THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING

IN CHANGING THE LEADER BEHAVIOR OF

EMERGENT STUDENT LEADERS

By

FLOYD B. HOELTING

Bachelor of Arts
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
1968

Master of Science
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1973

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING

IN CHANGING THE LEADER BEHAVIOR OF

EMERGENT STUDENT LEADERS

Thesis Approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ii

PREFACE

This dissertation is a study of the effectiveness of leadership
retreats in changing leader behavior.

The aim of the study was to select one specific component of
leader behavior, draw up a questionnaire, and then test to see if this
behavior could be taught to emergent student leaders, i.e., floor
presidents elected by residents of their floor. The over-all goal of
the study was to provide information necessary for evaluation of the
single student housing leadership training program.

Specific credit must be given to the many individuals and groups
who gave assistance in the completion of this study. The floor resi-
dents, floor presidents, and the housing administrators responded
promptly and willingly. Mr. Lynn Jackson, Miss Shaila Aery, Dr. Rex
Fennigan and Dr. Pat Murphy all gave their whole-hearted support and
encouragement to the activities undertaken; and all of the housing
personnel gave their guidance in the preparation of the instrument.

Special thanks must be given to the supervising doctoral committee,
without whom none of this would have come to be: Dr. Frank McFarland,
Dr. Bill Elsom, and Dr. Larry Perkins gave of their time and energies
unremittingly during all phases of the program. The association with,
and friendship of, these men is a cherished part of the past two years.

No words can express the appreciation given to my wife JoEllen
for her understanding, encouragement, and support during the events of

the past three years. Thanks must also be expressed to both sets of
parents and relatives who were always understanding and supportive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

In recent years much concern has been voiced about communication, or rather, lack of communication. This dissatisfaction has caused the birth of such phrases as communication gap, generation gap, and leadership gap (Adams, V., 1968, p. 8; Pervin, 1967, pp. 317-322). This concern has permeated all sections of our population, especially higher education, and has stimulated millions of Americans to attend different types of "group centered" communication retreats (Rogers, 1968, pp. 1-2).

While business, churches, hospitals, and law enforcement agencies are all involved in this group communication or sensitivity training, higher education is one of the leading exponents, and is offering this experience to faculty members as well as students (Rogers, 1968, pp. 1-2)

A very popular type of communication training in higher education today is leadership training. This type of training usually takes place in what is called a leadership retreat or leadership workshop. Aimed primarily at student government, student counselors, and student leaders in general, these retreats usually attempt to develop or change the leader behavior of the participants over night, over a weekend, or over a week period (Davis and Rothaus, 1969, p. II).

Some institutions of higher education have recognized the need for leadership training as an integral part of a student's development. These institutions usually have staff members, hired as group leadership coordinators, to work with different campus leadership training programs (National Training Laboratories Selected Reading Series, 1961, pp. 1-2). Other institutions have local staff members who feel or see a need for some type of leadership development, and take upon themselves the responsibility of organizing the groups and conducting the training.

If leadership training is effective in developing student leaders to their greatest potential, it is essential that all staff involved in this activity become true educators. They must be willing to be part of the educational scheme and strive continually to do what they feel is educationally sound and worthwhile (Adams, A., 1955, pp. 26-27).

Statement of the Problem

Halpin (1956, pp. 172-176) points out that in order to increase one's understanding of the leadership phenomenon, the notion of leadership as a trait must be abandoned and concentration placed instead upon the analysis of leader behavior. Gibb (1954, pp. 877-900) insists upon including personality factors, cultural forces, situations, and interactions in analyzing leadership. Hence, in the study of leadership a definitional problem exists. The definitional dilemma emerges from the fact that both descriptive and evaluative meanings have been incorporated into the term leadership, thus giving this single word two meanings: one is the behavior of a person in the leadership role, and the other is an evaluation of the individual's performance in the leadership

role. Some have added to this confusion by defining leadership as an innate capacity on the part of the individual (Kemp, 1964b, p. 262).

Halpin (1959, pp. 11-12) very clearly points out the difference between leader behavior and leadership:

> The distinction between 'leader behavior' and leadership is more than merely academic, to ask 'What is leadership?' presupposes the existence of a specified capacity in regard to leading. This question predicates within the individual an attribute or inherent characteristic of behavior. Those who hold this view tend to set little store by the prospect of training individuals in leadership behavior skills, for when leadership is conceived as an inherent capacity or potentiality, there is meager justification for devoting time to training for it.
> In contrast, consider the concept of 'leader behavior' and what it implies. First of all, it focuses upon observed behavior. No presuppositions are made about a one-to-one relationship between leader behavior and an underlying capacity or potentiality presumably determinative of this behavior. . . . Changes in behavior presumably can be induced through appropriate training, but the concept of capacity, by definition, implies a fixed level of ability and hence thrusts the burden of personnel determination upon selection, not training.

This study, then, is focused upon leader behavior as defined by Halpin rather than upon the inherent leadership of student floor presidents in residence hall settings. It is specifically concerned with one area of leader behavior, i.e., the leader's sensitivity toward those whom he is leading.

During the school year 1969-70, the division of student affairs of Oklahoma State University organized and conducted twenty-eight leadership workshops. Approximately thirty students attended each workshop. Each single retreat required two student personnel staff members to conduct as well as plan it. Each staff member spent approximately five hours planning and thirty-six hours conducting each workshop.

The cost of a single retreat for thirty students averaged

approximately $300.00.[1] This cost included food, lodging, and supplies
only; the staff did not charge for their services. Student organiza-
tions absorbed the cost of the retreat for the leaders. One can see
that the total time spent by the division for the 1969-70 academic year
was approximately 2,296 hours, at a cost of approximately $8,400 to the
students. An approximate total of 30,240 student hours was also
invested in the total workshops last year. With this investment of
$8,400 and 2,296 staff hours the only evaluation of these retreats was
a reaction questionnaire completed by the participants at the close of
the retreat (Appendix K).

Since leadership training is very costly in both time and money,
it should first be tested for productivity before being used on the
campus. The hazards of possible adverse consequences are greatly
reduced when unproven teaching methods are tested experimentally
(American Psychiatric Association, 1970, pp. 12-17). Sanford (1962,
p. 1025) urges experimentation rather than simply trying new ideas.
"Experimentation here," he points out, "means not merely innovation but
the designing of new programs in accordance with hypotheses, and the
use of experimental controls to determine the effects of the program."

Experimental evaluation of the effects that leadership training
has on leader behavior is needed before leadership training can become
an integral part of a student's total education experience. As Miles
noted:

> In the absence of evaluatory evidence, substitute bases
> for judgment are used, such as educational ideology, senti-
> ment or persuasive claims by advocates or salesmen. Most

---

[1]This information given to author by Dr. Rex Finnegan, Director of
Counseling Center, Oklahoma State University.

educational decisions appear to be made in an intuitive,
prudential manner . . . the opinions of users and clients
are invoked. Informal student reactions and teacher re-
sponses are assessed; perceived student boredom is taken as
an indicator of lack of learning, and the extra enthusiasm
of teachers and students usually found in a new program (with
its additional encouragement, recognition and shared wishes
for goal accomplishment) is mistaken for success of the
innovation. Yet, no hard data have been collected, and
decisions to terminate or continue the innovation are founded
on sand. (Miles, 1964, p. 657)

Specifically, this study is designed to provide some insight into
the effects of leadership training in changing one specific aspect of
leader behavior, leader sensitivity. An attempt was made to determine
if leader sensitivity could be taught at a leadership workshop. It was
also designed to see if this behavior continues in the university resi-
dence hall environment. It was assumed that if the results showed a
significant difference between training and no training, different
training techniques and behaviors could be determined and analyzed.
Then steps could be taken to improve or develop the leadership training
until it could be considered an effective part of the total educational
experience at Oklahoma State University.

Significance of the Study

As stated previously, it was the purpose of this study to deter-
mine the effectiveness of leadership training in changing the leader
behavior of emergent student leaders. Specifically, participants were
tested one month and two months after the workshop for a change in
their leader sensitivity.

The results of this study will be useful in: (1) providing addi-
tional variables for future studies in the area of leadership training,
(2) helping staff take more of an experimental approach to innovative

teaching techniques, (3) adding to existing knowledge and suggesting

additional research.

Hypothesis

The following null hypothesis was tested in this study:

There is no significant difference between the leader sensi-
tivity of student leaders who received leadership training
and student leaders who received no leadership training.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions were used in this study:

Leadership. "The contribution of a given individual to group

effectiveness, mediated through the direct efforts of others rather

than just himself." (Campbell, 1956, p. 1)

Leadership Workshop. A weekend (approximately thirty-six hours)

group centered conference aimed at teaching or changing specified

leadership behavior. The alternate term of leadership retreat is also

used to designate a leadership workshop.

Sensitivity Training. A training session that involves a closed

group established to allow an individual an opportunity to experience

himself more fully in his relation with others, and to discover at a

deeper, more intensive level what he and others are thinking and feel-

ing. Also, to learn how people relate to each other. Sensitivity

training creates an appropriate climate for feedback to follow presen-

tation of self. Alternate terms are training group, laboratory group,

basic encounter group, or a workshop in human relations, in leadership,

in counseling, in education, in research, in psychotherapy (Rogers,

1967, pp. 2-3).

Residence Hall. A unit of student housing built, maintained, and staffed by an institution as an educational facility to contribute to the goals undertaken by the institution. The alternate term dormitory is sometimes used to designate a residence hall.

Leader Behavior. The behavior of an assigned or unassigned leader in any group situation.

Hawthorne Effect. A research phenomenon in which at least a portion of the change in subject behavior is a result of the necessary interest shown by the researcher toward the subject.

Leader Sensitivity. Any behavior on the part of the leader of a group that displays an awareness of and responsibility to the individual and group needs as well as confidence in the integrity and growth of the group.

Emergent Student Leader. An undergraduate student living in a residence hall who has been elected president for a period of one semester of a floor having 63 residents. The alternate terms floor president and president are also used to designate an emergent student leader.

Limitations of the Study

This study involved student leaders from a large co-educational mid-western university with an enrollment of approximately 18,000 students. The student leaders were floor presidents of three twelve-story and one fourteen-story residence hall. Two of these halls housed male residents and two housed females. The 46 floor presidents were invited to attend a leadership workshop. From the 35 floor presidents that accepted the invitation 30 were randomly selected to attend. From

these 30, 15 presidents were randomly assigned to the experimental

group and 15 to the control group. Because the experimental groups

were volunteers, the results apply only to the sample used. Generali-

zations of results of this study to other institutions, residence

halls, or student leaders should not be made. Factors such as the

size, environment, traditions, or residence hall philosophy, and

requirements of Oklahoma State University could all affect the results

of the study. Another limitation of this study is the small number of

students in the groups used. Because of the lack of uniformity of

number of residents per student president in the 16 residence halls,

it was necessary to limit the study to the residence halls with uniform

facilities and number (63) of students per floor. This limitation

allowed for only 15 subjects per group.

Assumptions of the Study

The basic assumption of this study was that student residents

would be able to perceive a change in their floor president's leader

behavior at two different periods during the semester. Another assump-

tion was that the Hawthorne effect would be controlled by sending the

control group to a retreat area the same weekend as the experimental

group. This group was void of any teaching or training in the area of

group dynamics or leadership. It was also assumed that there would be

no significant contamination between groups after the workshop.

Summary

In this chapter leader behavior, group training, leader sensitivi-

ty, and some aspects of leadership training in the total educational

experience were discussed. The topic of evaluation was discussed, as well as the importance of experimentors' evaluation in higher education. Significance was given to the time and money already being spent on leadership training.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Leadership

Leaders have existed as long as man has been associated with man.
The first group leaders were known as medicine men. Then prophets,
philosophers, and teachers began to emerge as leaders. As society
became more and more complex, leaders and leader behavior became more
complex also (speech by Middleton, 1950, quoted in Petrullo and Bass,
1961, pp. v and vi).

Leadership and leader behavior are universal, time-honored topics
of discussion and concern. Military men, journalists, politicians,
novelists, dramatists, feminists, financiers, and physical scientists
have all presented ideas and theories on leadership (Petrullo and Bass,
1961, pp. 290-291). These theories on leadership have been recorded
throughout history. The "great man" theory at one extreme opposes the
situational leader at the other extreme with numerous theories falling
at different points in between (Glanz and Hayes, 1967, p. 95). Despite
the time and energy spent by students of leadership, there is very
little agreement on the subject other than the fact that leadership
does exist (Kemp, 1964, p, 187).

Machiavelli and Carlyle (Jennings, 1960, pp. 5-6) believed in the
great man approach. They held that certain great charismatic men are
born and people naturally followed them. Whereas Machiavelli believed

that leadership rested upon the power of cunning and force, Carlyle

believed that leadership rested upon intuitive insight in relativity

(Jennings, 1960, pp. 5-6).

John Stuart Mill held that great men gather people around them and

create situations of enlightment and critical thought (Jennings, 1960,

p. 7). William James suggested that great men need certain situations

in which to use their leadership ability, and if a great man does not

come upon the ideal situation, he might remain unknown (Jennings, 1960,

p. 7).

Modern writers Cattell (1957), Gibb (1954), and Sanford (1952)

approach leadership from both a behavioral and situational standpoint.

These men write that patterns of behaviors that occur within different

group situations are shared by all members of that group. In the situ-

ational leadership approach, it is believed different members of dif-

ferent groups will display different degrees of leadership behavior

depending upon the situation. Hemphill (1958) and Bass (1960) have

also built theoretical structures supporting this modern situational

leader behavior approach.

In recent years the need for concise experimental and theoretical

approaches to leadership has become apparent. Bruner (1950), Asch

(1950), Sanford (1952), Cartwright and Zarder (1953), Gibb (1954),

Heider (1958), Petrullo and Bass (1961), and Kemp (1964) have all

pointed out the need for integrative theory and improved experimenta-

tion.

> There are few practical problems facing social science
> more urgent than that of studying leadership experimentally
> and developing some test hypotheses to replace the copybook
> maxims that now fill most manuals on leadership, whether
> written for the Army, for industry, or for organizations like
> the Y. M. C. A. (Stouffer, 1949, p. 363).

Moreover, until social psychology has contributed a
systematic body of theory from which deductions can be
made to practical situations, with reasonable assurance from
past experimental research that the predictions will be
verified, such programs will be only minimally effective.
Here is an area of future research in which concentrated and
sustained effort is necessary. Only as a result of many
experimental studies can it be expected that the gap between
accepted stereotypes of good leadership behavior and actual
practice will be materially narrowed. (Stouffer, 1949,
p. 391)

Binet (1900) and Terman (1904) were two of the early experimenters

in the area of leadership among children. These two men developed a

method correlating aptitude test data with some criterion measure of

leadership performance. In 1915, Gowin did studies on physical charac-

teristics of leaders and found that leaders are usually taller, older,

and weigh more than the people who follow them. Interestingly enough,

Hunter and Jordan (1939) found leaders to be shorter, younger, and

weigh less than the people who follow them.

In 1927, the Personnel Research Federation called a conference on

leadership (Moore, 1927). The only conclusions were that leadership

concepts were changing and that more experimental research was needed

in the area of leadership.

Ralph M. Stogdill (1948, pp. 35-71) did a comprehensive study in

the area of leadership traits. In this study he collected 124 of the

most renowned international investigations of traits and characteris-

tics of leaders. He divided the leadership traits into twenty-seven

different types and then placed the results of each study under the

type of trait that had been tested in the study.

Under the first trait, chronological age, he discovered that six

studies found leaders to be younger than followers. Nine studies found

leaders to be older than the followers. Two studies found no

difference in age among leaders and followers, and one study discovered

that the age of leaders differs with situations.

Under the trait "height," leaders were found to be taller in eight

studies. Two studies found leaders to be shorter; two studies found no

significant difference between the height of the leaders and followers.

One study discovered that the height of the leader depends upon the

situation.

Stogdill (1948) published the following conclusion concerning the

124 studies he analyzed:

> A person does not become a leader by virtue of the
> possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern
> of personal characteristics must bear some relevant rela-
> tionship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of
> the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms
> of interaction of variables which are in constant flux and
> change. . . .
> The evidence suggests that leadership is a relation that
> exists between persons in a social situation, and that per-
> sons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be
> leaders in other situations. . . .
> The authors conclude that these findings provide
> 'devastating evidence' against the concept of the operation
> of measurable traits in determining social interactions.

These conclusions by Stodgill (1948, pp. 68-71) correspond with

the more modern theories of Hemphill (1949), Gibb (1954), and Kemp

(1964). These three authors hold that situations and individual behav-

ior are the primary ingredients of leadership and leader behavior.

Following the 1927 leadership conference some interesting studies

were published, including those of Cowley (1928) and Parten (1933).

These studies were starting to put more emphasis on the sociological

and psychological aspects of leading. Page (1935) tried to approach

leadership as a function of the group rather than of the individual.

He felt that the followers should be studied as thoroughly as the

leaders.

During the 1930's the sociometric method of identifying and evaluating leadership became popular. Jennings (1937) did a very complete study of the sociometric movement. Utilizing the sociometric studies, Moreno (1934) approached leadership from the amount or type of attraction, interaction, and different relationships that develop within a group situation. He later pointed out that his definitions of leadership were restricted to types of relationships. The leader is either chosen by a large number of persons, or is chosen by a number of powerful group members. The sociometric philosophy contends that behavior becomes leader behavior when it is used to facilitate the group problems and is recognized as such by the group members. It is apparent that additional studies similar to Jennings' (1953) need to be performed to refine leadership behavior concerning defined or sociometrically accepted plans.

Leadership, probably the most explored area of the group processes, has for several centuries been considered uniquely characteristic of a single person within each group. Many people today still hold this theory. The most modern theories, however, contend that leadership is a series of behaviors shared by everyone in the group (Glanz and Hayes, 1967, p. 276).

One group's leader may be another group's follower. This phenomenon could be caused by any number of factors; the primary one is the need of the group. A successful leader of several groups is usually flexible enough to modify his leadership behavior to meet the needs of each group (Hemp, 1964, p. 276).

Since all groups differ in their needs, one cannot predict the characteristics necessary to perform as a leader in a particular

situation. Certain characteristics, however, seem to predict leadership behavior somewhat better than others (Hemp, 1964, p. 276).

Such is the picture of leadership research. The picture of leadership research is in no way complete, but rather, just begun. Although the subject of leadership is old, no comprehensive theory is accepted because systematic experimental studies in the area of leadership still remain sparce and inadequate (Petrullo and Bass, 1961, p. xxix).

Sensitivity Training

The number of human relation or sensitivity training experiences has increased in recent years. This group training experience has been labeled "T-group," standing for training laboratory in group dynamics laboratory group, basic encounter group, or a workshop in human relations, in leadership, in counseling, in education, in research, in psychotherapy (Rogers, 1968, pp. 1-2).

During the past two decades T-groups have suddenly touched almost every segment of society. While administrators, teachers, and all specialists in education have always used the group process as a tool in training persons in human relations, only in the past ten to twenty years have other individuals and organizations become involved in the T-group process (Glanz and Hayes, 1967, p. 116)

A T-group is an unstructured setting with no socially determined group controls present. The group establishes its own norms, standards, friendships, patterns of communication, and problems on which to work. A T-group is usually unique in two ways: first, it is an ambiguous milieu in which members form a group without the usual controls;

and second, ongoing experiences of the group members are the case
studies from which the group learns about the functioning of individ-
uals, including oneself, as group members (Burke and Dennis, 1961,
p. 166). A professional leader encourages the group to discuss the
central topics (whatever they may be) or to stay focused upon the
ongoing group case studies rather than rambling from topic to topic.
A participating member of a T-group, by learning about the functioning
of the individuals and himself as group members, increases his aware-
ness of and sensitivity to emotional reactions and expressions in
himself and others (Bradford, Gibb and Benne, 1964, p. 110).

In a study done by Gage and Exline (1953, pp. 381-396), T-group
members became more sensitive toward others as a result of their T-
group experiences. They also became more aware of the other members
in the group.

Fleishman (1953, pp. 6, 205-222) did a study involving 122 foremen
in an industrial organization. These men attended a leadership train-
ing session aimed at making the foremen more "human relations oriented"
or sensitive toward the workmen under them. When attitude scales were
administered immediately before and immediately after the training
there was an increase in consideration and sensitivity on the part of
the participant. This training, however, did not produce any kind of
lasting change in the foremen's leader behavior. Evaluation of the
training taken back on the job yielded different results than the first
post-test did. Many of the foremen showed less sensitivity toward the
workmen back in the actual work situations than they did when they took
the pre-test. Fleishman concluded that further study was necessary to
determine a way to make the effects of leadership training more lasting.

Testing simply an individual's change in awareness of self-concept, Butler and Haigh (1954, pp. 55-57) found that an individual's self-concept and concept of ideal self became more congruent after human relations training. Omwake (1952, pp. 47, 624-625) discovered that as an individual's acceptance of himself changes, so does his acceptance of others.

The City College of New York offered a continuous three-day T-group program to its students in 1964. The objectives of the training sessions were to help participants to gain an understanding of both their own and others' behavior. Based upon the participants' responses to the post-training, reaction from 99 percent of the students reported they had gained new insights in this area (Gassner, Gold, and Snadowsky, 1964, pp. 33-43).

Mr. Robert T. Davis, president of the National Leadership Institute, insists that his institution is "simply attempting to prove that leadership is a trainable thing. . . . We are trying to fight depersonalization in our society." He added that:

> . . . . everything is being taught in schools except how to
> live with other people. . . . If enough students could
> receive this type of training and pass it along to others,
> the terrific crisis on college campuses today would disap-
> pear. (Delong, 1968, pp. 6-9)

In 1968 the Ohio Society of Professional Engineers hired a team from the National Leadership Institute to conduct a two-day leadership laboratory with 67 college students and 17 professors attending. A secluded woodland lodge was rented for the occasion (Davis and Rothaus, 1969). Comments from participants concerning the leadership lab ranged from excellent to poor.

One girl said, 'I liked it. I got to meet people.' A
civil engineer wearing scuffed boots complained, 'I prefer
lectures and problem-solving methods practice.'
   One boy, president of his 1700-person dormitory, was a
little disgusted. 'Those who should be here aren't.' This
student admitted he had 'behaved outrageously' just to see
if the group would stop him. They didn't and he was disap-
pointed. 'Yeah, I like it fine,' he said, 'but I'm not sure
I'm learning anything.'
   A civil engineer who sees himself as a 'sort of retiring
person,' said, 'It's helpful.' In a burst of enthusiasm, he
added, 'It has Dale Carnegie beat all to heck.'
   A sophomore girl from Kent State was ecstatic, if vague:
'I feel my life has grown tremendously from this experience.'
One fellow said, 'Recently I'd lost interest in leadership
but this lab has me really psyched to become a leader. All
I have to do is find something worthwhile to lead.' (Davis and
Rothaus, 1969, p. 9)

Some contend that sensitivity training is not what it has been

sold to be. Joseph T. English, M. D., writes:

   Today we are witnessing a proliferation of sensitivity
training programs aimed at persons in educational, industrial,
and community settings. Variations of sensitivity training
programs have been established that purport to train community
development leaders, promote international relations, secure
labor-management harmony, increase marital happiness, and
resolve other thorny problems via the T-group method of
enhancing interpersonal communications. That so much has
been promised by sensitivity training and as little delivered
by means of evaluation and research findings suggests that
psychiatrists should be increasingly aware and distressed
about these programs. . . . Sensitivity training appears to
have been so effectively oversold to an unaware public that
it is not uncommon for teachers, business representatives,
high government officials, and others to be required, as a
function of their jobs, to participate in these sessions.
As a consequence, these participants involuntarily and unknow-
ingly may be subjected to personal onslaught in a pseudo-
psychotherapeutic situation characterized by inappropriate
transferences and unrelenting group social pressures to
'reveal themselves,' while unprotected by the ethical safe-
guards which are inherent in a professional therapeutic
encounter. For some participants the results have been
traumatic indeed. (English, 1969, pp. 874-875)

Several authors (Laing and Munger, 1959, pp. 80, 231-234), and

Gragg (1953) view leadership training as simply a method of wasting

time. Some critics have accused the movement as being a style of

communist brainwashing or a perversion of group therapy that makes

healthy minds sick. (Time, November 9, 1970, p. 54).

The American Psychiatric Association in a 27-page task force

report concluded that "the intensive group experience is intrinsically

neither good or bad." (American Psychiatric Association, 1970) It went

on to point out that the effect of group experience on behavior can be

determined by systematic research and it is time that this research be

carried out.

It seems to be too soon to evaluate the value of sensitivity

training. Many new studies must be made and replicated before any

judgment can be made. There is little question, however, that the

ability to lead, to be an effective group member, and to be sensitive

to other humans are learned characteristics. Whether these character-

istics are learned best when left to chance or when taught through

training programs is yet to be decided. The literature simply shows

that no conclusions about the positive or negative effects of sensitiv-

ity training can be drawn from the studies in this area.

Summary of Related Literature

In this chapter the author covered some of the available litera-

ture related to leadership, group training. It related different

theories within each of the areas of study. It was noted leadership

has been studied for centuries but no one theory has been proven

experimentally to hold true for all group processes. It was also noted

that evaluation of group training methods is sparse, yet necessary. It

would seem, then, that those involved in group training laboratories

should benefit from an investigation into the behavioral change of student leaders resulting from a leadership workshop.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of a leadership workshop on a given group of student leaders. The experimental group of leaders was compared to a control group of leaders on the dimension of leader sensitivity. The control group also attended a retreat. No leadership training was given at the control retreat. The comparison measure to evaluate the effect of the experimental treatment was a 40-item questionnaire completed by 15 randomly selected residents on the floor of each student leader. This questionnaire was completed both one month and two months after the leadership retreats. Thus leader behavior was observed in terms of each leader's sensitivity toward other group members as perceived and evaluated by the group members.

Subjects

From a total population of 46 floor presidents residing in two all male residence halls and two all female residence halls, volunteers were asked to attend one of two leadership workshops being conducted in February of the 1970-71 school year. From the 35 volunteers, 30 were randomly selected to attend the retreats. From the 30 presidents

selected for the study, 15 were randomly assigned to the control group and 15 were randomly assigned to the experimental group.

The male and female halls are a pattern of four high-rise residence halls. Two of the halls house women and two house men. Each floor has a president elected by the sixty-three student residents. The first floors in each hall house twelve graduate students with no floor president.

All subjects were told that they were being used to test the effectiveness of two different types of leadership training. None of the members in either group knew that they were in either a control or experimental group.

Subjects were chosen only from those volunteering to attend the workshop. It was felt that a more significant change in behavior would occur within those leaders who volunteered to attend rather than those who might be forced to attend.

After the 15 presidents for the experimental group and the 15 presidents for the control group had been selected, 15 floor residents were randomly selected from each of the floors. Both one month and two months after the workshops all 450 residents completed a 40-item questionnaire evaluating their president's leader sensitivity. This questionnaire was first completed one month after the training retreat. The questionnaire was re-administered after a two-month interval to determine if the leader sensitivity pattern persisted.

Workshop Instructors

Each workshop had two instructors. The two instructors conducting the control group workshop were graduate students who had no training

or experience in conducting leadership workshops. They were instructed
not to teach or structure any part of the weekend, but to be available
in case of an emergency.

The two instructors of the experimental group were both counselors
in the Oklahoma State University counseling center. They both had
previous training in conducting leadership workshops and had conducted
more than 20 workshops in each of the two previous academic years. The
researcher explained to the two instructors exactly what was to be
taught, and the two men cooperatively drew up a curriculum aimed at
teaching leader sensitivity.

Treatment

The experimental workshop was conducted at a secluded woodland
lodge owned by the university. The fifteen presidents began their
workshop at 4:00 p.m. Friday, February 19, 1971. For the next 24 hours
the instructors attempted to teach leader sensitivity to the partici-
pants by use of games, lectures and discussions. (See Appendix E.) All
training was focused around the topic "leader sensitivity." All meals
were catered during this 24-hour period as well as any other needed
supplies. None of the participants left the lodge nor had any contact
with anyone outside the workshop other than the man who delivered the
meals. He was instructed not to communicate or interact in any way
with the participants.

The fifteen presidents in the control group attended their retreat
at the same time as the experimental group but at a different location.
At this retreat no aspects of leader behavior or leader sensitivity
were discussed. If at any time the control group began discussing any

aspect of leader behavior or leader sensitivity the staff member did not stop the discussion, but did not instruct the group in this area. The control group was sent to a retreat to compensate for the "Hawthorne effect" that might have otherwise affected the evaluation.

Evaluation Instrument

The evaluation instrument was drawn up from five different instruments used in previous studies evaluating different aspects of leader behavior. The five instruments were those used by Fiedler (1958), Stodgill (1957), Pope (1970), Browne (1958), and Petrullo (1961).

The first preliminary form contained a total of 100 items (Appendix A). In order to improve the validity and shorten the form, it was administered to 10 professional student personnel workers on the Oklahome State University campus, five men and five women. These ten judges were not part of single student housing. These judges did not have knowledge of the floor president's exact position in a residence hall, but they did have sufficient knowledge of leader sensitivity to assist in the evaluation of this preliminary form. They were asked to:

> Please list these items in the order of which they most pertain to leader sensitivity. The item that is the best indicator of leader sensitivity should be #1 and the item that is the poorest indicator of leader sensitivity should be #100. (Appendix A)

Upon receipt of these 10 preliminary forms, a mean score of each item was tabulated. The top 50 items were retained to be used in the second form (Appendix B).

Ten single student housing administrators were then given the 50-item questionnaire. The cover sheet to their questionnaire read as follows.

In this study <u>leader sensitivity</u> is defined as, 'Any
behavior on the part of the leader of a group that displays
an awareness of and responsibility to the individual and
group needs, as well as confidence in the integrity and
growth of the group.'

Please list these items in the order of which they most
pertain to leader sensitivity. The item that is the best
indicator of leader sensitivity should be #1 and the item
that is the poorest indicator of leader sensitivity should
be #50.

It was the belief that due to the housing administrators' knowl-

edge of and experience in working with residence hall floor presidents,

they would be of great assistance in evaluating the second form.

Upon receipt of the 10 second forms, a mean score of each item was

tabulated. The top 40 items were retained to be used as the final

instrument (Appendix C).

The 40-item questionnaire was then drawn up with five possible

responses to each item: (AL)- if your floor president <u>always</u> displays

this behavior; (SO)- if your floor president <u>sometimes</u> displays this

behavior; (DN)- if you <u>do not know</u> of your floor president's behavior

in this area; (RA)- if your floor president <u>rarely</u> displays this behav-

ior; (NE)- if your floor president <u>never</u> displays this behavior.

(Appendix C) This allowed for a 5-point scale ranging from "always

displays" 5 points to "never displays" 1 point. If an item was not

answered it was scored as 3 points or "do not know." The final instru-

ment contained two negative items which were scored the reverse of the

other 38 items; 1 point for always and 5 points for never.

As mentioned above two preliminary instruments were used in

achieving validity. The first form of 100 items was shortened to 50.

In the second form 50 items was shortened to 40 items. This 40-item

form then became the final evaluation instrument. All responses were

made on a five-point scale ranging from "always displays" to "never displays." This instrument was then given to each of the 450 randomly selected residents.

Instrument Reliability

In an effort to determine the reliability of the instrument it was administered to a total of 72 residents of floor presidents who had not volunteered to attend the retreat. Forty-two were male residents and 30 were female residents. This test was administered to these 72 residents on the same date it was first given to the 450 residents taking part in the study. Using a test-retest situation the same instrument was then administered to the same 72 residents three weeks after they responded to the first administration of the questionnaire. After receiving both the test and retest scores, the results of the two tests were statistically analyzed through the use of the Pearson Product moment correlation procedure. The basic formula used was:

$$r = \frac{\sum XY - \frac{(\sum X)(\sum Y)}{n}}{\sqrt{\left[\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}\right]\left[\sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{n}\right]}}$$

The application of the above formula to the data (Appendix D) obtained from the test-retest situation resulted in a reliability coefficient of +.88.

Statistical Treatment

The questionnaires were completed by the 15 floor residents of each of the 30 retreat participants. (See Appendixes F and G.) A

completely randomized design analysis of variance was used to determine
whether or not a significant difference existed between the treatment
group and the control group. (See Appendixes I and J.)

The independent variables were treatment (leadership training) and
no treatment. The dependent variables were the questionnaire responses
one month and two months after the treatment. The significance level
for this study was established at .05. This same procedure was used
one month and two months after the workshop to determine whether or not
a significant difference existed.

Summary

In this chapter the author viewed the design and methodology used
in the planning, administration, and evaluation of this study. Mention
was made of the random selection and assignment of subjects, the random
selection of the floor residents, the construction of the instrument,
the test-retest reliability of +.88, and the inter-judge validity of
the instrument, and the statistical treatment used in analyzing the
data.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Using the statistical procedures outlined in Chapter III, calculations were made to determine whether or not a significant difference was present between the control group and the experimental group. The analysis of variance was run on data gathered both one month and two months after the retrest.

The hypothesis of this study stated: There is no significant difference between the leader sensitivity of student leaders who received leadership training and student leaders who received no leadership training. On the basis of the analysis of variance completed (Appendixes I and J) this hypothesis was accepted. The data resulting from the analysis of variance showed no significant difference at the .05 level. These data are given in Table I and Table II.

In summary, the statistical analyses conducted to test the hypothesis resulted in no significant difference. There was no significant difference both one month and two months after the retreat.

On the basis of the data obtained and the analyses completed, the stated null hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON TEST ONE

(One month after the retreats)

Source	Sum of Squares	dF	Mean Squares	F	P
Total	4275.47	29	-		
Between	89.20	- 1	89.20	.5966*	N.S.
Within	4186.27	28	149.51		

*4.20 needed for significance at the .05 level.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON TEST TWO

(Two months after the retreats)

Source	Sum of Squares	dF	Mean Squares	F	P
Total	5018.77	29	-		
Between	23.80	- 1	23.80	.1334*	N.S.
Within	4994.97	28	178.39		

*4.20 needed for significance at the .05 level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study tested the change in leader sensitivity of male and
female dormitory floor presidents after they attended a leadership
retreat. The dormitory floor presidents were randomly selected and
then randomly assigned to either an experimental or control condition.
A forty-item questionnaire was used, asking fifteen randomly selected
students from each floor to indicate how they felt each item applied to
their floor president. Thirty male and female floor presidents and 450
male and female residence hall occupants participated in the study, as
well as two trained leadership workshop coordinators, and two graduate
students who volunteered to supervise the control group during their
retreat.

The remainder of this chapter will summarize the findings of the
study and offer conclusions based on the results of the study. Recom-
mendations for future study and research will also be included in this
chapter.

Summary

The participants in this study were thirty male and female dormi-
tory floor presidents. They represented 35 volunteer floor presidents
residing in two men's and two women's dormitories at a midwestern state
university with an enrollment of approximately 18,000 students. Thirty

floor presidents were randomly selected from the 35 presidents who volunteered to attend either of the workshops. Fifteen of these student leaders were randomly assigned to an experimental retreat and fifteen to a control retreat.

The evaluation instrument was designed by the researcher, by drawing from five different instruments used in previous studies evaluating different aspects of leader behavior. The five instruments were those used by Fiedler (1958), Stodgill (1957), Pope (1970), Browne (1958), and Petrullo (1961). It was made up of 40 items which had been validated to describe leader sensitivity. Four hundred and fifty randomly selected residents (15 for each workshop participant) responded to each statement on a 5-point scale which ranged from "always" displays a certain type behavior to "never" displays a certain type behavior. This evaluation was completed both one month after the leadership workshop and two months after the leadership workshop. (See Appendixes F and G.)

Statistical calculations were completed through the use of the analysis of variance procedure with a completely randomized design. (See Appendixes I and J.) The significance level for this study was established at .05.

Conclusions

It was the purpose of this study to determine whether or not there is a significant difference in the leader-sensitivity of student leaders who received leadership training and those student leaders who received no leadership training. Based upon the results of this study the following result can be named.

There is no significant difference between the leader sensi-

tivity of student leaders who received leadership training

and student leaders who received no leadership training.

It should be cautioned that the conclusion mentioned above is based

upon a limited study of 30 floor presidents. Any inferences or gener-

alizations of the results of this study cannot go beyond the population

of the 35 volunteer floor presidents from which the 30 participants

were selected.

Recommendations

This study of group leadership training found no significant

difference in the leader behavior of student leaders, evaluated one

month and two months after the retreat. On the basis of these results

certain recommendations need to be made to the institution involved in

the research.

1. Efforts should be made to study and evaluate the current

    leadership training program.

2. Student participants should be cautioned that the effec-

    tiveness of group training in changing behavior has not

    been proven, and the results of this type of training can

    only be speculated.

Future research in the area of leader behavior and leader sensi-

tivity seems likely. The results of this study suggest the following

future research.

1. This study, or similar studies, should be replicated both

    at this institution and other institutions. This replica-

    tion would strengthen the instrument, the study, and

support or fail to support the present findings.

2. Experimental studies are needed to replace the current melea of descriptive, attitudinal scales which tell nothing of behavioral change but only of one's disposition or impressions.

3. Experimental research is necessary to identify and eliminate the meaningless group endeavors, and support the meaningful approaches in group work.

In summary, research in all areas of group training seems to be making little headway. Although different types of group training have been with us for over 15 years, very little has been attempted to prove their effectiveness at behavioral change. Meaningful research should be started immediately by all institutions that are using or planning to use group training as a method of changing leader behavior. This research should be continuous in order to offer to all students valid training methods rather than unproven fads.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerson, L.

1942   Children's Behavior Problem: Relative Importance and
        Intercorrelation Among Traits. Chicago: University of
        Chicago Press, 1942.

Adams, Arthur S.

1955   "Housing Officers Are Educators and Should Never Forget It."
        College and University Business, Vol. 19 (July), 26-27.

Adams, Velma (ed.)

1968   "People, Places, and Things." College Management, Vol. 3
        (January), 8.

American Psychiatric Association

1969   "Groups." The American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 126,
        No. 6 (December).

1970   Encounter Groups and Psychiatry, Task Force Report. April,
        pp. 12-17.

Argyris, C.

1967   "On the Future of Laboratory Education." J. Appl. Aehov.
        Sci., Vol. 3, pp. 153-183.

Asch, S. E.

1952   Social Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

Baldwin, L. E.

1932   "A Study of Factors Usually Associated With High School
        Leadership." (Unpublished Master's thesis, Ohio State
        University).

Barnard, C. E.

1938   The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard.

Bass, B. M.

 1967   Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior. New
         York: Harper.

Bellingrath, G. C.

 1930   "Qualities Associated With Leadership in Extra-Curricular
         Activities of the High School." Teach. Coll. Contr. Educ.,
         No. 399.

Binet, A.

 1900   La Suggestibilite. Paris: Libraire C. Reinwald, Schneicher
         Freres Editeurs.

Bradford, L. P., J. R. Gibb, and K. D. Benne, eds.

 1964   T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method: An Innovation in
         Re-education. New York: Wiley.

Browne, C. G.

 1958   The Study of Leadership. Danville, Illinois, pp. 166,
         218-220.

Bruner, J. S.

 1950   "Social Psychology and Group Process." Annual Review of
         Psychology, Vol. I. Edited by C. P. Stone and D. W. Taylor.
         Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Burke, R., and W. Dennis

 1961   "Changes in Perception of Self and Others During Human
         Relations Training." Human Relations, II, 165-182.

Butler, J. M., and G. V. Haigh

 1954   "Changes in the Relation Between Self-Concepts and Ideal
         Concepts Consequent Upon Client-Centered Counselling."
         Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Edited by C. Rogers
         and R. Dymond. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Buttgereit, H.

 1932   "Fuhrergestalten in der Schulklass." Z. Angew Psychology,
         Vol. 43, 369-413.

Caldwell, O. W., and B. Wellman

 1926   "Characteristics of School Leadership." Journal of Educa-
         tional Research, Vol. 14, 1-15.

Campbell, Donald T.
   1956   "Leadership: Definition and Criterion." Leadership and Its
            Effects Upon the Group. Columbus: Ohio State University,
            p. 1.

Cartwright, D., and A. Zarden (eds.)

   1953   Group Dynamics. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson.

Cattell, R. B.

   1957a   "A Mathematical Model for Leadership Role and Other
            Personality-Role Relations." Emerging Problems in Social
            Psychology. Edited by M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson. Norman,
            Okla.: Oklahoma University.

   1957b   Personality and Motivational Structure and Measurement.
            Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co.

Cowley, W. H.

   1928   "Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders." Journal of
            Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 23, pp. 144-157.

Davis, Robert T., and Paul Rothaus.

   1969   The Art of Leadership in Education. National Leadership
            Methods, November, p. II.

Delong, Richard B.

   1968   "Leadership Is a Learnable Thing." News in Engineering,
            November, pp. 6-9.

Drewyor, Art

   1970   "Hillsdale College Trains 100 in Leadership." The Blade,
            June 9, Second News Section, p. 1.

Eichler, G. A.

   1934   "Studies in Student Leadership." Penn. St. Coll. Student
            Education, No. 10.

English, Joseph T.

   1969   "Sensitivity Training: Promise and Performance." The
            American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 126, No. 6 (December),
            pp. 874-875.

Fiedler, Fred E.

   1958   Leader Attitudes and Group Effectiveness. Urbana: Univer-
            sity of Illinois Press, pp. 47-64.

Finch, F. H., and H. A. Carroll

1932   "Gifted Children as High School Leaders." _Journal of_
         Genetic Psychology, vol. 41, pp. 476-481.

Fleishman, E. A.

1953   "Leadership Climate, Human Relations Training, and Supervi-
         sory Behavior." _Personnel Psychology_, vol. 6, pp. 205-222.

Gage, N. L., and R. V. Exline

1953   "Social Perception and Effectiveness in Discussion Groups."
         Human Relations, vol. 6, pp. 381-396.

Garrison, K. C.

1935   "A Study of Some Factors Related to Leadership in High
         School." _Peabody Journal of Education_, vol. 11, pp. 11-17.

Gassner, S., J. Gold, and A. Snadowsky

1964   "Changes in the Phenomenal Field as a Result of Human Rela-
         tions Training." _Journal of Psychology_, vol. 58, pp. 33-41.

Gibb, C. A.

1954   "Leadership." _Handbook of Social Psychology_. Edited by
         Lindsey. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Glanz, Edward C., and Robert W. Hayes

1967   _Groups in Guidance_. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Goodenough, F. L.

1930   "Inter-relationships in the Behavior of Young Children."
         Child Development, vol. 1, pp. 29-48.

Gowin, E. B.

1915   _The Executive and His Control of Men_. New York: MacMillan.

Gragg, Charles L.

1953   "Because Wisdom Can't Be Told." _The Case Method of Teaching_
         Human Relations and Administration. Edited by K. R.
         Andrews. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Halpin, Andrew W.

1956   "The Behavior of Leaders." _Educational Leadership_, XIV
         (December).

1959   The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. 2nd ed.
          Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of
          Chicago.

Heider, G.

1958   The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York:
          Wiley.

Hemphill, J.

1958   "Administration as Problem Solving." Administrative Theory
          in Education. Edited by A. W. Halpin. Danville, Ill.:
          Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Hunter, E. C., and A. M. Jordon

1939   "An Analysis of Qualities Associated With Leadership Among
          College Students." Journal of Educational Psychology,
          vol. 30, pp. 497-509.

Jennings, Eugene E.

1960   "Princes, Heroes, and Supermen." An Anatomy of Leadership.
          New York: Harper and Brothers.

Jennings, H. H.

1953   Leadership and Isolation. New York: Ongmans Green.

Kemp, C. Gratton

1964a   "Bases of Group Leadership." Personnel and Guidance
          Journal, XLI.

1964b   Perspectives on the Group Process--A Foundation for Counsel-
          ing With Groups. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Laing, J. M., and P. F. Munger

1959   "Group Process Conceptions." Education, vol. 80, pp. 231-
          234.

"Leadership Among High School Pupils"

1933   Teachers Coll. Contr. Educ., no. 559.

Miles, Matthew B.

1964   "Innovation in Education: Some Generalizations." Innova-
          tion in Education. Edited by Matthew B. Miles. New York,
          N. Y.: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia
          University, p. 657.

Moore, B. V.

1927   "The May Conference on Leadership." Personnel Journal, vol. 6, pp. 124-128.

Moreno, Jacob L.

1934   Who Shall Survive? A New Approach to the Problems of Human Interrelations. Washington, D. C.: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co.

National Training Laboratories

1961   National Training Laboratories Selected Reading Series. Vol. 2: Leadership in Action. Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories and National Education Association, pp. 1-2.

Newsletter, W. I., M. J. Feldstein, and T. M. Newcomb

1938   Group Adjustment: A Study in Experimental Sociology. Cleveland: Western Reserve University.

Nutting, R. O.

1923   "Some Characteristics of Leadership." School and Society, vol. 18, pp. 387-390.

Omwake, K.

1954   "The Relation Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories." Journal of Consulting Psychology, vol. 18, pp. 443-446.

Page, D. D.

1935   "Measurement and Prediction of Leadership." American Journal of Sociology, vol. 41, pp. 31-43.

Parten, M. B.

1933   "Leadership Among Preschool Children." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 27, pp. 430-440.

Partridge, E. D.

1934   "Leadership Among Adolescent Boys!" Teach. Coll. Contr. Educ., No. 608.

Pervin, Laurence A.

1967   "The College as a Social System." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 38 (June), pp. 317-322.

Petrullo, Luigi and Bernard B. Bass

1961   Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt,
        Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., pp. 290-291.

Pope, Haslon Don.

1970   The Perceived Role of the University Residence Hall Student
        Assistant. Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University,
        1970, pp. 126-128.

Remmelen, M. K.

1938   "Analysis of Leaders Among High School Seniors." Journal of
        Experimental Education, vol. 6, pp. 413-422.

Reynolds, F. J.

1944   "Factors of Leadership Among Seniors of Central High School,
        Tulsa, Oklahoma." Journal of Educational Research, vol. 37,
        pp. 356-361.

Rogers, Carl R.

1968   "The Process of the Basic Encounter Group." La Jolla,
        California: Western Behavioral Sciences Institute.

Runyon, Richard P., and Audrey Haber

1967   Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Addison-Wesley
        Series in Psychology, p. 85.

Sanford, F. H.

1950   Authoritarianism and Leadership. Philadelphia, Pa.: Insti-
        tute for Research in Human Relations.

1953   "Research on Military Leadership." Current Trends, Psychol-
        ogy in the World Emergency. Pittsburgh: University of
        Pittsburgh.

1962   "Research and Policy in Higher Education." The American
        College. Edited by Nioitt Sanford. New York: John Wiley
        and Sons, Inc., p. 1025.

Sheldon, W. H.

1927   "Social Traits and Morphologic Type." Personnel Journal,
        vol. 6, pp. 47-55.

Stodgill, Ralph M.

   1948   "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership: A Survey of
            Literature." The Journal of Psychology, vol. 25, pp. 35-71.

Stodgill, Ralph M., and A. E. Coons

   1957   Leader Behavior. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau
            of Business Research, Monogr. No. 88, pp. 153-156.

Stouffer, S. A., et al.

   1949   The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life. Vol. I.
            Princeton, N. J.:

APPENDIX A

FIRST PRELIMINARY INSTRUMENT

In this study leader sensitivity is defined as, "any
behavior on the part of the leader of a group that displays
an awareness of and responsibility to the individual and
group needs, as well as confidence in the integrity and
growth of the group."

Please list these items in the order of which they
most pertain to leader sensitivity. The item that is the
best indicator of leader sensitivity should be #1 and the
item that is the poorest indicator of leader sensitivity
should be #100.

Thank you for your understanding, cooperation, and
assistance.

> Floyd Hoelting
> Willham Complex
> Ext. 6264 or 6265

LEADER SENSITIVITY TO OTHERS

1. Regularly seeks out residents' needs and complaints in an effort to improve conditions on floor.

2. Whenever possible uses experience, knowledge, and needs of residents in making decisions on the floor.

3. Attitude is supportive, friendly, and helpful, rather than hostile.

4. Is kind but firm.

5. Is genuinely interested in the well being of residents.

6. Endeavors to treat people in a sensitive, considerate way.

7. Is just if not generous.

8. Has confidence in integrity and motivation of residents rather than being suspicious and distrustful.

Neg. 9. Is selfish and conceited.

10. Compliments residents on their work in front of others.

11. Helps aid residents with personal problems.

12. Notices conflicts when they occur in the group.

13. Gives personal attention to residents who need it.

14. Follows residents' suggestions (whenever possible).

15. Protects the personal welfare of individual residents.

16. Promotes a friendly atmosphere during floor meetings.

17. Makes sure residents are informed.

18. Does not expect too much from residents.

19. Works with residents on floor projects.

20. Guards the floor against criticism.

21. Criticises with explanation.

22. Prefers to be called by his or her first name.

23. Gathers the floor together to talk things over.

24. Promotes the importance of floor to the public.

25. Keeps up to date about the progress of the floor.

26. Gives praise where praise is due.

Neg. 27. Keeps to himself or herself with no regard for others.

28. Establishes means for residents to communicate with each other.

29. Encourages teamwork on the part of the residents.

Neg. 30. Expects more than residents can put out.

31. Compromises on points where opinion differences occur.

32. Is on first names basis with the residents on the floor.

Neg. 33. Acts without notifying the floor.

Neg. 34. Is an iron handed ruler.

35. Seeks feedback from residents on the floor.

36. Tries to make it pleasant to be a member of the floor.

37. Speaks in a manner that is easily understood.

Neg. 38. Disciplines a resident in front of other residents.

Neg. 39. Will not cooperate with the residents unless things are done his way.

40. Listens as well as speaks during discussions.

41. Has time for other residents.

42. Encourages that everyone's point of view be understood.

43. Invites residents to express their ideas and opinions.

Neg. 44. Treats floor residents as cogs in a machine.

Neg. 45. Puts the welfare of the floor above the welfare of the residents on the floor.

46. Goes along with suggestions from the residents.

47. Plays down rumors when they occur.

48. Allows residents to do things in the manner they think best.

49. Harps on mistakes individual residents have made.

50. Explains decisions and actions to the floor.

Neg. 51. Moves ahead without consulting the residents.

52. Changes stand when placed in a tight situation.

Neg. 53. Holds the same individual responsibilities when things go wrong.

54. Treats all students alike.

55. Supports residents in their actions.

56. Takes time to find out the progress of each student.

Neg. 57. Is not interested in what students do when they are not on the floor.

58. Tries to work floor ideas into operation.

59. Considers resident feelings in establishing floor procedures.

60. Establishes opportunity for the interaction of attitudes and beliefs between all residents of the floor.

61. Works toward effective floor projects by making sure residents are organized and focused.

62. Helps residents to grow by insuring their freedom to participate in floor decisions.

63. Creates a good floor team which is friendly and cooperative.

64. Seems to build high group loyalty through using participation and other recognized methods of leadership.

65. Is responsible for the floor setting specific goals and checks its progress toward these goals regularly.

66. Utilizes the talents of all residents in order to insure success of floor projects.

Neg. 67. Is selfish and conceited, worries more about himself than other residents.

68. Is generous and not hoggish and shares in the proper way.

Neg. 69. Is afraid he or she does more than their share of the work.

70. Relies fully on the information and experience made available to him or her by his or her superiors.

71. Explains policies of Single Student Housing in such a way that residents of the floor are motivated to carry out the policies.

72. Maintains efficient communication of all relevant information concerning various levels of the University.

73. Clearly outlines floor's functions and objectives in an effort to promote participation.

74. Displays confidence in his or her ability to perform his or her job.

75. Is open minded to suggestions and criticisms of residents on floor as well as superiors.

76. Clearly defines problems and brings them into sharp focus.

77. Expects residents' performance level to be sufficiently high enough to stretch them and help them grow, but not so high as to break them.

78. Voluntarily gives suggestions and coaching to residents whose performance is below standard.

79. Is supportive rather than punitive when mistakes are made.

80. Has adequate competence, particularly in those situations where the duties are not standardized.

81. Makes sure democracy is practical whenever a part of or the total floor is deciding something.

82. Is willing to risk the loss of popularity or support of others by taking a firm stand to discipline someone on the floor.

Neg. 83. Uses his leadership ability to take advantage of others.

84. Displays impartiality in dealing with the residents.

85. Accepts responsibility enthusiastically.

86. Is honest and plays square with everyone.

87. Is good natured and does not look for trouble.

88. Helps others to understand themselves.

89. Shows an interest in the grades of the residents.

90. Is worthy of the trust of the residents.

91. Solves problems related to the physical comforts of the residents.

92. Keeps all of the residents' personal problems confidential.

93. Aids the residents to know and understand the rules, policies, and traditions of the residence hall.

94. Feels that his or her first responsibility is to the residents.

95. Becomes involved whenever a resident has a problem.

96. Respects the personal opinions of the residents.

97. Participates in all of the activities of the residence hall and their floor.

98. Criticises his or her own poor decisions.

99. Refers residents to others only after he has attempted to help them.

100. Seeks out residents who seem to have problems.

APPENDIX B

SECOND PRELIMINARY INSTRUMENT

In this study, <u>leader</u> <u>sensitivity</u> is defined as, "any behavior on the part of the leader of a group that displays an awareness of and responsibility to the individual and group needs of the floor residents; and holds confidence in the integrity and growth of the group."

Please list these items in the order of which they most pertain to leader sensitivity. The item that is the best indicator of leader sensitivity should be #1 and the item that is the poorest indicator of leader sensitivity should be #50.

Thank you for your understanding, cooperation, and assistance.

Floyd Hoelting
Willham Complex
Ext. 6264 or 6265

LEADER SENSITIVITY TO OTHERS

1. Respects the personal opinions of the residents.

2. Endeavors to treat people in a sensitive, considerate way.

3. Is genuinely interested in the well being of residents.

4. Attitude is supportive, friendly, and helpful, rather than hostile.

5. Listens as well as speaks during discussions.

6. Is open minded to suggestions and criticisms of residents on floor as well as superiors.

7. Is supportive rather than punitive when mistakes are made.

8. Keeps all of the residents' personal problems confidential.

9. Regularly seeks out residents' needs and complaints in an effort to improve conditions on floor.

10. Seeks feedback from residents on the floor.

11. Helps aid residents with personal problems.

12. Is worthy of the trust of the residents.

13. Gives personal attention to residents who need it.

14. Invites residents to express their ideas and opinions.

15. Feels that his or her first responsibility is to the residents.

16. Has confidence in integrity and motivation of residents rather than being suspicious and distrustful.

17. Considers residents' feelings in establishing floor procedures.

18. Helps others to understand themselves.

19. Takes time to find out the progress of each student.

20. Becomes involved whenever a resident has a problem.

21. Seeks out residents who seem to have problems.

22. Explains decisions and actions to the floor.

23. Whenever possible uses experience, Knowledge, and needs of residents in making decisions on the floor.

24. Displays impartiality in dealing with the residents.

25. Encourages that everyone's point of view be understood.

26. Is honest and plays square with everyone.

Neg. 27. Is selfish and conceited.

28. Clearly outlines floor's functions and objectives in an effort to promote participation.

Neg. 29. Will not cooperate with the residents unless things are done his way.

30. Gathers the floor together to talk things over.

31. Helps residents to grow by insuring their freedom to participate in floor decisions.

32. Establishes means for residents to communicate with each other.

33. Follows residents' suggestions (whenever possible).

34. Makes sure residents are informed.

35. Displays confidence in his or her ability to perform his or her job.

36. Notices conflicts when they occur in the group.

37. Shows an interest in the grades of the residents.

38. Encourages teamwork on the part of the residents.

39. Establishes opportunity for the interaction of attitudes and beliefs between all residents of the floor.

40. Creates a good floor team which is friendly and cooperative.

41. Compromises on points where opinion differences occur.

42. Has time for other residents.

43. Protects the personal welfare of individual residents.

44. Clearly defines problems and brings them into sharp focus.

45. Is responsible for the floor setting specific goals and checks its progress toward these goals regularly.

46. Gives praise where praise is due.

Neg. 47. Puts the welfare of the floor above the welfare of the residents on the floor.

48. Solves problems related to the physical comforts of the residents.

Neg. 49. Harps on mistakes individual residents have made.

50. Maintains efficient communication of all relevant information concerning various levels of the University.

APPENDIX C

FINAL INSTRUMENT

FLOOR PRESIDENT'S LEADER SENSITIVITY

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to test the leader behavior of your floor president. You are requested to respond to each of the statements on the attached sheets by circling one of the five possible answers. Your responses should indicate how you feel each statement applies to your floor president.

This information is completely confidential and will in no way, effect or reflect upon your floor president. CIRCLE

        AL - if your floor president always displays this behavior;
        SO - if your floor president sometimes displays this behavior;
        DN - if you do not know of your floor president's behavior in this
             area;
        RA - if your floor president rarely displays this behavior;
        NE - if your floor president never displays this behavior.

1. Respects the personal opinions of the residents.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

2. Endeavors to treat people in a sensitive, considerate way.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

3. Is genuinely interested in the well being of residents.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

4. Attitude is supportive, friendly, and helpful, rather than
   hostile.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

5. Listens as well as speaks during discussions.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

6. Is open minded to suggestions and criticisms of residents on
   floor as well as superiors.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

7. Is supportive rather than punitive when mistakes are made.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

8. Keeps all of the residents' personal problems confidential.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

9. Regularly seeks out residents' needs and complaints in an
   effort to improve conditions on floor.
   AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

10. Seeks feedback from residents on the floor.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

11. Helps aid residents with personal problems.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

12. Is worthy of the trust of the residents.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

13. Gives personal attention to residents who need it.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

14. Invites residents to express their ideas and opinions.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

15. Feels that his or her first responsibility is to the residents.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

16. Has confidence in integrity and motivation of residents rather than being suspicious and distrustful.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

17. Considers residents' feelings in establishing floor procedures.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

18. Helps others understand themselves.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

19. Takes time to find out the progress of each student.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

20. Becomes involved whenever a resident has a problem.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

21. Seeks out residents who seem to have problems.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

22. Explains decisions and actions to the floor.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

23. Whenever possible uses experience, knowledge, and needs of residents in making decisions on the floor.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

24. Displays impartiality in dealing with the residents.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

25. Encourages that everyone's point of view be understood.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

26. Is honest and plays square with everyone.
    AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

Neg. 27. Is selfish and conceited.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

28. Clearly outlines floor's functions and objectives in an effort to promote participation.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

Neg. 29. Will not cooperate with the residents unless things are done his way.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

30. Helps residents to grow by insuring their freedom to participate in floor decisions.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

31. Establishes means for residents to communicate with each other.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

32. Makes sure residents are informed.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

33. Encourages teamwork on the part of the residents.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

34. Establishes opportunity for the interaction of attitudes and beliefs between all residents of the floor.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

35. Creates a good floor team which is friendly and cooperative.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

36. Has time for other residents.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

37. Protects the personal welfare of individual residents.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

38. Clearly defines problems and brings them into sharp focus.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

39. Gives praise where praise is due.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

40. Solves problems related to the physical comforts of the residents.
AL - SO - DN - RA - NE

APPENDIX D

TEST - RETEST RELIABILITY COMPUTATIONS

TEST-RETEST

FORMULA USED:
$$r = \frac{\sum XY - \frac{(\sum X)(\sum Y)}{N}}{\sqrt{\left[\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}\right]\left[\sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{N}\right]}}$$

Where: r = Pearson r (product moment correlation coefficient)

$\sum XY$ = Summation of the cross-products

$(\sum X)(\sum Y)$ = Summation X times summation Y

$\sum X^2$ = Summation of squared scores

n = The number of cases

$\sum Y^2$ = Summation of squared scores for Y

$(\sum X)^2$ = Summation X, quantity squared

$(\sum Y)^2$ = Summation Y, quantity squared.

COMPUTATION

$$r = \frac{2,006,742 - \frac{(11,749)(12,075)}{72}}{\sqrt{\left[1,955,665 - \frac{138,039,001}{72}\right]\left[2,069,633 - \frac{145,805,625}{72}\right]}}$$

$$r = \frac{2,006,742 - 1,970,405.21}{\sqrt{[38,456.65][44,554.87]}}$$

$$r = \frac{36,336.79}{41,393.6}$$

$$r = .8778$$

APPENDIX E

FACILITATOR'S SCHEDULE

FLOOR PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

FACILITATOR'S SCHEDULE

FLOOR PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

February 19-20, 1971

Camp Redlands, Lake Carl Blackwell

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1971

Time	Event	Location
4:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Registration	Dining Hall
5:00 - 6:00 p.m.	Introduction and Group Building Exercise Introduction - Rex Sentence Completion - Pat Coctail Mix - Rex Group Building - Dyads, Four through Dinner - Pat	Chapel
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	Dinner	Dining Hall
7:00 - 7:20 p.m.	One-Way-Two-Communication - Pat	Chapel
7:20 - 7:45 p.m.	Why Are We Here?	Chapel

	Topics: Why Did I Come Originally?
	     How Do I Feel About Being Here?
	     What Do I Want to Accomplish?	

7:45 - 8:30 p.m.	Communication Series	Chapel

7:45 - 8:00	Introduction to Communication
	  in Groups - Rex
	    Sending and Receiving Messages
	    Blocks
	    Defensive Communication	

8:00 - 8:20	Paraphrasing - Dyad, Triad, Group Start	
8:20 - 8:30	Feedback - Practice in Dyads	
8:30 - 8:45 p.m.	Break	Chapel

8:45 - 9:30 p.m.	Agree - Disagree Statements - Pat
	   Four groups of 4 or 5 participants
	   Report Back and Discussion
		Chapel

9:30 - 10:15 p.m.	Power Politica and Wrap-Up - Rex	
10:30 p.m.	Close - Break/Snacks	Dining Hall

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1971

Time	Event	Location
8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast	Dining Hall
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Space Decision/Use of Group Resources and Decisions by Consensus - Rex and Pat Two groups of 7 or 8 Pat - Introduce Consensus Rex - Exercise	Chapel
10:00 - 10:15 a.m.	Lecturette on Leadership and Roles - Rex and Pat	Chapel
10:15 - 10:45 a.m.	Break	Dining Hall
10:45 - 12:00	Role Playing Male versus Female in Student Government Administration versus Student on Hall Visitation	
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch	Dining Hall
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Back Home Application Series	Chapel
1:00 - 1:15 p.m.	Generating Back Home Topics as a Floor President Two Groups - What topics or problems would you like to have answers to by the time you leave today?	
1:15 - 1:25 p.m.	Consensus on Topics Raised for Work	Chapel
1:30 - 3:30 p.m.	Group Work (Hollow Square as Possible Alternatire)	
3:30 - 4:00 p.m.	Wrap-Up and Close Written Evaluation	

APPENDIX F

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, FLOOR

RESIDENTS' TEST RESULTS[*]

S1		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		171	172	
Resident 2		126	163	
Resident 3		152	154	
Resident 4		155	172	
Resident 5		170	172	
Resident 6		182	184	
Resident 7	154.67 / 15 ⌐ 2320	161	155	152.40 / 15 ⌐ 2286
Resident 8		146	153	
Resident 9		109	109	
Resident 10		119	102	
Resident 11		192	120	
Resident 12		180	188	
Resident 13		146	149	
Resident 14		147	147	
Resident 15		164	146	
		2320	2286	

S2				
Resident 1		135	120	
Resident 2		120	120	
Resident 3		93	120	
Resident 4		120	120	
Resident 5		120	120	
Resident 6		120	120	
Resident 7	122.60 / 15 ⌐ 1839	120	120	120.00 / 15 ⌐ 1800
Resident 8		120	120	
Resident 9		120	120	
Resident 10		121	120	
Resident 11		120	120	
Resident 12		120	120	
Resident 13		120	120	
Resident 14		122	120	
Resident 15		168	120	
		1839	1800	

S3				
Resident 1		146	153	
Resident 2		177	182	
Resident 3		170	171	
Resident 4		156	172	
Resident 5		165	142	
Resident 6		160	147	
Resident 7	156.80 / 15 ⌐ 2352	160	200	162.33 / 15 ⌐ 2435
Resident 8		123	130	
Resident 9		171	184	
Resident 10		136	119	
Resident 11		186	189	
Resident 12		175	190	
Resident 13		150	185	
Resident 14		127	119	
Resident 15		150	152	
		2352	2435	

S4		TEST ONE		TEST TWO	
Resident 1		97		104	
Resident 2		80		131	
Resident 3		120		128	
Resident 4		146		122	
Resident 5		160		144	
Resident 6		148		165	
Resident 7	15 ⌐117.87⌐ 1768	120		116	15 ⌐137.00⌐ 2055
Resident 8		141		159	
Resident 9		62		128	
Resident 10		103		96	
Resident 11		73		176	
Resident 12		120		200	
Resident 13		125		146	
Resident 14		153		120	
Resident 15		120		120	
		1768		2055	

S5		TEST ONE		TEST TWO	
Resident 1		184		175	
Resident 2		166		180	
Resident 3		168		200	
Resident 4		168		183	
Resident 5		174		182	
Resident 6		163		170	
Resident 7	15 ⌐158.40⌐ 2376	157		156	15 ⌐164.53⌐ 2468
Resident 8		132		123	
Resident 9		159		180	
Resident 10		158		154	
Resident 11		158		147	
Resident 12		178		175	
Resident 13		134		146	
Resident 14		91		108	
Resident 15		186		189	
		2376		2468	

S6		TEST ONE		TEST TWO	
Resident 1		168		165	
Resident 2		125		138	
Resident 3		175		172	
Resident 4		167		181	
Resident 5		154		128	
Resident 6		99		144	
Resident 7	15 ⌐156.53⌐ 2348	149		135	15 ⌐160.47⌐ 2407
Resident 8		153		162	
Resident 9		166		159	
Resident 10		196		194	
Resident 11		158		198	
Resident 12		152		149	
Resident 13		144		144	
Resident 14		168		165	
Resident 15		174		173	
		2348		2407	

S7		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		143	130	
Resident 2		160	153	
Resident 3		187	200	
Resident 4		183	189	
Resident 5		167	165	
Resident 6		124	146	
Resident 7	15 ⌐164.07 / 2461	142	160	15 ⌐172.47 / 2587
Resident 8		163	170	
Resident 9		183	173	
Resident 10		179	188	
Resident 11		151	183	
Resident 12		176	179	
Resident 13		168	195	
Resident 14		164	170	
Resident 15		171	186	
		2461	2587	

S8		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		164	161	
Resident 2		166	178	
Resident 3		44	43	
Resident 4		166	120	
Resident 5		163	161	
Resident 6		184	171	
Resident 7	15 ⌐153.47 / 2302	135	145	15 ⌐149.27 / 2239
Resident 8		166	179	
Resident 9		106	115	
Resident 10		164	129	
Resident 11		198	200	
Resident 12		170	166	
Resident 13		177	169	
Resident 14		181	179	
Resident 15		118	123	
		2302	2239	

S9		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		164	151	
Resident 2		132	124	
Resident 3		150	175	
Resident 4		160	150	
Resident 5		158	165	
Resident 6		176	183	
Resident 7	15 ⌐161.47 / 2422	174	170	15 ⌐150.33 / 2255
Resident 8		198	144	
Resident 9		187	194	
Resident 10		166	119	
Resident 11		188	174	
Resident 12		64	66	
Resident 13		138	124	
Resident 14		178	124	
Resident 15		189	192	
		2422	2255	

S10			TEST ONE			TEST TWO
Resident 1			161			176
Resident 2			163			150
Resident 3			184			170
Resident 4			153			151
Resident 5			167			167
Resident 6			158			200
Resident 7	15	166.93 / 2504	177		15	176.47 / 2647
Resident 8			142			150
Resident 9			161			182
Resident 10			156			176
Resident 11			165			159
Resident 12			200			200
Resident 13			192			200
Resident 14			174			190
Resident 15			151			176
			2504			2647

S11			TEST ONE			TEST TWO
Resident 1			122			192
Resident 2			173			200
Resident 3			158			158
Resident 4			189			120
Resident 5			183			200
Resident 6			151			141
Resident 7	15	154.60 / 2319	104		15	161.47 / 2422
Resident 8			146			162
Resident 9			154			158
Resident 10			163			160
Resident 11			140			134
Resident 12			155			177
Resident 13			188			190
Resident 14			124			122
Resident 15			169			180
			2319			2422

S12			TEST ONE			TEST TWO
Resident 1			171			174
Resident 2			156			120
Resident 3			120			120
Resident 4			156			167
Resident 5			182			179
Resident 6			157			144
Resident 7	15	159.13 / 2387	165		15	154.80 / 2322
Resident 8			154			158
Resident 9			167			160
Resident 10			170			150
Resident 11			156			150
Resident 12			171			149
Resident 13			120			120
Resident 14			191			171
Resident 15			151			198
			2387			2322

S13		TEST ONE	TEST TWO
Resident 1		137	131
Resident 2		120	152
Resident 3		189	189
Resident 4		141	161
Resident 5		154	159
Resident 6		175	171
Resident 7	15 ⟌ 153.40 2301	162	160
Resident 8		154	195
Resident 9		200	200
Resident 10		126	167
Resident 11		72	60
Resident 12		170	172
Resident 13		193	192
Resident 14		169	162
Resident 15		139	164
		2301	2435

Test Two: 15 ⟌ 162.33 / 2435

S14		TEST ONE	TEST TWO
Resident 1		154	169
Resident 2		169	158
Resident 3		151	144
Resident 4		178	152
Resident 5		150	177
Resident 6		196	198
Resident 7	15 ⟌ 156.80 2352	162	174
Resident 8		168	183
Resident 9		135	153
Resident 10		94	95
Resident 11		142	100
Resident 12		171	181
Resident 13		125	129
Resident 14		191	136
Resident 15		166	174
		2352	2323

Test Two: 15 ⟌ 154.87 / 2323

S15		TEST ONE	TEST TWO
Resident 1		144	159
Resident 2		142	125
Resident 3		141	144
Resident 4		120	119
Resident 5		188	183
Resident 6		132	151
Resident 7	15 ⟌ 158.80 2382	176	197
Resident 8		191	184
Resident 9		188	126
Resident 10		142	165
Resident 11		159	138
Resident 12		166	171
Resident 13		152	175
Resident 14		150	171
Resident 15		191	200
		2382	2408

Test Two: 15 ⟌ 160.53 / 2408

APPENDIX G

CONTROL GROUP, FLOOR RESIDENTS'

TEST RESULTS[*]

---

[*]Scoring range, 5.00 (always) to 1.00 (never) on each item. Highest possible score = 200.

S1		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		164	139	
Resident 2		170	163	
Resident 3		149	142	
Resident 4		154	141	
Resident 5		146	167	
Resident 6		139	133	
Resident 7	15 ⟌ 2300 153.33	174	180	15 ⟌ 2201 146.73
Resident 8		172	166	
Resident 9		165	167	
Resident 10		108	94	
Resident 11		150	156	
Resident 12		166	137	
Resident 13		147	149	
Resident 14		120	120	
Resident 15		176	147	
		2300	2201	

S2		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		187	194	
Resident 2		195	186	
Resident 3		119	132	
Resident 4		187	190	
Resident 5		171	197	
Resident 6		170	176	
Resident 7	15 ⟌ 2695 179.67	162	158	15 ⟌ 2658 177.20
Resident 8		170	181	
Resident 9		192	194	
Resident 10		196	197	
Resident 11		200	200	
Resident 12		179	137	
Resident 13		197	194	
Resident 14		180	130	
Resident 15		190	192	
		2695	2658	

S3		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		120	150	
Resident 2		163	192	
Resident 3		158	151	
Resident 4		195	194	
Resident 5		128	124	
Resident 6		152	183	
Resident 7	15 ⟌ 2369 157.93	172	163	15 ⟌ 2415 161.00
Resident 8		151	127	
Resident 9		164	170	
Resident 10		179	178	
Resident 11		188	176	
Resident 12		192	172	
Resident 13		120	150	
Resident 14		120	120	
Resident 15		167	165	
		2369	2415	

S4			TEST ONE	TEST TWO		
Resident 1			177	171		
Resident 2			192	136		
Resident 3			163	127		
Resident 4			200	200		
Resident 5			174	171		
Resident 6			120	200		
Resident 7	15	164.60 / 2469	163	151	15	161.53 / 2423
Resident 8			155	200		
Resident 9			192	160		
Resident 10			120	120		
Resident 11			134	111		
Resident 12			168	175		
Resident 13			160	177		
Resident 14			165	138		
Resident 15			186	186		
			2469	2423		

S5			TEST ONE	TEST TWO		
Resident 1			150	172		
Resident 2			176	178		
Resident 3			179	173		
Resident 4			187	181		
Resident 5			174	163		
Resident 6			153	161		
Resident 7	15	166.93 / 2504	161	157	15	165.53 / 2483
Resident 8			141	138		
Resident 9			150	166		
Resident 10			170	140		
Resident 11			192	193		
Resident 12			175	171		
Resident 13			150	144		
Resident 14			193	193		
Resident 15			153	153		
			2504	2483		

S6			TEST ONE	TEST TWO		
Resident 1			153	160		
Resident 2			174	169		
Resident 3			200	191		
Resident 4			130	130		
Resident 5			175	184		
Resident 6			187	182		
Resident 7	15	165.67 / 2485	167	173	15	168.33 / 2525
Resident 8			174	193		
Resident 9			153	184		
Resident 10			116	116		
Resident 11			179	198		
Resident 12			154	146		
Resident 13			163	151		
Resident 14			170	148		
Resident 15			190	200		
			2485	2525		

S7		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		168	182	
Resident 2		118	152	
Resident 3		163	192	
Resident 4		135	127	
Resident 5		164	167	
Resident 6		164	174	
Resident 7	15) 158.67 / 2380	164	175	15) 170.47 / 2557
Resident 8		188	200	
Resident 9		169	186	
Resident 10		171	181	
Resident 11		149	165	
Resident 12		138	147	
Resident 13		157	159	
Resident 14		168	179	
Resident 15		164	171	
		2380	2557	

S8		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		156	157	
Resident 2		178	184	
Resident 3		180	140	
Resident 4		160	171	
Resident 5		144	146	
Resident 6		120	120	
Resident 7	15) 162.00 / 2430	175	184	15) 162.20 / 2433
Resident 8		169	163	
Resident 9		133	179	
Resident 10		184	189	
Resident 11		133	146	
Resident 12		113	125	
Resident 13		200	189	
Resident 14		185	187	
Resident 15		200	153	
		2430	2433	

S9		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		164	168	
Resident 2		141	126	
Resident 3		119	114	
Resident 4		141	144	
Resident 5		122	123	
Resident 6		166	189	
Resident 7	15) 147.33 / 2210	186	182	15) 146.20 / 2193
Resident 8		149	70	
Resident 9		157	156	
Resident 10		137	137	
Resident 11		150	158	
Resident 12		168	180	
Resident 13		126	138	
Resident 14		143	144	
Resident 15		141	164	
		2210	2193	

S10		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		126	137	
Resident 2		158	64	
Resident 3		76	128	
Resident 4		124	124	
Resident 5		153	140	
Resident 6		165	71	
Resident 7	$15\overline{)2108}\ ^{140.53}$	44	151	$15\overline{)1958}\ ^{130.53}$
Resident 8		150	139	
Resident 9		163	120	
Resident 10		171	149	
Resident 11		171	143	
Resident 12		150	139	
Resident 13		167	155	
Resident 14		104	156	
Resident 15		186	142	
		2108	1958	

S11		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		165	163	
Resident 2		135	146	
Resident 3		105	104	
Resident 4		159	186	
Resident 5		179	192	
Resident 6		135	194	
Resident 7	$15\overline{)2215}\ ^{147.67}$	131	155	$15\overline{)2372}\ ^{158.13}$
Resident 8		149	104	
Resident 9		172	161	
Resident 10		116	161	
Resident 11		153	155	
Resident 12		153	138	
Resident 13		144	186	
Resident 14		167	133	
Resident 15		152	194	
		2215	2372	

S12		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		142	164	
Resident 2		171	169	
Resident 3		113	114	
Resident 4		193	180	
Resident 5		114	192	
Resident 6		143	135	
Resident 7	$15\overline{)2304}\ ^{153.60}$	171	185	$15\overline{)2456}\ ^{163.73}$
Resident 8		158	162	
Resident 9		192	200	
Resident 10		143	179	
Resident 11		169	169	
Resident 12		112	109	
Resident 13		174	171	
Resident 14		161	168	
Resident 15		148	159	
		2304	2456	

S13		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		179	113	
Resident 2		166	164	
Resident 3		142	139	
Resident 4		78	96	
Resident 5		172	153	
Resident 6		155	163	
Resident 7	15 ⌐ 149.87 / 2248	136	127	15 ⌐ 147.27 / 2209
Resident 8		140	149	
Resident 9		167	172	
Resident 10		171	147	
Resident 11		182	174	
Resident 12		147	163	
Resident 13		137	140	
Resident 14		128	145	
Resident 15		148	164	
		2248	2209	

S14		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		111	81	
Resident 2		142	123	
Resident 3		156	162	
Resident 4		124	167	
Resident 5		115	110	
Resident 6		125	125	
Resident 7	15 ⌐ 143.07 / 2146	183	168	15 ⌐ 139.47 / 2092
Resident 8		176	156	
Resident 9		172	120	
Resident 10		149	190	
Resident 11		145	145	
Resident 12		131	129	
Resident 13		170	168	
Resident 14		119	120	
Resident 15		128	128	
		2146	2092	

S15		TEST ONE	TEST TWO	
Resident 1		177	177	
Resident 2		146	177	
Resident 3		159	163	
Resident 4		177	189	
Resident 5		155	132	
Resident 6		138	173	
Resident 7	15 ⌐ 156.40 / 2346	144	151	15 ⌐ 167.67 / 2515
Resident 8		161	186	
Resident 9		182	200	
Resident 10		143	170	
Resident 11		154	161	
Resident 12		187	172	
Resident 13		138	174	
Resident 14		167	170	
Resident 15		118	120	
		2346	2515	

APPENDIX H

FLOOR PRESIDENTS' MEAN SCORES

TEST ONE

	CONTROL GROUP			EXPERIMENTAL GROUP	
		SQ			SQ
S1	153.33	23,519.09	S1	154.67	23,922.81
S2	179.67	32,281.31	S2	122.60	15,030.76
S3	157.93	24,941.88	S3	156.80	24,586.24
S4	164.60	27,093.16	S4	117.87	13,893.34
S5	166.93	27,865.62	S5	158.40	25,090.56
S6	165.67	27,446.55	S6	156.53	24,501.64
S7	158.67	25,176.17	S7	164.07	26,918.96
S8	162.00	26,244.00	S8	153.47	23,553.04
S9	147.33	21,706.13	S9	161.47	26,072.56
S10	140.53	19,748.68	S10	166.93	27,865.62
S11	147.67	21,806.43	S11	154.60	23,901.16
S12	153.60	23,592.96	S12	159.13	25,322.36
S13	149.87	22,461.02	S13	153.40	23,531.56
S14	143.07	20,469.02	S14	156.80	24,586.24
S15	156.40	24,460.96	S15	158.80	25,217.44

$\Sigma X = 2,347.27$ $\Sigma X^2 = 368,803.99$ $\Sigma X = 2,295.54$ $\Sigma X^2 = 353,994.30$

TEST TWO

	CONTROL GROUP			EXPERIMENTAL GROUP	
		SQ			SQ
S1	146.73	21,529.69	S1	152.40	23,225.76
S2	177.20	31,399.84	S2	120.00	14,400.00
S3	161.00	25,921.00	S3	162.33	26,351.03
S4	161.53	26,091.94	S4	137.00	18,769.00
S5	165.53	27,400.18	S5	164.53	27,070.12
S6	168.33	28,334.99	S6	160.47	25,750.62
S7	170.47	29,060.02	S7	172.47	29,745.90
S8	162.20	26,308.84	S8	149.27	22,281.53
S9	146.20	21,374.44	S9	150.33	22,599.11
S10	130.53	17,038.08	S10	176.47	31,141.66
S11	158.13	25,005.10	S11	161.47	26,072.56
S12	163.73	26,807.52	S12	154.80	23,963.04
S13	147.27	21,688.45	S13	162.33	26,351.03
S14	139.47	19,451.88	S14	154.87	23,984.72
S15	167.67	28,113.23	S15	160.53	25,769.88

$\Sigma X = 2,365.99$ $\Sigma X^2 = 375,525.20$ $\Sigma X = 2,339.27$ $\Sigma X^2 = 367,475.96$

APPENDIX I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

TEST ONE

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Test One
(One Month After the Retreat)

Control Group
   Sum of scores - 2,347.27
   Sum of scores squared - 368,803.99
   Sum of scores, quantity squared - 5,509,676.45
   Mean - 156.48

Experimental Group
   Sum of scores - 2,295.54
   Sum of scores squared - 353,994.30
   Sum of scores, quantity squared - 5,269,503.89
   Mean - 153.04

Total
   Sum of X - 4,642.81
   Sum of X squared - 722,798.29
   Sum of X, quantity squared - 21,555,684.70

COMPUTATION

   Total SS equals Sum of X^2 minus Sum of X quantity ^{2} divided by N
            equals 722,798.29 minus 21,555,684.70/30
            equals 4275.47.

   Between SS equals Sum of X quantity ^{2} for each group divided by
                                    N minus the Correction Term
            equals 367311.76 plus 351300.26 minus 718522.82
            equals 89.20

   Within SS equals Total SS minus Between SS
            equals 4275.47 minus 89.20
            equals 4186.27

SOURCE	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	4275.47	30-1	-		
Between	89.20	2-1	89.20	.5966	N.S.
Within	4186.27	28	149.51		

* 4.20 needed for significance at the .05 level.

APPENDIX J

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

TEST TWO

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Test Two
(Two Months After the Retreat)

Control Group
   Sum of scores - 2,365.99
   Sum of scores squared - 375,525.20
   Sum of scores, quantity squared - 5,597,908.68
   Mean - 157.73

Experimental Group
   Sum of scores - 2,339.27
   Sum of scores squared - 367,475.96
   Sum of scores, quantity squared - 5,472,184.13
   Mean - 155.95

Total
   Sum of X - 4,705.26
   Sum of X squared - 743,001.16
   Sum of X, quantity squared - 22,139,471.67

COMPUTATION:

   Total SS equals Sum of X^2 minus Sum of X quantity ^{2} divided by N
            equals 743,001.16 minus 22,139,471.67 divided by 30
            equals 5,018.78

   Between SS equals Sum of X quantity ^{2} for each group divided by
                                    N minus the Correction Term
            equals 373,193.91 plus 364,812.28 minus 737,982.39
            equals 23.80

   Within SS equals Total SS minus Between SS
            equals 5,018.78 minus 23.80
            equals 4,994.97

SOURCE	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	5018.77	30-1	-		
Between	23.80	2-1	23.80	.1334	N.S.
Within	4994.97	28	178.39		

* 4.20 needed for significance at the .05 level.

APPENDIX K.

POST MEETING REACTION SHEET

POST MEETING REACTION SHEET

Entire Workshop

1. In general, the activities of the workshop were:

| of great help | of some help | of no help |

2. As a result of this workshop, I have experienced change in the following areas: (please circle one number for each).

	NO CHANGE	SOME CHANGE		MUCH CHANGE	
a. Skills of group leadership	1	2	3	4	5
b. Seeing groups differently	1	2	3	4	5
c. Attitudes toward leadership	1	2	3	4	5
d. Information	1	2	3	4	5
e. Motivation to act differently	1	2	3	4	5
f. Seeing myself differently	1	2	3	4	5

3. In what specific ways do you plan to alter behavior as a result of your thinking and training during this workshop?

4. What kinds of help would you have liked that you did not get in this workshop?

5. What kinds of activities would you like to see follow this conference? (Please check those that apply.)

    a. Another conference similar to this one? When_____

    _____

    b. A written report of this conference?_____

    c. Consultant help for your committee?_____

    d. Resource materials? What kind?_____

    e. Short periodic skill training sessions? How often?_____

    _____

    f. Small work group meetings of students who lead committees similar to yours: Who should attend?_____

    g. List any others:

6. What suggestions would you make to the planning committee for next Leadership Conference?

7. Please list any other benefits of this conference?

2

VITA

Floyd B. Hoelting

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING IN CHANGING THE
          LEADER BEHAVIOR OF EMERGENT STUDENT LEADERS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

   Personal Data: Born in Tulia, Texas on February 16, 1943, the son
        of Mary Berkenfeld and Norbert August Hoelting.

   Education: Graduated from Olpe, Kansas High School in May, 1961;
        received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Kansas State Teachers
        College with a composite Social Science major and minor in
        January, 1968; received the Master of Science degree from
        Kansas State Teachers College in August, 1968, with a major
        in Secondary Education and a minor in Social Science; and
        completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree
        at Oklahoma State University in May, 1973, with a major in
        Student Personnel and Guidance.

   Professional Experience: Assistant to Dean of Students at Kansas
        State Teachers College 1967 to 1968; Administrative Assistant
        to Dean of College of Education 1968-1969, adviser to Inter-
        fraternity Council and Residence Halls Association at Kansas
        State Teachers College; Head Resident/complex director at
        Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, from 1969 to
        1971; Assistant Director of Housing at Oklahoma State Univer-
        sity June, 1971 to present.

   Professional Organizations: American Personnel and Guidance
        Association; American College Personnel Association; National
        Association of Student Personnel Administrators; Association
        of College and University Housing Officers; Southwestern
        Association of College and University Housing Officers;
        Chairman of "Evaluation Committee" 1971 to present; member
        of College and University Housing Officers' "Educational
        Programs Committee."