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INTRODUCTION

General Area of Leadership in a Democratic Society

Leadership and leaders have played an integral part in the history of the United States and the development of this nation. The establishment of the United States on a democratic basis gave direction for the functioning of the government, its people, and its leaders. In a democracy, the emergence of democratic leadership is essential.

The expansion and development of the United States have brought complex challenges to the leaders of the nation. The rise of the nation into an industrial giant has emphasized the role of leaders. There is practically no area in the development of the United States and its present day functioning wherein leaders have not been important. Thus there is a focus upon past and present leadership and leaders and even more upon the continued development and emergence of leaders in this country.

Areas such as mental health, industry, and education, as well as many others have stressed the importance of leadership and leaders. For example one writer has pointed out this leadership relationship to mental health:

We know now that the mental health of the members of a group is partly a function of the group's leadership and of the emotional climate created by those in the leader's role. Experiments seem to show that merely the experience of
participating actively in deciding one's own
destiny or the experience of being a member of a
self-governing group may have positive therapeutic
effects for the members of that group. (37, pp.
8-9)

The efforts on the part of industry to understand and empha-
size the human relations factors with their workers by
leaders in the industrial organization reiterates the im-
portance of leaders and leadership in our society. The many
leadership programs, articles, workshops, and proposed leader-
ship techniques utilized in industry and big business
support the stress and importance placed on leadership and
leaders in the United States.

The recent trend of a re-conceptualization of the role
of the teacher conceiving of him as a leader as well as an
espouser of intellect illustrates the importance of leader-
ship and the leader in education. This new way of defining
the role of the teacher stresses the influence of the class-
room "leader" upon the social climate of the group, and its
effects upon the learning behavior of the students. (37,
p. 14)

Questions of who shall lead and how individuals may be
prepared for effective leadership pose problems of primary
concern for education in democracy. Jones (55, p. 30)
emphasized the need for determining the attributes of
leadership and leaders in order to select future leaders,
to plan adequate training of leaders, and to develop
individual abilities.
There is a need for understanding man's activities and behavior as a leader in order to attempt to answer these questions. The demand for effective leaders is great. Leadership is recognized as a learned process. Thus with the proper knowledge and skills leaders can be educated and trained. Recognition of leadership as a learned process leads us to the realization that leadership and leaders are a concern of all the members of a society.

Colleges and Universities as Avenues for Emergence of Formal Leaders

The colleges and universities in the United States provide an expected avenue for emergence of leaders and their development. The continuing increase of the number of youth going to college and graduating and the changing norm from expectation of having a high school diploma to obtaining a college degree emphasizes high value placed on college for the development of individual intelligence, skills and talents including leadership understanding and skills. The desire expressed by industry for college graduates to become employees and industry's training programs for college graduates to assume administrative and leadership roles in their companies points out the importance placed on leadership development in colleges and universities. The expectations of communities and society that college graduates play
important leadership roles strongly point the way to the realization of the role of colleges and universities in developing youth for leadership roles in our society.

In the last fifteen years, an important development of residence halls systems on college and university campuses has taken place. The residence systems have become focal points for the development of the well-rounded student with many opportunities for development of individual talents and intellect and the assumption of various leadership roles. S. Earl Thompson (55, p. 142) stressed the importance of the student's residence when he said:

Any attempt to develop the student as a whole must take into consideration that part of his environment which lies outside the classroom and laboratory. The focal point of that area of experience is the student's place of residence. If educational institutions are to secure maximum student development in health, personality and social adjustment, academic success, and in other areas of personal achievement, they must take into careful account the housing program.

This importance of residence systems as a factor in education and providing leadership opportunities is further evidenced by the continual expansion of residence systems' physical plants, increased number of administrative personnel and increased recreational and activity space for use by resident student leaders.

It is assumed that there is some degree of transferability of leadership by those who are student leaders to leadership roles in the larger society after their graduation.
Studies by Courtenay (80, p. 62-63) and Clem and Dodge (80, p. 62-63) substantiate this assumption. Chowdhry and Newcomb (28, p. 271) give some support for the transferability of leadership concept from college life to later leadership responsibility in reference to college student leaders. This investigator accepts the position that leadership development during college, and explicitly in the residence halls systems, will tend to direct those same individuals toward leadership positions in the larger community and society. Importance of the leader in colleges and universities is thus stressed as providing potential leaders for the future.

The primary concern of this research is the sociological and psychological factors which play a role in the emergence of formal student leadership in a men's residence hall. The interest in this problem stems from the recognition of the importance of leadership, the need for development of leaders from the ranks of college and university students, the specific recognition of the leadership development and leadership opportunities available in a men's residence system, observation and analysis of the residence system as a social system where leaders function and develop, and the experience and recognition of the problems of procuring sufficient leadership and leaders, both in quality and in numbers.
It is not the intention of this investigator to study the selection of formal student leaders but rather to concentrate on the sociological and psychological factors which may differentiate the emergence of formal student leaders as contrasted to those delineated as non-leaders in a residence system. In this way, the investigator hopes to develop insight into the emergence of leadership in the residence system and thus, perhaps, provide a basis for selection and development of leaders at an early stage of their college careers.

Emphasis upon the problem of knowing what to look for in trying to obtain leaders in a men's residence system has been shown by statements from current student leaders and residence administrators expressing the following:*

1. There is a lack of candidates emerging for the formalized leadership positions in residence systems.

2. There is a lack of competitive spirit for the formalized leadership positions in residence systems.

3. There is a lack of knowledge of factors--social, psychological and ecological--affecting the emergence and development of student residents for the roles of formalized leadership in the residence systems.

In a recent editorial in the Reflector, the newspaper of the

*Comments summarized from interviews with residence student leaders and administrators, 1955-1959, and experience of the investigator.
Men's Residence Association, Iowa State University, the following was stated:

Some Houses are having trouble getting qualified candidates to run. Many men are "too busy" or have no interest in devoting time to a House Office. The quality of a house's program is directly proportional to the quality of the officers. (61, p. 2)

The expression of concern by residence student leaders and administrators for the emergence of elected leaders and the possible variables which would be related to such emergence of elected leaders furnished a primary basis for the direction of this study.

Major purpose

To test the major hypothesis: that there are sociological and psychological variables which will provide a basis for differentiating between those who emerge as formal leaders and those who are designated as non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Minor purposes

To develop and test a theoretical framework for recognizing those who would be considered potential leaders in the Men's Residence Association at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

To contribute to the general body of knowledge concerning
elected leadership in a men's residence halls system. To contribute to the general body of knowledge concerning leadership and the study of leadership.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The usual pattern for the review of literature will not be followed in this dissertation. Instead, the researcher will review the literature as it is relevant to various phases of the study (9, p. 8). The purposes of reviewing the literature include: (1) acquainting the research writer with background, findings and methods in a given area of research, (2) providing a theoretical framework for the research study, (3) aiding in the development and statement of hypothesis, and (4) helping in other areas of the research. It is hoped that these purposes will be more fully accomplished and more meaningful by reviewing the literature throughout the dissertation as it pertains to specific areas under investigation.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Men's Residence Association*: A Historical and Social System Setting

Historical and organizational perspective

This study was made at the Men's Residence Halls, the university built and operated housing for single undergraduate men, on the campus of Iowa State University of Science and Technology.

The Men's Halls physical plant has developed from one building built in 1927 to house approximately 100 students to three buildings with a housing capacity of 2204 single undergraduate men in the academic year 1959-1960. At the time of this study 1845 undergraduate single men students were being housed in the three Men's Halls, Friley, Helser and Westgate Halls.

The first organizational structure of students living in the Men's Halls was initiated in 1946 when the wing system type of organizational structure emerged. However, in 1948 the arrangement of the students and division of the physical structure was changed to form small groups (on the

*The Men's Residence Association is the duly approved student government organization within the Men's Residence Halls at Iowa State University of Science and Technology and has been functioning as such since 1948. The Men's Residence Association will hereinafter be referred to as the M. R. A.
average of 50-60 men) and small physical structure sections which became the basis for the present day "house system". In 1951 the first sections of Friley Hall were in operation and 1? houses were established. At this time the house system was fully accepted as the physical, operational and organizational arrangement for the Men's Halls. There was a student government and student supervisors were placed in charge of the men living in each of the houses. The student government was called the Men's Residence Association, hereinafter to be called the M. R. A., and the student supervisors were referred to as the Head Resident group. The M. R. A. and Head Resident Group were the two student groups developed and utilized to enhance and strengthen the living opportunities and experience in the Men's Residence Halls. This pattern of organization has continued and expanded to the present time.

Since this study primarily concerned the members of the M. R. A., a more detailed description of the M. R. A. may be important. The M. R. A. is composed of all the men who live in the Men's Residence Halls. When a male student signs his Men's Halls contract he voluntarily agrees to live in the Men's Halls and become a member of a specific house and the M. R. A. It is required that dues be paid to the M. R. A.; house dues voted upon and passed by the majority of a house membership are also binding upon a resident.
Thus a resident's membership in the M. R. A., though basically voluntary, is somewhat an automatic process as long as he lives in the halls.

The residents are divided into groups varying in size from 32 to 78. Each group is called a house group and the physical area occupied and utilized by the house group is called a house. Each house has a specific name which is used by its members for identification purposes and utilized by the M. R. A., the Head Residents and the halls administration in carrying out their specific responsibilities and functions.

The student government for the men's halls, as already stated, is the M. R. A. There is an over-all organizational structure including an M. R. A. constitution and officers who are elected at-large by the residents of living in all of the halls. Each house has a student government, a replica of the over-all M. R. A. organizational structure, which is a part of and basic to the total M. R. A. organizational structure. Each house has a constitution and officers elected by the members of the house. There are numerous activities, clubs and committees under the sponsorship and authority of the M. R. A. and house student governments.

The elected officer positions in the over-all M. R. A. organization include President, Internal Vice-president,
External Vice-president, Secretary, Treasurer, Activities Chairman, Intramurals Chairman, Social Chairman and representatives to the all-university student governing body, the Cardinal Guild. The elected officers in each house usually include President, Vice-president, Secretary, Treasurer, Activities Chairman, Intramurals Chairman and Social Chairman.

The M. R. A. over-all officers are elected within the first month of winter quarter and assume office by the middle of the same quarter. The house officers are elected at the end of winter quarter and assume office beginning the first day of spring quarter. The term of office is one year.

In the past two years an innovation has gradually been taking place by which the present large councils composed of a representative of each house (40 in number) for activities, intramurals, scholarship and social program are being replaced by commissions. The commission system is being inserted into the M. R. A. organizational structure with each commission composed of appointed leaders (6 to 10 in number) who supervise the functions of several houses in an area. The chairman of the commission is an individual who is elected on an at-large basis. This commission system is basically an attempt to develop another level of leadership opportunity within the M. R. A. governmental organizational framework.
This brief description of the M. R. A. historical and organizational development delineates the many and varied opportunities for leadership positions and roles available to residents of the men's halls.

The M. R. A. as a social system

The M. R. A. was studied as a social system although not included specifically as part of the theoretical framework. M. R. A. members, both leaders and non-leaders, are included in the study of the M. R. A. social system.

The M. R. A. is considered a social system in the conceptual terms as developed by Loomis (60, pp. 1-7). Allen (1) has analyzed the M. R. A. in a social system framework. The elements of a social system as delineated by Loomis (60, pp. 1-7) are clearly a part of the M. R. A. social system. The elements discussed by Loomis include ends, norms, status positions, roles, power and authority patterns, sanctions, rights and territoriality.

The M. R. A. ends include providing an orderly method for student representation and communication to the university administration and opportunities for development of individual skills, talents and abilities, for example, leadership and organizational skills. Opportunities for making the student's residence at a university an educational experience by learning to live in a heterogeneous group and getting along with people of all walks of life
is another M. R. A. purpose or end.

Norms in the M. R. A. and houses are clearly illustrated by the rules and regulations specified in the halls handbook and the written expectations of conduct for residents used in several houses. The positions of elected officers are recognized by hall residents as having status within the houses and halls with related roles expected to be performed. The M. R. A. and house constitutions delineate clearly the various elected positions with the respective duties and roles for each elected officer. Responsibilities of the individual M. R. A. and house member are also specified.

Authority and power is also specified to some extent in the constitutions of the M. R. A. and houses as well as in written outlined procedural policies for each elected office or position. Authority and power are centralized, to a large extent, in the main elected officers such as the presidents, vice-presidents, secretaries, treasurers and chairmen of the main areas of intramurals, social programs and activities. Even though there is turnover in personnel serving in the various formal elected positions, the positions are so established with formalized authority and power that the leadership remains centralized according to the indicated positions. There are sporadic attempts at delegation of authority by top officers of the M. R. A. and house but the attempts usually are feeble and not continuous.
The chairmanships are often filled by a limited number of key younger residents being groomed to take over the leadership positions or by the already-proven leaders who have been accepted into the inner circle of authority and power.

Sanctions operate in various forms in the M. R. A. and houses with one primary formal channel of sanction utilized. It is the student conduct committee. Each house has its own student conduct committee, composed usually of the house president and head resident, which has written specified authority and sanctions which can be used to cope with negative behavior in the house and halls. Positive sanctions are often shown by the recognition of top scholars or athletes in a house or the halls such as choosing a "scholar of the week" or "athlete of the week". Approval or disapproval of degrees of scholarship achievement are also given in the form of posting quarterly grade point averages with comments of praise and disapproval for various individuals.

Rights are also protected and supported within the framework of sanctions used in the M. R. A. and halls. For example, any individual who receives some ruling from the house conduct committee may appeal the decision to a higher conduct committee or the administration if he thinks the decision was unfair. Each individual resident also has the right to privacy in his own room and the right to participate or not participate in the various activities and programs within
the house or halls. Rights of the group or organization supercede the individual rights in the case of paying M. R. A. and house dues. All residents of the men's halls automatically are members of the M. R. A., as already stated, and thus required to pay an M. R. A. dues. Each resident is also required to pay house dues if such house dues are voted upon and passed by the majority of the house members.

Territoriality has a tremendous effect upon the individual and the M. R. A. Territoriality is considered the physical area in which the individual lives or functions. The division of the halls into houses and house groups provides the formal organizational structure through which a member must carry on his house activities. This is the area in which a resident lives, sleeps and spends much of his leisure time in study or activities. This territoriality delineation provides the individual person a base of operation and identification. The physical area in which a person is placed, that is the house to which he is assigned, often has effect upon the interests and participation of residents in house and hall activities. Residents often participate in activities because a certain house has a norm for a great amount of activity by house members. Thus that territory, the house to which the man has been assigned, and territory norm have great influence upon that individual resident. Territoriality also affects such things as atmosphere of the
house, for example, houses which are located in the main thoroughfares or resident or visitor traffic seem to be noisier than those houses located where there is little traffic.

As illustrated briefly by the author*, all of the elements of a social system are in evidence in the M. R. A. and have tremendous effect upon the individual residents, the house and hall organization, and the development of leaders in the social system. The M. R. A. social system is strengthened by the men's halls and university administrations for the administrators give encouragement and financial support to the M. R. A. and the house organizations, especially to the elected leaders within the M. R. A. and houses. The interplay of all of these social system elements of the M. R. A. continually affect the elected leader and the non-leader and thus the elements are integral parts of the factors being investigated in this research.

General Background of Leadership

The demand for effective leadership and leaders is great. However, there is little research in this area that has sound theory. There is a trend for more study of leadership and leaders by social scientists, especially

*For detailed analysis of the M. R. A. as a social system see Allen (1).
psychologists and sociologists. They have met a wide range of problems; the methods used to investigate such problems are varied. Studies relative to authoritarian leader, the emergent or natural leader, the formal leaders in a bureaucratic organization, and experiments in leadership training indicate some of the specific facets of leadership being investigated.

Some problems specifically involved in studying leadership include (23, pp. 535-536):

1. The difficulty of disentangling assumptions about what leadership "ought to be" from research oriented questions of "what produces what".

2. The difficulty in choosing an acceptable definition of the terms leader and leadership.

3. The difficulty of application of effective scientific methods to the study of leader and leadership.

Primary methods which have been used for identification and study of leaders include (80, p. 36):

1. Observation of behavior in group situations.

2. Choice of associates (voting).

3. Nomination or rating by qualified observers.

4. Selection (and rating or testing) of persons occupying positions of leadership.

5. Analysis of biographical and case history data.

6. Listing of personal traits considered essential to leadership and rating individuals on the basis of these traits.
7. Supplementary methods such as tests of intelligence and personality; questionnaires; rating scales; and interviews.

It is obvious there are differences in the approaches to leadership and leader investigation. These differences may be due to differences in social composition of the groups involved, differences in methodology employed, differences in leader criteria, differences in the orientation of the investigator, as well as numerous other reasons. These differences partially explain the lack of coordinated effort in the study of leadership and leaders thus substantiating the lack of sound theory and available codified data in this area. Due to the lack of validity and relevance in the personality measurements, the failure to use sound operational definitions of a leader, and a tendency to ignore low, but sometimes suggestive, relationships Cattell and Stice (25, p. 250) feel that research in this field has failed to contribute good theoretical generalizations and effective applied work.

General Background of Leadership Research

Definition of leader

Definitions and concepts of the leader are elusive, varied and perhaps as many as the number of people investigating or studying leadership and the role of leaders.
Literature has indicated concepts such as Carter (20, pp. 22-23) suggests (a) leadership which involves the polarization of members of the group around some central person, (b) leadership thought of in terms of group goals, (c) and leadership discussed on the basis of sociometric choice. Cattell (24, pp. 48-49) proposes a new concept called "syntality" and Knickerbocker (59, pp. 3-5) talks about the "romantic" and "functional" concepts of leadership. Pigors (71, pp. 3-5) emphasizes that the study of leadership involves the four elements of leader, members as individuals, the group as a functioning organization and the situation.

Review of the literature, although indicating various approaches to leadership and leaders, shows that there are several elements being reiterated in the research done such as the leader, goals and goal achievement, the situation, leader behavior or functions and the follower. These elements seem to be relevant to any study of leadership and leaders; however, the two definitions of leader listed by Morris and Seeman (64, p. 14) are most appropriate to this investigation of leadership in the Men's Residence Halls at Iowa State University of Science and Technology*:

1. The leader is an individual in a given office—in a standardized position of high influence potential.

---

*Iowa State University of Science and Technology will hereinafter be referred to as Iowa State.*
2. The leader is an individual named by the group as leader.

These definitions provide the basis for the definition of leader in the Men's Residence Association as the elected formal leaders of the Men's Residence Association at Iowa State. On the basis of reviewed literature leadership in the M. R. A. will be studied as the function of social and psychological variables. Carter (20, p. 24) further states that leadership can be defined in terms of leadership behaviors. Leadership behaviors are any behaviors the experimenter wishes to so designate or, generally, any behaviors which experts in this area wish to consider as leadership behaviors. This investigator will be considering the variables studied in this research as the leadership behaviors. The universe being considered is that of the college student members of the M. R. A. at Iowa State. Thus to adapt these definitions to the framework of this research the formal leader in the M. R. A. will be defined as that individual who has been elected to a formalized position or given office in his house, the M. R. A. or/and on campus. The non-leader will be defined as that individual who has not been elected to a formalized position or given office in his house, the M. R. A. or on campus. The outside leader will be defined as that individual who has not been elected to a formalized position or given office in his house or the M. R. A., but has been elected to a formalized position or given office outside his house.
Leaders relative to the situation

Recent leadership studies have emphasized the relationship of the leader to the situation. Bogardus (13, p. 62) represents one of the earlier investigators who emphasized the situational approach to leadership. He emphasized that the leader can be taught skills in the process of analyzing and controlling situations. He further emphasized that leadership generally does not transfer from one specific situation to another, but that leaders should regard any situation as part of a larger situation. The development of leadership depends on studying situations and acquiring skill in them. In order to "learn" leadership a person analyzes situations and develops appropriate techniques for controlling them. Tead (82, p. 22) indicated that the opportunity to lead is furnished by the total environment and that leadership is always related to specific situations and needs.

Gouldner (39, p. 13) indicated that leadership must be examined in specific kinds of situations facing distinctive problems and that similarities among some leadership situations or problems must be emphasized. When discussing patterns of leadership traits Stogdill (80, p. 60) stated that patterns of leadership traits differ with
the situation and emphasized that there is a preponderance of evidence from a wide variety of studies which indicates that patterns of leadership do differ with the situation. The study by Carter, Haythorn, Shriver and Lanzetta (21, pp. 551-560) with eighth grade groups stressed the relationship of leadership and the situation. Leadership, according to Gibb (35, p. 71), is always relative to the situation to the extent that a certain kind of situation is required before the leadership relation will appear at all, and in the sense that the particular set of social circumstances existing at the moment determines which attributes of personality will confer leadership status and consequently determines which members of a group will assume the leadership role and which qualities of personality function to maintain the individual in that role.

These studies and other literature reviewed pointedly stress the importance of the situation and that leadership is characteristic of the situation involved. An additional point indicated by these studies is the relationship of the emergence of leadership patterns and attributes within a specific situation. This relationship between attributes and situation gives support for this investigation of sociological and psychological variables of the formal elected leaders in the Men's Residence Association. The Men's Residence Association, as a social system (1, p. 30), provides the specific situation within which formal
leaders emerge through the process of election by members of their group. This formal leadership is being studied as a function of specific sociological and psychological variables relevant to this specific situation and social system.

Leaders and the personal trait approach

The study of leadership traits per se is one approach to the investigation of leadership and leaders and one which has been frequently used. However, studies of leader traits per se have been inconclusive. In reviewing leadership literature, Pelz (70, p. 50) stated that empirical studies have failed to find traits that are universal in successful leaders. Cartwright and Zander (23, p. 537) in discussing leader traits said:

On the whole, the attempt to discover the traits that distinguish leaders from nonleaders has been disappointing.

One major reason for the disappointing outcome of the trait approach of investigation of leadership may be due to the lack of adequate tools or methods for measuring personality traits. However, although most studies have not been fruitful in finding universal personal traits, most research studies have found some traits, attributes or variables within a specific situation delineating the leader from non-leader or follower. In his review of leadership studies, Stogdill (80, p. 63) concluded that there is fairly good
support that leaders excel non-leaders in intelligence, scholarship, dependability and responsibility, activity, social participation and socio-economic status. He further concludes that qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader.

Superior socio-economic status, higher intelligence and scholastic attainment were social and personal characteristics found by Sward (80, p. 61) to differentiate 125 leaders from 125 followers. His results suggested that there are general traits which characterize leaders, such traits are likely to vary with the leadership requirements of different situations. In his study the college community was his specific situation. Richardson and Hanawalt (42, p. 152) found in the relationship of leadership to the Bernreuter Personality measures that the average college leader is more dominant, extroverted and self-confident than the average non-leader. Their results also showed that leaders were more inclined to take on additional responsibilities, were freer from feelings of humility and self-consciousness, were at ease in working in the presence of others and were more willing to offer an idea for discussion. The specific situation in which these differences between leader and non-leader were shown was the college community.
Images held by peers of student residence leaders were shown by Kidd (58, p. 4) to include traits such as being friendly, cooperative and pleasant, responsible, mature and respected, intelligent, capable, considerate, moral and quiet. These images held by their peers delineated these fellow students as leaders within the men's residence situation.

Investigators in the field of leadership are generally coming to the conclusion that certain minimal abilities may be observed in all leaders regardless of the situation. Leadership has become recognized as a dynamic relationship between personality and the group situation and variables within that situation. Gibb (35, p. 68) viewed the relationship of leadership to the individual as a quality of his role within a particular and specified social system. The emergence of leadership is from an interactional relationship between the leader and the situational variables.

The trait approach is integrated into this research within the framework of this interactional process between the leader and the situational variables. The Men's Residence Association provides the situation in which formal elected leadership emerges, permitting investigation of this leadership and these leaders as a function of sociological and psychological variables.
Designation of elected leaders

A question which often arises concerns the election of individuals to formal leadership positions on the basis of personality or friendship rather than on the basis of perceived leadership abilities, traits or patterns of behavior. A secondary question also appears in reference to the ability of the peer group to select their leaders rather than selection through some objective criteria used by persons other than peer members of a group such as supervisors, bosses, teachers and others.

Recent literature gives fairly strong answers to these questions by supporting the position that elected leaders are usually picked on a basis of leadership qualities, traits or behavior patterns rather than friendship or personality. Thus the peer group, taking other factors into consideration, is one of the best avenues for the selection of such leaders either by election or nomination.

Hollander and Webb (50, p. 412) in their study of leadership, followership and friendship concluded from their results that peer nominations on leadership are by no means a total function of friendship ties but, rather, that friendship only plays a minor part in the emergence of leadership nominations. Their findings tend to substantiate the fact that peer nominations are not mere "popularity contests" but represent consideration of other variables
which enable an individual to fulfill a leadership role.

Chowdhry and Newcomb (28, p. 272) concluded from their study on relative abilities of leaders and non-leaders in a college situation that, within a few weeks of entering college, freshmen, on the whole, were able to size up the dominant community trends and leadership roles to be assumed. These findings tend to substantiate the early recognition of the situation and leadership roles in the situation, thus providing a basis for their ability to elect leaders on the basis of leadership qualities, traits or behavior patterns.

Leaders used in this study have been elected to their positions by their peers. Based on the existing literature and research and an intimate knowledge of the system, it is the contention of the author that the elected leaders in the M. R. A. have been selected, in most cases, on the basis of their ability to fill the leadership roles to the level of expectation of their peers, rather than on the basis of friendship and personality. However, these latter elements may be involved to some degree in the leaders' election to the formal leadership roles. Research pointing to the selection of leaders on the basis of role expectation includes a study conducted on two officer candidate classes for military service concerning buddy ratings on the basis of friendship or leadership criteria pointed out that ratings by class members, the peer group, were the better measure of
leadership factors than any other groups or variables (86, p. 158). Gouldner (39, p. 634) re-emphasized this position concerning selection of leaders by their peers and concluded that evidence to the present seems to support the conclusion that members of a group are more capable of picking their own leaders than are other individuals such as supervisors, bosses, instructors. Research, therefore, tends to support the use of the group elected formal leaders of the M. R. A. in this investigation in order to study sociological and psychological variables of which leadership is a function in a specific situation or social system.

Summary

Leader is defined as an individual in a given office or in a standardized position of high influence potential and who has been named as leader by the group (64, p. 14). In this investigation, the specific definitions of leader, non-leader and outside leader were:

1. Leader in the Men's Residence Association is that individual who has been elected to a formalized position or given office in his house, the Men's Residence Association or/and on campus.

2. Non-leader in the Men's Residence Association is that individual who has not been elected to a formalized position or given office in his house, the Men's Residence Association or on campus.

3. Outside leader in the Men's Residence Association is that individual who has not been elected to a formalized position or given office in his house or the Men's Residence Association
but has been elected to a formalized position or
given office outside of his house and the Men's
Residence Association.

This thesis deals with the study of sociological and
psychological variables which appear to affect leadership
within the specific situation of the M. R. A. Leader is de­
fined as the person who has been elected to a formalized
position or given office in his house, the M. R. A. or/and
on campus. The residents who meet this criteria are in­
cluded in the leader group. The focus of this study is the
leader as contrasted to the non-leader. This approach is
taken in order to study and attempt to cope with the problem
of how to increase the number of halls residents running for
elected office and the development of larger numbers of
residents to aspire to the formal leadership roles in the
houses and M. R. A.

General Hypotheses

Three groups, as already defined, are involved in this
study of the elected leaders which characterized the leader­
ship in the Men's Residence Association at Iowa State
University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa, 1959-1960:
the leader, the non-leader and the outside leader. The
development of this study was based upon certain assumptions
directing the investigator to his basic hypotheses. These
assumptions were:
1. It is assumed that leadership is a recognizable social phenomenon in our culture, society and social systems.

2. It is assumed that as such, it is a legitimate subject for scientific investigation.

3. It is assumed that the sociological and psychological variables affecting those who emerge as formal leaders can be isolated and defined so as to allow investigation and study of them.

4. It is assumed that the Men's Residence Association is a social system (1, p. 30).

5. It is assumed that there are sociological and psychological variables affecting the members of the Men's Residence Association.

6. It is assumed that the sociological and psychological variables affect the members of the Men's Residence Association in varying degrees.

In this study the variance or differences of variables becomes a test of the effect of sociological and psychological variables as related to the elected leadership.

The major theoretical hypothesis for this study is:

That there are sociological and psychological variables which will provide a basis for differentiating between those who emerge as leader and non-leader in the Men's Residence Association, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa, 1959-1960.

The sociological and psychological variables to be studied as affecting elected leadership in the Men's Residence Association are: personal characteristics, formal interaction, goal aspirations, norm knowledge and compliance, communication, authority attitude, identification, status perception and relevant reference group value on leadership.
Personal characteristics

Personal characteristics may be defined as the degree to which certain physical, mental and emotional traits or qualities are held by an individual. These traits or qualities of leaders refer to those which are typically indicated in research and literature. Whereas the majority of studies do not hold that trait measurement per se is very beneficial, the studies do definitely show there are traits or qualities representative of leaders in specific situations. These traits and qualities are present as shown by the persistence of leader roles within various contexts. Eaton (39, pp. 618-619) says "the potential testing of leadership is enhanced by the observation that there appears to be some degree of persistence of leadership, despite changes in social circumstances". Gouldner (39, p. 37) does support the position that leadership, or leadership traits, are relative to the situation but also maintains there may be some traits common to all leaders although this does not mean that all leaders are the same. Dexter (39, p. 592) emphasizes the role of unique traits or qualities of the leader by stating "that the most important instrument with which the leader has to work is himself—his own personality and the impression which he creates on other people".

There are probably as many trait or quality lists representing leadership and leaders as there are people
investigating the area. The direction given by these many trait and quality lists is again to point out that there are traits or qualities representing leaders, as differentiated from followers or the non-leader, in specific situations. Literature reveals that some of the traits representative of leadership and leaders and found in varying degrees in various studies include intelligence, age, special skills, aggressiveness or dominance, scholarship, confidence, adaptability, interests, self-expression, flexibility, knowledge, social responsibility, appearance, judgment and decision making, initiative, persistence, ambition, maturity, cooperation, energy, enthusiasm, bio-social activity, extroversion and social skills. According to a panel of judges from the Men's Residence Halls those characteristics which appear most pertinent to this study are intelligence, social interests, social skills, judgment, maturity, activity and energy, dominance and cooperation. These particular qualities will be utilized for measurement of personal characteristics possessed by the leader and non-leader in the Men's Residence Association.

Literature and research, as already indicated, support the use of the previously listed pertinent personal characteristics in studying leadership. Stogdill's (80, pp. 34-71) survey of 124 leadership studies lends further support to the use of these selected personal characteristics
in such a study. In his studies of leadership Gouldner (39, pp. 27-42) adds support to the relationship of leadership with intelligence and social interests. Homans (51, p. 440) emphasizes self-knowledge of the leader as a primary step in self-control implying the needed quality of maturity in a leader. Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb (66, p. 439) in a study involving 125 prominent students in college showed that these prominent students classified as leaders had higher scores in college aptitude tests than non-leaders. In his study of leadership in a summer camp Miller (63, pp. 58-59) found evidence which supported the relationship of leadership and self-confidence and the relationship of leadership and sociability as evaluated by counselors of the emerging leaders in the camp.

Investigation of these traits and qualities of the leader and non-leader in the Men's Residence Association and differentiation of the degree of these personal characteristics between the two groups, should provide a basis for strengthening those qualities of leadership in present leaders and in those who may emerge as elected leaders in the future. As Tead (82, p. 23) said in supporting the study of leadership qualities, "Good qualities can be strengthened". The theoretical hypothesis for investigating the personal characteristics of leaders in this specific situation is:
There are differences in the degree of personal characteristics between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-60.

**Formal interaction**

Interaction may be defined as the degree of reciprocal awareness, response and contact between two or more persons in a social situation. Interaction is essential in social and group life. The word implies a two-way process between individuals. Gibb (35, p. 72) indicates that a principle of leadership is social interaction. He says, "There can be no leadership in isolation, it is distinctly a quality of a group situation. There can be no leader without followers". Jennings (37, p. 49) states, "Both isolation and leadership were found to be products of interpersonal interaction . . . ."

The relationship of leadership and interaction is further pointed up by Hemphill (47, p. 227) saying, "It is the interaction of the leader who possesses a given set of personal attributes and the group whose efficient functioning demands that particular combination of attributes which results in successful leadership." Leadership emerges in the interactional process of the group and personal attributes of a specific individual. It is possible to pick out the leader of a group by following the chains of interaction in the group, according to Homans (51, p. 418). Leaders, through
this interactive process, are able to recognize and respond
to the needs of others and in this way help the individual
member and the group toward their goals and fulfillment of
their needs. It then follows that the leader who can help
the individual and group attain their goals will interact
with others to a greater degree. It is also the leader's
responsibility to originate interaction as a requirement of
his leadership role. Leaders help to widen the social
participation of others.

Participation serves as a measurement of interaction.
The degree of participation with and for the group by the
leader is an important characteristic of the interactional
process involving a leader. In his participation the leader
is able to learn to take others into account and facilitate
group life and cohesion. It is a process where the leader
and members are able to associate with each other and share
in group activities. Stuart Chapin (27, pp. 141-146) was
one of the first to consider and describe social participa-
tion and wrote:

There is direct correlation between the number
of groups that the average person may belong to
and the intensity of his participation in each
group activity as indicated by such objective facts
as regularity of attendance, membership on
committees and financial support.

A corollary to this position is that leaders would tend to
participate and thus interact to a greater degree with others
and in groups than would non-leaders.
It is also the contention of this author, and born out by literature, that college students will tend to continue in the same pattern of participation behavior as begun early in life. In brief, the individual who has been active in the home, in the home town, in high school will continue this active behavior pattern in the college community of which he becomes a member. In this study, the implication is that the leader in the Men's Residence Association, Iowa State, will receive a higher social participation score than the non-leader.

Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb (66, pp. 531-532) in their studies further suggest that leaders are more active participants than non-leaders. Gardner and Thompson (34, p. 287) show a relationship between the positions of fraternity leadership in out-groups and the degree of participation in those out-groups, suggesting that such positions of leadership are attained by those who have greatest participation in the out-groups. Research and literature thus support the contention that leaders will interact to a greater degree with others and groups than will non-leaders. The theoretical hypothesis for this variable as related to leadership is:

There are differences in the degree of interaction with other persons and groups between leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

Goal aspiration

Goal aspiration may be defined as the degree or level
to which an individual establishes his aim, purpose or objective which defines the field of desire and direction of effort of an individual or of an associated group of people. Individual aspirations toward goals, as they relate to distinguishing the leader, are the major concerns of this investigation.

Psychologists and sociologists recognize that levels of goals and aspirations toward those goals are as diverse as human needs and interests of the individual. The importance of goals in the motivational process of the individual, especially in the development of the emergent leader, is rapidly agreed upon by social scientists. Crow's (31, p. 99) discussion of motivation and goals imply the relationship of goals and the leader as she points out that goals serve as the focal point for internal forces to direct behavior, causing one stimulus pattern to be more forceful than another. Individuals usually possess both long-run and short-run goals and their level of achievement toward or level of aspiration toward these goals may determine their degree of frustration and the degree to which they fulfill a role of leadership. The corollary to this position is that there will be differentiation between the leader and non-leader on the basis of aspiration toward these goals.

Crow (31, p. 289) indicates that the level of aspiration toward goals usually is higher for the individual of higher
intelligence than for the dull. Since most research studies support the conclusion that leaders possess higher intelligence than non-leaders, the implication could be made that the leader then usually possesses higher goal aspirations than the non-leader. Aspiration levels then may be a differentiating variable between leader and non-leader.

Studies related to goal aspiration of the individual point out, at least in part, that aspiration may be a resultant of leadership or that leadership may be a resultant of goal aspiration. This relationship appears to be somewhat circular in nature. However, it does demonstrate that goal aspiration of individuals does have an effect on their motivation to become leaders. This suggested effect on the development of a leader is re-emphasized by Hanawalt, Hamilton, and Morris (64, p. 156) in their study of 20 student leaders and 20 student non-leaders, concluded that the average level of aspiration of leaders was found to be significantly higher than that of the non-leaders. Their objective data from the experiment indicate that leaders are likely, on the average, to set a higher level of goal aspiration than non-leaders.

The theoretical hypothesis for this variable, therefore, is:

There are differences in the goal aspiration between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.
Norm knowledge and compliance

Norm knowledge and compliance may be defined as the degree to which an individual knows and adheres to the behavior expectations of his group. A norm is an idea in the minds of the members of a group specifying the appropriate and inappropriate behavior of its members and leaders. Some norms may be held by all the members of a group but apply only to one of them; they define what a single member in a particular position is supposed to do (51, p. 124). Most people are unconsciously governed by norms so that they become integrated within a person's behavior pattern. Norms provide a framework for patterned behavior by indicating limitations to an individual in his everyday functioning. Thus such patterned behavior can be predicted and differences among individual members in a group can be delineated by their position within the group. Norms vary in intensity and strength as well as being subject to change. Such variations and change usually affect both the members and the leader though perhaps in different degrees and in a different manner.

Newcomb (67, pp. 269-275) delineates a fourfold classification of areas in which groups commonly develop norms. These four areas are material objects, other group members, other groups and their own institutions. He points out that one thing which holds a group together is the fact that its
members attribute similar meanings to responses to common objects; that to the members of any group other groups (and individuals as representatives of other groups) are common objects; that patterns of behavior or activities cluster around central values of the society; and that associated with these central values is a set of ideas, beliefs, knowledge and "lore" commonly referred to as ideology. Ideologies are codifications of certain kinds of group norms. All of these kinds of norms are alike in providing standard meanings in terms which permit group members to communicate, to behave in a similar manner, and for group members to recognize and understand one another and the respective positions of individual members within a group more clearly. In this manner differentiation of the leader and non-leader within a group is integrated within the group interaction. These norms provide both meanings and goals which in turn are basic to communication that subsequently transmits the group expectations to the individual specifying appropriate and inappropriate behavior.

All groups evaluate a man's behavior and govern his judgments. According to Homans (51, p. 179), the more closely a man in his activities conforms to the norms, the more popular he is and the higher his social rank. Gouldner (39, p. 17) points out that formal and informal norms alike operate to sift out individuals with certain
characteristics, permitting some access to leadership while denying it to others. He further states that groups tend to create their own leaders, and the leader gets his power by conforming more closely than anyone else to the norms of the group. The leader, according to Homans (51, pp. 426-428), lives up to the group norms as follows:

1. The leader is the person who comes closest to realizing in his behavior the norms of the group.

2. The leader must be zealous as anyone else in obeying his own orders; in other words, set the example.

3. The leader must live up to the norms of the group—all the norms—better than any follower.

4. What is important to the followers is always important to the leader.

Homans summarizes by saying that the leader is the person who comes closest to realizing the norms the group values highest. As long as the norms are accepted by the group members, the leader in that group must embody them. The leader's embodiment of the norms gives him his high rank, and his rank attracts people—he is the one to whom people come.

Norms and leadership are thus closely related and this relationship provides a basis to predict that the leader and non-leader can be differentiated according to their knowledge and adherence to their group(s) norms. The theoretical hypothesis for this variable is:
There are differences in the degree of knowledge and compliance of group norms between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

Communication

Communication may be defined as the degree to which an individual conveys, imparts and receives such things as information, ideas, sentiments, beliefs and attitudes to and from others.

Although we usually think of communication in terms of language or verbal communication, non-verbal communication such as gestures, imitation and visual representations are included (10, p. 71). Communication is basic to the socialization process of every individual and becomes a part of each one in varying degrees. Thus communication may be used as a basis for differentiating between individuals within the same group such as leader-follower or leader-non-leader.

Two-way communication is essential to any group for it is through two-way communication that all relevant members of a group can really become involved in the group interaction. Where there is only one-way communication there tends to be an increase in the inaccuracy of that communication and group members feel less confident in the function of communication. Filtering and distortion of communication continuously takes place, but is greater in one-way
communication. It is difficult for the relevant individuals or groups to have complete and clear communication in a one-way communication process. In one-way communication, also, there may develop in the members a feeling of being left out or unsure of themselves and loss of identification with the group or leaders. Beal, Bohlen and Raudabaugh (10, p. 78) state that "where there is the desire to change attitudes and subsequent behavior of group members, two-way communication in formal or informal discussions with group members tends to be more effective than one-way communication by lecture or a direct order from above". Gouldner (39, pp. 611-612), in referring to administrators and employees (as leaders), emphasized the necessity for two-way communication saying that formal and informal channels set up a flow of interaction developing clearer understanding between administrator and employee such as coping with complaints, observations and recommendations more easily and more quickly. It is crucial that leaders especially develop and utilize their communications with their group to the fullest.

The heterogeneity of groups indicates the need for development of effective communication channels. Effective communication is a necessity to help integrate the various individual attitudes, occupational experiences, feelings, etc. into functioning groups. Thus different levels of communication skills are needed to communicate to different
levels within a group in this blending process of a group and its individual members. Sensitivity to the communication channels is essential to the leader in carrying out his roles and maintaining his position with his diverse group members.

Most of the studies of leadership reveal the capacity for communication as one of the skills associated with leadership status. "Successful supervisors and leaders seem to achieve their results by paying attention not only to the group members as individuals but to the relationships, interactions and communications within the group. A group member is more productive when he feels that he has access to the important lines of communication and that relevant information is communicated to him. Of special importance is communication on matters that affect him and the definition of his role", according to Beal, Bohlen and Raudabaugh (10, p. 73).

As already indicated, communication is important to the leader-follower relationship. Homans (51, p. 462) pointed out that the leader must not only communicate to his followers but must explain in such a way that the followers will accept his ideas, suggestions and plans. If communication fails in one direction, it will fail in others and thus jeopardize the leader's position. This emphasizes how important it is for the leader to develop and work at communication within his group.
Jennings (28, pp. 272-273) says "Each (leader) appears to establish rapport quickly and effectively with a wide range of other personalities..." and "seems to possess attitudes and personality characteristics which make it possible for him to be in fuller communication with the members of the group". Giving orders and listening are both involved in the communication process of the leader. Homans (51, pp. 429-440) delineates the following specific points in these areas:

1. The leader in giving orders:
   a. Interacts most often with persons nearest him in social rank and his orders are usually transmitted to the group through them.
   b. Allows his lieutenants always to have access to communicate to him.

2. The leader in listening:
   a. Must be informed about the whole situation inside and outside his group in order to give orders.
   b. Must know his group members.
   c. Must allow his group members to inform him and what is told him must be kept in confidence.
   d. Must accept what is told him without showing approval or disapproval of what is being said. He must create a permissive atmosphere in his communication process.

Another concept, stated by Smith (6, p. 500) is that of centrality "... the individual occupying the most central position in a pattern of communications in a group is most
likely to be recognized as the leader". Thus, delineation of the leader can be made by means of communication channels.

Literature thus supports the concept that the leader and communication are highly interrelated and implies that communication can provide a basis differentiating between the leader and non-leader.

The theoretical hypothesis for this variable is:

There are differences in the degree of communication with others between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

Authority attitude

Authority attitude may be defined as the attitude expressed toward acceptance and use of power or command. Authority is an interactive process through which a group delineates for each member or each group the scope for action in making decisions, assuming and carrying out responsibilities and obtaining cooperation from others (79, p. 39). Typically, there is a hierarchy in groups and organizations of any size in which certain individuals and groups are assigned the right to issue orders to others (15, p. 206). However, the authority of others circumscribes and defines the authority held and used by any group member. Authority is a variable of leadership and its use is relative to the situation in which the leader is functioning. According to Homans (51, p. 423), the leader
has a two-fold purpose in his use of authority: (a) to attain the purposes of the group, and (b) in so doing, to maintain a balance of incentives, both reward and punishment, sufficient to induce his followers to obey him. Gouldner (39, p. 685) indicated that the function of authority is to minimize the scope and range of fear as a determinant of social relationships.

Gouldner (39, p. 16) also emphasizes that authority and power must be considered as characteristics of leaders. Authority represents power which has been legitimatized. (15, p. 568). Thus when one talks about authority, he is also talking about power. This legitimacy of power, hence authority, depends upon the perception of the group members and their values. Social power is, within limits and through channels, defined in the interactional process of group members and leaders.

Literature (39, p. 667) reveals that acquisition of personal power is one of the common outlets for human aspirations and energies and that some individuals become more absorbed in that outlet than do others. This position stated from the literature suggests that the study of authority may provide a basis for differentiating between leader and non-leader.

The control of social power is the ability to supply and deprive some of something (39, p. 671). Democracy and
concomitant popular education attempt to deter and restrain the dangerous aspects of individual power seekers. However, fundamental to control of social power is the group members' popular support or lack of support of the leader's exertion of power and command. Power seekers are realizing that they need the acceptance and support, or at least acquiescence, from group members (39, p. 676). Power seekers are helped by the tendency of group members to feel a need for power seekers and tend to willingly support and utilize them within the limits established by the group members.

A leader cannot motivate his group from one social climate or situation to another unless to some extent his orders are obeyed. Orders differ from norms in degree—in the degree to which they apply to future change and in the degree to which they arise from patterned interaction (51, p. 417). If the leader's order is accepted by group members and provides control and direction to individual and group activity, the order is then said to carry authority. The leader's power does depend upon his ability to carry his group with him. The leader will be careful not to give orders which will not be accepted or followed by group members. Such disobedience would be a threat to his leadership status and role and the leader must maintain his own position within a group. Obedience to orders from the leader is in part dependent upon the legitimation given his authority by
subordinates. The subordinate needs to feel that the leader is a "rightful" occupant of his leadership position. Thus the subordinate obeys not only because it is expedient for himself and his group but also because he becomes morally obligated to obey the leader (40, p. 79).

Problems arise in the relationship of leadership and authority. Uncertainty as to who possesses authority can create tensions among the group members for then it is difficult to distinguish to whom there is obligation. Hemphill (47, p. 370) pointed out the recurrent problem of knowing the degree to which a leader should assume a role of authority. The findings of his leadership study suggest that authoritative behavior on the part of the leader is most successful in groups which closely restrict membership, in groups described by members who have high status in their groups, and in groups described by members who do not feel dependent on their groups. He further indicated that results showed that "leaders who lose prestige by allowing members to get the better of them are less successful". Results also showed that leaders tended to subordinate their own personal gain to the group's welfare.

Research literature indicates definitely that there is a close relationship between leadership and authority and implies that the study of authority within a group may differentiate between the leader and non-leader.
The theoretical hypothesis for this variable is:

There are differences between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960 in the attitudes expressed toward acceptance or use of authority.

**Status perception**

Status perception may be defined as the individual's perception of status given to a relative position of an individual or group in the hierarchy of a social system. Status is that degree of prestige or value designated to individuals or groups depending upon their relative position in the hierarchy of a social system.

According to Roman (51, p. 179), status involves several elements: the organization, an individual who is carrying on a particular kind of activity or maintaining a certain level of activity and the relative position of an individual within the communication system. The individual is then designated as having some degree of value or importance based upon these elements of status.

Gouldner (39, pp. 129-130) points out that social status refers to the interrelatedness of people in a group. An individual often assumes a position in a group with prestige indicated for that status position. The individual occupying such a position tends to behave in ways similar to others who are filling the same relative position. The culturally prescribed demands for certain status positions is a primary determinant of the behavioral consistencies
in a given position as there are specific expectations, obligations and rights related to each status position. Gouldner (39, p. 130) emphasizes that "... status can be characterized as a cluster of expectations directed at the occupants of certain social positions"—in brief, the role to be fulfilled. This perspective of status would give relevancy to this investigation in tending to suggest that all those designated as having the status of leaders would have like roles while all those delineated as non-leaders would have like roles. It is also indicated from literature that those in different status positions would have different roles. Gouldner (39, p. 129) emphasized this latter point saying, "The individual occupying similar positions tends to behave in ways similar to others in the same position and differently from persons occupying different positions". Thus, it would be expected that leaders and non-leaders would have different roles and perceptions.

There is usually delineation of status on the basis of ascribed and achieved status (24, p. 193). Ascribed status usually refers to that prestige which is inherent in the position attained by an individual by birth. The individual has no control over the attainment of ascribed status position. Achieved status usually refers to prestige that is designated to a position which is attainable by the efforts of an individual who has control over its attainment.
"A person is limited in attaining an achieved status only by his own efforts, ability and luck" (24, p. 193).

Literature and research indicate that every group has a status within its social system. Each group is ranked by the members in the social system and by other groups which co-exist in the social system. Beal, Bohlen and Raudabaugh (10, p. 119) state that this status of a group in a social system is dependent to a degree upon how consistent its goals and objects and means are with the general community values. It follows that individuals of a group would be designated as having the status or prestige of the group of which they are members. There would, however, be different perceptions of that group status by group members in different status positions within the group. Thus it is conjectured that leaders and non-leaders will show differences in their perception of the status of the group of which they are members.

Some ideas and data stressed by Homans and Stogdill include:

1. The higher a man's social rank, the larger will be the number of persons who originate interaction for him, either directly or through intermediaries (51, p. 182).

2. The higher a man's social rank, the larger the number of persons for whom he originates interaction, either directly or through intermediaries. Interaction confirms his rank. (51, p. 182)
3. The higher a man's social rank, the more frequently he interacts with persons outside his own group. Social equals tend to interact with one another at high frequency. (51, p. 186)

4. The leader will maintain his own position. He can do nothing to lead his group unless he is established as a person from whom authoritative orders will come. He must originate interaction for a group if he is to establish and maintain his rank. (51, pp. 425-526)

5. Leaders tend to come from a socio-economic background superior to that of the average of their followers. (51, p. 56)

6. Leaders are persons who tend to rate higher than average in popularity and prestige. (51, p. 59)

Therefore, the theoretical hypothesis for the variable of status is:

There are differences between the leader and non-leader in their perception of status given to participation in M. R. A. and related activities, Iowa State, 1959-1960.

Relevant primary reference group effect

Relevant Primary Reference Group Effect is defined as the perception of the value placed on leadership by the most important primary reference group(s) of which an individual is a member.

Primary group may be defined as the degree to which primary relations have been established among members of a group. Primary relations refer to the degree of fulfillment of personal needs and wishes, the degree of personal communications among group members and the degree that individuals
are viewed as whole persons, being unique and individualistic, but seen as a total entity (15, pp. 124-127).

Reference group may be interpreted as the group to which an individual relates his behavior or as the group to which the individual actually belongs. The latter interpretation usually then designates the group as a membership reference group. These interpretations also point out that a reference group may or may not be a primary group depending upon the degree of primary relations established. However, both interpretations indicate the basic underlying assumption that the reference group does influence the individual whether the individual belongs to the group or merely uses it as a "point of reference".

This point has been stated by Merton (62, pp. 232-233) in his discussion of the influencing role of a reference group upon the individual. He said that "Individuals take as a base for self-reference the situation of people with whom they are in direct social interaction: primarily, the in-group of friends and associates". He further indicated that reference groups are innumerable and that these groups of which a person is a member are taken as relevant reference groups. These comparatively few relevant reference groups become "points of reference" for shaping a person's evaluations, attitudes and behavior. It is assumed that most individuals have some primary and reference groups
influencing them. Thus the author is interested in the relevant primary and reference groups and the value placed on leadership by these groups as it differentiates between the leader and non-leader.

The primary group usually functions as the main avenue of socialization of an individual. From the moment an individual is born he is a member of a group and the relationships established in that group and other groups of which a person becomes a member have great effect upon each individual. It could be hypothesized that those who have emerged into formal leadership positions have had more numerous and intense primary relationships with individuals and groups than those who have not emerged into formal leadership positions, though the experiences may have been with relatively similar type primary or reference groups.

The family, peer group and relevant reference groups past, present and future seem to influence and socialize individuals tremendously, according to psychological and sociological literature. As primary groups they may function to emotionally support, protect, aid in the development of the individual's self, provide security to the individual, fulfill personal needs and operate as social control agencies (62, pp. 132-146). These functions are carried out and affect the individual in varying degrees and develop different behavior patterns. The connotation pertinent to
this study is that there will be different behavior patterns resulting for the leader and non-leader related to the differing primary and reference group experiences. Riesman (73, pp. 208-209) particularly points out the influence of the parents and family upon the individual as well as those reference groups and individuals who serve as proxy parents or families. Jennings (54, p. 42) phrased the significance of such primary group relationships by saying "leadership . . . is a phenomenon which arises out of individual differences in interpersonal capacity for socio-group participation and is a phenomena which is indigenous to the specific milieu of the socio-group or socio-groups in which they are produced." Primary group relations and their effect may be interpreted as what is meant by Jennings.

According to Beal, Boland and Raudabaugh (10, p. 120) a pattern of forces which affects an individual and groups is the affiliation of individuals with groups. Individuals affiliate and participate in innumerable groups with each having some effect upon the individual, depending upon the value placed on that group by the individual. Some of the groups with which a person affiliates are more relevant and thus function as a more powerful force affecting and influencing the individual. The value placed upon these groups by the individual is related to the closeness of the individual's goals and the group goals. In essence,
these sociologists are stressing the effect of the relevant reference groups upon the individual. There is further implication that differences in individuals would be related to the differences in the relationships with relevant primary and reference groups.

Kelley (57, pp. 410-414) discusses reference groups on the basis of function. He indicates that their function may be comparative or normative. The comparative function relates to an individual referring to a group in making evaluations of himself or of others and the normative function provides a source of norms or standards toward which the individual is influenced to conform. The normative function is considered especially pertinent to this study.

As Kelley points out, the normative reference groups might be labeled as "influencing" groups. The individual is influenced by these groups by various means and they affect his decision-making process. The normative reference groups exert their influence upon an individual by communicating their expectations to him. The implication is that both the leaders and non-leaders will have reference groups, with some degree of primary relations established, and that these reference groups will have communicated some expectations concerning the assumption of leadership roles to the individual. It would be expected then that the reference groups for the leaders and non-leaders would have placed
some degree of value on leadership and their expectations of the individuals would be guided by the degree of value placed on leadership and the assumption of a leader role by the individual. The author thus conjectures that the relevant primary reference groups of the leader will have relatively high value placed on leadership and the assumption of a leader role while the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leader will have relatively low value placed on leadership and the assumption of a leader role. This author maintains that differences between leader and non-leaders will be shown by studying the differences in values placed upon leadership and the assumption of a leader role by their relevant primary reference group. It is therefore hypothesized that:

There are differences in the degree of value placed upon leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus by the relevant primary reference groups of the leader and the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

Identification

Identification may be defined as the degree to which an individual feels a part of, a concern with and belongs to a group or social system. Beal, Bohlen and Raudabaugh (10, p. 86) have described identification as a social, psychological and often emotional phenomena. Allport supports this viewpoint by indicating that identification, as a process,
conveys a meaning of emotional merging of oneself with others (5, p. 278). Broom and Selznick (15, p. 216) refer to this phenomena as the "internalization of influence" emphasizing the emotional content involved in the process of identification. All of these references stress that the individual becomes emotionally involved with other individuals or groups with the development of a feeling of "we-ness", often referred to as morale, esprit de corps or group solidarity.

Identification is an integral part of each individual's life as he is socialized from birth until death. Each person becomes a part of various groups in the process of growing up and assumes various roles in these groups depending often upon the identification made with the groups, their goals and values, or the individual group members. Identification is an important part of the socialization of an individual and as some psychologists and sociologists have stated. "In this way the individual fills an imagined place in a social group and learns and develops his social roles in various groups" (66, p. 512). It may be assumed that through this same process the leader role may be perceived and assumed by individuals, for leadership is a learned process.

The leader may be regarded as a separate part of this we-ness group or the formal structure. The leader often is
delineated by the degree to which he identifies with the group and group members, its values and goals. Gouldner (39, p. 714) stated that "social organization is a pattern of basic identifications in which feelings of reciprocity and intimacy are interwoven. Only thus does the individual have a sense of status. Only thus is communication established which makes effective leadership possible."

Tead (82, p. 108) talks about the leader's relationship to his group in pointing out that identification is a reciprocal process between the leader and the group. The leader identifies with the group but also serves as a symbol of the group to which the members identify. Miller (63, p. 29) substantiates this position saying "... looking at leadership as a result of identification one might expect that, because the leader acts as a symbol of the group, he must embody what the group believes in and feels, their values. The embodiment of these values would come about in the leader as a result of identity with the system." The further implication may be made that the leader would tend to identify with the group to a high degree, especially since he also serves as a symbol for the group members and embodies their values. The corollary then is that the leader would identify with the group to a greater degree than would the non-leader.

Reciprocal identification between the leader and group
members suggests strongly that the leader would also be highly involved in the activities of the group. Beal, Bohlen and Raudabaugh (10, p. 87) state that research shows that there is a high relationship between identity with a given group and participation in the group and its activities. It is logical for the group members to seek the leader to participate in the group activities. At times the leader may be the initiator or originator of group activities as an expected part of his social role of leader. Thus, it follows that the leader will participate to a greater extent in the group's activities than those designated as non-leaders and would therefore tend to identify to a greater degree with the group than the non-leader. The hypothesis for this variable of identification is:

There are differences in the degree of identification with the house and halls between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

In summary, the following theoretical hypotheses have been formulated relative to the differences between leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960:

Major hypothesis:

There are sociological and psychological variables which will provide a basis for differentiating between those who emerge as leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

Minor hypotheses:

There are differences in the degree of personal characteristics between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.
There are differences in the degree of formal interaction with other persons and groups between leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

There are differences in the goal aspiration between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

There are differences in the degree of knowledge and compliance of group norms between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

There are differences in the degree of communication with others between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

There are differences between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960, in the attitudes expressed towards acceptance and use of authority.

There are differences between leader and non-leader in their perception of the status given for participation in M. R. A. and related activities, Iowa State, 1959-1960.

There are differences in the degree of value placed upon leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus by the relevant primary reference groups of the leader and the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.

There are differences in the degree of identification with the house and the halls between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960.
METHODOLOGY

Preliminary Procedure

**Informal interviews**

Informal interviews with individuals familiar with the residence system and student leadership were carried out as a preliminary step in the development of this research. The author interviewed halls administration, student leaders in the men's halls, residents who were not considered leaders in the men's halls, members of the student supervisory group called the Head Residents and other individuals familiar with the men's halls and organization but who were not residents. Personnel from the student counseling service were also interviewed. In these interviews the following information was sought: (a) opinions about the importance of leadership, and (b) the need for greater development of leadership and of elected leaders in the men's halls. Information was also sought relative to the perceived factors affecting the development of leaders, more specifically, why some residents emerged as elected officers while others did not. Specific suggestions were obtained as to areas of investigation of the leader and non-leader in the men's halls as well as specific questions that could be used for obtaining data. The data pertaining to leadership in the men's halls
obtained in these interviews was consolidated and analyzed for the purpose of delineation of independent variables of halls' leadership which seemed most important to investigate. The nine independent variables selected for study seemed to be stressed sufficiently to point out their importance for differentiation of leaders and non-leaders. The variable of spatial relationship was considered but not emphasized to any marked degree, thus did not seem to warrant investigation in this study.

Construction of Indices, Pre-testing and Derivation of Empirical Hypotheses

Introduction

Leadership is often considered as an independent variable, however, it is being used in this study as a dependent variable. The nine independent variables, each considered as related to the dependent variable leadership, are personal characteristics, formal interaction, goal aspiration, norm knowledge and compliance, communication, authority attitude, status perception, identification and value placed on leadership by relevant primary reference group.

This section is divided into discussion of: (a) the approaches to construction, selection and adaptation of the indices used and the pre-testing procedure utilized,
(b) statement of epistemic correlations and pre-test results and (c) derivation of the empirical hypotheses.

Approaches to construction, selection and adaptation of indices used and the pre-testing procedure utilized

**Personal characteristics.** Review of literature of leadership indicated that 21 personal characteristics seem to show close relationship to leadership and the emergence of leaders. These 21 personal characteristics were defined, placed in alphabetical order and listed with a Likert-type value continuum indicated for each personal characteristic, ranging from very important to unimportant. A value of five (5) to one (1) was placed at each of the points in the continuum. A panel of 15 judges, representing men's halls residents, leaders and halls administrators who were familiar with the elected leadership positions in the Men's Residence Association, was asked to indicate the importance which they believed the halls residents placed on each of these listed personal characteristics as they were related to leadership in the M. R. A.

For purposes of economy and since other independent variables were involved in the study, it was decided that the five to ten personal characteristics rated highest by the panel of judges, would be used to measure the personal characteristics of the leader and non-leader in this
research. The ten personal characteristics indicated as having the greatest importance for the elected leader were friendliness, self-expression, cooperation, aggressiveness, dependability, social interests, confidence, abundant energy, maturity and initiative.

In consultation with personnel from the Iowa State Student Counseling Service, it was recognized that six of the ten personal characteristics were comparable to six of the scales already utilized in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Since validity and reliability had already been established for this measurement device, and for economy in selection and adaptation of indices for measuring these personal characteristics, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey Scales were accepted as the indices for measuring the selected personal characteristics of leaders and non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association. The entire test was utilized in gathering data in order to keep the scales to be used in proper context. However, only the scales of general activity (abundant energy), restraint (maturity), ascendance (aggressiveness and initiative), friendliness (friendly), personal relations (cooperation) and sociability (social interests) were utilized for analytical purposes. These scales selected from the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were chosen in consultation with the Iowa State Student Counseling Service personnel and on the basis of
descriptive interpretation designated for each scale. The scales chosen for use in this study were considered sufficiently similar in definition and interpretation to six of the top ten personal characteristics delineated by the panel of judges as most important to the elected leaders in the men's halls.

Since intelligence is the only personal characteristic discussed in literature and supported in research studies on leadership that is relatively close to being considered a universal personal characteristic of leaders, this characteristic was selected as an additional one to be measured. The raw total scores from the American Council of Education Tests (53) were obtained for use as a measure of intelligence.

Thus seven (7) indices were selected as measurements of personal characteristics to be utilized in studying the leader and non-leader in the Men's Residence Association.

**Formal interaction.** The author accepted social participation in formal voluntary organizations as a measure of formal interaction. This approach was developed by Chapin (27, pp. 157-164) and has been adapted and utilized by many researchers since its first use. For example, the study by Henningsen, Moss and Rogers (48, pp. 10-13) on the Iowa State campus adapted Chapin's approach for studying the social participation of Iowa State students.

This approach was first developed in 1928 by Chapin who
quantified several elements of participation. The elements delineated were (a) membership, (b) attendance, (c) contributions, (d) membership in committees and (e) positions as an officer. Arbitrary weights were assigned to each element.

The author adapted Chapin's social participation measurement technique using the elements of membership, attendance, membership on committees and positions as an officer. Arbitrary weights were assigned to each element. The scale was developed to measure social participation of the respondent during high school, his participation inside the residence halls since attending Iowa State and his participation outside the residence halls since attending Iowa State.

The social participation device was pre-tested with twelve (12) residents of the men's halls selected at random, primarily to check on clarity of: organization, terminology and instructions. None of the pre-test participants had any difficulty answering the questions asked and only minor changes were necessary in the instructions and terminology used. No change was made in the organization of the device.

Development of indices for independent variables goal aspiration, norm knowledge and compliance, communication, authority attitude, status, relevant primary reference group value on leadership and identification. Indices were developed for these seven independent variables using the
Likert technique (33, pp. 252-253 and 530-531). Items used in the development of the indices for each variable were obtained from the informal interviews, already discussed, from booklets, pamphlets, procedural and policy memorandums and notices and from the author's intimate knowledge of the men's halls system and the M. R. A. The number of items selected for the pre-test questionnaire for each dependent variable was: goal aspiration (5); knowledge and compliance (10); communication (10); authority attitude (10); status perception (16); identification (14); and, for relevant primary reference group value on leadership, a single Likert constructed question was developed.

For pretesting, these indices, with their specific items, were combined into one questionnaire, with two face sheets attached for obtaining general information. The questionnaire was then given to 26 men's halls residents designated as leaders and 26 men's halls residents designated as non-leaders. Both groups were selected on a random basis.

Correlations with the total score were made for each item of each measure. Analysis of variance was also computed for each measure between the two groups. On the basis of the correlations and the analysis of variance results, the number of items selected for each index was: goal aspiration (4); knowledge and compliance (4); communication (3);
authority (4); status (5) and identification (8). The same single Likert constructed question used on the pre-test was used for relevant primary reference group value on leadership.

These indices developed and constructed for the indicated seven independent variables plus the indices adapted for the personal characteristics and formal interactions variables were combined to make the final questionnaire used to gather data from the participants of this study. Two face sheets for obtaining general information from participants were attached to the questionnaire.

Statement of epistemic correlations and pre-test results

In this section the epistemic correlations relating the theoretical concepts to the operational concepts will be presented. Epistemic correlations* are propositions which link concepts to operations (44, p.16).

The epistemic correlations and the measures developed are presented as follows:

E.C. 1. The general activity scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of abundant energy for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

The general activity scale, utilized in this research, *Epistemic correlation will hereinafter be indicated as E.C.
appeared to be the best available measure of abundant energy. It is one of ten scales used in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The interpretation of the general activity scale is that individuals with a high score have strong drives, energy, vitality, speed, courage, activity and enthusiasm, while individuals with a low score are deliberate, inefficient, inactive and slow. By interpretation of the level of score obtained, differentiation can be made between individuals. Thus, the level of scores attained by the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. may provide a basis of differentiation between the two groups.

E.C. 2. The restraint scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of maturity for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

The restraint scale, utilized in this research, appeared to be the best available measure of maturity. It is one of the ten scales used in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The interpretation of the restraint scale is that individuals with a high score are deliberate, consistent, self-controlled, restrained and serious, while individuals with a low score tend to be impulsive, happy-go-lucky and love excitement. A person who is self-controlled, deliberate and consistent may often be referred to as being mature. In consultation with Iowa State Student Counseling Personnel, this scale and its interpretation were accepted as reflecting
maturity. By interpretation of the level of score obtained on this scale, differentiation can be made between individuals. Thus, the level of score attained by the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. may provide a basis of differentiation between the two groups.

E.C. 3. The ascendance scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of aggressiveness and initiative for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

The ascendance scale, utilized in this research, appeared to be the best available measure of aggressiveness and initiative. It is one of the ten scales used in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The interpretation of the ascendance scale is that individuals with a high score display social boldness, are self-defensive, tend toward being leaders, are conspicuous and tend to bluff, while individuals with a low score are socially submissive and followers. By interpretation of the level of score obtained, differentiation can be made between individuals. Thus, the level of scores attained by the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. may provide a basis of differentiation between the two groups.

E.C. 4. The friendliness scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of friendliness for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.
The friendliness scale, utilized in this research, appeared to be the best available measure of friendliness. It is one of the ten scales used in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The interpretation of the friendliness scale is that individuals with a high score lack fighting tendencies, are pacifistic, have a realistic way of treating frustrations, have the urge to please others, desire to be liked, are tolerant of hostile action, accept domination and respect others, while those individuals with a low score show hostility, fighting attitudes, are belligerent, resentful and want to dominate as well as feeling contempt for others. By interpretation of the level of score obtained, differentiation can be made between individuals. Thus, the level of scores attained by the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. may provide a basis of differentiation between the two groups.

E.C. 5. The personal relations scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of cooperation for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

The personal relations scale, utilized in this research, appeared to be the best available measure of cooperation. It is one of the ten scales used in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The interpretation of the personal relations scale is that individuals with a high score have tolerance and understanding of other people, have faith in
social institutions, have good personal relations and are cooperative, while those individuals with a low score are fault finding, critical of other people and of institutions, are hypercritical and suspicious and show self-pity. By interpretation of the level of score obtained, differentiation can be made between individuals. Thus, the level of scores attained by the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. may provide a basis of differentiation between the two groups.

E.C. 6. The sociability scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of social interests for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

The sociability scale, utilized in this research in an attempt to measure social interests, is one of the ten scales used in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The interpretation of the sociability scale is that individuals with a high score have many friends, are conversationalists, have social life, like the limelight and possess high social interest while individuals with a low score have few friends, are shy, avoid social contacts and are seclusive. By interpretation of the level of score obtained, differentiation can be made between individuals. Thus, the level of scores attained by the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. may provide a basis for differentiation between the two groups.
E.C. 7. The intelligence scale as measured by the total score of the American Council on Education Psychological Examination for College Freshmen* is a measure of intelligence for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

The intelligence scale, utilized in this research, appeared to be the best available measure of intelligence. It is one of three scales used in the American Council on Education Psychological Examination for College Freshmen. The test is used in many colleges and universities for testing the scholastic aptitude of freshmen or potential freshmen students. This test has been used on the Iowa State campus for testing freshmen since about 1940. Reviewers of tests indicate that the A.C.E. test is a good intelligence test and is especially useful as an intelligence measure for college freshmen (30, pp. 185-186). By interpretation of the level of scores obtained, differentiation can be made between individuals. Thus, the level of scores attained by the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. may provide a basis of differentiation between the two groups.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey scales and the total intelligence scale from the A.C.E. test appeared to be the best available measures of personal characteristics of the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A. These two

---

The American Council on Education Psychological Examination for College Freshmen will hereinafter be referred to as the A.C.E. test.
tests have been used extensively in counseling and guidance work. The test scales have been shown to be reliable with correlations in the .80's. The scores attained on these scales do differentiate between individuals and thus may provide a basis for differentiating between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 8. The M. R. A. social participation scale during high school attendance time is a measure of formal interaction by leaders and non-leaders.

E.C. 9. The M. R. A. social participation scale for inside the men's halls since attending Iowa State is a measure of formal interaction by leaders and non-leaders.

E.C. 10. The M. R. A. social participation scale for outside the men's halls since attending Iowa State is a measure of formal interaction by leaders and non-leaders.

The M. R. A. social participation scales are adaptations of Chapin's social participation scale. It includes the elements of group membership, group meeting attendance, group member committee assignments and positions as an officer in the group. Each element was given arbitrary weight from 0 to 4. The weights were assigned as follows: group membership (1), meeting attendance (attendance at less than half of the meetings was 0 and attendance at half or more of the meetings was 2), committee assignments (3), and officer position held (4). Thus, scores for individuals
varied according to the degree of participation in an organization involving membership, attendance at meetings, committee work and officer positions held. For example, a person who belonged to one organization, attended more than half of the meetings, served on three committees, and had held one elected office would receive scores of 1 for membership in the organization, 2 for his attendance at meetings, 9 for having served on three committees and 4 for having held one elected office. A total score of 16 would be given the individual used in the example.

The items constituting the following constructed scales were obtained by pre-test analysis of a population of items logically related to the theoretical concepts utilized in the research. The pre-test responses to these items were subjected to analysis of variance as an indication of the predictive validity of the individual items. The .05 level of significance was used as the minimum criteria of acceptance for an item. Those items which failed to meet this criteria were subjected to additional analysis as specified below. This analysis served as the preliminary basis for the selection of the scale items.

Following the above analysis the correlations of each of the items with the total score on the scale were computed. These correlations served as the basis for discarding additional items. Items were retained which correlated relatively
high and homogeneous with the total score. The homogeneity of these correlations was taken as an indication of the degree of unidimensionality of the scale.

As a final step in selection, the mean scores for each of the remaining items were compared. To reduce the number of items in each scale to a workable number, some of the items with duplicate mean scale values were discarded. In the event two items had identical scale values the one with the higher item total score correlation was selected. Thus reliability was not sacrificed for brevity. Thus the final scales were composed of items with predictive validity, unduplicated scale values and unidimensionality.

As stated, these scales were pre-tested with a sample of the population to be used in the research. There were 26 leaders and 26 non-leaders utilized in the pre-test.

E.C. 11. The goal aspiration scale is a measure of the level of goal aspiration for the leaders and non-leaders in M. R. A.

This scale, composed of five Likert type items, attempts to assess the degree or level of goal aspiration for the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The pre-test responses obtained from the leaders and non-leaders were analyzed as previously indicated. Four of the items of the scale seemed most appropriate for measuring the level of goal aspiration of the leaders and non-leaders in the
The items selected included:

1. Exactly what type of work (specific occupation such as engineering, extension, teaching, etc.) and what specific job within that type of work do you expect to be doing by the end of 10 years after you graduate from Iowa State University?

2. By the end of the first 10 years after I graduate from Iowa State University, I expect to be earning: 

3. In helping me to get ahead in my job after graduation from Iowa State University, I believe experience in college activities:

4. In helping me to attain my expected level of income in my field of work after graduation from Iowa State University, I believe that experience in college activities:

Item 1, based upon the North-Hatt Occupational Status Scale (15, pp. 186-187) was the only direct measure of occupational aspiration and thus was arbitrarily included in the final scale. Significant differences were found for items 2 and 3 in the pre-test. Item 4 was selected on the basis of the additional analysis already specified. The correlations and analysis of variance results are shown in Table 1.

E.C. 12. The norm knowledge and compliance scale is a measure of the degree of knowledge of and compliance to group norms by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

This scale, composed of eleven Likert type items, attempts to measure the degree to which the leaders and

*For statement of the item and specific categories for answers and all following scales, see Appendix F.
Table 1. Correlation coefficients between each item and total score and F test of the difference between leaders and non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association for each item for the goal aspiration variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item^a</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient^b</th>
<th>Analysis of variance^c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>36.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Item selected to be used in final questionnaire.
^b Correlation coefficient of each item with the total score.
^c F test of difference between leaders and non-leaders (at 1 and 50 d.f.). The 1 percent and 5 percent significance levels are 7.17 and 4.03, respectively.

non-leaders knew and complied with the rules, regulations and norms in existence in the M. R. A. and men's halls. Four of the items of the scale appeared most appropriate for measuring the degree of knowledge of and compliance to group norms. The items selected included:

1. I feel that knowledge and understanding of M. R. A. (house and halls) rules and regulations is important.

2. I believe that for the good of organized living, all residents need to live according to the rules and regulations of the M. R. A. (house and halls).

3. I should move out of the halls if I cannot live up to the rules and regulations existing in them.
If I see a way to get around the rules and regulations in the halls I try it.

Significant differences were found for items 1, 3 and 4. Item 2 was selected on the basis of the additional analysis already specified. The correlations and analysis of variance results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation coefficients between each item and total score and F test of the difference between leaders and non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association for each item for the norm knowledge and compliance variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Analysis of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Item selected to be used in final questionnaire.

\(^b\)Correlation coefficient of each item with the total score.

\(^c\)F test of difference between leaders and non-leaders (at 1 and 50 d.f.). The 1 percent and 5 percent significance levels are 7.17 and 4.03, respectively.
--- E.C. 13. The communication scale is a measure of communication with others by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

This scale, composed of ten Likert type items, is an attempt to estimate the degree to which the leaders and non-leaders utilized communication facilities and displayed communication skills in the M. R. A. Three of the items of the scale appeared most appropriate for measuring the degree of communication with others. The items selected included:

1. I enjoy speaking up in formal group meetings.

2. I do write announcements to be put on the house bulletin board.

3. I feel that I express my ideas and views best by participating in house and hall activities.

Significant differences were found for items 2 and 3 in the pre-test. Item 1 was selected on the basis of additional analysis already specified. The correlations and analysis of variance results are shown in Table 3.

--- E.C. 14. The authority attitude scale is a measure of the attitudes expressed toward acceptance and use of authority by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

This scale, composed of ten Likert type items, is an attempt to assess the degree of attitude expressed toward the acceptance and use of authority by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. Four of the items of the scale appeared most appropriate for measuring the degree of authority
Table 3. Correlation coefficients between each item and total score and F test of the difference between leaders and non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association for each item for the communication variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Analysis of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>26.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aItem selected to be used in final questionnaire.*

*bCorrelation coefficient of each item with the total score.*

*cF test of difference between leaders and non-leaders (at 1 and 50 d.f.). The 1 percent and 5 percent significance levels are 7.17 and 4.03, respectively.*

attitude. The items selected included:

1. I favor the expulsion of residents who break rules and regulations.

2. As an elected leader in the house I would expect residents to carry out a job assigned them.

3. I feel that house officers have too much authority.

4. I think leaders should have authority.

Significant differences were found for all four items in the pre-test. The correlations and analysis of variance results are shown in Table 4.
Table 4. Correlation coefficients between each item and total score and F test of the difference between leaders and non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association for each item for the authority attitude variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item^a</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient^b</th>
<th>Analysis of variance^c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Item selected to be used in final questionnaire.

^b Correlation coefficient of each item with the total score.

^c F test of difference between leaders and non-leaders (at 1 and 50 d.f.). The 1 percent and 5 percent significance levels are 7.17 and 4.03, respectively.

E.C. 15. The status perception scale is a measure of the perception of status given by leaders and non-leaders for participation in M. R. A. and campus activities.

This scale, composed of sixteen Likert type items, is an attempt to assess the degree to which status is perceived and given for participation in M. R. A. and campus activities by leaders and non-leaders. Five of the items of the scale appeared most appropriate for measuring the degree of status perceived and given for participation in
M. R. A. and campus activities. The items selected included:

1. I feel that living in the Men's Halls gives me more prestige than living in off-campus housing.

2. I feel that mixing and participating in activities is important for giving me recognition and prestige.

3. I feel that participating in the house and halls gives more prestige than participating in church activities.

4. I feel that the M. R. A. has high prestige on campus.

5. Being an elected leader in the halls adds much to a resident's prestige.

Significant differences were found for item 2. Items 1, 3, 4 and 5 were selected on the basis of additional analysis already specified. The correlations and analysis of variance results are shown in Table 5.

E.C. 16. The relevant primary reference group value scale is a measure of the value placed upon leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus by the relevant primary reference groups of the leader and the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leader.

This scale, developed as a single Likert type item, is an attempt to measure the value which relevant primary groups are perceived to place on leadership in activities. This scale was pre-tested with the same groups in the same manner as the previously discussed five dependent variables. Since some participants did not indicate the full five
Table 5. Correlation coefficients between each item and total score and F test of the difference between leaders and non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association for each item in the status perception variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Analysis of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Item selected to be used in final questionnaire.

*b Correlation coefficient of each item with the total score.

*c F test of difference between leaders and non-leaders (at 1 and 50 d.f.). The 1 percent and 5 percent significance are 7.17 and 4.03, respectively.

primary reference groups requested in the information, an average score was obtained for each participant to be used for analysis purposes. The item was asked in two parts and included the following:

Please list below the five most important small groups to which you belong and are a part of since coming to Iowa State University: (Please give a name or describe each small group.)

Now after listing your five most important small groups to which you belong and are a part of since coming to Iowa State University, please list them again or refer to them as group 1, or group 2,
or group 3, etc. and indicate by checking ( )
the degree to which you think these small groups
place a value on being a leader in campus or
residence activities.

The computed F test for leader and non-leader differences
was 4.95 when significance at 5 percent level is 4.03. Thus,
the single item Likert type scale was utilized in the final
schedule for testing differences in the perceived value place
on leadership by the respective relevant primary reference
groups of the leaders and non-leaders.

E.C. 17. The identification scale is a measure of the
degree of identification with the house and halls by leaders
and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

This scale, composed of fifteen Likert type items, is an
attempt to measure the degree of identification felt by
leaders and non-leaders towards the house and halls. Eight
of the items appeared most appropriate for measuring the de­
gree of identification with the house and halls. The items
selected included:

1. As a member of the M. R. A. I should
purchase a M. R. A. pin and/or house guard pin.

2. I should buy and use house stationery.

3. I feel that I am definitely a part of my
house and its activities.

4. As a member of the M. R. A. I have a
responsibility to help it be effective and meaning­
ful to the residents.

5. As a member of my house I have a responsi­
bility to help carry out activities in it.
6. I feel that the M. R. A. membership is important to me.

7. I feel that the house is an important organization to me.

8. I often speak of the house as our house.

Significant differences were found for the first six items. Items 7 and 8 were selected on the basis of the additional analysis already specified. The correlations and analysis of variance results are shown in Table 6.

Derivation of empirical hypotheses

Having developed the general hypotheses and established the epistemic correlations, statement of empirical hypotheses* follows logically in this section. The general hypotheses, epistemic correlations and the empirical hypotheses for the independent variables used in this study are as follows:

General Hypothesis 1. There are differences in the personal characteristics between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.C. 1. The general activity scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of abundant energy for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 1. There are differences in the general

*Empirical hypotheses hereinafter will be indicated as E.H.
Table 6. Correlation coefficients between each item and total score and F test of the difference between leaders and non-leaders in the Men's Residence Association for each item for the relevant primary reference group value on leadership variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Analysis of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>12.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>19.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Item selected to be used in final questionnaire.
- Correlation coefficient of each item with the total score.
- F test of difference between leaders and non-leaders (at 1 and 50 d.f.). The 1 percent and 5 percent significance levels are 7.17 and 4.03, respectively.

activity score between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

**E.C. 2.** The restraint scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of maturity for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.
E.H. 2. There are differences in the restraint score between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 3. The ascendance scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of aggressiveness and initiative for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 3. There are differences in the ascendance score between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 4. The friendliness scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of friendliness for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 4. There are differences in the friendliness score between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 5. The personal relations scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of cooperation for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 5. There are differences in the personal relations score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 6. The sociability scale as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a measure of social interests for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 6. There are differences in the sociability score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.
E.C. 7. The intelligence score as measured by the total score of the A.C.E. test is a measure of intelligence for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 7. There are differences in the intelligence score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

General hypothesis 2. There are differences in the degree of formal interaction with other persons and groups between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 8. The M. R. A. social participation scale during high school attendance time is a measure of formal interaction by leaders and non-leaders.

E.H. 8. There are differences in the social participation score during high school attendance time between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 9. The M. R. A. social participation scale for inside the men's halls since attending Iowa State is a measure of formal interaction by leaders and non-leaders.

E.H. 9. There are differences in the social participation score for inside the men's halls since attending Iowa State between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 10. The M. R. A. social participation scale for outside the men's halls since attending Iowa State is a measure of formal interaction by leaders and non-leaders.

E.H. 10. There are differences in the social
participation score for outside the men's halls since attending Iowa State between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

**General hypothesis 3.** There are differences in the goal aspiration between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.C. 11. The goal aspiration scale is a measure of the level of goal aspiration for leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 11. There are differences in goal aspiration score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

**General hypothesis 4.** There are differences in the degree of knowledge and compliance to group norms between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.C. 12. The norm knowledge and compliance scale is a measure of the degree of knowledge and compliance to group norms by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 12. There are differences in the norm knowledge and compliance score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

**General hypothesis 5.** There are differences in the degree of communication with others between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.C. 13. The communication scale is a measure of communication with others by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.
E.H. 13. There are differences in the communication score between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

**General hypothesis 6.** There are differences between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., in the attitudes expressed towards acceptance and use of authority.

E.C. 14. The authority attitude scale is a measure of the attitudes expressed toward acceptance and use of authority by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 14. There are differences in the authority attitude score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

**General hypothesis 7.** There are differences between leaders and non-leaders in their perception of the status given for participation in the M. R. A. and related activities.

E.C. 15. The status perception scale is a measure of the perception of status given by leaders and non-leaders for participation in M. R. A. and campus activities.

E.H. 15. There are differences in the status perception score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

**General hypothesis 8.** There are differences in the degree of value placed on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus by the relevant primary reference groups of the
leader and the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.C. 16. The relevant primary reference group value scale is a measure of the value placed upon leaders in the M. R. A. and on campus by the relevant primary reference groups of the leader and the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leader.

E.H. 16. There are differences in the respective relevant primary reference group value on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

General hypothesis 9. There are differences in the degree of identification with the house and halls between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.C. 17. The identification scale is a measure of the degree of identification with the house and halls by leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 17. There are differences in the identification score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

Sample

Two groups are involved in this study: those who have been designated as leaders in the M. R. A. and those who have been designated as non-leaders in the M. R. A. For
purposes of this study the population of each group will be considered a single homogeneous population although the groups could be divided into subpopulations.

At the time this research was undertaken, the 1845 residents of the men's halls were each assigned a number according to the men's halls alphabetical roster which is used as a halls directory. A preliminary survey was carried out to ascertain an estimate of the number of residents who had held an elected office and thus by definition would be classified as leaders and the number of residents who had not held an elected office and would be classified, by definition, as non-leaders.

A random sample of 600 residents (approximately 30 percent) was obtained for the preliminary survey. The sample was selected during winter quarter, 1960, by use of the random numbers table (78, pp. 10-13). The academic classification of each participant in the preliminary sample was also obtained. Of the 600 participants in the preliminary random sample, there were 194 who met the criteria for leaders and 352 who met the criteria for non-leaders. There were also 54 residents in the preliminary sample who had not held an elected position in the M. R. A. but had held an elected position in some formal organization on campus outside of the M. R. A. and men's halls. These 54 individuals were classified as outside leaders. Survey cards were
returned by all participants in this preliminary survey.

The preliminary survey cards were then divided into the respective three groups, leader, non-leader and outside leader by academic classification. In the leader group there were 36 seniors, 54 juniors, 60 sophomores and 44 freshmen. In the non-leader group there were 32 seniors, 53 juniors, 93 sophomores and 174 freshmen. In the outside leader group there were 14 seniors, 12 juniors, 20 sophomores and 8 freshmen. The division by classification was made so that equal numbers by classification could be randomly selected from the leader and non-leader groups to control for the class differences, taking into account the possible differences in leadership opportunities due to length of time at the university and in the Men's Halls.

The final random sample for the investigation was selected from the preliminary survey respondents, with 30 in each academic classification from each group being asked to participate in the research. There was then a total of 120 men's halls residents in each of two groups being studied in the primary analysis or a total of 240 M. R. A. members in the main analysis of the research project. All of the individuals in the preliminary survey who were designated as outside leaders were also asked to participate in the study with the possibility of using their data for supplemental analysis purposes.
Since the large number of men residing in the halls made impractical the use of the total group, the indicated number (240) or about thirteen percent of the total population, was thought to be a sample of sufficient size for use in this research. The 240 randomly-selected participants was large enough to provide sufficient data for analysis and at the same time not too large for administering the questionnaires and scoring the answers. Men who were used in the pre-testing group were excluded from the random sample of the final participating group.

Field Procedure for Gathering Data

The preliminary survey card was given to the randomly-selected participants by their respective student supervisors, the Head Residents. The survey cards were completed and returned to the Head Residents who in turn sent them to the author. The cooperation of the Head Resident group is given credit for the 100 percent return of the survey cards.

Two weeks after the spring quarter of 1960 had begun, the 240 designated leaders and non-leaders selected randomly as participants for the research project were contacted by mail. A letter was sent to each participant telling him about the project and asking him to attend one of five
scheduled group interviews.* For those residents who were unable to participate during the week of the scheduled interviews, arrangements were made for individual interviews and time allotted for answering the questionnaires.

Of the 240 designated leaders and non-leaders asked to participate in the research project, 189 (79.75 percent) responded by coming to the group interviews. The remaining data were obtained through personal interviews so that 100 percent return of the completed questionnaires was obtained from the leader and non-leader participants.

This same procedure was utilized in obtaining data from those residents designated as outside leaders with questionnaires finally being completed and data furnished by 39 outside leaders, representing 65 percent of this group asked to participate.

A total of 279 usable schedules was obtained.

Statistical Analysis

Correlation coefficients and analysis of variance (78, pp. 172-210) were used in analyzing the pre-test data. The data from the final questionnaire were coded and punched on

*Interviews were scheduled during the week of April 23 to April 30, 1960. All group interviews were held in Helser Conference Room, located in Helser Hall. Times were varied for the interviews in an attempt to provide maximum opportunities for participants to attend.
IBM cards. Analysis of variance was used to determine the differences between leaders and non-leaders. Wert, Neidt and Ahmann (85, p. 172) state, "The analysis of variance has been designated to provide an efficient test of the significance of the differences between two or more groups simultaneously" (85, p. 172). This statistical method is used when data have been weighted by the numerical value assigned to each answer or have values designated for the material (85, p. 179). In this study the continuum of one to five was used in the measures for seven of the dependent variables. For the dependent variable of personal characteristics, as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, the raw scores from the scales were used and for the dependent variable of social participation a continuum of zero to four was used.

The data obtained from those residents were analyzed and the findings will be used to supplement the primary analysis between leaders and non-leaders.
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Analysis—Leader and Non-leader

In this section, the general hypotheses will be stated, followed by the empirical hypotheses, stated in null form, used to test each of the general hypotheses.

General hypothesis 1

There are differences in the personal characteristics between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.H. 1. There are no differences in the general activity score between the leaders and non-leaders of the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is not rejected.* The computed F test for leader and non-leader differences was 1.41 which is less than 3.90 needed for significance at the 5 percent level. The two groups seemed to be similar in their general activity scores as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These data do not support the original propositions. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 7.

E.H. 2. There are no differences in the restraint score between leader and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is not rejected. The computed F test for

*Following the usually accepted statistical level, significance at the 5 percent level will be accepted as a statistical significant difference.
Table 7. Analysis of variance of general activity score as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.35</td>
<td>43.35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>188.37</td>
<td>62.79</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.88</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>7,120.80</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7,401.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leader and non-leader differences was 1.81 which is less than 3.90 needed for significance at the 5 percent level. The two groups seemed to be similar in their restraint scores as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These data do not support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 8.

E.H. 3. There are no differences in the ascendance score between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 7.54 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their ascendance scores as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These data support the original proposition. The analysis
Table 8. Analysis of variance of restraint score as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.07</td>
<td>45.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>238.43</td>
<td>79.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.77</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>5,790.46</td>
<td>24.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>6,128.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$The computed F test for class differences was 3.18 which is greater than 2.65 needed for significance at the 5 percent level.

Table 9. Analysis of variance of the ascendance score as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey of the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>256.27</td>
<td>256.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87.02</td>
<td>29.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>7,886.73</td>
<td>33.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>8,259.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of variance results are shown in Table 9.

E.H. 4. There are no differences in the friendliness score between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is not rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was .003 which is less than 3.90 needed for significance at the 5 percent level. The two groups seemed to be similar in their friendliness scores as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These data do not support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table

Table 10. Analysis of variance of friendliness score as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122.51</td>
<td>40.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115.99</td>
<td>38.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>7,333.70</td>
<td>31.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7,572.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are differences in the personal relations score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is not rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 1.66 which is less than 3.90 needed for significance at the 5 percent level. The two groups seemed to be similar in their personal relations scores as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These data do not support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Analysis of variance of personal relations as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.34</td>
<td>51.34</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>379.31</td>
<td>133.10</td>
<td>4.31^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>7,167.36</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7,635.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aThe computed F test for leader and class interaction was 4.31 which is greater than 3.88 needed for significance at the 1 percent level.
E.H. 6. There are no differences in the sociability score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 14.01 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their sociability scores as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Analysis of variance of sociability score as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>656.70</td>
<td>656.70</td>
<td>14.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>116.05</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>10,873.90</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>11,680.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E.H. 7. There are no differences in the intelligence score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 9.76 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their intelligence scores as measured by the total score of the A.C.E. test. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Analysis of variance of intelligence as measured by the American Council of Education freshmen test scores of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,356.98</td>
<td>4,356.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>692.86</td>
<td>230.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>495.06</td>
<td>165.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100,900.92</td>
<td>446.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>106,445.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General hypothesis 2

There are differences in the degree of formal interaction with other persons and groups between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 8. There are no differences in the social participation score during high school attendance time between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is not rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was .24 which is less than 3.90 needed for significance at the 5 percent level. The two groups seemed to be similar in their social participation scores during high school attendance time. These data do not support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 14.

E.H. 9. There are no differences in the social participation score for inside the men's halls since attending Iowa State between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 130.96 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their social participation scores for inside the men's halls since attending Iowa State. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 15.
Table 14. Analysis of variance of social participation scores during high school attendance time of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,242.40</td>
<td>6,242.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,675.33</td>
<td>2,225.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,801.74</td>
<td>4,267.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>6,119,087.63</td>
<td>25,602.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>6,144,807.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Analysis of variance of social participation scores inside the men's halls since attending Iowa State of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,187.70</td>
<td>26,187.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,138.28</td>
<td>1,712.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,544.32</td>
<td>514.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>46,392.50</td>
<td>199.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>79,262.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe computed F test for class differences was 8.57 which is greater than 3.88 needed for significance at the 1 percent level.
E.H. 10. There are no differences in the social participation score for outside the men's halls since attending Iowa State between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 15.34 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their social participation scores for outside the men's halls since attending Iowa State. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 16.

Table 16. Analysis of variance of social participation scores outside the men's halls since attending Iowa State of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,116.82</td>
<td>4,116.82</td>
<td>15.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,801.42</td>
<td>1,600.47</td>
<td>5.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>672.34</td>
<td>224.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>62,242.60</td>
<td>268.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>71,833.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The computed F test for class differences was 5.97 which is greater than 3.88 needed for significance at the 1 percent level.
General hypothesis 3

There are differences in the goal aspiration between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.H. 11. There are no differences in the goal aspiration score between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 9.78 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their goal aspiration scores. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 17.

Table 17. Analysis of variance of goal aspiration scores of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.07</td>
<td>64.07</td>
<td>9.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>3.29a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,520.00</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,679.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe computed F test for class differences was 3.29 which is greater than 2.65 needed for significance at the 5 percent level.
General hypothesis 4

There are differences in the degree of knowledge and compliance of group norms between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.H. 12. There are no differences in the norm knowledge and compliance score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed $F$ test for leader and non-leader difference was 10.41 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their norm knowledge and compliance scores. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 18.

General hypothesis 5

There are differences in the degree of communication with others between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.H. 13. There are no differences in the communication score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed $F$ test for leader and non-leader difference was 64.22 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their communication scores. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 19.
Table 18. Analysis of variance of norm knowledge and compliance scores of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>69.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.81</td>
<td>19.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,544.44</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,677.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}The computed F test for leader and class interaction differences was 2.99 which is greater than 2.65 needed for significance at the 5 percent level.

Table 19. Analysis of variance of communication scores of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264.60</td>
<td>264.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>955.87</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,235.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General hypothesis 6

There are differences between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., in attitudes expressed towards acceptance and use of authority.

E.H. 14. There are differences in the authority attitude score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 20.80 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their authority attitude scores. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 20.

General hypothesis 7

There are differences between leaders and non-leaders in their perception of the status given for participation in the M. R. A. and related activities.

E.H. 15. There are differences in the status perception score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 25.73 which is greater than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their status perception scores. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 21.
Table 20. Analysis of variance of authority attitude scores of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>2.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>896.84</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,021.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThe computed F test for leader and class interaction differences was 2.80 which is greater than 2.65 needed for significance at the 5 percent level.

Table 21. Analysis of variance of status perception of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>254.20</td>
<td>254.20</td>
<td>25.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>2,292.10</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2,588.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General hypothesis 8

There are differences in the degree of value placed on leadership in the M.-R. A. and on campus by the relevant primary reference groups of the leader and the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leaders in the M. R. A.

E.H. 16. There are differences in the respective relevant primary reference group value on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 6.04 which is greater than 3.90 needed for significance at the 5 percent level. The two groups showed difference in their respective primary reference group value on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus scores. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 22.

General hypothesis 9

There are differences in the degree of identification with the house and halls between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A.

E.H. 17. There are no differences in the identification score between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The null hypothesis is rejected. The computed F test for leader and non-leader difference was 31.84 which is greater
Table 22. Analysis of variance of respective relevant primary reference group value on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus scores of the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.0012</td>
<td>7.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>.7002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0885</td>
<td>1.6962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>269.0666</td>
<td>1.1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>283.2598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than 6.77 needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The two groups showed differences in their identification scores. These data support the original proposition. The analysis of variance results are shown in Table 23.

Supplemental Analysis of Outside Leader Data

As previously stated, data were obtained from 39 men's halls residents who were designated as outside leaders. There were 6 freshmen, 11 sophomores, 11 juniors and 11 seniors in this group. The outside leader group represents a relatively small group within the M. R. A. as compared to the leader and non-leader groups. There were insufficient numbers of outside leaders available for use in this research.
Table 23. Analysis of variance of identification with the house and halls scores between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>952.02</td>
<td>952.02</td>
<td>31.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.98</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader x class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>152.45</td>
<td>50.82</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>6,935.73</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>8,095.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for the primary analysis. The author considers data obtained from the outside leaders as supplemental to the primary analysis between the leader and non-leader groups.

The data from the outside leaders will be compared to the data of the leaders and non-leaders by analysis of variance. Such an analysis should provide insight into the similarities and differences of the outside leaders, leaders and non-leaders and provide a basis for further research by following this procedure. Comparison of the three groups is shown in Tables 24, 25 and 26.

The analysis of the data indicates that the outside leader is more similar to the non-leader than to the leader in the M. R. A. Only one measure, social participation outside the halls since attending Iowa State, shows that the
Table 24. Comparison of the means of the outside leader with the means of the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A. by analysis of variance for each measure of the dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of dependent variables</th>
<th>F test results for comparison of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside leader-leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General activity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendance</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relations</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation during high school attendance time</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation inside the halls since attending Iowa State</td>
<td>29.39&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation outside the halls since attending Iowa State</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal aspiration</td>
<td>11.67&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm knowledge and compliance</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>42.38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Following the usually accepted statistical level, significance at the 5 percent level will be accepted as a statistical significant difference. The 5 percent level of significance for differences is 5.99.
Table 24 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of dependent variables</th>
<th>F test results for comparison of outside leader-leader</th>
<th>Outside leader-non-leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority attitude</td>
<td>10.80&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status perception</td>
<td>14.01&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant primary reference group value on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus</td>
<td>65.00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>16.70&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

outside leader is more like the leader than the non-leader. The similarity found on this measure, however, is somewhat built-in by definition. The criteria for definition of the leader and outside leader include activity outside the halls. Thus similarity between these two groups on the score from this particular measure would be expected. By analysis, there was significant difference found between the outside leader and non-leader on this measure.

The outside leaders appear more similar to the non-leader than to the leader on the measures of social participation inside the halls since attending Iowa State, goal aspiration, communication, authority attitude, status perception, identification and primary reference group value on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus. Significant
Table 25. Comparison of the means for the outside leader, the leader and non-leader groups in the M. R. A. for each measure of the dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of dependent variables</th>
<th>Means of the groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General activity</td>
<td>15.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint</td>
<td>17.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendance</td>
<td>16.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>14.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relations</td>
<td>18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>18.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>123.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation during high school attendance time</td>
<td>70.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation inside the halls since attending Iowa State</td>
<td>29.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation outside the halls since attending Iowa State</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal aspiration</td>
<td>17.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm knowledge and compliance</td>
<td>15.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority attitude</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status perception</td>
<td>17.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant primary reference group value on leadership in the M.R.A. and on campus</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of dependent variables</th>
<th>Means of the groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>30.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. Similarity of the outside leader group to leader and non-leader groups in the M. R. A. according to analysis of variance results and comparison of the group means for each measure of the dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures on which outside leader is more similar to leader</th>
<th>Measures on which outside leader is more similar to non-leader</th>
<th>Measures on which no differences between the groups were found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social participation outside the halls since attending Iowa State</td>
<td>Social participation inside halls since attending Iowa State</td>
<td>General activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal aspiration</td>
<td>Restraint</td>
<td>Restraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Ascendance</td>
<td>Ascendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority attitude</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status perception</td>
<td>Personal relations</td>
<td>Personal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant primary reference group value on leadership in the M.R.A. and on campus</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social participation during high school attendance time</td>
<td>Social participation during high school attendance time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm knowledge and compliance</td>
<td>Norm knowledge and compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification
differences are found between the leaders and outside leaders and no significant differences are found between the non-leader and outside leader on these measures. On all of these measures, except goal aspiration, the leaders obtained the highest scores, the non-leaders the next highest scores and the outside leaders the lowest scores.

On the measure of goal aspiration, the mean of the outside leader group is higher than the mean of the non-leader group but smaller than the mean of the leader group. No significant differences are found between the outside leader group and non-leader group but significant differences are found between the outside leader and leader groups. On this measure, goal aspiration, both the leaders and outside leaders obtained higher scores than the non-leaders.

No significant differences are found between the groups on the measures of general activity, restraint, ascendance, friendliness, personal relations, sociability, intelligence, social participation during high school attendance time and norm knowledge and compliance. It may be noted that most of the measures on which no significant differences are found attempt to measure the psychological variable of personal characteristics.

Although some insight is gained into the similarities and differences of the three groups as related to the specific measures used in this research, the analysis
primarily provides indications of areas for additional re-
search.
DISCUSSION

The findings of this study support the major hypothesis that there are sociological and psychological variables which will provide a basis for differentiating between those who emerge as leader and non-leader in the M. R. A., Iowa State, 1959-1960. Out of the 17 empirical hypotheses tested, twelve of them supported the major hypothesis. Also of importance is the fact that five of the hypotheses, primarily involving psychological variables, did not support the major hypothesis.

It is the author's belief that using the conceptual variable framework in studying leaders and non-leaders in a college residence hall has proved fruitful. The author will consider and briefly discuss each of the variables studied in relation to leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. Reference will also be made to the supplemental analysis of the outside leader as compared to the leader and non-leader. Limitations of this study and possible suggestions for future research will be discussed.

Personal Characteristics

Data obtained on the ascendance and sociability scales, as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and the intelligence scale, as measured by the A.C.E. test,
support the general proposition that there are differences in the degree of personal characteristics between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. The other scales used as measures of personal characteristics in this study do not support the general proposition. Highly significant differences between the two groups are found at the 1 percent level of significance for the ascendance, sociability and intelligence measures. The means of the groups show that the leaders score significantly higher than the non-leaders on these measures differentiating the leaders from the non-leaders.

Comparison of the outside leaders with the leaders and non-leaders on the seven measures for personal characteristics shows no significant differences between the outside leaders and the other two groups.

These personal characteristics differentiating the leaders and non-leaders in this study also appear to reflect some of the basic values in our culture. The author believes a stereotype of people in the United States depicts them to be aggressive, show initiative, have broad social interests and possess high intelligence. Those individuals in leadership positions and possessing college education are expected by the culture to personify these personal characteristics to a higher degree than the non-leaders. Thus, the leaders in a college residence were expected by the author to possess and show a higher degree of aggressiveness,
initiative, social interests and intelligence than those considered non-leaders and followers. The leaders are expected to obtain higher scores on these measures of personal characteristics than are the non-leaders. The analysis of the data in this study supports this expected differentiation between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A.

It should be noted that most of the measures which did not support the major proposition of differentiating leaders from non-leaders in the M. R. A. are those measures which attempt to measure the dependent variable of personal characteristics. The analysis comparing the outside leaders with the leaders and non-leaders showed that there were no differences between the outside leaders and non-leaders on all of the personal characteristic measures.

There was a limitation in the selection of the personal characteristics to be studied. Whereas a panel of judges was used to delineate those personal characteristics which they believed most necessary for a leader in the M. R. A., the panel was composed primarily of leaders or those individuals who worked closely with leaders in the M. R. A. Perhaps a better selection of personal characteristics might be made by using a panel of judges which represents more of a cross-section of the residence hall population including non-leaders and outside leaders on the panel. More research is needed on the personal characteristics which are most
important for the development of an individual living in the men's residence halls to fulfill a formal leader position and role. Little research has been done in this area.

The literature and research studies reviewed suggest that the failure of these measures to differentiate between the groups in this study may be due to the lack of the adequacy of the tools and method being used for attempting to measure personal characteristics. Additional research may be needed to improve existing measures or to develop new measures for studying personal characteristics of the leader as differentiated from the non-leader. The problem may really involve finding the specific measures which are applicable to this particular situation in a college residence hall. It must also be recognized that it is possible that these variables, to which the measurements are applied, may not be significant in the study of leadership.

Formal Interaction

Data obtained on the social participation scales for inside and outside the men's halls tend to support the general proposition that there are differences between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. in the degree of formal interaction with other persons and groups. However, the data from the high school social participation scale did not support the general proposition. Highly significant
differences between the leaders and non-leaders were found for the measures on social participation inside and outside the halls at the 1 percent level of significance. The means of the groups indicate that the leaders obtain higher scores than the non-leaders on the two social participation measures differentiating the leaders from the non-leaders.

Data from the outside leaders show that the outside leaders are significantly different from the leaders and are more similar to the non-leaders on the social participation inside the men's halls scale. The outside leaders are similar to the leaders and significantly different from the non-leaders on the social participation outside the men's halls scale. No significant differences are found for the outside leaders with the leaders and non-leaders for the high school social participation scale.

The data from leaders and non-leaders on the social participation outside the halls scale show that significant differences exist as related to academic classification. The implication is that those who have been in school longer have had, and have taken advantage of, greater opportunity to participate in activities outside the halls.

The data, in general support the concept that leaders participate more than non-leaders in formal organizations and formal activities. However, the differences found between the two groups may be more dependent on other factors
related to activity participation than on activities themselves such as situation of the on-going activity. An example is shown by the data in that no differences are found between the leaders and non-leaders in their social participation during high school attendance time but significant differences are found between the two groups in college activities.

Literature reports, and the author contended, that individuals follow an activity continuance pattern in their social participation in groups. That those active in high school events would be active in college events is an example of the contended activity continuance pattern. The data in this study do not support this activity continuance pattern. The leaders and non-leaders show no differences in the degree of social participation during high school attendance time but do show significant differences in their participation in college activities.

Additional research is needed to consider why some individuals who have participated in activities during high school attendance continue to participate in activities in college while others who have been active during high school attendance time do not participate as much as previously in college formal activities. Investigation of the effect of the individual's residence halls, fraternity, rooming house or family upon his social participation in formal activities
at college may be of value to understanding the development of leaders on a college campus and in a college residence hall.

A possible limitation in the social participation scales is the somewhat closed listing of formal activities and organizations which are functioning in a high school and in the residence halls and on campus at Iowa State. Although opportunity was provided on the questionnaire to list additional formal activities and organizations not found in the listing, the specific list of formal activities and organizations may have omitted some formal activities or organizations in which respondents had participated. Respondents may not have added some additional formal activities and organizations in which they participated. There is, however, no apparent reason to expect this phenomena to be differential between leaders and non-leaders.

Goal Aspiration

Data obtained on the goal aspiration scale support the general proposition that there are differences in goal aspiration between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. Significant differences are found between these two groups at the 5 percent level of significance on the measure of goal aspiration. The means of the two groups indicate that the leaders obtain higher scores on this measure than
do the non-leaders.

The data from the outside leaders show that the outside leaders are differentiated from the leaders on this measure. Significant differences at the 5 percent level of significance are found between the two groups. No significant differences are found between the outside leaders and the non-leaders. The means indicate that the scores obtained by the outside leaders are lower than the leaders' scores but higher than the non-leaders' scores.

Differentiation of the leaders from the non-leaders on the intelligence scale and the goal aspiration scale would appear to indicate the relationship (previously stated as shown in literature) that those with higher intelligence have higher goal aspiration. In this study the leaders show higher scores than the non-leaders on the intelligence and goal aspiration measures.

A limitation of this measure of the goal aspiration variable is the lack of any attempt to attempt to analyze the circular effect of leadership upon goal aspiration and of goal aspiration upon leadership. The literature and research reviewed revealed a somewhat circular relationship existing between these two variables. Little research has been done to clarify the specific relationship existing between leadership and goal aspiration. Further research is thus in order relative to the specific relationship of
leadership and goal aspiration as the variables pertain to the leaders in the M. R. A.

Additional research is planned on the comparison of the occupational status level of the fathers of the respondents in this study and the expected occupational goal aspiration level of the respondent. Further research on the differences of the occupational status level of parents of the leaders as compared to the parents of the non-leaders might be valuable in understanding the differences in goal aspiration levels of the leaders and non-leaders.

Norm Knowledge and Compliance

Data obtained on the norm knowledge and compliance scale support the general proposition that there are differences in the degree of knowledge and compliance of group norms between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. Highly significant differences are found between the two groups at the 1 percent level of significance on the measure of norm knowledge and compliance. The means of the two groups show that the leaders obtain higher scores than the non-leaders on this measure.

The data from the outside leaders show that there are no significant differences between the outside leaders and the leaders and non-leaders.

The review of literature indicated that the leader is
the person who comes closest to knowing and adhering to the norms of a group and that the leader is the embodiment of the norms as perceived by him and the group members. The data tend to support this proposition. Also, the data show that the leader appears to have higher regard and concern for the norms, specifically the formal rules and regulations, of the M. R. A. than do the non-leaders.

A limitation of this measure on norm knowledge and compliance is that the measure may not be inclusive enough of the various rules and regulations in existence and operation in the M. R. A. The informal norms are not considered in this study. There is also little latitude permitted for consideration of the norms as related to specific situations in which the compliance to norms by leaders and non-leaders is involved. Research is needed relative to the informal norms functioning and their relationship to the formal norms in the M. R. A. Study of the relative importance of the various formal and informal norms functioning in the M. R. A. might be of value especially as related to the value system permeating the M. R. A.

Communication

Data obtained on the communication scale support the general proposition that there are differences between leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. in the degree of
communication with others. Highly significant differences are found between the two groups at the 1 percent level of significance on the measure of communication.

On this measure significant differences are found between the outside leaders and the leaders and no significant differences are found between the outside leaders and non-leaders.

The means of the three groups indicate that the leaders obtain the highest scores, the non-leaders the next highest scores and the outside leaders the lowest scores.

An implication from the data is that leaders are more concerned with communication in the M. R. A. than are the non-leaders and the leaders probably develop their communication channels more fully than do the non-leaders. Thus, communication channels may differentiate the leaders from the non-leaders in the M. R. A. This approach to delineating leaders by their communication channels in a group is suggested by literature. Additional research relative to the communication channels of the leaders and non-leaders might be beneficial to understanding leaders' position and roles in the M. R. A. and might lead to an avenue for obtaining more potential leaders to run for the elected leadership positions.

The area of communication channels and their effect in the M. R. A. needs more research due to the progressive increase in numbers of members in the M. R. A. As the size of
the group has increased so have the problems in relation to reciprocal communication between the leaders and the non-leaders. New approaches for expediting communication in a thorough and precise manner need to be sought in order to assist the efficient functioning of the leaders in the M. R. A. More expansion of the men's halls and the M. R. A. is planned for the future. Therefore, better understanding of the communication channels and other factors related to effective communication is imperative for those concerned with the administration and operation of the men's halls and M. R. A.

Authority Attitude

Data obtained on the authority attitude scale support the general proposition that there are differences between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. in the attitudes expressed towards acceptance and use of authority. Highly significant differences were found between the two groups at the 1 percent level of significance on this measure.

Significant differences are found between the outside leaders and the leaders and no significant differences are found between the outside leaders and the non-leaders on the measure of authority attitude. But it should be remembered, authority is measured in terms of attitude toward M. R. A. authority.
The means of the three groups indicate that the leaders obtain the highest scores, the non-leaders the next highest scores and the outside leaders the lowest scores.

An implication made from the data is that the leaders are more prone than the non-leaders to accept and use authority. There seems to be the general feeling in both groups that leaders should have some degree of authority to use in their position. However, some of the non-leaders indicated, by written comments on the schedule, that authority should be given to and used by the leader only in specific situations. No clarification was made in the comments as to the type of situations in which leaders should have and use authority. Research is needed to determine more clearly what is meant by the comments of these non-leaders concerning the use of authority by leaders.

An underlying implication present in the data, which needs further study, is that the leaders and non-leaders are in disagreement concerning the acceptance and use of authority by leaders in the M. R. A. The suggested disagreement may exist to the extent where the two groups openly, as well as behind the scenes, oppose each other. From this difference in attitude toward the acceptance and use of authority might arise other disagreements and possibly conflict between the two groups. A negative attitude might result toward both the leaders as persons and the formal leadership
positions. A subsequent result could be a lack of members of the M. R. A. running for an elected office because of negative attitudes toward the elected leadership positions. Thus, research on the importance of the differences between the leaders and non-leaders in their attitudes expressed toward the acceptance and use of authority may have relevance to the procurement of more M. R. A. members running for an elected leader.

Another possible area of research is the comparison of expressed attitudes toward the acceptance and use of authority of the student supervisors, called the Head Residents, in comparison to the authority attitudes expressed toward the elected leader. More understanding of the role authority plays in the operation of the entire men's halls and M. R. A. might be gained through such research.

**Status Perception**

Data obtained on the status perception scale support the general proposition that there are differences between the leaders and non-leaders in their perception of the status given for participation in the M. R. A. and related activities. Highly significant differences are found between the two groups at the 1 percent level of significance on the measure of status perception.

Highly significant differences are found between the
outside leaders and the leaders and no significant differences are found between the outside leaders and the non-leaders on this measure.

The means of the three groups indicate that the leaders obtain the highest scores, the non-leaders the next highest scores and the outside leaders the lowest scores on the status perception measure.

The data indicate that the leaders place higher prestige value than do the non-leaders upon the M. R. A. organization and the elected officer positions in the M. R. A. and houses. An inference may be made that the leaders place a higher prestige value than do the non-leaders upon themselves and their leadership position. This inference is supported in the literature by the concept that the individual assumes the designated status or prestige of his group. If higher status or prestige was attached to the leader and the formal elected leadership position, then the number of residents running for formal elected office might be expected to increase. The differences found between the two groups on the measure of status perception points out the need for additional research on the effect of the status perception of the two groups upon the number of M. R. A. members running for a formal elected officer position in the M. R. A. and houses.

Limitations on the present measure used for status
perception include the lack of consideration of the status perception of the appointed offices in the M. R. A. and houses and their comparative prestige to the formal elected officer positions. Study of the perceived prestige of an informal leader compared to the perceived prestige of the formal leader might also provide more insight into the relative ranking of the status perception of the formal elected leader in the M. R. A.

Relevant Primary Reference Group Effect

Data obtained on the relevant primary reference group effect scale support the general proposition that there are differences in the degree of value placed upon leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus by the relevant primary reference groups of the leaders and the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leaders in the M. R. A. Significant differences were found between the two groups at the 5 percent level of significance on the measure of relevant primary reference group effect.

Highly significant differences were found between the outside leaders and the leaders and no significant differences were found between the outside leaders and the non-leaders on this measure.

The means of the three groups indicate that the leaders obtained the highest scores, the non-leaders the next highest
scores and the outside leaders the lowest scores.

The data in part support the author's conjecture, previously stated, that the relevant primary reference groups of the leader will have relatively high value placed on the leadership and assumption of a leader role while the relevant primary reference groups of the non-leader will have relatively low value placed on leadership and the assumption of a leader role. The data showed significant differences between the two groups on this measure with the leaders obtaining higher scores than the non-leaders. The leaders' respective relevant primary groups place higher value on leadership and the assumption of the leader role than do the non-leaders' relevant primary reference groups. The respective relevant primary reference group of the non-leaders, in comparison to the relevant primary reference groups of the leaders, placed low value on leadership and assumption of the leader role.

Limitations to this measure include: the indicated values placed upon leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus were estimated values of the relevant primary groups on leadership as perceived by the respective leader and non-leader groups rather than the actual values designated by the members of the respective relevant primary reference groups; and several of the respondents failed to list any relevant primary reference groups and thus there were no values by
the respective relevant primary groups on leadership in the M. R. A. and on campus. On the latter limitation, the author would expect all of the respondents to have some relevant primary groups to list and indicate their value on leadership in the M. R. A. and thus perhaps the respondents who failed to list any relevant primary reference groups did not fully understand what was asked. A limited bias may thus have entered the findings of the measure.

Further research is necessary to know more about the role that the relevant reference group plays by influencing individuals to run or not run for a formal elected office. Insight into this aspect of influence upon the individual resident might give direction to find and utilize such relevant primary reference groups for developing potential formal leaders in the M. R. A. For instance, it may be assumed that those leaders who are members and have high identity with primary reference groups who place high value on leadership as a status giving device should continue in their leadership role and maintain or enhance their status. However, a basic question not answered by this thesis is how to find and utilize non-leader primary reference groups that place a relatively high value on hall leadership. It is this type of group that should be of aid in influencing non-leaders to aspire to leadership positions. Additional alternatives such as the following are also available:
(a) enhance the prestige of leadership positions to the degree that they become status giving attributes in more non-leader groups; (b) channel potential leaders into primary reference groups that are known to place high value on hall leadership status; and (c) try to place the leaders (who have been shown in this thesis to put high value on leadership positions) in non-leader groups with the expectation that the leader should influence the non-leader group norms to place high value on leadership positions. A study of the members of the relevant primary reference groups of the leaders and non-leaders might help deduce the relative influence of these primary reference groups upon the individual M. R. A. member. Additional research might also show the role of the relevant primary reference groups in the functioning and operation of the M. R. A. and the men's halls.

Identification

Data obtained on the identification scale support the general proposition that there are differences between the leaders and non-leaders in the M. R. A. in the degree of identification with the house and halls. Highly significant differences were found between the two groups at the 1 percent level of significance on this measure.

Significant differences were found between the outside leaders and the leaders and no significant differences were
found between the outside leaders and the non-leaders on the measure of identification.

The means of the three groups indicate that the leaders obtained the highest scores, the non-leaders the next highest scores and the outside leaders the lowest scores.

The corollary previously stated by the author that the leader would identify with the group to a greater degree than would the non-leader is supported by the data. The leaders obtain higher scores than the non-leaders on this measure indicating a higher degree of identification with the M. R. A. by the leaders than by the non-leaders.

The literature pointed out that there is a high relationship between identity with a given group and participation in the group and its activities. The data support this generalization that the leaders obtaining significantly higher scores than the non-leaders in the social participation inside the halls scale and the identification scale. The leaders do appear to identify and participate more in the M. R. A. than do the non-leaders.

Identification by individuals may be with other individuals as well as with groups. This measure did not consider the possible identification of the leaders and non-leaders with specific individuals or individuals in specific status positions such as elected leaders identifying only with other elected leaders. Research relative to the influence of identification by leaders and non-leaders with
individuals might provide some insight into why some M. R. A. members run for an elected office and others do not. More research is necessary to understand what role and to what extent the influence of individuals who serve as points of identification play in the procurement, development and functioning of the formal elected leader in the M. R. A.

The relationship between leadership and identification may be considered as somewhat circular in nature. The question arises as to whether a person becomes a leader and then identifies with other leaders or groups or the total hall system and thus is influenced to strive for other and higher status leadership positions or whether the individual identifies with a leader or the system and then strives for leadership positions. The reciprocal influence of identification upon leadership and leadership upon identification was not considered in the literature reviewed by the author. Study on this reciprocal relationship of leadership and identification might prove valuable in understanding one of the possible motivating forces influencing an individual to strive for leadership positions.

Additional Limitations

As the author developed this study several limitations were recognized, some of which have already been stated. It is believed that additional limitations need to be
There may be weaknesses in this study because of the methods used in obtaining data from selected participants who were unable to attend the scheduled group interviews. These respondents who were unable to attend the scheduled group interviews were permitted to answer the questions at their convenience within a limited time schedule in their own rooms. For these respondents, this time allowed for answering questions gave opportunity for discussion by the participants with other people concerning the questions. Such discussion of questions could have influenced the respondents' answers to the questions and in that manner have affected the data obtained on the schedule and subsequently the results of the analysis and the interpretation of the data received. Perhaps obtaining the data only in scheduled group interviews or in supervised small group or individual interviews might have prevented this possible weakness.

The scope of the study was limited by the prior establishment of the leader and non-leader definitions. These definitions did not permit consideration of appointed officers of the M. R. A. as leaders nor informal leaders as specified categories in this study. Both the appointed leaders and the informal leaders could be the subjects of future research projects.

The interaction of the variables were not analyzed in
this research. Further research and analysis are planned to assess which variables are predictive of leadership when controls are placed on all of the variables. The present research centered on the differences which exist between the leader and non-leader in the M. R. A. on certain selected dependent variables.

Additional Research

The author recognized the need for limiting this research to specific objectives thus many additional alternatives were eliminated in the formulation of the specific objectives and as the study developed, ideas evolved for additional research.

As stated in the limitations, the over-lapping and interplay of the dependent variables were not considered in the study. Additional research is needed to determine which variables are predictive and to ascertain if the variables might be measuring the same factors involved in differentiating the leaders from the non-leaders. Perhaps two or three of the variables would provide an equally effective differentiation function as the total number of variables used in this study. This step in research is in progress by the author utilizing the statistical approach of multiple regression.

Much research could be done to determine whether or not
the participants' age, curriculum, home environment, military experience, siblings, parents' occupation, education and income, size of high school and graduating class, college grade point and length of residence time in the halls have any positive or negative relationship to being a leader or non-leader.

Research is needed to determine why the outside leaders appear more like the non-leaders than the leaders. More insight could be gained concerning the outside leaders' reasons for participating in activities outside the halls to a greater extent than in activities inside the halls.

A study could be made of the informal leaders and/or the appointed leaders. The author conjectures that these two groups play important roles in the M. R. A. social system and have an influencing relationship upon the elected leaders. Greater insight through research on these two groups is needed to better understand the functions of a college residence student government.

Further research on the independent variables used in this study and additional analysis of the data obtained could provide direction for the development of a practical and simplified tool or technique for ascertaining which members of the M. R. A. would most likely become elected leaders. A beginning step in the research would be to plot the individual scores of the respondents in the two groups
to delineate ranges of scores for each of the two groups used in this research. Those individuals who scored within the determined score ranges expected for leaders could be given special attention in an attempt to meet the problem of needing more residents to run for formal offices in the M. R. A. In this way more residents in the halls might be encouraged to run for a formal elected office and thus, to some degree, help alleviate the problem of not enough residents running for the elected offices in the M. R. A. and houses. Those individuals scoring in the ranges established for non-leaders could be encouraged to participate more and become a part of a training program of members for group participation and beginning leadership positions. Though these steps could be taken with those indicated as leaders and non-leaders, the general responsibilities to all residents would continue to be carried out.

A study could be done comparing the elected leaders used in this study with the student supervisory group, called Head Residents. The relationship of this student supervisory group to the leaders and non-leaders also could be studied.

The degree to which the elected leaders are successful in their positions was not part of this study. More research could be done in an attempt to delineate the leader group by the degree of both actual and perceived success
achieved in their elected position.

A follow-up study could be made of those designated as leaders or non-leaders in this research, to consider their relative success after leaving the university. Study of the effects of their assumption or lack of assumption of leadership roles in the halls on their later success in society could provide additional insight into the role of activities and leadership training in college as preparation for their later community and society roles.
SUMMARY

The United States is recognized as the strongest proponent of the democratic way of life. This recognition is, in part, due to the leadership shown by the formal leaders of our nation, both past and present. Among the means for the development of such leaders are the colleges and universities in the United States. Residence halls are one of the segments of college life which is providing opportunity for leadership training and development.

The major purpose of this study is to test the hypothesis that there are sociological and psychological variables which provide a basis for differentiating between those who have emerged as formal leaders and those who do not hold these formal leadership roles in the M. R. A. at Iowa State. Leadership is the dependent variable. In this study the leader is defined as that individual who has been elected to a formalized position or given office in his house, the M. R. A. or/and on campus.

Out of a review of literature and sociological and psychological theory, a framework was developed involving nine independent variables. These independent variables are personal characteristics, formal interaction, goal aspiration, norm knowledge and compliance, communication, authority attitude, status perception, identification and relevant
primary reference group effect. The dependent variable of leadership was linked with the nine independent variables to formulate nine general hypotheses. Seventeen (17) empirical hypotheses were developed to support or refute the general hypotheses.

Data for this study were gathered from the Men's Residence Halls, Iowa State. The sample of the residence halls population consisted of equal numbers of residents randomly selected within each academic classification strata. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 120 residents who met the criteria for leaders and 120 residents who met the criteria for non-leaders. Completed questionnaires were also obtained from 39 residents who met the criteria for outside leaders. The outside leader data were used for supplemental analysis. The data were coded and punched on IBM cards for analysis.

The hypothesized differences between leaders and non-leaders were supported by the data on 12 of the 17 empirical hypotheses stated for the nine independent variables developed in this study. Significant differences were found between the leaders and non-leaders in the following measures: ascendance, sociability, intelligence, social participation inside the halls, social participation outside the halls, goal aspiration, norm knowledge and compliance, communication, authority attitude, status perception, relevant primary
reference group value on leadership and identification. In all cases the leaders attained higher scores than the non-leaders.

The hypothesized differences between leaders and non-leaders were not supported by the data on five of the 17 empirical hypotheses involving two of the nine independent variables developed for this study. No significant differences were found between the leaders and non-leaders on the measures of general activity, restraint, friendliness, personal relations and social participation during high school attendance time.

Analysis was made of the data obtained from the outside leaders as a supplemental analysis to the primary analysis between the leaders and non-leaders. In general, the outside leaders appeared more similar to the non-leaders than the leaders.

Limitations of the study and suggestions for additional research are discussed.
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APPENDIX A: PRELIMINARY SURVEY CARD

Dear Resident:

Your help is needed in a research study, supported by the M.R.A. and the residence administration, concerning the activities of residents of the Men's Halls. We need some preliminary information from YOU, so hope you will be willing to check ( ) the items below which apply to you:

I have held an elected office in an organization since coming to Iowa State University. (Pres., Vice-Pres., Treas., Sec., etc.) ___Yes ___No

If you have held an elected office (answered yes to the above question) in an organization since coming to Iowa State University, please check ( ) all of the items below which apply to you:

I have held an elected office in the house or halls. (Pres., Vice-Pres., Treas., Sec., Activities Chr., Social Chr., Intramural Chr.) ___Yes ___No

I have held an elected office outside the house and halls. ___Yes ___No

Please return this card to your Head Resident by Tuesday noon, March 29.

Many thanks,

Jim Allen, Instructor of Sociology in Charge of Research Project
APPENDIX B: LETTER INVITING STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH STUDY

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Economics and Sociology

Dear Resident:

Would you be willing to spend about two hours participating in a current research project? I hope you will, because that is what I am asking you to do.

Since you have been living in the halls you have no doubt observed the varied interests and activities of the halls residents. No thorough study has been made of these varied interests and activities. Such a study is now underway with the purpose of gaining insight into the interests and activities or, one might say, the way of life of the halls residents. This study is being supported by the Men's Residence Association and the residence halls administration.

A random sample of halls residents from whom we would like to obtain information has been drawn and your name is among those chosen. Instead of contacting you individually, we are asking groups of you to meet with us for approximately two hours or less during the week of April 23-30. Would you please indicate on the enclosed form which of the suggested times would be most convenient for you, and then plan to attend at that time. If none of these times fits your schedule please so indicate and I will contact you personally so that we can arrange a more suitable time.

It is very important that we obtain the needed information from each of you.

All meetings will be held in the Helser Conference Room in Helser Hall. They will last no longer than two hours and you may finish sooner. There is no preparation you must make, nor do you need any particular skills or knowledge to participate. Just bring a pen or pencil with you.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me. My office is in 201 Ag. Annex; my phone number is x3653.
Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and, of course, all individual information will be kept confidential.

Sincerely yours,

James G. Allen
Instructor, Sociology
(In charge of research study)
APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR THE SCHEDULED INTERVIEWS

IMPORTANT -- READ BEFORE ANSWERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

THANKS FOR HELPING OUT.

Don't let this volume of papers frighten you. Two hours should be about the maximum time needed to complete filling them out.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS.

1. Verbal instructions will be given before you start completing the questionnaires. Please listen to them carefully.

2. There will be two parts to this research study for you to complete. When you have finished the first part, please go to the second part. Please check to see that the same number is on both parts of the research material. The purpose of the numbers are to keep the material for each person together. In no way do the numbers identify you personally.

3. The first two pages consist of questions of a general nature. Please fill them out before you actually answer the questions in the remainder of the questionnaire.

4. Please complete one page at a time. Do not look ahead to the other pages.

5. Read the instructions at the top of each section and at the beginning of the second part of the material and then read each question carefully before answering. (Usually the answer is checking ( ) the degree to which the question applies to you.)

6. After finishing a section, do not go back and add to or change what you have done.

7. Feel free to ask questions if necessary.

8. Perhaps you will have some difficulty seeing how all the things you are asked to do fit together. For those who desire to remain for five minutes following this session, the entire research project will be explained so that you can see how your work fits into the total project.
9. Our many thanks for helping out on this research project and again, I wish to emphasize that all individual information will be kept confidential.

10. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to the person in charge and give your name and house. At this time we will be able to indicate those who have participated at this time so to make it unnecessary to call on you again. This check-off system is merely to inform us as those who have participated and in no way is used to identify the individual with his completed material. Do not write your name and house on the material you are completing.

NOW PLEASE COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRES
APPENDIX D: FACE SHEETS ON QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

Obtaining general information

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Economics and Sociology

Individual General Information Form

Where did you spend the most time before coming to college? (check one)
___ Classification (check one)
___ Freshman
___ Sophomore
___ On a farm
___ Junior
___ In a town (10,000 people or less)
___ Senior
___ In a city of 10,000 to 50,000
___ Graduate
___ In a city of 50,000 to 100,000
___ Special
___ In a city over 100,000

What was the size of your high school when graduating (number of students) ______

What was the size of your graduating class in high school____

Curriculum________ Age____ All College Grade Point_______

Are you a veteran of military service? ____Yes ____No

Family: Are both parents living? ____Yes ____No; of no, which parent is living (check one)

Mother____ Father____ Neither____

Number of brothers____ Ages of brothers__________

Number of sisters____ Ages of sisters__________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education (grade last completed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father's approximate income__________
Mother's approximate income__________

**General information:**

Number of quarters lived in the halls (include present quarter as one complete quarter) _______

**Activity and elected office experience:**

While at ISU have you participated in house and/or hall activities?  ____Yes  ____No
While at ISU have you held an elected office in the house or halls?  ____Yes  ____No
While at ISU have you participated in activities outside the house or halls?  ____Yes  ____No.

For those who have participate or held an elected office in the house or halls please give the following specific information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (specify house or hall activity)</th>
<th>Elected position such as pres., vice-pres., etc. (if any held)</th>
<th>Number of quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-
For those who have participate or held an elected office in some activity outside the house or halls please give the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Elected position such as pres., vice-pres., etc. (if any held)</th>
<th>Number of quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the back of this sheet to list any additional activities or elected offices held.
APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE RESEARCH STUDY
Please Read Carefully

Now we would like to know if you have belonged or participated in any formal organizations or activities — that is organizations that have regular meetings and/or activities, etc. and in some cases a set of officers — such as student government, athletics, social, church, etc., during your high school age period and since you have been at Iowa State University.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read carefully the following instructions and give the requested information.

In the first column read (or list those not indicated put under "others") the organizations in which you have participated. If you are not sure in which area you should indicate an organization, list it under "others."

In columns 2, 3, and 4 indicate the number of organizations in which you participated, the number of committee memberships, and the number of officer positions held. In columns 5 and 6 check under the column which applied to your attendance in the organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal organizations during high school age period before coming to Iowa State University:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations Participated in</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Number of Committees</th>
<th>Number of Offices</th>
<th>Attend less than 1/2 of meetings</th>
<th>Attend 1/2 or more of meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
During high school age period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.S.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student gov't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic - baseball, football, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social - dance and party committees, prom, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music - chorus, band, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics - debate, oratory, etc. (declamatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism - newspaper, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special activities hocooming, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church, Sunday school, choir, youth group, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camera, hot-rod, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Formal organizations within the houses and halls since attending Iowa State University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Gov-t cabinets, councils, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-dance committees and party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics (intramurals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious clubs and honorary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special activities- newspaper, radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous and political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (list)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicate below in columns 2, 3, and 4 the number of: |
| (2) Number of Organizations |
| (3) Number of Committees |
| (4) Number of Offices |
| (5) Number of Attend Less |
| (6) Check ( ) the degree of attendance applicable: |
| (7) Attend 1/2 |
| (8) Attend 1/2 or more of meetings |

| University: |
| (2) FFA, 4-H, DeMolay, Scouts, etc. |
| (3) Others (list) |
Social Participation:

Formal organizations outside of the houses and halls since attending Iowa State University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student gov't-Guild, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-dance and party committees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and honoraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special activities-Veishea, homecoming, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious-council, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics-debate, oratory etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism-newspaper, magazines, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative groups (University)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department or College (Division)-council, club, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (Ames and hometown or other)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious - church, Sunday school, choir, youth group, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest - camera, flying, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth or young people's groups - rural, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (list) ;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would like to know what are some of your expectations for the future after you graduate from Iowa State University. Therefore, we would like you to indicate your future expectations and your feeling toward activities in achieving these expectations, by checking ( ) the items which represent your expectations and feelings.

1. Exactly what type of work (specific occupation such as engineering, extension, teaching, etc.) and what specific job within that type of work do you expect to be doing by the end of 10 years after you graduate from Iowa State Univ.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific type of work (teaching, engineering, extension, etc.)</th>
<th>Expected specific job within the type of work such as Physics Teacher, Chemical Engineer doing research, Supervisor of extension personnel, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. By the end of the first 10 years after I graduate from Iowa State University, I expect to be earning: (check one)

- [ ] 5,000 - 6,500
- [ ] 6,500 - 8,000
- [ ] 8,000 - 9,500
- [ ] 9,500 - 11,000
- [ ] 11,000 - 12,500
- [ ] 12,500 - 14,000
- [ ] 14,000 - 15,500
- [ ] 15,500 - 17,000
- [ ] over 17,000

3. In helping me to get ahead in my job after graduation from Iowa State Univ., I believe experience in college activities:

- [ ] Would help me much.
- [ ] Would help me some.
- [ ] Would help me little.
- [ ] Would make no difference.
- [ ] Would hinder me some in getting ahead.
4. In helping me to attain my expected level of income in my field of work after graduation from Iowa State University, I believe that experience in college activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would help me much.</th>
<th>Would help me some.</th>
<th>Would help me little.</th>
<th>Would make no difference.</th>
<th>Would hinder me some in attaining it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Residents vary in their degree of information and feelings toward the way of living in the residence halls. We would like to know how you feel about the expected way of life in the halls.

Please read carefully each statement listed below and then indicate by checking ( ) the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I feel that knowledge and understanding of the M.R.A. (house and halls) rules and regulations is important.

2. I believe that for the good of organized living, all residents need to live according to the rules and regulations of the M.R.A. (house and halls).

3. I should move out of the halls if I cannot live up to the rules and regulations existing in them.
4. If I see a way to get around the rules and regulations in the halls I try it.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Individuals communicate with others in various ways and have varying feelings as to the way they like to express their views and ideas. We would like to know how you communicate with other residents and your feelings as to how you like to express your views and ideas.

Please read carefully each statement listed below and indicate by checking ( ) the degree to which you agree or disagree that the statement represents how you communicate with others and feel toward how you express your views and ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I enjoy speaking up in formal group meetings.

2. I do not write announcements to put on the house bulletin board.

3. I feel that I express my ideas and views best by participating in house and hall activities.

Individuals view authority in different ways. We would like to know how you feel about authority and its use.

Please read carefully each statement listed below and indicate by checking ( ) the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement concerning authority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I favor the expulsion of residents who break rules and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As an elected leader in the house I would expect residents to carry out a job assigned them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that house officers have too much authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think leaders should have authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals perceive and are oriented toward status and prestige in different ways and in varying degrees. We would like to know how you feel about status and prestige.

Please read carefully each statement listed below and indicate by checking ( ) the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement concerning status and prestige.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that living in the Men's Halls gives me more prestige than living in off-campus housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents in the Men's Halls have varying degrees of feeling toward their house and the halls. We would like to know how you feel toward the halls and your house.

Please read carefully each statement listed below and indicate by checking ( ) the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement concerning your feeling towards your house and the halls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that mixing and participating in activities is important for giving me recognition and prestige.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that participating in the house and halls gives more prestige than participating in church activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel that the M.R.A. has high prestige on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being an elected leader in the halls adds much to a resident's prestige.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. As a member of the M.R.A. I should purchase a M.R.A. pin and/or house guard pin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I should buy and use house stationery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I am definitely a part of my house and its activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. As a member of the M.R.A. I have a responsibility to help it be effective and meaningful to the residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. As a member of my house I have a responsibility to help carry out activities in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel that the M.R.A. membership is important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel that the house is an important organization to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I often speak of the house as our house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals usually belong to and are part of small groups in which they participate frequently, regularly, intimately and know the other members quite well. Sometimes these small groups are difficult to be named, but could be described such as coffee group, after-class group, bull session group, corridor gang, music group, dating group, social group, etc. We would like to know something about your small groups in which you participate frequently, regularly, intimately and know the other members quite well.
Please list below the five most important small groups to which you belong and are a part of since coming to Iowa State University: (Please give a name or describe each small group.)

1. Group ____________________________________________
2. Group ____________________________________________
3. Group ____________________________________________
4. Group ____________________________________________
5. Group ____________________________________________

Now after listing your five most important small groups to which you belong and are a part of since coming to Iowa State University, please list them again or refer to them as group 1, or group 2, or group 3, etc. and indicate by checking ( ) the degree to which you think these small groups place a value on being a leader in campus or residence activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Very High Value</th>
<th>High Value</th>
<th>Some Value</th>
<th>Little Value</th>
<th>No Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>