assistant editor, vice-president	60
Secretary	50
Treasurer	40
Senator, councilor, advisor	25
Cabinet member, board member	25
Committee chairman (if all year)	25
Committee member (if all year)	15

The range, median, and mean of each of the two leader groups in the evaluation of officers held appear in Table XI below.

TABLE XI

Range, Median, and Mean of the Albright College Leaders and the Oregon State College Leaders in the Evaluation of Offices Held

	AC leaders	OSC leaders
Range	125-400	40-450
Median	260	182.5
Mean	255.33	176.67

There is a wider range of points among the Oregon State College leaders than among those of Albright College. The lowest number on the Oregon State scale is eighty-five points beneath that of Albright College and the highest number is fifty points above that of Albright College. The median, or half way number, of the Albright College leaders is considerably higher than that of the Oregon State College leaders indicating that a larger number of the Albright College leaders have a greater number of points than those of Oregon State College. The mean, or average, of the points also shows that the Albright College leaders have more office holder points per student than those of Oregon State College.

A summary of this chapter will appear in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Findings

Favorable characteristics in which each of the tested groups equaled or excelled the other groups in the medians and means of the three inventories appear in Tables XII, XIII, and XIV respectively, which follows.

TABLE XII

Favorable Characteristics Resulting from the C-scores of the Guilford-Martin Profile Chart for Factors STDCR in which Each Group Equaled or Excelled One or Both of the Other Groups

Item	AC leaders	AC non-leaders	OSC leaders
Median	Extrovert	Extrovert	Extrovert
	Happy-go-lucky	Happy-go-lucky	Happy-go-lucky
			Sociable
			Cheerful
Mean			Stable
		Extrovert	Extrovert
	Happy-go-lucky		Happy-go-lucky
			Sociable
			Cheerful
			Stable

In Table XII favorable characteristics of Factors STDCR which are duplicated in the median and the mean C-scores on the Guilford-Martin Temperament Profile Chart are, for the Albright College leaders, "happy-go-lucky"; for the Albright College non-leaders, "extrovert"; and for the Oregon State College leaders, "extrovert," "happy-go-lucky," "sociable," "cheerful," and "stable." Among the

Albright College leaders the median is as extrovertive as the median of the Albright College non-leaders and the Oregon State College leaders, but the mean (or average) of the group does not equal nor exceed the mean of either of the other groups tested in that characteristic. In the Albright College non-leader group the median is as "happy-go-lucky" as the median of the Albright College leaders and the Oregon State College leaders, but the mean of the group does not equal nor exceed the means of the other two groups in that characteristic. The Oregon State College leaders equal or exceed the Albright College groups in the median and mean of every factor.

TABLE XIII

Favorable Characteristics Resulting from the Heston Inventory of Traits ASECPH in Which Each Group Equalled or Excelled One or Both of the Other Groups in the Means and Medians

Item	AC leaders	AC non-leaders	OSC leaders
Median			Analytical thinking Sociability
		Emotional Stability	
	Personal relations		Confidence
	Home satisfaction		
Mean			Analytical thinking Sociability
		Emotional Stability	
			Confidence Personal relations
	Home satisfaction		

In Table XIII the favorable characteristics which are duplicated in the medians and means are, for the Albright College leaders, "home satisfaction"; for the Albright College non-leaders, "emotional stability"; and for the Oregon State College leaders, "analytical thinking," "sociability," and "confidence." In the Albright College leader group the median is higher than that of the Albright College non-leaders and the Oregon State College leaders in "personal relations," but the mean does not rank higher than the means of the other two groups tested. In the Oregon State College leader group the mean has "personal relations" as one of

its outstanding characteristics, but the median in that characteristic does not exceed the medians of the Albright College groups.

For the Minnesota Multiphasic Personal Inventory the lower scores, which are the more favorable, have been used. According to Table XIV, which follows, the characteristics which are duplicated in the medians and means are, for the Albright College leaders, "hypochondriasis" and hysteria"; for the Albright College non-leaders, "masculinity-femininity," "paranoia," and psychasthenia"; and for the Oregon State College leaders, "depression." Interpreting these it would seem that the Albright College leaders are not so worried about their health and have the least hysteria symptoms of the groups tested; the Albright College non-leaders are the most normal in sex interest, the least suspicious, and have the fewest phobias; and the Oregon State College leaders have the most confidence in themselves.

TABLE XIV

Characteristics Resulting from the T scores of the Minnesota Multiphasic personality Inventory in Which Each Group Gave as Favorable or More Favorable Responses Than the Other Groups

Item	AC leaders	AC non-leaders	OSC leaders
Median	Hypochondriasis		
	Depression		Depression
	Hysteria	Hysteria	
	Psychopathic Dev.	Masculinity-fem.	
		Paranoia	
Mean		Psychasthenia	
		Schizophrenia	
	Hypomania		
	Hypochondriasis		
	Hysteria		Depression
Mean		Psychopathic dev.	
		Masculinity-fem.	
		Paranoia	
		Psychasthenia	
			Schizophrenia
		Hypomania	

In activity points the Albright College leaders average per student 78.66 more points than the Oregon State College Leaders who were tested.

An over-all picture of the three groups appears in Table XV below. Accordingly only one of the outstanding characteristics of the Albright College leaders is also outstanding among the Oregon State College leaders, namely, "happy-go-lucky." The non-leaders have two which are like those among the Oregon State College leaders, namely, "extrovert" and "stability."

TABLE VI

Outstanding Favorable Characteristics of the Albright College Leaders, the Albright College Non-leaders, and the Oregon State Leaders on the Three Inventories: Guilford, Heston, and Minnesota Multiphasic

Inventory	AC leaders	AC non-leaders	OSC leaders
Guilford		Extrovert	Sociable Extrovert Cheerful Stable
	Happy-go-lucky		Happy-go-lucky
Heston		Emotional stability	Analytical thinking Sociability
	Home satisfaction		Confidence
Minnesota Multiphasic	Not unduly worried about health		Self-confidence
	Normal symptoms of hysteria	Normal sex interest Not unduly suspicious No outstanding phobias	

Conclusions

Some of the qualities, especially of the Oregon State College leaders, are similar to those in the excerpts of other writers. Tead(p. 8) and McCuen (p.9) include "intelligence" as a quality associated with leadership, and Sanderson (p.8) includes "superior mental ability." In the list of qualities associated

with the leaders of Oregon State College there is "analytical thinking," which requires intelligence or superior mental ability. The three groups in the present study were not given a special intelligence test to determine how they rate in that factor. "Self-confidence" is included in Sanderson's (p.8) list; "self-confidence" in that of Irwin (p.9); and "confidence" as well as "self-confidence" in the Oregon State College list.

Among the experiments in Chapter III, Middleton (p.22) has listed "Intelligence" and "Sociability", which are similar to the Oregon State College "analytical thinking" and "sociable"; Dexter (p.22) lists "good disposition" and "pleasing personality," Flemming (p.23) includes "intelligence"; Burnett (p.24) includes "pleasing personality"; and Clemmer (p.25) states that the leaders among the prisoners were "more intelligent" than the non-leaders.

From the foregoing comparisons it would seem that three traits are persistent among leaders: intelligence, confidence, and pleasing personality. In the groups tested the Oregon State College leaders seem to meet all of these qualifications for their outstanding characteristics are analytical thinking, sociable, confidence, extrovert, cheerful, stable, and happy-go-lucky, home satisfaction, not unduly worried about health, and normal symptoms of hysteria: but as was stated above, the personality of the non-leaders might also be considered pleasing for they are the most normal of the three groups in sex interest, psychasthenia, and hypomania; they rank high as extroverts; and are emotionally

stable. Hanawalt and Richardson (p.23) found that their leaders were "better adjusted" than the non-leaders and that there was no difference in "sociability" among the leaders and non-leaders.

The types of leadership in the present study were not determined. nor were the leaders trained. Time will tell whether or not their leadership ability will be enduring.

The combination of inventories in the present study discloses only one special trait which the two groups of leaders have in common and which are lacking in the non-leaders, namely, "happy-go-lucky." Evidence from this study would indicate that the differences found as a result of each inventory would caution against placing too much weight on a single inventory. Additional or other combinations of inventories or tests might be tried to determine whether they agree on specific traits of character. Perhaps the so-called leaders in this study are mere headmen holding a position of leadership, or perhaps certain students with real leadership ability are overbalanced by others who lack that ability. A suggestion for further study would be to find some means of determining how well the so-called leaders have performed their duties of leadership, set up a new category or standard to designate which ones might be called leaders, and then test them against a group of non-leaders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ball, M. Margaret. The leadership principle in national socialism. *Journal of the history of ideas* 3:74-93. January 1942.
2. Bavelas, Alexander. An analysis of a situation preliminary to leadership training. *Journal of educational sociology* 17:426-430. 1944.
3. Bavelas, Alexander and Kurt Lewin. Training in democratic leadership. *Journal of abnormal and social psychology* 37:115-119. 1942.
4. Behnke, John A. Famine in leadership. *School and society* 65:397-399. 1947.
5. Bellows, Henry Adams. Follow the leader. *Forum* 95:90-95. February 1936.
6. Bluemel, Charles Sidney. Mind in government. *Mental hygiene* 16:233-237. April 1932.
7. Brent, Charles Henry. Leadership; the William Belsen Noble - lectures, delivered at Sanders Theatre, Harvard university, December 1907. N. Y., Longmans, 1920. 259p.
8. Bryant, Authur. Leadership: the prime minister and government services. *Illustrated London news* 193-825. June 28, 1941.
9. Burnett, Collins W. Leadership on the college campus. *Educational research bulletin* 20:35-41. Feb. 14, 1951.
10. Cabot, Philip. Hands vs. heads. *World's work* 49:92-97. November 1924.
11. Chevalier, W. Pattern for leadership. *Business week*, Sept. 19, 1942. p.99.
12. Clemmer, Donald. Leadership phenomena in a prison community. *Journal of criminal law* 28:861-872. 1938.
13. Courtenay, Mary Ethel. The persistence of leadership. *School review* 46:97-107. February 1938.
14. Cowley, William Harold. The college president as leader. *Association of American colleges, Bulletin* 25:546-551. 1939.

15. Crowley, John J. Do student leaders excel after graduation? *California journal of secondary education* 16:167-170. March 1941.
16. De Marche, David F. The superimposed leader. *Sociology and research* 31:454-457. 1947.
17. Dexter, Emily S. What constitutes campus popularity in course or individual? *School and society* 23:758-760. June 12, 1926.
18. Eichler, George A. Leaders are made. *School activities* 9:169, 198. December 1937.
19. Essential qualities of a woman leader; prize essays. *Ladies home journal* 50:44. April 1933.
20. Flemming, Edwin G. A factor analysis of the personality of high school leaders. *Journal of applied psychology* 19:596-605. 1935.
21. Ganders, Harry Stanley. "Headship" or leadership. *Nations schools* 19:33-34. February 1937.
22. Guilford, J. P. An inventory of factors STDCR. Rev. ed. Beverly Hills, Cal., Sheridan supply, n.d. 2p.
23. The Guilford-Martin temperament profile chart. Beverly Hills, Cal., Sheridan supply, ©1948. 2p.
24. Hanawalt, Nelson Gilbert and Helen M. Richardson. Leadership as related to the Bernreuter personality measures: IV. *Journal of abnormal and social psychology* 28:397-411. 1944.
25. Harding, Lowry Waring. Twenty-one varieties of educational leadership. *Educational leadership* 6:299-302. 1949.
26. Hathaway, Starke R. and J. Charnley McKinley. Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory. Manual. N. Y., Psychological corp., 1951. 31p.
27. Henderson, Algo Donmyer & Dorothy Hall. Antioch College; its design for liberal education. N. Y., Harper, 1946. 280p.
28. Heston, Joseph C. Heston personal adjustment inventory. Manual. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y., World book, ©1949. 34p.

29. Hollingworth, Leta Stetter. What we know about the early selection and training of leaders. Teachers college record 40:575-592. 1939.
30. Irwin, James R. Characteristics of a leader. Nation's schools 38:30. July 1946.
31. Kandel, Isaac Leon. Leadership and education in other times and in our times. Teachers college record 40:565-574. 1939.
32. McCuen, Theron L. Leadership and intelligence. Education 50:89-95. October 1929.
33. Middleton, Warren Candler. Personality qualities predominant in campus leaders. Journal of social psychology 13:199-201. 1941.
34. Mort, Paul R. Leadership in democratic living; Introduction. Teachers college record 40:561-564. 1939.
35. Nafe, Robert W. A psychological description of leadership. Journal of social psychology 1:248-266. 1930.
36. Sanderson, Ezra Dwight. Leadership for rural life. N. Y. Association, 1940. 127p.
37. Spaulding, Charles B. Types of junior college leaders. Sociology and social research 18:164-168. 1933.
38. Tead, Ordway. The art of Leadership. N. Y. McGraw, 1935. 308p.
39. Van Waters, Miriam. Child who is a leader. Survey 58:498-505. 1927.
40. Webster's collegiate dictionary. 5th ed. Springfield, Mass., G. & C. Merriam Co., 1947. 1275p.
41. What makes a leader? Infantry journal 56:64-65. February 1945.
42. White, Lynn Townsend, Jr. The crisis in democratic leadership. Vital speeches 10:655-659. Aug. 15, 1944.
43. Williamson, Ralph L. Training volunteer lay leaders in rural parishes. Religious education 40:78-82. March 1945.