





DEPOSITED BY THE FACULTY OF  
GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

I x M



.1H99 .1946



UNACC.

1946

M.Sc. Thesis

Department of Psychology

BERNARD HYMOVITCH

MENTAL FACTORS IN LEADERSHIP FROM EARLY TO LATE ADOLESCENCE.

McGILL UNIVERSITY

MAY, 1946.

## PREFACE

The attention of the writer was attracted to the phenomenon of leadership while working with youth groups in the Montreal Y.M.H.A. It was the function of the writer as supervisor, to guide club advisors in the process of developing club members for leadership. It was the uncertainty of that guidance that stimulated the undertaking of this study, which attempts to discover what factors are important in leadership in adolescent friendship clubs.

The results of this study may have been more useful if many socio-economic and ethnic groups of both boys and girls had been included. However the limitation of time made it necessary to restrict this study to thirteen Jewish groups of boys.

To the Board of Directors and Education Department Staff of the Montreal Young Men's Hebrew Association, I am indebted for making available the subjects for this investigation. The study was supervised by Dr. C.E. Kellogg, who aided in the formulation of the problem and who guided the investigation in all its phases. To Dr. F.S. Alexander and Dr. Malmo, I wish to express my appreciation for their interest in the progress of the study. I am also indebted to a host of Y.M.H.A. Club Advisors who assisted in the administration of the tests.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Definitions and Orientations	4
III. History of Previous Work	13
I. Detailed Report of Studies	13
II. Summary	24
III. Some Other Lists of Traits in Leadership	27
IV. Procedure and Results	29
I. The Group	29
II. The Measuring Instruments	30
A. The "Guess Who" Quiz	30
B. The "Ranking for Presidency"	34
C. Correlations	35
III. The Test Group	35
IV. Results of Test Group	36
V. A. Factor Analysis	37
B. Interpretation of the Factor Matrix	38
VI. Revision of the "Guess Who" Quiz	39
VII. Final Measurement and Results	41
VIII. Charts and Tables	
A. Table of Final Correlations of Traits with Leadership	42
B. Original Form of "Guess Who" Quiz	43
C. Typical Calculation of Correlations	47
D. Factor Analysis Charts	48
E. Table of Factor Loadings	53
F. Revised "Guess Who" Quiz	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS cont'd.

	<u>Page</u>
V. Interpretation and Conclusions	59
I. Systematic Interpretation Correlations	59
II. Conclusions	70
VI. Bibliography	72

## INTRODUCTION

There was once a time when it was the fashionable thing for orators and debaters to argue whether history created great men, or whether history was created by great men. Although, as Kimball Young (76) has pointed out, the topic bore a close resemblance to the futile and fruitless "chicken or egg" controversy, its existence was justified in that it was instrumental in attracting the attention of men to the importance of studying the phenomenon of leadership.

During the past few decades political organizations, industry, labor, and the military have recognized the importance of leadership in the further development of their causes. Concomitantly, there has developed an awareness of the necessity of training for leadership. Bogardus (7), Partridge (62), and Lindeman (38) have stressed that leadership is an important phenomenon in a democracy, and that we must train for leadership.

However, such questions as "What is leadership?", "Are there types of leaders?", "For what do we want to train leaders?", "Who shall be chosen?", must be answered before any attempt is made to institute a training program. Thus, research attempting to answer the above-stated questions becomes extremely important.

Indeed, an even more basic question has at times been asked. Is it possible to train leaders, or is leadership dependent solely on inherited characteristics? Ordway Tead (73) has adequately replied that, "There is enough evidence to repudiate the old lie that leaders are born not made. Truly there are born leaders, but many of the



rest of us possess qualities which can be developed with the result that our skill at leading may be appreciably strengthened."

The phenomenon of leadership assumes added significance in the field of mental hygiene. Jersild (44) has stated that from the point of view of children's social adjustment it is very important to see that no individual is always at the end of the procession. A knowledge of what traits are advantageous to leadership and can be readily developed, would therefore be a useful tool in the hands of teachers, camp counsellors and child guidance people.

Partridge (63) has viewed the necessity of learning more about leadership from another standpoint. He feels that a recognition of leadership and how it operates is fundamental to an understanding of the behaviour of young people. He reflects the attitude of group workers, when he further adds that one very practical reason for recognizing the importance of leaders among young people is to furnish an avenue of approach to the group. The writer, in his supervision of club advisors, has discovered a corollary to the above proposition. It is often possible to judge the efficacy of a youth group work program and of the approach of the club advisor by means of a study of the leaders chosen by the group.

Thus it is obvious that the implications of the phenomenon of leadership are widespread, and the necessity of further research correspondingly pressing and essential. The experimental study with which this thesis is concerned may be regarded as one more of the numerous attempts that were, and are being made to throw light on the above-stated problem.

- Specifically, the purpose of this study is to investigate
- (1) the relationship between a series of traits and leadership in adolescent friendship clubs, and
  - (2) the variation of the relationship between those traits and leadership, from early to late adolescence.

## DEFINITIONS AND ORIENTATION

The purpose of this chapter is primarily to present the series of concepts which have provided the theoretical foundation for the study that was carried out. Reference will be made to many of these concepts in the chapters on procedure and interpretation.

Leadership has been defined in numerous ways. Although many of the definitions do not overlap with each other, they are nevertheless usually not contradictory, since the complexity of the phenomenon allows for many different approaches and an almost corresponding number of definitions. Mumford (57) has defined leadership as the preeminence of one or a few individuals in a group in the process of control of societary phenomena. Brown's (12) definition deviates little from that of Mumford. To her leadership is the investiture of certain individuals with a public character, and responsibility for the common consequences of all participants in the group. Young's (76) emphasis is on the individual rather than the group. His definition is that leadership is the uniqueness and individuality of the person who is the pace-setter of the group. Bogardus (7) likewise emphasizes the role of the leader, whom he defines as a person who exerts special influence over a number of people. Tead (73) repeats that leadership is the activity of influencing people, but adds, "to cooperate towards some goal which they come to find desirable.". It should be noted that Tead has emphasized that the influence is directed towards getting the group to satisfy the group's needs. Partridge's (62) definition does not go that far. In his Ph. D. thesis, he defined leadership as the



ability and disposition to inspire confidence in others, over a period of time, and to cause them to act and to think in the way the leader desires them to act and to think. It may be inferred from this definition that the individual may direct his influence to satisfy his own needs rather than those of the group. Bogardus (7), as a matter of fact, has described both types of leader, whom he called autocratic and democratic. Autocratic leadership rules persons without consulting them. It wields an iron club. It leads in terms of its own wishes, wants and desires; it molds the action of others to suit its own plans. Pure autocracy uses dominating methods in order to attain a goal of dominance. Democratic leadership grows out of the needs of the group. It seeks to define these needs and to stimulate the members to secure adequate satisfactions. The democratic leader draws people up to their best levels rather than driving them on in line with his own purposes. He suggests rather than orders. Democratic leadership depends upon personal contacts rather than on objective decrees.

Kurt Lewin (53) and his associates have amply demonstrated the superiority of the democratic approach with club groups.

However, Pigors (65) claims that what has been described as autocratic leadership isn't actually leadership, but domination. In leadership we have power with, rather than over others. The individual who seeks power for its own sake extends his influence in a very different manner. Domination is a process of control in which, by the assertion of superiority a person regulates the activities of others for purposes of his own choosing.

It is interesting to note that Partridge in a later work (63) has stated that "among young people domination exists more seldom than leadership."

Thus, in contrast with his concept of domination, Pigors defines leadership as the process of mutual stimulation (or reciprocal reinforcement) which by the successful interplay of relevant individual differences, controls human energy in the pursuit of a common cause.

In the present study, the criterion for the leadership capacity of the subjects, was the average rank each subject was given by all other members of the group, for the position of presidency of the group. The writer recognizes that statements such as Cowley's (24) "Leaders are distinguished from mere position holders or 'head men'.", may be correct in certain situations. However, it is maintained that in the groups employed for this experiment, the president is not merely a "figurehead", but a functional leader. He is the chairman at the regular weekly meetings of the group. He is the head of the executive. He represents the group on the Club Council. He is usually the contact person for staff supervisors, and usually represents the group at outside functions.

Although no single definition of leadership has been selected, those of Mumford, Brown, Tead, Bogardus, and Pigors, may all be considered adequately descriptive of the position of presidency.

A study of leadership may be approached from three aspects. Leadership may be regarded as a personality phenomenon. "Leadership bears a vital relationship to individuality and its complementary element sociality.", says Bogardus. Individuality refers to those traits which set one person off from another, and sociality is composed of those behaviour traits which identify one person with another. Cooley (22) has expressed the same concept by saying that leadership

7.

has an aspect of sympathy and conformity, as well as individuality and self-will. In the words of a "field theoretician", Britt (9) has stated that the successful leader must have membership-character in the group he is attempting to lead. The leader must also represent a region of high potential in the social field. He must demonstrate that in certain ways he is not just one of the herd, but that he possesses unique characteristics which set him apart from his fellows.

Leadership may also be regarded as a group phenomenon. Leadership is inherent in group organization. It is a product of group life and an outgrowth affecting group values. "Together, personality and group write the story of leadership." (7).

The concept of "leaders and led" each respectively in his own camp, has been discarded (62). Britt's view that leadership is a circular process, with an alternating interstimulation, may be regarded as a simplification of Pigor's description of reciprocal reinforcement, interplay of individual differences, and mutual stimulation. Jones (45) has stated that every leader must be a follower in certain situations, while Caldwell and Wellman (15) have added, "not only of social situations and of group desires, but of specific leadership of other individuals in specific situations.". J.F. Brown (11) has said that "the leader must realize the existing field structure, and that only when his leadership falls in with that structure, is he successful.".

Thus we have seen that leadership is a function of both the personality and the group. However, the emphasis on interaction, in the previous paragraph, leads us to recognize that the phenomenon must also be regarded as a social process. As Bogardus has said, it is a



social process, involving a number of persons in mental contact with each other, and reacting to each other. It is therefore important to note that like all social processes, leadership is dynamic, with a constantly changing structure, and with (to borrow a term from Gesell (32),) periods of recurrent equilibrium.

In the discussion of the group, it was noted that most leaders must be followers in certain specific activities. It therefore follows that leadership is not only a function of the personality and the group, but must be directly related to the specific social situation, including the specific activities of the group. Hence, if the specific social situations call forth different individuals to assume leadership, it may be concluded that different personality patterns are required to fulfill different leadership positions. Thus it is implied that there are different types of leaders. Leaders differ depending upon the social situation in which they are placed. While there may be certain general qualities in all leadership, it would be a mistake to set down a priori, a series of qualities of all leaders, ignoring the place which circumstance, time, and place have in the expression of superiority. In other words, one can no more understand leadership than any other social process, without taking into account, first the group situation in which it occurs, and secondly, the culture patterns concerned (76). Britt (9) has added that if you wish to analyze the social psychology of leadership, so that the materials will be useful to you personally, you should choose some PARTICULAR SITUATION, and then by observational and experimental methods, make a careful study of leadership in that particular situation.

This approach seems partially to be in contradiction to Marion Brown's (12) statement that there more likely are many types of

leadership positions than many types of leaders. Since the evidence presented by Brown is rather sparse, the writer is inclined to regard her conclusion as rather premature and unwarranted, although probably true of certain combinations of situations.

Various classifications of types of leaders have been proposed. The majority of these obviously apply to only certain restricted situations. For example, in her study Brown attempted to discover whether the following classification would stand up:-

1. Executive
2. Initiative
3. Symbolic
4. The expert

It is little wonder that those types did not reveal themselves to be valid in a high school study.

Another very superficial grouping was presented by Spaulding (71) who suggested the following types:-

1. The Social Climber
2. The Intellectual Success
3. Goodfellow
4. Big Athlete
5. Athletic Activity Type

It is obvious that although this classification may be useful to those concerned with Junior College leaders, generalization into the fields of industry, the military, science, and the political world would be ridiculous.

Two different series of classifications which may be a little

more meaningful have been presented by Bogardus (7). The first is oriented towards the goal of leadership, and consists of the following:-

1. Democratic Leaders
2. Paternalistic Leaders
3. Autocratic Leaders

These types were previously discussed. The second classification describes the

1. Social Leader
2. Mental Leader
3. Executive Leader.

Although very interesting, it is doubtful whether this second typology would stand up to scientific analysis. Gowin (33) has likewise suggested that there are two types, the executive and the intellectual.

Some psychologists have classified leaders according to the DEGREE of contact with those who are led (2), (27).

1. Persuasive Leaders - Great deal of Contact.
2. Dominant Leaders - Little less Contact.
3. Institutional Leaders - Based on acquired Prestige.
4. Leadership of the Expert - Practically no personal contact.

Others have classified leaders according to TYPE of contact with those who are led (7), (27).

1. Face-to-face leaders, who influence through direct contact with "the led" and through the charm of their "personalities", persuasiveness of speeches, and sometimes the impressiveness of physique. This type includes the Persuasive and Dominant types listed above.



2. The Indirect leaders; Inventors, authors, artists, composers and some executives, who influence by their work rather than their personalities. This group includes the Institutional and the Expert types of leaders.

The method of selection of the leader has been used as the criterion for the following classification: (73), (27):

1. Self-appointed leaders.
2. Group-appointed leaders.
3. Executive-appointed leaders.

Leaders have also been classified according to their interests (36):

1. Intellectual leaders.
2. Artistic leaders.
3. Executive leaders.

Another interesting distinction was made by Le Bon (49), who has distinguished between acquired and personal prestige. Young (76) has pointed out how leadership and prestige go hand in hand. Acquired prestige is that resulting from name, fortune and reputation. Personal prestige is something essentially peculiar to the individual; it may coexist with reputation, glory and fortune, or be strengthened by them, but is perfectly capable of existing in their absence.

Nafe (58) has suggested a series of types of leaders that are useful in description of any type of leadership. His types consist of six pairs of mutually opposite descriptions. They are as follows:-

- |                                  |                         |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>A</u> 1. Dynamic              | 2. Static               |
| <u>B</u> 1. Initiator            | 2. Director             |
| <u>C</u> 1. Impresses the group. | 2. Expresses the group. |

- |          |                |                |
|----------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>D</u> | 1. Permanent   | 2. Temporary   |
| <u>E</u> | 1. Volunteer   | 2. Drafted     |
| <u>F</u> | 1. Generalized | 2. Specialized |

A more recent study, (see Chapter on History of Studies) by T.E. Coffin (21) has found the "three types of leadership functions" closely related to Spranger's six types of men, and Sheldon's more recent classification of people as cerebrotonic, somatotonic and viscerotonic.

Thus this chapter has presented the orientation of the study as regards definition, "the leader and the led", the social process, the emphasis on the particular situation, and the types of leadership.

## HISTORY OF PREVIOUS STUDIES

This chapter concerns itself with a synoptic review of most of the previous studies of leadership. Only studies relevant to the particular problems presented in this thesis were chosen. Other studies less relevant are mentioned throughout this work.

Havelock Ellis (29), under the influence of Galton's study of genius, refined in 1904 the list of great names appearing in a standard biographical dictionary, thereby arousing interest in the problem of delineation of world leaders worthy of study.

James McKeen Cattell (17), first improved upon Ellis' study by

- (a) employing five leading world biographical dictionaries, and
- (b) introducing measurement of greatness by the amount of space allotted to each individual.

Whereas Ellis had stressed greatness in ability, Cattell stressed the eminence and recognition of the individual.

Catherine M. Cox (25), in 1926 further improved Cattell's work by introducing three tests to the biographical studies:

- (a) unquestioned eminence (from Cattell)
- (b) unusual achievement, not a consequence of fortuitous circumstance, such as birth (from Ellis), and
- (c) only those persons for whom adequate early age records exist, were included.

The significance of her studies was the introduction of achievement and activity as measuring sticks.

Louis M. Terman (74), in 1904, reported the first experimental study to be undertaken. He presented groups of four youngsters, with a series of pictures and objects, about which he asked various questions. These questions were to be quickly answered aloud. His criterion for a leader was a youngster, whose responses were copied by others. A second set of objects and pictures were then presented to the youngsters after the original groups were broken up and the youngsters redistributed. Information regarding the youngsters was then obtained from teachers who rated the subjects on five and three-point scales that were constructed for health, dress, socio-economic status, and so on. Results showed that leaders tended to be larger, better dressed, of more prominent parentage, brighter in school, more daring, more fluent of speech, better looking, greater readers, and less emotional. Leaders tended to be conspicuous although not always characterized by socially desirable traits. This study has been criticized for its poor technique, lack of refinement of traits, and because the situation was unnatural.

Chevaleva and Sylla (19), reported a study of 400 children's groups in 1928. They studied leadership within these groups and then placed the leaders that were discovered into other groups. The results of their studies are reported in language not consistent with modern research, but which would seem to indicate that the leaders were more intelligent and extroverted.

Chevaleva - Janorskya (20), in another European study of 888 spontaneous groupings of children 3 to 8 years of age, reported as follows:

(a) Leadership arose in a crisis, or when a particular activity was desired.

(b) Leadership went to older youngsters, and to those who had more experience.

(c) Leaders had more energy, greater speed of response to situations and had the wish "to be in the limelight."

Leta S. Hollingworth (39), studied the leadership of gifted children and found that leaders have a higher I.Q. than the average. However, if the I.Q.'s are too superior the youngsters are rejected, isolated, and misunderstood. A youngster of I.Q. 180 lived in practical isolation from his classmates. On discovering his I.Q. he was placed in an "opportunity class" where the average I.Q. was 160. By the end of the year he held a position of high prestige and leadership amongst his fellows. As Jersild has said, "A child may fail to achieve leadership if he is too far above his associates in ability."

Finch and Carrol (30), likewise showed that gifted children were more likely to be leaders in groups of superior children than in average groups.

Charlotte Buhler (13) and Mildred Parten (60,61), have both demonstrated in a series of articles that leadership manifests itself at a very young age. Both of these authors discovered leadership in preschool groups ranging from three to six years of age.

Nutting (59) and Prosh (67), in two separate studies have reported their results based on athletic leaders. Nutting asked about 200 girls in the 7th and 8th grades to name two girls whom they considered to be the best leaders. Here, as in Prosh's study, the term

leadership was narrowly defined by the situation of the experiment; leadership meant chiefly the capacity to lead in games and gymnasium work. The votes tended to bunch, a few girls receiving a heavy vote. Leadership in this situation seems unconnected with scholastic success.

Bennett and Jones (4), studied twenty-nine students at Rochester. The I.Q. of each student was determined by eight sub-tests of the Otis Group Intelligence Test. The leadership ability of each student was estimated through the combined judgments of instructors, principal, and athletic director. They found that intelligence was a prerequisite to leadership. They also reported that superiority in stature and energy were important factors.

L.H. Moore (56), asked juniors and seniors in a women's college "to select from the entire student body of over 1800, three students whose leadership they would follow most willingly.". They were also asked to mention the characteristics of the three that they considered desirable for leadership. In the results, Moore listed the following leadership and anti-leadership traits:

<u>Leadership</u>	<u>Anti-Leadership</u>
democratic attitudes	indifference
vitality	narrowness
positiveness	timidity
friendliness	affectation
enthusiasm	egotism
sympathy	silliness
trustworthiness	fickleness
perseverance	stubbornness



Theron L. McCuen (54), studied 1374 students at Stanford University.

The leaders' scores on the Thorndike Intelligence Tests were correlated with the average score of the group. This resulted in a correlation of  $+ .4028$ . Thus the importance of intelligence as a factor in leadership was again indicated.

E.B. Gowin (33), compared leaders of the "head man" type with lesser executives in similar lines of work and found them to be taller and heavier.

Caldwell and Wellman (15), concluded from their studies that children, who were leaders in school, were above average in scholarship. The difference was not so large for athletic leaders but even these exceeded the average of their class. Leaders were rated as extroverts with the exception of those who were on the editorial staff of the school paper. Outstanding physical achievement was a characteristic of athletic leaders, but not important for other leaders.

Thrasher (75), in his book "The Gang", reported that: gameness was the most important characteristic of leadership. Leaders made decisions quickly and acted upon them directly. Physical prowess, imagination, and intelligence were also recognized as significant factors. However, Thrasher reported that the qualities of the leaders varied greatly both within a single group and amongst different groups.

Leib (50), a German investigator, asked over 2000 girls and boys who were the most capable leaders of their class and why. The qualities emphasized were: physical superiority, good behaviour towards companions, class spirit, intellectual superiority, steadiness, public speaking ability, liveliness and courage. Religious, political and class prejudices were important.

Broich (10), another German investigator, found that while boys emphasized bodily superiority, girls emphasized communicativeness and cheerfulness. Whereas the girl tended to prefer democratic leadership, the boys appeared to prefer a "boss". According to his group, the essential qualities were good physique, intelligence, knowledge, "Acting and thinking for the group rather than for oneself", character, and popularity with the group. Academic achievement appeared to be of greater significance among girls.

Ray Hammil Simpson (70), in a study of those "who influence and those who are influenced in discussion" found a high correlation between the ability to influence and high grades in college. However, no relationship was discovered with the following paper and pencil tests: Bernreuter's Personality Inventory, Maslow's Social Personality Inventory for Women, Allport & Floyd's Ascendance Submission Test and the Hartmann Social Attitude Inventory.

Ernest De Alton Partridge (62), studied Boy Scout leaders. He reported the following correlations:

leadership and intelligence .87  
 leadership and dependability .87  
 leadership and appearance .87  
 leadership and athletic prowess .62  
 leadership and pleasing voice .51

Partridge in his report made two references relevant to this study. He attempted to employ the "Guess Who" technique but was compelled to discontinue this method when an insufficient number of responses did not allow for significant correlations. Secondly, he admitted the existence of a strong halo effect with his final technique, which obscures the significance of results.

Marion A. Brown (12), in her study of high school pupils, found that intelligence and scholastic achievement were both important in the "pattern of leaders". Socio-economic status was also positively correlated with leadership. She also found leaders to have a greater diversity of interests than average students.

A Detroit Teachers College Report (26), in 1929, described another interesting study. More than 5000 children were asked to name a best friend and a leader of their group and to give reasons for their choice. There were striking differences in the qualifications for friendship and leadership. In general, ability and achievements were much more important qualifications for leaders, and social qualities, even of good sportsmanship, much less important - at least according to these studies - than they were for friendship.

W.H. Cowley (23), studied 20 criminal leaders and as many criminal followers, a similar number of student leaders and followers, and of non-commissioned officers and privates. The leaders in all three groups believed in themselves, made decisions quickly and stuck to their decisions. However, a great dissimilarity of most other traits was discovered between the three groups.

Carlson and Harrell (16), in an analysis of Life's "Ablest Congressmen" Poll, revealed three important factors:

- (a) industry or "push" (drive)
- (b) intellectual fortitude (intelligence)
- (c) popularity

Hunter and Jordan (41), gave many physical, mental, personality, scholastic, attitude and sociometric tests to 82 carefully selected male college

students and to a control group of 103 non-leaders. Critical differences were found for several traits and it was concluded that a typical leader was

- (a) younger, lighter in weight, and had fewer physical defects.
- (b) superior in intelligence, scholarship and vocabulary.
- (c) more dominant and self-sufficient.

E.G. Flemming (31), applied a factor analysis to 71 high school girl leaders who had been rated by their teachers. Four significant, independent factors were discovered:

- (a) fairness
- (b) originality
- (c) liveliness
- (d) pleasant voice

M.E. Courtenay (79), has stated that whatever leadership is, it is a persistent type of behaviour. In his study, he showed that the percentage of high school leaders who become leaders in college and in the community, is four times as great as the percentage of non-leaders. Thus he concluded that "ability to influence others is a fairly permanent grouping of traits."

W.H. Reals (68), found among other things, that with intelligence, age and sex constant, a better general appearance is conducive to leadership amongst high school students.

Helen Hall Jennings (43), employing sociometric techniques, found that both isolates as individuals and leaders as individuals resemble and differ markedly in personality from one another as they vary from each other respectively as a group. While many points of overlapping

appear in the personalities of leaders as individuals, and similarly for isolates as individuals, real differences of personality appear to characterize the members of either group respectively as persons. Jennings therefore concludes that the why of leadership appears not to reside in any personality trait singly considered, nor even in a constellation of related traits, but in the inter-personal contribution of which the individual becomes capable in a specific setting eliciting such a contribution from him.

L.D. Zeleny (77), found that in discussion groups, leaders were more self-confident, participated to a greater extent, and had more prestige than non-leaders. However, leaders and non-leaders were not distinguishable by appearance.

W.C. Middleton (55), had 30 campus leaders rated by four or more students according to the North Carolina Scale for Fundamental Traits. The six highest ratings were as follows:

- (a) character
- (b) intelligence
- (c) persistence
- (d) accuracy
- (e) sociability
- (f) judgment

The six lowest ratings were on

- (a) radicalness
- (b) modesty
- (c) emotionality
- (d) extraversion
- (e) decisiveness
- (f) adaptability

Results of this study may be interpreted either as applying to a very restricted situation and of negligible use for other groups, or as a reflection of the inadequacy of the technique.

C.E. Howell (40), administered to college classrooms, the Zeleny Group Membership Record and a scale of willingness to accept the leadership of specific individuals. He discovered that leadership was related neither to scholarship nor intelligence in that particular group.

Hanawalt, Richardson and Hamilton (37), in a recent study concluded that college leadership is more closely tied up with dominance than with any of the other scales employed. It should be noted that reference is not made to domination (Pigor's concept) but to dominance.

T.E. Coffin (21), has attempted to discover a functional relationship between leadership traits and situations which demand leadership. A job analysis of leadership yielded three primary categories of leadership functions.

- (a) planning or ideational
- (b) organizational
- (c) persuasive

Through an analysis of previous lists of traits, Coffin reduced the number to eleven main groups. These eleven groups then seemed to cluster about the three functions which Coffin postulated. He then compared the groups of traits that clustered about each of the three functions with Spranger's "Types of Men" and Sheldon's recent classification of body and temperament types. He found Spranger's theoretical, political and social types, and Sheldon's cerebrotonic, somatotonic, and viscerotonic, respectively, linked with planning, organizational and persuasive functions.

R.N. Drake (28), secured students' ratings for 106 college women and found the following correlations with leadership:

Self-confidence	.59
Originality	.58
Aggressiveness	.56
Sociability	.52
Intelligence	.47
Cooperativeness	.44
Humor	.38
Emotional stability	.38
Trustworthiness	.37
Desire to impose will	.37
Idealism	.34
Common sense	.34
Cheerfulness	.29
Desire to excel	.29
Farsightedness	.25
Strength of will	.23
Kindness	.22
Conscientiousness	.21
Interest in religion	.10
Tact	.08
Stubbornness	.05
Hypocrisy	.02
Sympathy	.02

Excitability	-.03
Pure-mindedness	-.06
Selfishness	-.08
Introversion	-.10
Conceit	-.11

### SUMMARY OF HISTORY

Since studies in leadership are of a varied and diffuse nature, a summary entails some classification. For the purpose of clarity, this summary deals with four main approaches to the problem.

1. Biographical
2. Experimental
3. Observational
4. Testing and Measurement

The biographical studies of Ellis (29), Cattell (17) and Cox (25) make their contribution to this field by

- (a) providing a rich field of data
- (b) stimulating further study
- (c) emphasizing the longitudinal approach rather than the cross-sectional method.

The disadvantages of the biographical approach are

- (a) the subjectivity of the data
- (b) the biographers were not trained for scientific observation and interpretation
- (c) only data of particular interest to the biographer was selected



- (d) biographical studies tend to remove the subject from the context of his environment thus negating the recognition of leadership as a social process.

The experimental studies carried on by Terman (14), Chevaleva-Janovskya (19), Sylla (20) Partridge (62), Hollingworth (39), Simpson (70), and Jennings (43), have yielded much insight into the dynamics of the leadership process. The distinguishing features of the experimental studies mentioned above are

- (a) a definite attempt to control and vary the dependent variables
- (b) the technique of studying leadership in experimentally developed groups and the subsequent shifting of both leaders and followers into new groups. This approach is frequently supplemented with testing and measurement
- (c) this method allows for trained observation and scientific recording of data.

The disadvantage of this method of investigation is that the experimentally devised situations may not correspond to true life situations.

The diversity of the objectives and subsequent data of the several studies included herein preclude the possibility of a briefer summation of results and conclusions than was presented in the main body of the chapter.

The observational method employed by child psychologists and sociologists has also shed light on various aspects of leadership. This approach is usually utilized to study the general social development of the individual in the group, as well as the dynamics of group interaction.

While emphasis is not primarily placed on leadership, these studies have frequently yielded significant information. Thrasher (75), for example, in his study of gangs, has pointed out that leaders, within a single group as well as among different groups, vary greatly. Child psychologists (60,61,13) have made their contribution in pointing out that the phenomenon of leadership exists in very young groups as well.

The testing and measurement approach to this topic has been most frequently utilized to discover traits and constellations of traits of leadership within and among groups of diverse nature. Intelligence tests, questionnaires, personality inventories, and rating scales are employed. While results yield a rather restricted common area of agreement, the extreme diversity of traits studied and of results obtained, make difficult a brief summary. The inconsistency of results may be partially attributed to group differences. A series of trait lists developed by various investigators appear in the next few pages. A more detailed consideration of traits is presented in the chapter on interpretation of the results of the present study.

SOME OTHER LISTS OF TRAITS IN LEADERSHIP

F.H. Allport (1)

1. Trait of Ascendancy
2. Physical power
3. High motility
4. Tonus
5. Erect aggressive carriage
6. Tenacity
7. Face-to-face mode of address
8. Reinforcement of energy
9. Restraint
10. Inscrutability
11. Expansiveness
12. High intelligence
13. Understanding
14. Keen susceptibility to social stimulation
15. Tact
16. Zeal
17. Social Participation
18. Character
19. Drive

Cooley (22)

- |                              |                                |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Superior than others      | 4. Self-reliance               |
| 2. Significant individuality | 5. Militant gloating "I" (ego) |
| 3. Breadth of sympathy       | 6. Good communicator of ideas  |
| 7. Feeling of ascendancy     |                                |

even before deed

## L.L. Bernard (5)

- |                                           |                                |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Striking physical personality          | 16. Persistence                |
| 2. Size                                   | 17. Good natural ability       |
| 3. Good looks                             | 18. Originality                |
| 4. Appearance of strength of body         | 19. Initiative                 |
| 5. Appearance of strength of character    | 20. Good intellectual training |
| 6. Ready speech                           | 21. Soundness of judgment      |
| 7. Oratorical gift                        | 22. Mental flexibility         |
| 8. Readiness in repartee                  | 23. Forethought                |
| 9. Sympathy                               | 24. Intellectual vision        |
| 10. Sense of justice                      | 25. Moral vision               |
| 11. Humanitarianism                       | 26. Positive idealism          |
| 12. Honesty                               | 27. Cheerful                   |
| 13. Good faith                            | 28. Poise                      |
| 14. Insight                               | 29. Self-confidence            |
| 15. Courage                               | 30. Organizing ability         |
| 31. Knowledge of human nature and society |                                |

## O. Tead (73)

- |                                |                      |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Physical and nervous energy | 6. Technical mastery |
| 2. Purpose and direction       | 7. Decisiveness      |
| 3. Enthusiasm                  | 8. Intelligence      |
| 4. Integrity                   | 9. Teaching skill    |
| 5. Integrity                   | 10. Faith            |

## Dearborn (45)

- |                 |                              |
|-----------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Intelligence | 5. Insight                   |
| 2. Initiative   | 6. Kindliness                |
| 3. Courage      | 7. Good humour               |
| 4. Self-trust   | 8. Knowledge of human nature |

## PROCEDURE & RESULTS

### I. THE GROUP

The groups employed in this experiment were boys' friendship clubs sponsored by the Montreal Young Men's Hebrew Association. These groups varied in age from thirteen to twenty-one, and in membership from ten to twenty-five. The socio-economic status of the groups tested was primarily upper "lower class" and lower "middle class".

The groups are patterned as miniature democracies - their prime purpose being to educate the membership for "participation in a democracy".

The majority of these clubs were formed through a nucleus of youngsters who had been friends previous to their membership in the "Y". The youngsters consider the club as the medium for the expression of special interests among their close friends. Thus the selection of members is primarily based on the congeniality of the individual. Each member of the group is under continual observation by the rest of the group. He is obliged to make his contribution to the club's meetings, as well as to participate in the cultural, social, and athletic activities.

The system of elections closely parallels that of parliamentary procedure.

Within groups such as these it is usual for cliques to form around opposing leaders from time to time. Intensification of these cliques usually leads to a crisis situation in the group. Equilibrium within the group is re-established only after resolution of the

conflict through compromise, arbitration and reformation.

Each of these groups has a "club leader" who is an adult appointed by the staff supervisors, and ratified by the groups. This leader is in reality an advisor to the group. Regular "progress reports" from the advisor to supervisor made possible the selection of groups for testing during a period of equilibrium. Only those groups which had been in existence for a minimum of six months were chosen.

## II. THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

It was not the intention of this experiment to ascertain directly the traits possessed by the various individuals, since a member ordinarily is not selected for leadership on the basis of a test-revealed personality pattern, but rather by the extent to which that pattern manifests itself overtly in the particular situation, and the extent to which that pattern is recognized by the other members. The validity of the group's evaluation is assured by the small size of the group, the intimacy of individual interaction, and by the constant appraisal of efforts as related to abilities by the members. As Ordway Tead (73) has suggested, "Leaders are studied by their followers more closely than may be realized."

Two instruments were utilized for obtaining the youngsters' ratings of each other:

A. "Guess Who" Quiz

B. Ranking Scale for the Position of President

### II. A. THE "GUESS WHO" QUIZ

The "Guess Who" technique was introduced by Hartshorne and May. The use of this technique in the present study closely parallels Tryon's (78) procedure.

While the technique itself was borrowed, the actual quiz was completely reconstructed and developed to meet the needs of the particular situation.

The Quiz (see page 43) consisted of twenty-five pairs of descriptions "of the way some people behave". Each pair consisted of a single trait. (An example is given below.)

- 1A. He has a good sense of humour, is always telling good jokes and making good wise-cracks.
- 1B. He hasn't a sense of humour, seldom tells any jokes or makes any good wise-cracks. He sometimes doesn't laugh even when someone tells a good joke.

The trait in the example may be named "sense of humour". Description 1A obviously is the positive aspect while 1B is the negative.

The Quiz is given simultaneously to a complete group. Each member is asked to mention all of the members of the group that fit each description. The quizee is informed that several members will very often fit a single description, and that he may omit any question which he considers as applicable to none of the members.

The raw score for a single member on a single trait is therefore the algebraic sum of the number of times that that individual was mentioned by the complete group on description A (positive) and B (negative) of that trait. For example, youngster X, mentioned on trait 1A by 5 other members and mentioned on trait 1B by two other members is given a raw score of  $(+5) + (-2) = +3$ . By this method it is possible to obtain a raw score for each member of a group on each of the twenty-five traits. When all of the raw scores of a group on a single

trait are obtained, each individual can be given a rank for that trait.

The traits that were employed were selected from various lists which had been previously compiled, as well as from the personal experience of the writer in supervising such groups in previous years. For purposes of discussion and interpretation, each description has been given a trait name. It is not intended in this study to establish the validity of the trait names. To be "operational", or more simply, more scientifically careful, it is therefore stated that those names are merely symbols which were arbitrarily chosen for the descriptions. Thus, it is not claimed that the trait names and the respective descriptions conform to psychological definitions. To make it possible for the youngsters to associate the descriptions with individuals, it was necessary that those descriptions be very specific in nature. The descriptions therefore made definite reference to the way certain personality traits might reveal themselves in the behaviour of the individual in the situations provided by the club's activities. As Cox (45) has stated, "any trait shown must be shown with reference to specific situations. A general trait would be one that is shown in all situations where there are stimuli that might result in the reaction revealing the trait. In this sense there probably are no general traits; they would not be desirable if they were possible. A trait is not something possessed by an individual, but a tendency to respond in a certain specific or general way to a specific type of situation".

One of the problems encountered in the analysis of most types of rating techniques is the extent of "halo effect" influence. The halo effect is the tendency to classify a person on the whole as good or bad, and then to rate him on all traits in keeping with his



opinion. This effect can, according to Greene,(34) sometimes be avoided by rating all persons on a trait at the same time, rather than rating one person on all the traits listed before considering the next person. Greene further adds that, "True relationships may be approximated by pooling the ratings of several persons on the basis that personal prejudices will tend to cancel each other out". The "Guess Who" technique incorporates both of these suggestions. To further counteract the halo effect the instructions clearly request careful selection, honest and as unprejudiced as possible. The specificity of the descriptions also helps defeat the "halo error".

An error was discovered in the first form of the test. Description No. 4 was found to be impractical since every youngster in the group must fit into one of the opposite aspects:

4A. He is very active in the club council and is  
widely known in the department.

4B. He is not very active in the club council, and  
is not widely known in the department.

Description No. 4 was therefore not scored, and was eliminated in the revised form.

As the quiz was to be given to a varied age group, it was recognized that some of the descriptions would have to contain reference to situations applicable to various age groups. This fact was explained in the instructions. Description 13A on the first form, which referred to educational achievement, contained the following:-

13A. He does very well in school. He likes  
studying and knows a lot. He has or is  
getting a good education.

The phraseology employed in the descriptions was very similar to that employed by the groups.

On the first form the youngsters were asked to mark down the names of all youngsters on blank sheets, provided for that purpose. This procedure made the task of scoring a very tedious and lengthy one. Each response of each youngster had to be individually tabulated. Special tabulating forms had to be drawn up for the purpose. With an average of approximately three responses per youngster per description, it meant that some three thousand tabulations were made with the test group in order to obtain the raw scores. Again, a special form was used for changing raw scores into ranks.

## II. B. THE RANKING FOR PRESIDENCY

Each member of the group was also asked to rank all of the other members of the group in the order that he would like to see them president of the club. The position of president of the club is considered the highest position of leadership. It was made clear in the chapter on "Definitions and Orientation" that the president of these groups is not merely a figurehead, but the functional leader of the group.

The subjects were told to

1. Make believe that every member of the club had sufficient time to devote to the position.
2. Neglect consideration of any club by-laws which would eliminate some individuals from opportunity to be elected president.
3. Make believe that all members knew parliamentary procedure.

These instructions were given to exclude factors that were not related to personality and capacity.

The raw score of an individual in the group, on the ranking for presidency, was the arithmetic sum of the ranks given to that member by all of the other members of the group. When the raw scores of all of the members was obtained, it was possible to rank the members on the basis of the total evaluation of the group.

### II. C. CORRELATIONS

It is clear that after a group has taken the "Guess Who" Quiz and has done the "Ranking for Presidency", each member of the group has a rank for leadership and a rank for each of the twenty-five traits. Thus it was possible, by employing the method of rank differences, to determine the correlations between each of the traits and leadership, for that group.

### III. THE TEST GROUP

The first form of the "Guess Who" Quiz and the "Ranking for Presidency" were presented to a test group. The group was composed of eighteen members of sixteen years of age, and met all the requirements of the study. The club had been in existence two years, and had a competent leader whose reports showed the group to be in a state of equilibrium. The club leaders of the groups kindly cooperated by acting as proctors during the administration of the Tests.

During the administration, two proctors were present. The names of all the members of the group were placed on a blackboard in order to refresh the memories of the subjects. The attitudes of the testees was very cooperative. After administration and scoring of the two instruments, correlations were determined.

#### IV. RESULTS

The following correlations were obtained:

##### CORRELATIONS WITH LEADERSHIP (PRESIDENCY)

1. Sense of Humor	=	.65
2. Public Speaking Ability	=	.66
3. Unselfishness	=	.81
4. (Eliminated)		
5. Popularity with opposite sex	=	.39
6. Pugnacity	=	-.09
7. Intelligence	=	.90
8. Restlessness	=	-.22
9. Athletic Ability	=	.21
10. Grown-up	=	.35
11. Tidy and clean	=	-.06
12. Friendly	=	.86
13. Educational Achievement	=	.16
14. Group Spirit	=	.87
15. Work for group	=	.59
16. Daring	=	.61
17. Fairness	=	.82
18. Good looking	=	.16
19. Cooperation and Sacrifice	=	.76
20. Well-dressed	=	.17
21. Show-off	=	-.15
22. Ingenuity	=	.81
23. Participation in discussions	=	.93
24. Respect for elders	=	.02
25. Overaggressiveness	=	.10
26. Popularity in group	=	.76

The concurrence and stability of the subjects' responses were found to be very great. There was seldom any considerable controversy among youngsters on evaluation of any youngster on any trait. The greatest problem in the use of the "Guess Who" Technique (mentioned in Partridge's study) was overcome, since a normal distribution of raw scores was obtained on each trait, thus making possible significant correlations. (see page 36).

#### V.A. FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor Analysis of the results was undertaken to

- (a) discover whether any questions were duplicated  
or irrelevant
- (b) afford greater insight into the meaning of the  
results.

The first step in the process was to determine the inter-correlations of the 25 traits. The results were recorded as a chart of 625 inter-correlations (see Factor Analysis Chart I). On the completion of this chart, the centroid method of Factor Analysis was then applied. The 23 complicated steps, with their corresponding checks, produced the first factor loadings and the first factor residuals (Chart II). Since these residuals were significantly high, the process was repeated. This procedure was repeated until four series of factor loadings and their corresponding factor residuals were obtained. (see Charts III, IV, and V.)

Inspection of the fourth factor residuals (see Chart V) revealed that only the descriptions of restlessness, No. 8, respect of elders, No. 24, and over-aggressiveness, No. 25, provided significant

residuals, that is, with two or more of their factor residuals above .20.

The reappearance of these high residuals gave insight into the peculiarities of the three descriptions, suggesting revision. Thus, there was no further need to continue the process. A table of factor loadings, or a factor matrix was then prepared. (see page 53)

#### V. B. INTERPRETATION OF THE FACTOR MATRIX

Inspection of the factor matrix yielded the following conclusions.

Description No. 8 (restlessness) which had originally given a correlation with leadership of  $-.22$ , seemed to be unrelated to leadership and the other traits. A similar result was obtained with description No. 24 (respect for elders) whose original correlation with leadership was  $.02$ .

It was surprising to find that description No. 25 (over-aggressiveness) fell into the same category, since it would be expected that "extent of aggressiveness" would be related to other factors and leadership. Thus it became apparent that the fault lay in the measuring instrument.

Further inspection revealed that over-aggressiveness (No. 25) was closely related to "show off" (No. 21) whose original correlation with leadership was  $-.15$ . This was interpreted as duplication of descriptions. Unselfishness and considerateness (No. 3), fairness and justice (No. 17), cooperative (No. 19) were very closely related. Duplication was again indicated. Similarly, intelligence (No. 7) and ingenuity (No. 22) were interpreted by the youngsters as descriptive of the same trait. Such was the case for friendliness (No. 12) and popularity (No. 26).

Although "neat and tidy" seemed unrelated to all other traits, it was considered possible that this was characteristic of this particular age group and might be more significant in the older groups.

Pugnacity (No. 6), which had yielded correlation of  $-.09$ , appeared unrelated to all other traits. As in the case of No. 25, the measuring instrument was at fault, since balance in the trait may have been more desirable than either extreme.

No attempt was made to name the four factors that had been removed. In using the Centroid Method, we do not know directly from the inter-correlations just where the ability axes should be placed. The Centroid Method merely gives us two or more orthogonal reference axes and the factor loadings are the projections of the test Vectors upon those axes. It would be gratuitous to attempt to give psychological meaning or significance to a Centroid axes. As Guilford (35) has pointed out, it probably does not correspond to any real variable in human nature.

It was not considered of sufficient importance to this study to rotate the axes, thus adding to a task which had already proved to be an extremely lengthy and tedious one.

## VI. REVISION OF THE "GUESS WHO" QUIZ

(see page 54) The following revisions were made.

(a) Recording of Responses. To facilitate the scoring procedure, the subjects were instructed to record each response on a separate secret ballot, with the number of the description on the same ballot. Thus was eliminated the extremely awkward process of tabulating each response. All ballots referring to a single description were collected.

simultaneously and they had only to be sorted to obtain the algebraic sums and the raw scores

It was felt that the secret ballot would also promote greater honesty on the part of the subject.

(b) Instructions. The use of the secret ballot necessitated a revision and amplification of the instructions.

(c) Revision of trait descriptions presented.

1. The description "activity in the department" (No. 4) was eliminated because of its impracticability.

2. "Restlessness" (No. 8) and "respect for elders" (No. 24) were eliminated because of their irrelevancy.

3. To eliminate duplication of description the following combinations were made:

<u>ORIGINAL FORM</u>		<u>REVISED FORM</u>
"friendliness" (No. 12)	)	
"popularity" (No. 26)	)	"friendliness and popularity" (No. 10)
"unselfish and considerate" (No. 3)	)	"unselfish and cooperative" (No. 3)
"fair and just" (No. 17)	)	"fair, just and considerate" (No. 15)
"cooperative" (No. 19)	)	
"ingenuity" (No. 22)	)	
"intelligence" (No. 7)	)	"intelligence" (No. 6)
"show off" (No. 21)	)	
"over-aggressiveness" (No. 25)	)	"moderate aggressiveness" (No. 19)



4. A three-point scale was introduced for "pugnacity" (No. 5) and "moderate aggressiveness" (No. 19). The three-point scale used here employed three descriptions: moderation (a) in the trait was considered positive and each of the extremes (b) and (c), was considered negative. The scoring was as follows:

$$a - (\text{the difference between } b \text{ and } c)$$

For example, a subject who was mentioned by five other youngsters on (a), by three on (b) and two on (c) is given a raw score of

$$\begin{aligned} a - (b - c) \\ 5 - (3 - 2) &= 4 \end{aligned}$$

Again, where (a) = 5, (b) = 2, and (c) = 3, the score would be

$$\begin{aligned} a - (c - b) \\ 5 - (3 - 2) &= 4 \end{aligned}$$

This method of scoring is actually not a deviation in theory from the method used on the two-point scale since in both cases equal numbers of extreme responses cancel each other out.

5. Additional descriptions - further reading suggested the addition of the following four traits: "dependability" (No. 20), "self-confidence" (No. 21), "energy" (No. 22), and "persuasibility" (No. 23).

6. Minor changes in the wording of descriptions were also made.

## VII. THE FINAL MEASUREMENT AND RESULTS

The revised "Guess Who" Quiz and the "Ranking for Presidency" were then administered to twelve other groups, carefully chosen to meet the specific qualifications previously discussed.

The resulting 276 correlations appear on the following page.

Traits		Age												16 Test group
		13	14	14	15	15	16	16	16½	17	17½	21	21	
Sense of humour	(1)	.37	.42	.79	.26	-.08	.66	.77	.26	.44	+ .44	-.11	.69	.65
Speaking ability	(2)	.42	.36	.61	.44	.57	.85	.90	.82	.87	+ .80	+ .84	.84	.66
Cooperative and unselfish	(3)	.84	.54	.78	.28	.25	.79	.75	.18	.38	+ .66	-.16	.74	.81
Popularity with opposite sex	(4)	.16	.27	.49	.45	.31	.34	.34	.65	.56	+ .37	+ .21	.22	.39
Moderate pugnacity	(5)	-.13	.61	.31	.25	-.23	.49	.72	.46	.35	+ .62	+ .53	.63	
Intelligence	(6)	.52	.64	.79	.93	+ .89	.93	.99	.76	.94	+ .87	+ .89	.97	.90
Athletic ability	(7)	.64	.88	.33	.22	+ .10	.78	.69	.18	.19	+ .35	+ .11	.32	.21
Grown-up	(8)	.49	.60	.86	.46	.62	.63	.95	.56	.74	+ .85	+ .83	.41	.35
Neat and tidy	(9)	.48	.04	.50	.00	0	.63	.57	.36	.12	-.07	+ .39	.66	-.06
Friendliness	(10)	.47	.78	.82	.49	.73	.52	.80	.40	.76	+ .79	+ .31	.72	+ .86
Educational achievement	(11)	.63	.45	.44	.35	.46	.88	.84	.68	.80	+ .61	+ .82	.83	+ .16
Group spirit	(12)	.25	.60	.73	.67	.56	.90	.87	.65	.63	+ .90	+ .23	.90	+ .87
Work for the group	(13)	.59	.90	.95	.81	.82	.80	.74	.68	.68	+ .76	+ .37	.91	+ .59
Daring	(14)	.17	.51	.49	.13	-.13	.07	.80	.02	.55	+ .71	+ .21	.16	+ .61
Fair, just and considerate	(15)	.68	-.07	.88	.59	.44	+ .16	.76	.03	.29	+ .74	+ .75	.09	+ .82
Good looking	(16)	.44	.22	.75	.25	.44	.28	.62	.43	.53	+ .16	-.04	.55	.16
Well dressed	(17)	.53	0	.11	.05	.07	.22	.52	.44	.14	-.10	+ .59	.45	.17
Participation in discussion	(18)	.65	.79	.71	.74	.61	.86	.95	.83	.73	+ .74	+ .89	.88	.93
Moderate aggressiveness	(19)	.48	.85	.64	.58	0	.63	.61	.13	.58	+ .71	+ .33	.60	
Dependability	(20)	.76	.40	.81	.78	.73	.86	.88	.40	.66	+ .82	+ .35	.34	
Self-confidence	(21)	-.10	.59	.81	.88	.78	.47	.33	.69	.66	+ .85	+ .62	.29	
Energy	(22)	.49	.70	.71	.48	.73	.63	.74	.41	.54	+ .73	+ .14	.66	
Ability to persuade others	(23)	.40	.72	.45	.62	.78	.69	.96	.64	.89	+ .81	+ .96	.22	



GUESS WHO!

INSTRUCTIONS:

Below will be found a series of descriptions of the way some people behave. You are to write the names of any club members who fit that description.

Several members will usually fit each description. Each club member may be mentioned under many different descriptions. You may skip any description if you do not think any club member fits it.

On the blackboard you will find a list of all the names of the club members. You may look at the board but refrain from looking around the room.

Please do this seriously. Be honest about all members, even if you do or do not like them.

- 
- 1 a. He (or shee) has got a good sense of humour, is always telling good jokes and making good wise cracks.
  - 1 b. He hasn't got a sense of humour. Seldom tells any jokes or makes any good wise cracks. Sometimes he doesn't laugh even when somebody tells a good joke.
  - 2 a. He is a very good speaker; he speaks clearly without hesitating and usually uses the proper words.
  - 2 b. He is a poor speaker, he either is nervous and afraid to speak, or uses poor words and is hard to understand. He may hesitate a lot when he speaks.
  - 3 a. He doesn't think only of himself, he is very considerate of others. He always shares what he has, if it is possible.
  - 3 b. He usually thinks only of himself, he is not considerate of others. Usually would not share something he has, unless he has to do so.
  - 4 a. He is active in club department (outside club) and is known by other clubs and the council.
  - 4 b. He is not active in the rest of the club department, and is not well known by the council.

- 5 a. He is very popular with the opposite sex.
- 5 b. He is not at all popular with the opposite sex.
- 6 a. He often gets into fights and arguments with other members.
- 6 b. He never fights or argues with others. He always gives in to the others or he shuts up altogether.
- 7 a. He is clever and usually knows what is good or bad for the club. His opinions are usually correct. He catches on to things quickly.
- 7 b. He is quite dull; his opinions are usually useless and incorrect. He usually cannot understand anything unless it is quite simple.
- 8 a. He is quite restless, can't seem to sit still, is always moving about. He does not pay attention too much.
- 8 b. He always sits still, and seldom ever moves about or makes noises. He almost always pays attention.
- 9 a. He is good in sports and active games. He usually helps the team very much by his ability to play very well.
- 9 b. He is poor in sports. He usually hinders the team. The team is better off when he does not play.
- 10 a. He is very grown-up for his age. He acts and thinks like older people.
- 10 b. He never acts his age. Everybody thinks he is younger than he is even after talking to him.
- 11 a. He is very neat and tidy and clean. His hair is usually combed. His clothes clean and pressed. His face and hands washed. His shoes polished. He is always clean-shaven.
- 11 b. He usually looks untidy and dirty. His hair is seldom combed, his clothes seldom clean and pressed. His face and hands often dirty. He often needs a shave. His shoes are very seldom polished.
- 12 a. He is very friendly and gets along with everybody in the group. He doesn't get angry often. He seldom gets into arguments.
- 12 b. He isn't friendly with most of the club. Has arguments with many of the members often. He often gets angry. He doesn't try to make friends.
- 13 a. He does very well in school. He likes to learn and he knows a lot. He has or is getting a very good education.

- 13 b. He doesn't like school and does very poorly in school. He doesn't know much about school-work. He has a poor education.
- 14 a. He has a lot of group spirit. Always sticks up for the club. He will fight for the club.
- 14 b. He has very little group spirit. Seldom sticks up for the club. He will not fight for the club.
- 15 a. He works very hard for the club, or would if he had the chance.
- 15 b. He does very little work for the club, and wouldn't do more if he had the chance.
- 16 a. He is afraid of almost nothing. He likes to take a chance. He will do things even if they may get him in trouble.
- 16 b. He is afraid to do a lot of things. He doesn't like to take a chance. He won't do anything if he thinks he might get into trouble.
- 17 a. He is always very fair and just. He always votes for what is best and not for his friends or for what he likes. He tries to give everybody a fair break.
- 17 b. He is always unfair and unjust. He always votes for his friends or for what he likes and not for what is best for the group. He never tries to give anybody a break.
- 18 a. He is very good-looking.
- 18 b. He is quite homely.
- 19 a. He is usually ready to cooperate, to do his share even if it means going out of his way. He tries to help out all the time even if the group decides to do something he doesn't like.
- 19 b. He normally does not cooperate or do his share. He won't go out of his way or help out when group decides to do something he doesn't like.
- 20 a. He is usually very well-dressed. He always wears the right thing at the right time. His clothes always look attractive and good. He goes in for the newest styles.
- 20 b. He usually looks poorly-dressed. He seldom wears the new styles. His clothes do not look attractive and good.
- 21 a. He is usually a show-off.
- 21 b. He very seldom tries to show off.

- 22 a. He often gets very good and new ideas.
- 22 b. He never gets a good or new idea.
- 23 a. He takes part in most discussions in the club.
- 23 b. He takes part in very few discussions.
- 24 a. He respects most older people very much.
- 24 b. He does not respect older people at all. He often talks back to older people.
- 25 a. He often pushes other people around. He always wants to be first. He always wants and tries to get the center of attraction.
- 25 b. He never pushes other people around. He never tries to be first. He never goes out of his way to be the center of attraction.
- 26 a. He is liked by almost all the members of the group. Most members like to go out with him.
- 26 b. He is liked by very few members of the group. Most members do not like to go out with him.



	L.A.	(12) D	d <sup>12</sup>	(13) D	d <sup>13</sup>	(14) D	d <sup>14</sup>	(15) D	d <sup>15</sup>	(16) D	d <sup>16</sup>	(17) D	d <sup>17</sup>	(18) D	d <sup>18</sup>	(19) D	d <sup>19</sup>	(20) D	d <sup>20</sup>
Brown	2	1	1	3	1	2	0	6.5	4.5	21.5	2	0	4.5	9.5	6.5	11.5	14.5	20.5	
Hollinger	4	4.5	.6	.25	2	2	4	10.5	6.5	42.5	4	0	18	14	19.6	2	2	4	5
Rabinovitch	1	2.5	1.5	2.25	4.5	3.5	12.5	6	5	25	1.5	.5	.25	15.5	14.5	20.5	4.5	3.5	12.5
Cohen	9	6	3	9	4.5	4.5	20.5	5	4	16	1.5	6	36	5	4	16	15	6	36
Surkes	3	11	8	64	2.5	5.5	20.5	8	5	25	1.5	1.5	2.25	3.5	.5	20.5	7.5	4.5	20.5
Shapiro	12.5	13	.5	12.5	14.5	2	4	8	4.5	20.5	10.5	2	4	6.5	6	36	9	3.5	12.5
Pinchuk	7	2.5	4.5	20.5	1	6	36	1	6	36	4	3	9	6.5	.5	20.5	2	5	25
Kahensky	6	7	1	1	7	1	1	3.5	2.5	6.25	6.5	15	25	8.5	2.5	6.25	2	4	16
Sharg	5	4.5	.5	12.5	10.5	56	30.5	8	3	9	4	1	1	8.5	3.5	12.5	7.5	2.5	6.25
Segal	8	9	1	12.5	4.5	20.5	14.5	6.5	42.5	9	1	1	14	6	36	12.5	4.5	20.5	15
Mathanson	12.5	13	.5	12.5	14.5	2	4	12	.5	25	10.5	2	4	11	1.5	20.5	14	1.5	20.5
Atlas	14	15	1	17	3	9	3.5	10.5	10.5	18	4	4	16	13	1	18	4	16	2
Sezant	10	9	1	12	2	4	17	7	49	17	7	49	11	1	1	10.5	.5	20.5	10.5
Magid	16	16	0	12.5	3.5	12.5	18	2	4	13	3	3	9	19	3	9	12.5	3.5	12.5
Bercovitch	11	9	2	4	10.5	15	20.5	10.5	.5	25	8	3	9	3.5	7.5	11.5	10.5	.5	20.5
Dubinsky	15	17.5	25	6.25	8.5	6.5	42.5	19	4	16	15	0	0	17	2	4	6	9	81
Katz	18	13	5	25	16	2	4	16	2	4	12	6	36	15.5	2.5	6.25	16.5	1.5	2.25
Stariss	17	19	2	4	18.5	1.5	20.5	14.5	2.5	6.25	15	2	4	11	6	36	16.5	.25	13
Phillips	19	17.5	1.5	20.5	18.5	.5	25	13	6	36	19	0	0	1	18	324	19	0	10.5
		143 = +.87		442.550 = +.59				448.0 = +.61			201. = +.82			953. = +.16			273.0 = +.76		950.50 = +.17



CHART-I - FACTOR ANALYSIS.

NO.	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	Σrk
1	+0.87	+0.40	+0.70	+0.71	+0.39	+0.49	-0.09	-0.05	+0.50	+0.36	+0.77	-0.07	+0.71	+0.55	+0.74	+0.58	+0.32	+0.60	+0.52	+0.05	+0.42	+0.57	+0.71	+0.12	+0.87	11.74
2	+0.40	+0.79	+0.54	+0.40	+0.24	+0.79	+0.03	+0.22	+0.62	+0.21	+0.51	+0.58	+0.56	+0.42	+0.32	+0.66	+0.06	+0.41	+0.38	-0.25	+0.73	+0.72	+0.28	-0.04	+0.43	9.45
3	+0.70	+0.54	+0.88	+0.61	+0.45	+0.81	+0.55	+0.26	+0.45	-0.15	+0.80	+0.34	+0.77	+0.71	+0.48	+0.81	+0.09	+0.88	+0.13	-0.25	+0.70	+0.74	+0.27	-0.12	+0.77	11.68
5	+0.71	+0.40	+0.61	+0.80	+0.46	+0.45	+0.02	+0.02	+0.62	+0.45	+0.70	-0.06	+0.56	+0.47	+0.77	+0.40	+0.47	+0.47	+0.66	+0.30	+0.60	+0.52	+0.10	+0.47	+0.80	11.77
6	+0.39	+0.24	+0.45	+0.46	+0.72	+0.12	+0.15	+0.01	+0.04	+0.03	-0.73	+0.03	-0.22	-0.07	-0.17	+0.35	-0.20	+0.33	+0.08	+0.52	-0.28	+0.23	+0.13	+0.43	+0.50	4.60
7	+0.49	+0.79	+0.81	+0.80	+0.45	+0.95	+0.49	+0.26	+0.46	-0.21	+0.70	+0.47	+0.79	+0.75	+0.41	+0.80	+0.17	+0.63	-0.12	-0.21	+0.89	+0.95	+0.24	-0.07	+0.60	11.13
8	-0.09	+0.03	+0.55	+0.02	-0.15	+0.49	+0.67	-0.20	+0.30	+0.56	+0.23	-0.60	+0.15	-0.04	+0.66	-0.06	+0.57	-0.23	+0.54	+0.67	+0.53	-0.12	+0.53	+0.66	+0.45	6.42
9	-0.05	+0.22	+0.26	+0.02	+0.01	+0.26	-0.20	+0.42	-0.14	-0.23	+0.22	+0.31	+0.42	+0.13	-0.08	+0.19	+0.12	+0.19	-0.21	-0.04	+0.33	+0.29	+0.06	+0.03	+0.12	2.53
10	+0.50	+0.62	+0.45	+0.62	+0.04	+0.46	+0.30	+0.22	+0.72	+0.50	+0.42	+0.15	+0.46	+0.45	+0.72	+0.56	+0.24	+0.36	+0.66	+0.11	+0.51	+0.49	+0.01	+0.39	+0.59	10.17
11	+0.36	+0.21	-0.15	+0.45	+0.03	-0.21	+0.56	-0.23	+0.50	+0.81	+0.01	-0.18	-0.01	-0.10	+0.43	-0.16	+0.45	-0.16	+0.81	+0.26	-0.02	-0.09	+0.04	+0.27	+0.41	4.14
12	+0.77	+0.51	+0.80	+0.70	-0.73	+0.70	+0.23	+0.22	+0.42	+0.90	+0.90	+0.13	+0.72	+0.52	+0.62	+0.71	+0.36	+0.68	+0.42	-0.31	+0.66	+0.66	+0.06	+0.16	+0.90	12.08
13	-0.07	+0.58	+0.34	-0.06	+0.03	+0.47	+0.60	-0.20	+0.15	-0.18	+0.13	+0.60	+0.22	+0.24	-0.25	+0.29	+0.65	+0.32	0	-0.46	+0.37	+0.39	+0.60	-0.41	-0.08	1.26
14	+0.71	+0.56	+0.77	+0.56	-0.22	+0.79	+0.15	+0.42	+0.46	-0.01	+0.72	+0.22	+0.82	+0.82	+0.68	+0.47	+0.13	+0.82	+0.09	-0.11	+0.61	+0.82	+0.01	+0.09	+0.60	9.73
15	+0.55	+0.42	+0.71	+0.47	+0.07	+0.75	-0.04	+0.18	+0.45	+0.43	+0.62	-0.25	+0.68	+0.54	+0.84	+0.81	+0.51	+0.40	+0.59	+0.28	+0.51	+0.55	+0.42	+0.24	+0.84	11.86
16	+0.74	+0.32	+0.48	+0.77	+0.45	+0.81	+0.55	+0.26	+0.45	-0.15	+0.80	+0.34	+0.77	+0.71	+0.48	+0.81	+0.09	+0.88	+0.13	-0.25	+0.70	+0.74	+0.27	+0.44	+0.39	10.49
17	+0.58	+0.66	+0.81	+0.66	-0.17	+0.95	+0.49	+0.26	+0.46	-0.21	+0.70	+0.47	+0.79	+0.75	+0.41	+0.80	+0.17	+0.63	-0.12	-0.21	+0.89	+0.95	+0.24	-0.07	+0.60	6.40
18	+0.32	+0.06	+0.09	+0.88	+0.24	+0.79	+0.67	-0.20	+0.30	+0.56	+0.23	-0.60	+0.15	-0.04	+0.66	-0.06	+0.57	-0.23	+0.54	+0.67	+0.53	-0.12	+0.53	+0.66	+0.45	9.22
19	+0.60	+0.41	+0.88	+0.61	+0.45	+0.81	+0.55	+0.26	+0.45	-0.15	+0.80	+0.34	+0.77	+0.71	+0.48	+0.81	+0.09	+0.88	+0.13	-0.25	+0.70	+0.74	+0.27	+0.44	+0.39	8.07
20	+0.52	+0.38	+0.13	+0.66	+0.08	-0.12	+0.54	-0.21	+0.66	+0.81	+0.34	-0.42	+0.67	+0.82	+0.59	+0.11	+0.32	+0.08	+0.81	+0.22	+0.23	+0.27	+0.45	+0.41	+0.50	1.52
21	+0.05	-0.25	-0.25	+0.30	+0.52	-0.21	+0.67	-0.04	+0.11	+0.26	-0.31	-0.46	0	-0.11	+0.28	-0.29	+0.26	-0.36	+0.22	-0.88	-0.17	-0.01	+0.65	+0.88	-0.06	11.62
22	+0.42	+0.73	+0.70	+0.60	+0.28	+0.89	+0.53	+0.33	+0.51	-0.02	+0.66	+0.37	+0.69	+0.61	+0.51	+0.70	+0.32	+0.59	+0.23	+0.91	+0.91	+0.95	+0.27	+0.05	+0.54	11.62
23	+0.57	+0.72	+0.74	+0.52	+0.23	+0.95	-0.12	+0.29	+0.49	-0.09	+0.66	+0.39	+0.82	+0.53	+0.55	+0.72	+0.17	+0.68	+0.22	+0.22	+0.27	+0.27	+0.12	+0.15	+0.65	11.62
24	+0.71	+0.28	+0.27	-0.10	+0.13	+0.24	+0.53	+0.06	+0.01	+0.04	+0.06	+0.60	+0.11	+0.01	-0.42	-0.05	+0.32	-0.36	+0.45	+0.65	+0.12	+0.65	+0.64	+0.64	+0.88	2.46
25	+0.12	-0.04	-0.12	+0.47	+0.43	-0.07	+0.66	+0.03	+0.39	+0.40	+0.16	-0.41	+0.20	+0.09	+0.24	-0.05	+0.44	-0.25	+0.41	+0.88	+0.91	+0.95	+0.27	+0.05	+0.54	4.80
26	+0.87	+0.43	+0.77	+0.80	-0.50	+0.60	+0.45	+0.12	+0.59	+0.27	+0.90	-0.08	+0.75	+0.60	+0.84	+0.72	+0.39	+0.68	+0.50	-0.06	+0.54	+0.65	+0.88	-0.04	+0.90	12.77
Σrk	11.74	9.45	11.68	11.77	4.60	11.13	6.42	2.53	10.17	4.14	12.08	1.26	9.73	11.86	10.49	6.40	9.22	8.07	1.52	11.62	11.62	2.46	4.80	12.77	20.53	
K <sub>1</sub>	0.810	0.652	0.806	0.812	0.318	0.768	0.443	0.175	0.702	0.286	0.834	0.087	0.849	0.672	0.819	0.724	0.442	0.636	0.557	0.105	0.802	0.802	0.170	0.331	0.882	14.4033
K <sub>2</sub>	0.6561	0.4251	0.496	0.6593	0.1011	0.5898	0.1962	0.0306	0.4928	0.0818	0.6956	0.008	0.7208	0.45166	0.6708	0.5242	0.1954	0.4045	0.3103	0.0110	0.6432	0.6432	0.0289	0.1096	0.777	0.069034



## CHART-II - FACTOR ANALYSIS

[illegible]



# CHART-III - FACTOR ANALYSIS.

NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
1	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
2	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
3	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
4	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
5	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
6	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
7	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
8	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
9	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
10	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
11	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
12	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
13	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
14	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
15	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
16	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
17	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
18	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
19	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
20	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
21	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
22	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
23	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
24	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
25	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575
26	572	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575	575

$\Sigma r = 38.080$   
 $\sqrt{\Sigma r} = 6.171$   
 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Sigma r}} = .162$   
 CHECK = 6.169

$K_3 = -429 \quad 299 \quad -200 \quad -170 \quad -630 \quad +334 \quad -092 \quad 224 \quad 148 \quad -168 \quad -340 \quad 373 \quad 132 \quad 110 \quad -200 \quad 043 \quad -132 \quad -186 \quad 321 \quad 247 \quad 300 \quad -137 \quad 404 \quad -412$

$K_2$



CHART - IV - FACTOR ANALYSIS.

No.	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
1	+.391	+.516	+.001	+.042	+.021	+.010	+.485	+.098	+.004	+.059	+.063	+.017	+.079	+.052	+.067	+.011	+.088	+.025	+.008	+.107	+.124	+.047	+.516	+.629	+.021	
2	+.226	+.281	+.074	+.017	+.059	+.029	+.029	+.026	+.182	+.004	+.026	+.203	+.122	+.156	+.045	+.027	+.056	+.150	+.260	+.160	+.055	+.021	+.163	+.129	+.047	
3	+.468	+.074	+.036	+.008	+.059	+.032	+.468	+.026	+.004	+.128	+.082	+.057	+.010	+.045	+.068	+.029	+.100	+.083	+.025	+.084	+.031	+.025	+.175	+.040	+.058	
5	+.473	+.017	+.448	+.473	+.148	+.024	+.473	+.027	+.040	+.040	+.019	+.051	+.056	+.003	+.008	+.096	+.013	+.038	+.069	+.123	+.047	+.006	+.168	+.128	+.029	
6	+.148	+.059	+.059	+.148	+.166	+.055	+.132	+.011	+.034	+.034	+.152	+.003	+.043	+.166	+.121	+.019	+.103	+.116	+.051	+.129	+.097	+.052	+.108	+.065	+.062	
7	+.055	+.032	+.032	+.024	+.055	+.492	+.492	+.099	+.031	+.029	+.016	+.038	+.040	+.038	+.013	+.006	+.076	+.095	+.200	+.013	+.044	+.040	+.042	+.080	+.021	
8	+.485	+.010	+.029	+.032	+.032	+.492	+.492	+.068	+.023	+.023	+.062	+.018	+.160	+.025	+.108	+.085	+.135	+.045	+.081	+.167	+.383	+.203	+.087	+.077	+.070	
9	+.029	+.029	+.029	+.026	+.027	+.011	+.068	+.236	+.048	+.062	+.023	+.018	+.160	+.025	+.108	+.085	+.135	+.045	+.081	+.167	+.383	+.203	+.087	+.077	+.070	
10	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	+.004	
11	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	+.059	
12	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	+.063	
13	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	+.017	
14	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	+.079	
15	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	+.052	
16	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	+.067	
17	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	+.011	
18	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	+.088	
19	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	+.025	
20	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	+.008	
21	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	+.107	
22	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	+.124	
23	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	+.047	
24	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	+.516	
25	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	+.629	
26	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	+.021	
Ar	2.081	2.307	.461	.501	1.764	.018	.007	.421	1.115	2.687	.503	1.822	1.468	1.584	.593	.739	2.46	1.183	2.141	2.083	1.738	.405	3.338	.828	.332	$\Sigma r = 30.456$
K <sub>1</sub>	.380	-.421	.084	-.092	-.322	.003	-.001	.077	-.204	-.491	-.092	-.333	.268	.290	.108	.135	-.045	.216	.391	.381	-.348	.074	.604	.151	.061	$\sqrt{\Sigma r} = 5.519$
K <sub>2</sub>																										$\frac{1}{\Sigma r} = .18178$



# CHART-V - FACTOR ANALYSIS.

NO.	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
1	+372	-159	-074	-014	+017	+009	+485	-127	-074	-246	+028	-144	-023	-058	-048	-040	+071	-057	-141	-038	+003	+019	+315	-028	-044
2	-159	+104	+039	-056	-016	-030	-029	+029	-096	-074	-065	+063	+009	+034	0	-084	-075	+059	+095	0	-099	-010	-060	+065	+021
3	-074	+039	+461	-016	+032	+032	-468	+020	-021	+087	+074	-087	-033	+021	-077	+018	+096	+065	+062	+052	+004	-031	+220	+027	-063
5	-014	-056	+461	-016	+032	+032	-468	+020	-021	+087	+074	-087	-033	+021	-077	+018	+096	+065	+062	+052	+004	-031	+220	+027	-063
6	+017	-039	+016	+118	+062	+054	+132	-036	-100	-025	+011	-020	-030	-030	-018	-084	+009	-058	-033	-158	+018	-076	-063	-142	-035
7	+009	-030	+032	+024	+092	+492	-492	-099	-030	-099	-122	-037	-041	+037	+013	+005	-076	-096	-199	+066	-045	+040	-044	-080	-021
8	+485	-029	+468	-473	-492	-492	+492	+068	-120	-023	+016	-210	-047	-130	-071	+096	+105	+172	-081	-167	+383	+203	-087	-077	-070
9	-127	-029	+020	-020	-054	-099	-068	+230	-220	-010	-069	-044	-139	-140	-085	-095	-200	-082	+061	+079	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029
10	-074	-096	-021	-021	-100	-030	-068	+230	-220	-010	-069	-044	-139	-140	-085	-095	-200	-082	+061	+079	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029
11	-246	-074	-065	-025	-205	-057	-068	+230	-220	-010	-069	-044	-139	-140	-085	-095	-200	-082	+061	+079	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029
12	+028	-065	+074	+011	+122	-029	+068	+230	-220	-010	-069	-044	-139	-140	-085	-095	-200	-082	+061	+079	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029
13	-144	-023	-058	-048	-040	+071	-057	-082	+048	-054	-039	-013	-025	-078	-055	-027	-203	-111	-125	-020	+282	-100	-034	-041	-069
14	-023	+009	+034	-058	-048	-040	+071	-057	-082	+048	-054	-039	-013	-025	-078	-055	-027	-203	-111	-125	-020	+282	-100	-034	-041
15	-058	+034	+021	-030	-073	-037	-071	-130	-073	-071	-023	-002	-073	-071	-023	-004	+072	+048	-054	-039	-013	-025	-078	-055	-027
16	-048	0	-077	-018	-086	-013	-071	-130	-073	-071	-023	-002	-073	-071	-023	-004	+072	+048	-054	-039	-013	-025	-078	-055	-027
17	-040	-084	+018	-084	-062	-005	-096	-095	-200	-082	+061	+079	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116	-103
18	+071	-057	+059	-065	-076	-089	-076	-096	-101	-025	-078	-055	-027	-203	-111	-125	-020	+282	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116
19	-057	-059	-065	-076	-089	-076	-096	-101	-025	-078	-055	-027	-203	-111	-125	-020	+282	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116	-103
20	-141	-095	-060	-027	-032	-032	-468	-029	-096	-074	-065	+063	+009	+034	0	-084	-075	+059	+095	0	-099	-010	-060	+065	+103
21	-038	0	+052	-158	+066	-014	-167	+383	+203	-087	-077	-070	-035	-057	-085	-095	-200	-082	+061	+079	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029
22	+003	-099	-010	-060	+065	+027	-063	-142	-035	-021	-029	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116	-103	-103
23	-019	-010	-031	-220	-027	-063	-142	-035	-021	-029	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116	-103	-103	-103
24	+315	-060	+027	-063	-142	-035	-021	-029	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116	-103	-103	-103	-103	-103
25	-028	+065	+021	-063	-142	-035	-021	-029	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116	-103	-103	-103	-103	-103
26	-044	+021	-063	-142	-035	-021	-029	-069	-043	-073	-102	-029	-100	-034	-041	-069	-031	-114	-116	-103	-103	-103	-103	-103	-103



FACTOR LOADINGS

	1	2	3	5	6*	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24*	25	26
1st	810	652	806	812	318	768	443	175	702	286	834	087	849	672	819	724	442	636	557	105	802	802	170	331	882
2nd	005	326	455	-188	284	497	-622	305	-197	-635	303	635	269	319	-334	452	-415	566	574	-781	297	393	-570	-760	078
3rd	-429	299	-200	-170	-630	334	-092	224	148	-168	-360	373	132	110	-200	043	-118	-132	-186	321	247	300	-137	404	-412
4th	380	-421	084	-092	-322	003	-001	077	-204	-491	-092	-333	268	290	108	135	-045	216	391	381	-318	074	604	151	061

\*Reflected

## GUESS WHO!

### A Quiz for Club Members

#### INSTRUCTIONS:

Below will be found a series of descriptions of the way some people behave. With these descriptions you will receive a series of slips or ballots. You are to decide which members of the club fit each description. Then you are to write the name of each member that you have selected on a separate ballot with the number of the description on the same ballot.

Several members will very often fit a single description. Each club member will therefore probably be mentioned under many different descriptions. You may skip any description if you do not think any member fits it.

On the blackboard you will find a list of all of the members of the club. It is advisable that you should use that list in order to refreshen your memory.

Your ballots will be collected while you are working on the quiz. You therefore do not put your own name on the ballots and there is therefore no record of your opinion. The names of all members are discarded when the results are obtained, therefore, remember, that there is nothing personal about the quiz. PLEASE TELL THE TRUTH! Be honest and unafraid to mention even your best friend on any description, if you think it fits him. Try, as well, to be fair in your selection even to a member you don't like. Above all, it is your true opinion we want.

You are not to mention your own name on any of the ballots. Let the other members decide whether you fit any description.

Since this quiz is for young and old, some questions will contain phrases or sentences that will not apply to your age group. You are to refer to those parts of the descriptions that you think apply to your age group.

#### Example:

No. 21      "He is very big".

Ballots

No. 21	No. 21	No. 21	No. 21
J. Jones	R. Smith	T. Lake	S. Brown

No. 27 "He is very small".

Ballots

No. 27
N. White

No. 27
T. Roger

No. 6 "He wears Red ties".

No ballots. You do not mark any ballots if a question doesn't apply to anyone in the club.

No. 18 "He is a good member".

No. 18 White	No. 18 Roger	No. 18 Jones	No. 18 Carr	No. 18 Lake
No. 18 Doe	No. 18 Smith	No. 18 Reed		

---

- 1 a. He has got a good sense of humour, is always telling good jokes and making good wisecracks. He laughs at all good jokes.
- 1 b. He hasn't got a sense of humour, seldom tells any jokes or makes any good wisecracks. Sometimes he doesn't even laugh when someone tells a good joke.
- 2 a. He is a very good speaker; he speaks clearly without hesitating and usually uses the proper words.
- 2 b. He is a poor speaker; he either is nervous and afraid to speak, uses poor words and is hard to understand. He may hesitate a lot when he speaks.
- 3 a. He doesn't think only of himself. He always shares what he has if it is possible. He is usually ready to cooperate, to do his share even if it means going out of his way. He tries to help out all of the time even if the group decides to do something he doesn't like.

- 3 b. He usually thinks only of himself. He would usually not share something he has. He usually does not cooperate or do his share. He won't go out of his way to help out when the group decides to do something he doesn't like.
- 4 a. He is very popular with the opposite sex.
- 4 b. He is not at all popular with the opposite sex.
- 5 a. He fights or argues with other members only when it is really necessary.
- 5 b. He often fights or argues with other members.
- 5 c. He never fights or argues with other members.
- 6 a. He is clever and usually knows what is good or bad for the club. His opinions are usually correct. He catches on to things quickly; he gets good ideas.
- 6 b. He is quite dull; his opinions are usually useless and incorrect. He usually cannot understand anything unless it is quite simple.
- 7 a. He is good in sports and active games. He is a great help to the team because of his ability to play well.
- 7 b. He is poor in sports; he usually hinders the team because of his lack of ability to play.
- 8 a. He is very grown up for his age. He acts and thinks like older people.
- 8 b. He never acts his age. Everybody thinks he is younger than he is, even after talking to him.
- 9 a. He is neat and tidy and clean. His hair is usually combed; his clothes clean and pressed; his face and hands washed; his shoes polished, (if older) is always clean shaven.
- 9 b. He usually looks untidy and dirty. His hair is seldom combed; his face is seldom clean; his shoes seldom polished; his clothes not pressed. (if older -- he is often unshaven).
- 10 a. He is very friendly and gets along with almost all members of the group. Most members think he is nice and like to go out with him.
- 10 b. He is not friendly with most of the members; he doesn't try to make friends; most members do not like to go with him.
- 11 a. (if at school) He does very well in school; he likes studying a lot and knows his work. (if older) He has or is getting a very good education.



- 11 b. He doesn't like school and does very poorly. He does not know much about his school work. (if older - he has a poor education).
- 12 a. He has a lot of group spirit and always sticks up for the club. He will fight for the club.
- 12 b. He has very little group spirit and seldom sticks up for the club; he would not fight for the club.
- 13 a. He works very hard for the club, or would, if he had the chance.
- 13 b. He does very little for the club and would not do more even if he had the chance.
- 14 a. He is afraid of almost nothing; he likes to take a chance; he will do things even if they may get him into trouble; he is daring and has courage.
- 14 b. He is afraid to do a lot of things. He does not like to take a chance; he would not do anything if he thinks it might get him into trouble; he is not daring and hasn't much courage.
- 15 a. He is always very fair and just; he always votes for what is best and not for his friends or for what he likes. He tries to give everybody a fair break. He is very considerate of others.
- 15 b. He is usually unjust and unfair. He always votes for his friends or for what he likes and not for what is best for the club. He does not try to give anybody a break; he is inconsiderate of others.
- 16 a. He is quite good looking.
- 16 b. He is quite homely.
- 17 a. He is usually very well dressed. He always wears the right thing at the right time; his clothes always look attractive and good.
- 17 b. He usually looks poorly dressed. His clothes look neither attractive nor good.
- 18 a. He takes part in most discussions in the group.
- 18 b. He takes part in very few discussions in the group.
- 19 a. He tries to be the centre of attraction only when he deserves it; he only tries to be first when he should be first; he will only push other people around when necessary; he is neither a show-off nor too shy or modest.

- 19 b. He always wants to be first. He always wants and tries to be the centre of attraction; he often pushes other people around; he is a show-off.
- 19 c. He never tries to be first. He never tries to be the centre of attraction; he is very shy and modest. He lets other people push him around.
- 20 a. He is very dependable and can be relied upon to carry out any job he undertakes.
- 20 b. He is not dependable and cannot be relied upon to carry out any job he undertakes.
- 21 a. He always seems very sure of himself.
- 21 b. He seldom seems sure of himself.
- 22 a. He has an awful lot of energy. He is a very active person who is continually busy either at school, at work, in the club or with his other hobbies. He never seems tired.
- 22 b. He hasn't much energy. He does not take part in any activities; he seems tired and listless.
- 23 a. He is very good at persuading people to do things or to believe things.
- 23 b. He is very poor at persuading people to do or believe anything.

## INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

In the previous chapters it has been made clear that the results of studies of leadership in particular situations, and of particular ethnic, socio-economic and age groups, cannot be interpreted as giving insight into leadership in other situations and in different groups. Therefore it is recognized that the results obtained in this study apply only to adolescent friendship clubs; of the particular pattern of those of the Montreal Y.M.H.A.; made up of Jewish youngsters of the upper "lower class" and lower "middle class"; and having been in existence for a minimum of six months.

Interpretation of the results of the correlations of each trait with leadership will be presented, followed by a more general discussion.

The results of the youngest group are to a great extent discounted because of the limited number of responses that were given.

All correlations of approximately .60 or greater are considered significant. Since the number of youngsters in each group was small, all correlations below approximately .60 are considered insignificant.

### 1. SENSE OF HUMOUR

It is reasonable to expect that a sense of humour may be an important characteristic of a leader. A sense of humour allows an individual to retain an objective attitude when one is insulted or when social tension appears. Humour relieves strain, shortens social distances and shatters tense moments, thus allowing constructive action to proceed. Humour helps keep the leader close to his followers, and prevents him from becoming cold and distant.

This trait was mentioned by Dearborn (45), Cole (83) and Drake (28) as quite important.

With five of the groups tested, significant correlations were obtained, while in the remaining groups correlations ranged from  $-.11$  to  $.44$ . The high correlations were found throughout the age group. It would seem therefore that while a sense of humour may contribute towards leadership, it is not a prerequisite to leadership.

## 2. SPEAKING ABILITY

The functions involved in the description of this ability are as follows:

- a. Verbal ability, involving a good vocabulary.
- b. Pleasant voice and good pronunciation.
- c. Ease of presentation, depending upon experience.

It is obvious that this trait, like many others, also depends on intelligence, emotional stability, education and other traits. However, in this study each trait is hypothesized as a separate unit.

Since these groups spend a good deal of time in discussion, one would expect speaking ability to be significant. Drake (27), Flemming (31) and Partridge (62) have stressed the importance of voice. Terman's (74) study showed leaders to be "more fluent of speech", while Cooley (22) has stated that a leader must be "a good communicator of ideas", and Allport (1) referred to "a face-to-face mode of address". Bernard (5) simply emphasized that leaders had the "oratorical gift".

In this study, while four of the five youngest groups yielded insignificant results, all of the older eight groups gave high correlations, with five above  $.83$ . Thus it would seem that the trait becomes more important to leadership at about sixteen years of age.

### 3. COOPERATIVE AND UNSELFISH

One would expect that this trait would yield very high correlations in all of these groups because of the emphasis on the trait in the very pattern of the groups. Reference to this pattern was made in the chapter on "Definitions and Orientation".

This trait has been implied in many of the previous lists. Specifically, the studies of Moore (55) and Broich (10) made reference to the democratic attitudes of cooperation and unselfishness.

Although in seven of the groups tested, the correlations were significant, six of the groups gave low correlations, and these were scattered throughout the age-group.

The results may be due to the fact that under certain circumstances, the objectives of the group may be such that an individual with undesirable traits seems required as leader. This is particularly true if there is a highly competitive program between groups, and a subsequently exaggerated desire for efficiency at any cost. These "democratic" groups seem to be capable of the same errors that have been shown by nations.

### 4. POPULARITY WITH THE OPPOSITE SEX

This trait yielded insignificant correlations almost throughout the age-group, with the only exceptions being two sixteen year old groups. That is the age period when the lads first mingle with the opposite sex at parties and on dates. The lowest correlations were obtained at the two extremes emphasizing that even though popularity with the opposite sex is not important to leadership, it assumes its greatest importance at the peak of adolescence.

## 5. MODERATE PUGNACITY

It is interesting to note that while an insignificant and negative correlation was obtained with the test-group when the two-point scale was utilized, four of the groups yielded significant correlations on the three-point scale. Thus, again it is noted that a balance in pugnacity may be important, but is not prerequisite to leadership. Again we note that the group will accept leadership from "a boss" type of individual, despite the fact that they recognize him as such.

## 6. INTELLIGENCE

Although the quiz did not employ the word "intelligence", insight, understanding, cleverness and imagination were implied. Bogardus (7) has stated that among the basic elements comprising intelligence are observation, foresight, evaluation, reflection and reasoning. Indeed all of those functions are implied in the description in the quiz. It is therefore felt that the descriptions definitely referred to intelligence.

Almost every study done and every list of traits compiled has stressed the importance of intelligence. The results of this study conform to those of the previous investigations. The youngest two groups yielded correlations which were barely significant. However, of the remaining eleven groups, nine yielded correlations of .87 or more, with one as high as .99.

The results of these groups do not correspond to the approach taken in a recent book on Military Leadership (64), where it is stated that given other desirable qualities, only average intelligence may be required.

Partridge (62) employing Thorndike's concept of three types of intelligence has referred to social intelligence as the most important in leadership in boys' groups. The definition he proposes for this social intelligence is the ability to handle and get along with people. It is the contention of the writer that the function of the leader in the groups here studied required much more than social intelligence.

## 7. ATHLETIC ABILITY

Many studies (1), (5), (75), have indicated that physical prowess is important to leadership. The closest approximation to physical prowess in the club's activities was athletic ability.

The correlations of leadership with athletic ability were insignificant in all but three of the groups. Of these three groups, one was a sixteen year old group, while the other two were the youngest tested. The results indicate that in the clubs with which this Study is concerned, athletic ability is only important in athletic leadership, except in early adolescence, when the youngsters are so very conscious of body, physical growth and relative physical strength, and when so much of their energies and interest is devoted to athletics.

## 8. GROWN UP

The importance that the process of "growing up" assumes to the adolescent is reflected in the high correlations with leadership that were obtained. Of the thirteen groups tested, nine yielded significant correlations, while the lowest of the insignificant was .35. It is also interesting to note that the low correlations were scattered throughout the age-group, showing that none of the age-groups involved, place too great an emphasis on this characteristic.

## 9. NEAT AND TIDY

It was not surprising to find that only three groups gave significant correlations on this trait, and even those three were barely significant. The highest correlation was obtained by the oldest group and was .66. The results conformed with what everyone (particularly parents) who has anything to do with adolescent boys, knows.

## 10. FRIENDLINESS

Tead has stated as follows: "Affection is essential for the leader because it predisposes people towards being influenced. On the whole, individuals prefer to do and be what they believe those who care for them want them to do and to be. They then have something to live up to. People thus get a sense that they are needed - and everyone wants the support of feeling themselves necessary to someone or to some cause. In short, the friendly attitude is the influencing attitude."

The results of this study closely paralleled those of the Detroit Teachers College Study (26), for although eight of the groups yielded significant correlations ranging between .72 and .86, the others ranged between .31 and .52. It seems that friendliness is important, however it does not seem to be the "sine qua non" that Cole (83) has thought it to be. Ability and achievement again appear capable of compensating for a desirable trait.

## 11. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

The results on this trait showed that educational achievement was much more important in the older age groups. While the oldest seven groups all yielded significant correlations, with five over .80, only one of the younger groups gave a significant correlation.



Previous investigators have produced conflicting results. While Terman (74) and Brown (12) came to the conclusion that leadership and educational achievement were highly correlated, and Jones (45) has listed high scholastic rank as the third most important factor in leadership, Reynolds (84) obtained a correlation of only .27, and Howell (40) concluded that there was no correlation.

One would expect the results obtained in this study when it is realized that whereas the studious lad in high school is considered a "plugger", his counterpart in the university is highly respected.

#### 12. GROUP SPIRIT

The "will to win" (73) for the group, and loyalty to the group is what the youngsters mean by "group spirit". The importance of this characteristic in the groups is shown by the fact that in eleven of them, significant correlations were obtained, with five over .87.

It is interesting to note that while many of the leaders are surcharged with "spirit" they are nevertheless not "unselfish and cooperative".

#### 13. WORK FOR THE GROUP

The fact that it was not the lack of cooperation but rather selfishness that caused some of the low correlations on Description 3, is shown by the high correlation obtained on this trait. Discounting the results of the youngest group, eleven of the twelve remaining groups yielded significant correlations, with two above .70, three above .80, and three above .90.

#### 14. DARING.

Bogardus (7) has stated that "an ability to dare and to do transform opportunity into leadership."

Thrasher (75) stated that in gang groups "gameness" was the most important characteristic. Many other investigators have claimed courage to be a most important trait. The results of this study have shown the trait to be unimportant since only two of the groups gave significant correlations. This result may however be due to the fact that the description emphasized "daring" rather than "courage".

#### 15. FAIR, JUST AND CONSIDERATE

The results on this trait were quite similar to those of "cooperative and unselfish". Only six of the groups yielded significant results, while six of the other correlations ranged from  $-.07$  to  $.30$ . The interpretation of these results is similar to that of Description 3. Although the characteristics relevant to this description seem important, they are not prerequisite to leadership.

#### 16. GOOD LOOKING AND 17. WELL DRESSED

Terman (75) is the only investigator who has claimed "good looking" and "better dressed" as characteristic of leaders. However, Partridge (62), and Reals (68) in a more recent study, have found that general appearance was highly correlated with leadership. Zeleny (77) has recently found that appearance was not correlated with leadership. It is obvious that the general appearance to which they refer may not correspond to "good looking" and "well dressed".

While only two significant correlations were obtained on "good looking", not even one significant correlation was yielded by "better dressed". This result is surprising, and demonstrates that these groups carefully evaluate the members in choosing leaders. The negligibility of the "halo effect" is also implied herein.

#### 18. PARTICIPATION IN DISCUSSIONS

This characteristic was specifically introduced to this study

because of the nature of the groups, and has not been found in any previous investigations.

The extent of participation in discussions is to a great extent a function of intelligence, speaking ability and interest in the group.

The results obtained have supported that hypothesis. Like intelligence, every correlation was significant. Like speaking ability, the youngest groups ranged from .61 to .79, while the eight older groups ranged from .73 to .95, with six above .83.

The results point to the fact that the group is able to distinguish between individuals that participate a great deal without a corresponding contribution, and those whose contribution is proportional to the extent of participation in discussions.

However it is also obvious that the leader of the group must possess this characteristic.

It is interesting to note that the intercorrelation received between "intelligence" and this trait with the test group, was .95.

#### 19. MODERATE AGGRESSIVENESS

Whereas "overaggressiveness" yielded a correlation of .10 in the original form, eight of the groups gave significant correlations on "moderate aggressiveness". However, only two of the correlations were above .64.

It is obvious that the submissive individual is seldom a leader in this type of group. The overaggressive or obtrusive individual is often chosen as leader, however, his leadership eventually arouses sharp adverse reactions. Under certain circumstances the able

but overaggressive individual may be retained as leader even after the appearance of a sharp reaction. Thus, while he eventually loses his authority, he enjoys long periods of leadership until the reaction sets in, and often even after it. During these stages his leadership is usually just tolerated.

The results indicate that groups prefer moderate aggressiveness but will sacrifice their preference for ability, for a period of time.

Other individuals only become overaggressive after holding office. As Tead (73) has said, "Those in a position of influence over others have their special temptations. They may come to feel much too superior, to be too self-willed and insistent, too pompous, too intent and urgent about their mission. It is easy for their points of strength to become so exaggerated that they are betrayed by them."

It is the individual that can attain, and retain, a balance in this trait, who makes the ideal leader of these groups.

## 20. DEPENDABILITY

This trait was added after a few discussions with club advisors indicated its importance. Partridge (62) had obtained a correlation of .87 on this trait and leadership. The results of this study indicated that dependability is important but will be sacrificed. While eight of the groups yielded significant correlations, with four above .82, four other groups' correlations ranged from .34 to .40. It is interesting to note that the two oldest groups gave the lowest correlations, again indicating that they rely on their workers for this trait and look for other traits in their leaders.

## 21. SELF-CONFIDENCE

This trait was added because of the widespread attention given it in the literature. Dearborn (45), Thrasher (75), Cooley (27),

Cowley (23), Zeleny (77), Terman (74), and many other investigators have claimed it to be a most significant trait. Drake (28) found it the highest of twenty-nine traits among college women.

Nine of the groups in the present study yielded significant correlations on this trait. Those that did not were spread throughout the age group. Thus results conformed to those of previous investigations. However, only two of the correlations were very high.

Jennings (43) hypothesis that leadership depends on the capacity for inter-personal contribution, implies that the truly self-confident individual should make a good leader since he does not need to lean on others. Sward (72) has suggested that in many cases it is the conflict over inferiority, by way of compensation, which leads to positions of prominence. However, those individuals whose self-confidence is born of compensation often reveal their feelings of inferiority under certain circumstances, and these reversions would be noticed in small club groups. Thus it would appear from our results that providing the inter-personal contribution is made in certain spheres of activity, "leaning" on others in other spheres may be tolerated.

## 22. ENERGY

Indefatigable energy is characteristic of leadership, according to most investigators (1), (7), (64), (18), (16), (4), (56), (19).

The present study indicated that either the youngsters were not able to evaluate this trait in individuals, the description did not provide a satisfactory word-picture of "energy", or that the trait is not as important in the groups studied. Seven of the groups yielded significant correlations, however not one was greater than .74.

### 23. ABILITY TO PERSUADE OTHERS

This quality actually depends upon many of the afore-mentioned traits, and obviously connotates different meanings for different groups. Three of the groups yielded insignificant correlations, while the other nine were above .60, with two at .96. The interpretation of these results is difficult.

It might be concluded that if any such trait exists as a separate entity, it is very important to leadership.

### CONCLUSIONS

The three prerequisites for leadership in the friendship clubs studied are:-

1. High intelligence, compared to the rest of the group.
2. Readiness to work hard for the club.
3. Capacity and interest to participate in discussion of club affairs.

Those traits (Nos. 3, 10, 15, and 19) which are indicative of a well-integrated and socialized individual, seem to be important attributes, but they are often sacrificed in order to meet the exigencies of the particular situation.

Other traits that characterize many of the leaders studied are:-

1. Group Spirit
2. Grown up
3. Dependability
4. Self-confidence

5. Energy

6. Ability to persuade

"Educational Achievement" and "Speaking Ability" become very important traits in leadership in the groups that are composed of sixteen year old members and older.

"Athletic Ability" is closely related to leadership only in the very youngest of adolescent boys' groups.

The following traits were discovered to be unrelated to leadership in the groups studied:-

1. Popularity with the opposite sex
2. Moderate pugnacity
3. Good looks
4. Well dressed

It would seem that the results obtained from the techniques employed in this study, have thrown sufficient light on the phenomenon of leadership in adolescent friendship clubs, to justify their use.

It is nevertheless recognized that longitudinal or developmental studies are required in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the dynamics of leadership.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ALLPORT, F.H., "Social Psychology", Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1924.
2. BARTLETT, F.C., "The Social Psychology of Leadership", Journal of the National Institute for Industrial Psychology, 1926, 3:188-193.
3. BELLINGRATH, G.C., "Qualities Associated with Leadership in Extracurricular Activities of the High School", Teachers College Contributions to Education, 1930, No. 399.
4. BENNETT, H.S., and JONES, B.R., "Leadership in Relation to Intelligence", School Review, 31:125-128, 1923.
5. BERNARD, L.L., "Introduction to Social Psychology", New York, Henry Holt & Co. Inc., 1926, Chapter 34.
6. BIRD, CHARLES, "Social Psychology", D. Appleton-Century, 1940.
7. BOGARDUS, EMORY S., "Leaders and Leadership", D. Appleton-Century, New York, London, 1934.
8. BRIDGES, J.W., "Personality as a Work of Art", Psychological Review, 52:6:320-323, 1945.
9. BRITT, STEUART H., "Social Psychology of Modern Life", Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., New York, 1941.
10. BROICH, K., "Fuhrer anforderungen in der Kindergruppe", (Qualification of Leaders in Childrens' Groups), Zsch. f. angew. Psychol., 1929, Vol 32, 164-212.
11. BROWN, J.F., "Psychology and the Social Order", McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, 1936
12. BROWN, MARION AGNES, "Leadership Among High School Pupils", Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1933.
13. BUHLER, CHARLOTTE, "The Social Behavior of the Child", The Handbook of Child Psychology, 392 - 431.
14. BURNHAM, W.H., "The Wholesome Personality", D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1932.
15. CALDWELL, OTIS W., and WELLMAN, BETH, "Characteristics of School Leaders", Journal of Educational Research, 14:1-15, 1926.
16. CARLSON, H.B., and HARRELL, W., "An Analysis of Life's 'Ablest Congressmen' Poll", Journal of Social Psychology, (In Social Psychology of Modern Life - Britt.)



BIBLIOGRAPHY cont'd.

17. CATTELL, J. McKEEN, "A Statistical Study of Eminent Men",  
Popular Science Monthly, 62:357-377 (In "Leaders and  
Leadership" - Bogardus).
18. CHAPIN, F.S., "Leadership & Group Activity", Journal of Applied  
Sociology, VIII;142-145, 1924.
19. CHEVALEVA-JANORSKYA, E., and SYLLA, D., "Essaie d'une étude sûr  
les enfants meneurs", Journal de Psychologie, 1929,  
26:604-612. (In "Experimental Social Psychology", -Murphy and  
Murphy)
20. CHEVALEVA-JANORSKYA, E., "Les groupements spontanees d'enfants  
à l'âge prescolaire", Archives de Psychologie, 20:219-233.
21. COFFIN, T.E., "A Three-Component Theory of Leadership", Journal  
of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1944, 39:68-83.
22. COOLEY, C.H., "Human Nature and the Social Order", Charles  
Scribner's Sons, New York, 1902, 293,294,296.
23. COWLEY, W.H., "The Traits of Face-to-Face Leaders", Journal of  
Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1931, 26:304-313.
24. COWLEY, W.H., "Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders", Journal  
Of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1928, 23:144-157.
25. COX, CATHERINE M., "The Early Mental Traits of 300 Geniuses",  
Stanford University Press, 1926, pp.31 ff.
26. DETROIT TEACHERS COLLEGE REPORT, "How Children Choose Friends",  
First Annual Report of the Society for the Scientific  
Study of Character, 1929.
27. DRAKE, RALEIGH M., "Outline of Social Psychology", Mary Washington  
College of the University of Virginia, Fredericksberg,  
Virginia, 1946, Volume I.
28. DRAKE, R.N., "A Study of Leadership", Character & Personality,  
1944, 14:285-289.
29. ELLIS, HAVELOCK, "A Study of British Genius", Hurst and Blackett  
Ltd., London, 1904.
30. FINCH, FRANK H., and CARROL, HERBERT A., "Gifted Children as  
High School Leaders", Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1932,  
41:476-482,
31. FLEMMING, E.G., "A Factor Analysis of the Personality of High  
School Leaders", Journal of Applied Psychology, 1935, 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY cont'd.

32. GESELL, A., and ILG, F.L., "Infant & Child in the Culture of Today", Harper Brothers, New York, 1943.
33. GOWIN, E.B., "The Executive and his Control of Men", MacMillan Co., 1915, pp. 6-7.
34. GREENE EDWARD B., "Measurements of Human Behaviour", The Odyessy Press, New York, 1941.
35. GUILFORD, J.P., "Psychometric Methods", McGraw Hill, 1936, New York.
36. GURNEE, HERBERT, "Elements of Social Psychology", Farrar & Rinehart, New York, 1936.
37. HANAWALT, N.G., RICHARDSON, H.M., and HAMILTON, R.J., "Leadership as Related to the Bernreuter Personality Scale: II An Item Analysis of Responses of College Leaders and Non Leaders", Journal of Social Psychology, 1943, 17:251-267.
38. HENDRY, C.E., "Leadership in a Democracy", Journal of Educational Sociology, 1944, 17:385-438.
39. HOLLINGWORTH, L.S., "Gifted Children: Their Nature and Nurture", MacMillan, New York, 1926.
40. HOWELL, C.E., "Measurement of Leadership", Sociometry, 1942, 5:163-168.
41. HUNTER, E.C., and JORDAN, A.M., "An Analysis of Qualities Associated with Leadership Among College Students", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1939, 30:497-509.
42. HURLOCK, E.B., "Child Development", McGraw-Hill, 1942, New York.
43. JENNINGS, HELEN H., "Leadership and Isolation", Longmans, Green & Co., New York, Toronto, 1943.
44. JERSILD, ARTHUR T., "Child Psychology", Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1944.
45. JONES, ARTHUR J., "The Education of Youth for Leadership", McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., New York, 1938.
46. KATZ, D. and SCHANK, R.L., "Social Psychology", Wiley, New York, 1938.
47. KLINEBERG, OTTO, "Social Psychology", Holt, New York, 1940.
48. LAPIERRE, R.T., and FARNSWORTH, P.R., "Social Psychology", McGraw-Hill, 1942.
49. LeBON, G., "The Crowd", MacMillan Co., 147-159, 1922, (In "Social Psychology - Source Book" - Kimball Young).

BIBLIOGRAPHY cont'd.

50. LEIB, A., "Vorstellungen und Urteile von Schülern über Führer in der schulk classe" (Ideas and Judgments of Pupils About Leaders in the School Class), Zsch. f. angew. Psychol., 1928, 30:241-346; (In "Experimental Social Psychology"-Murphy and Murphy, P. 403.).
51. LEIGH, R.D., "Group Leadership", W.W. Morton & Co., New York, 1936.
52. LEOPOLD, LEWIS, "Prestige: A Psychological Study of Social Estimates", T. Fisher Union, London, 1913, (In "Leadership or Domination", Pigors).
53. LIPPITT, R., and WHITE, R.K., "The 'Social Climate' of Children's Groups", (In "Child Behaviour and Development", Barker, Kounin & Wright, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1943, pp.485-508).
54. McCUEN, THERON L., "Leadership and Intelligence," Education, 1929, 50:867,
55. MIDDLETON, W.C., "Personality Qualities Predominant in Campus Leaders", Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13:199-201.
56. MOORE, L.H., "Leadership Traits of College Women", Sociology and Social Research, 17:44-54.
57. MUMFORD, EBEN, "Origins of Leadership", American Journal of Sociology, 12:216-240, 1906-07.
58. NAFE, ROBERT W., "A Psychological Description of Leadership", Journal of Social Psychology, 1:248-266.
59. NUTTING, L.R., "Some Characteristics of Leadership", School and Society, 18:387-390, 1923.
60. PARTEN, MILDRED B., "Leadership Among Preschool Children", (Rewritten for Periodical by Mary Shirley), Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1933, 29:430-440.
61. PARTEN, MILDRED B., "An Analysis of Social Participation, Leadership, and other Factors in Preschool Play Groups", Ph.D. Thesis, Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1929.
62. PARTRIDGE, ERNEST De ALTON, "Leadership Among Adolescent Boys", Ph.D. Thesis, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1934.
63. PARTRIDGE, ERNEST De ALTON, "Social Psychology of Adolescence", Prentice-Hall Inc., New York, 1939.

BIBLIOGRAPHY cont'd.

64. PENNINGTON, L.A., HOUGH, ROMEYN B., and CASE, H.W., "The Psychology of Military Leadership", Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1943.
65. PIGORS, PAUL, "Leadership or Domination", Houghton Mifflin Co., Riverside Press, Cambridge, Boston, 1935.
66. PIGORS, PAUL, "Leadership and Domination Among Children", Sociologus, June, 1933, 9:142.
67. PROSH, FREDERICK, "The Basis on Which Students Choose Their Leaders", American Physical Education Review, 1928, 33:265-269.
68. REALS, W.H., "Leadership in the High School", School Review, 1938, 46:523-531.
69. SANDERSON, D., and NAFE, R.W., "Studies in Rural Leadership", Publications of the American Sociological Society, 1929, 23:163-175.
70. SIMPSON, RAY HAMILL, "A Study of Those Who Influence and Those Who are Influenced in Discussion", Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1938, Ph. D. Thesis.
71. SPAULDING, CHARLES B., "Types of Junior College Leaders", Sociology and Social Research, 8:164-168.
72. SWARD, K., "Temperament & Direction of Achievement", Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, 4:406-429.
73. TEAD, ORDWAY, "The Art of Leadership", McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1935.
74. TERMAN, L.M., "A Preliminary Study in the Psychology and Pedagogy of Leadership", Pedagogical Seminary, 2:413-451, 1904.
75. THRASHER, FREDERICK M., "The Gang", University of Chicago Press, 1927.
76. YOUNG, KIMBALL, "Source Book for Social Psychology", Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1927.
77. ZELENY, L.D., "Characteristics of Group Leaders", Sociology & Social Research, 1939, 24:140-149.
78. TRYON, CAROLINE McCANN, "Adolescent Evaluations of Adolescent Personality", (In "Child Behaviour and Development"-Barker, Kounin and Wright) McGraw-Hill, New York, 1943, PP. 485-508.

BIBLIOGRAPHY cont'd.

79. COURTENEY, M.E., "Persistence of Leadership", School Review, 1938, 46:97-107.
  80. MURPHY, G. and MURPHY, L.B., "Experimental Social Psychology", Harper and Bros., New York, 1931.
  81. MURPHY, G., MURPHY, L.B., and NEWCOMB, T.M., "Experimental Social Psychology", Harper and Bros., New York, 1937.
  82. BARKER, R.G., KOUNIN, J.S., and WRIGHT, H.F., "Child Behaviour and Development", McGraw-Hill, New York, 1943.
  83. COLE, LUELLA, "The Psychology of Adolescence", Farrar & Rinehart, 1936
  84. REYNOLDS, F.J., "Factors of Leadership Among Seniors of Central High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma", Journal of Educational Research, 1944, 37:356-361.
-



