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Samples from three groups—Junior Leaders, 4-H members, and Non-4-H members—were compared to determine the effectiveness of the Junior Leader organization in Southwestern Indiana. Each sample in the three groups was given the Michigan Leadership Scale and a background information sheet. Comparisons were made between the groups and within each group. The study indicated that the Junior Leader group did not show a significant difference on enough of the variables in the study to conclude the members' skills could be directly attributed to the organization. The Junior Leader group was found to be significantly higher on some of the variables and in regard to involvement in other organizations. The Junior Leader group had a higher grade point average than the Non-4-H members group. The 4-H member group was significantly higher when the means were compared on leadership skills and involvement in other organizations than the Non-4-H member group. The 4-H member group had the highest grade point average of the three groups.
CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Junior Leader organization is a component of the total 4-H program, an informal educational program organized and carried out by professional staffs and volunteers in every county across the United States. The program is a vital part of the Extension Service, which is a branch of the Land Grant University in each state. Regular 4-H clubs meet approximately ten times a year; but more of the meetings are held in the spring and summer months. Young people in Junior Leaders participate not only in their own local 4-H clubs but also in the countywide organization. The Jr. Leaders meet on a regular basis throughout the year and work on numerous activities. Thus the members are somewhat more involved in the total 4-H program by being a part of the Jr. Leader organization.

Every county in every state of the United States has an Extension Service. Counties do vary as to number of Extension Agents in each county, but the average number is three agents. One person works with the agricultural program, one with home economics, and one person works the youth program, which includes 4-H. The Extension Service is designed to help the clientele in the county in any way possible.

The 4-H program began near the turn of the century and developed with the idea of preparing the young people in rural areas
for life on the farm. The first 4-H clubs involved corn, livestock, garden, and food clubs. In this way technology from the land grant university was passed on to the young people through the Extension Service. The program was set up on the basis of an informal teaching mode. That principle remains today except that the 4-H program has branched out to include many activities other than the farm related ones. Extension professionals also work to involve more young people in the urban areas.

A 4-H member in today's program can select subjects to learn about ranging from the traditional ones to computers, rockets, electricity, or dog obedience. Young people can choose from over fifty projects. Once they have chosen their projects, they attend the 4-H club meetings and interact with many other 4-H members taking the same or different projects. The 4-H member must complete requirements for each project and then exhibit a finished product at the 4-H fair. The 4-H program is vocational in that members learn first hand about the projects because they learn by doing. The members also learn how to get along with others in the club meetings and many times must commit to added responsibilities by taking part on committees and other functions.

The Jr. Leader organization is an important component of the total 4-H program. These young people must be 4-H members between the ages of 14 and 19. They meet with other young people their age from all over the county. They plan programs and activities that are carried out throughout the year. These members also serve as role models for the younger 4-H members. The Jr. Leaders quite often are officers in the local 4-H club and offer assistance to
both the 4-H leaders and younger members. The Jr. Leaders also have more opportunities to serve in other leadership roles such as camp counselors, project superintendent assistants at the 4-H fair, and assistants at the State Fair.

The mission of the Jr. Leader program is to develop leadership qualities in its members. To be involved in the club the Jr. Leaders must accept more responsibility, interact with peers and adults to direct their energies toward a common set of goals, and lead not only the countywide group but also local clubs in a variety of situations. In these three ways the Jr. Leader organization appears to facilitate leadership ability.

The question that arises is, "Does participation in Jr. leaders increase leadership skills?". Leadership is a concept that one cannot see. It is an intangible quality, but one which is ever important in our society. Companies today are looking for people who demonstrate the qualities associated with leadership. If participation in Jr. Leaders does indeed increase the individual's skills, the program is fulfilling its mission and contributing to the member's future.

The skills of the Jr. Leader can be evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the organization. In this study three different groups of young people from the ages of fourteen to eighteen were sampled and tested in regard to leadership skills. The groups consisted of Jr. Leaders, 4-H members who were not Jr. Leaders, and students who were members of neither. The last two groups served as control groups. The three groups were compared by statistical analysis to determine if the Jr. Leaders develop in leadership
skills more than the other young people. Prior leadership research helped in the examination of the Jr. Leaders. With the review of research evaluation of the leadership skills in the three groups and a comparison between the groups, an in-depth examination was made of the effectiveness of the Jr. Leader organization in developing leadership in its members.

A problem arises in determining if the members' leadership skills increase from involvement in activities other than Jr. Leaders. The leadership skills of the individuals may develop due to their involvement in the youth organizations at church, speech teams at school, or sports activities. If individuals participate in one or more of these other activities their leadership skills might improve even if that organization’s purpose is not specifically to increase leadership qualities. They may serve in a leadership capacity in other organizations. Since other activities would likely influence leadership skills, involvement in other activities was examined and was an important consideration in this study.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The research on leadership can be divided into five areas: definitions, theories, traits, styles, and interaction of a group with the leader. Leadership is a topic that has been of great interest to researchers for quite some time, as evidenced by the wealth of available material. In each of the five areas many people have explained the different aspects of leadership many different ways thus, numerous theories and studies exist.

Definitions of Leadership

The first area of concern on leadership involves definitions. How does one define leadership? Ralph M. Stogdill outlines ten different definitions of leadership: group processes personality, inducing compliance, exercise of influence, behavior, persuasion, power relation, goal achievement, interaction, differentiated role, and initiation of structure. Each of these definitions takes a different approach in explaining the reason that people emerge as leaders. Taking persuasion as an example, if one is a politician, most of his or her leadership is likely to be persuasive. Another definition is exercise of influence and most bosses would fall into this category.

Leadership has also been defined in a number of other ways by researchers who have worked in the area.

"Leadership is the exercise of authority." (Dubin, 1951)
"Leadership is the initiation of acts that result in a consistent pattern of group interaction directed toward the solution of mutual problems." (Hemphill, 1954)

"The leader is the man who comes closest to realizing the norms the group values highest; this conformity gives him his rank, which attracts people and implies the right to assume control of the group." (Homans, 1950)

"The leader is the person who creates the most effective change in group performance." (Cattell, 1951)

"The leader is one who succeeds in getting others to follow him." (Cowley, 1928)

"Leadership is the process of influencing group activities toward goal setting and goal
Fred Fiedler and Martin Chemers state that there are two commonalities in these definitions. One, that leadership is the relationship between people in which influence and power are involved. Two, leaders cannot stand alone. There must be followers.

Theories of Leadership

The second relevant aspect of leadership focuses on theories. One of the most controversial theories is Fiedler's Contingency Model of leadership effectiveness. His theory states that leadership depends on two factors: the person's personality and whether he or she is task-motivated or relationship motivated. According to this theory no one person comes into this world as a leader, but a certain personality that fits the right situation will form a leader. Mr. Fiedler has completed experiments with many different groups including Open-Hearth Steel Shop, Consumer Sales Cooperative, Management teams, a hypnosis study, leadership training, ROTC, and many more. He has researched leadership quite extensively. Thus, Fiedler suggests leadership depends on the individuals personality and motivation.

Albert Murphy states that "Leadership does not reside in a person. It is a function of the whole situation." He sees leadership as a process rather than a set of qualities. Leaders fit the needs of a group. The group does not conform to the leader.
Leadership constantly changes because people change.7

Murphy gives several examples of his thoughts on situational leadership. The leader of a group of people lost out in the woods would be different from the leader of a social group. Every job is different with a different set of requirements to determine what a good leader is.8

He provided two ways to study the process of leadership: job analysis and sociometry. Job analysis is based on a list of traits for that specific assignment. Sociometry is more valuable because it is a process that shows the network of the personality of the situation. Sociometry is a means of following the process of leadership.9

With similar thoughts Dean Barnlund conducted an experiment to determine if leadership was dependent on situational variables. His theory was that one person who emerges as a leader in one social setting may be ineffective in a different setting. Barnlund's work involved measuring consistency of leadership when tasks were varied.10

The methodology of this study involved twenty-five students enrolled in group discussions at Northwestern University. Three series of group meetings were held on two consecutive evenings. The subjects were randomly assigned to five-member committees that rotated to a different task every thirty minutes. Each group was given a specific task on six different problems involving motor, artistic, mathematical, literary, social, and spatial skills. In each session the individuals joined a new committee. At the end of the each session the members in the groups were asked to fill out a
brief questionnaire on the individual they would choose to nominate as a leader.11

The results indicated that only one individual received the same ranking throughout the six different sessions. Several correlation tests were conducted on the data to determine relationships. Scores for each pair of activities were correlated and only one of the fifteen coefficients was significant. The overall results of the experiment supported the theory that leadership is dependent upon situational variables.12

Dr. Warren Bennis believes leadership can be a learned behavior. He conducted interviews with sixty successful chief executive officers and thirty outstanding leaders from the public sector. From the interviews he found four areas of competency that all the leaders possessed: attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning, and development of self through positive self-regard.13

The first area focuses on attention through vision. All leaders see a vision and are able to motivate others in striving toward that vision. The leaders draw others to them because they have dreams, sets of intentions, frames of reference. They themselves are so enthusiastic about this vision that others want to be a part of the process.14

The second area centers on meaning through communication. Leaders must be able to communicate to involve others in working toward the vision. People can have lots of visions and dreams, but without communication those ideas are worthless. Leaders are able to bring those visions or dreams down to a level that the audience
views as real and tangible. The ideas are understandable.15

The third area focuses on trust through positioning. Without trust an organization would falter. Subordinates must trust in their leader to develop a strong organization. The main determinant of trust is reliability. Followers are much more comfortable with a leader whom they can count on and who does not change positions often. Followers are also much more likely to believe the leader who is consistent and to respect him or her even when the followers do not agree completely with the leader's decisions.16

The last area concentrates on the development of self through positive self-regard. Leaders must be able to manage themselves before they can lead others. Leaders know themselves and their strengths and nurture these strengths. Failure is not a word in their vocabularies. They call them mistakes, errors, stumbles, and a variety of other words. They see problems as just part of the process and not as mistakes. Fletcher Byrom, chairman of the board of Koppers, said "Worry was an obstacle to clear thinking."17

Bennis also states that in organizations with effective leaders empowerment is evident through four themes. First, people feel significant. They are not just numbers or cogs in a wheel but human beings with feelings and significance. Second, learning is an ongoing process. Failures are nonexistent, just mistakes to tell the individual what to change the next time. Third, people are part of a community or family. There is a strong sense of unity in the organization. Fourth, the work is exciting, challenging, and fun. There is a set goal that everyone is pulled toward and interested in achieving. These four factors are components of effective
Bennis also suggests that an organization must have an identity. Every organization incorporates four concepts of organizational identity into the realm of leadership:

1) the manifest organization— or the one formally displayed and viewed on the "organizational chart"; 2) the assumed organization— or the one individuals perceive and would draw as to the way things really are; 3) the extent organization— or the situation as revealed through the eyes of an "objective" observer, such as an outside consultant; and 4) the requisite organization— which represents an image of the situation were it in accord with the various realities facing the organization.

Bennis believes the ideal organization will contribute to keeping all four of these concepts as closely aligned as possible and will decrease the confusion of the organization's identity.

Ralph M. Stogdill gives a comprehensive overview of six theories that have been identified to explain the emergence of leadership. The theories of Bennis and Fielder's both appear in his list under Personal-Situational and Interaction-Expectation,
respectively. The other theories that complete his list include Great Man theories, Environmental theories, Humanistic theories, and Exchange theories. The great man theories conclude that leaders have inherited characteristics that predestine them to lead. They have unique qualities that make them superior to others. Environmental theorists suggest the emergence of a great leader occurs because of time, place, and circumstance. This theory correlates to Murphy's situational leadership. The particular situation plays an extremely important part in leadership development. Humanistic theorists maintain that the organization must conform to the individual as the leader. The leader must bring out the creative expression of the group and must help in the interaction process. The exchange theorists suggest that leadership develops because of the exchange that takes place in an organization. The leader benefits from being in power, and so do the members. Thus, the emergence of leadership does not conform to a strict set of guidelines but to involves an interaction of many factors.

The theory that best fits the Jr. Leader organization involves Bennis's theory of leadership. His concept that leadership skills can be learned is the basis for the Jr. Leader organization. Other theories would suggest leadership develops because of the situation, innate abilities, or the organization's adaptation. If these other theories are better explanations of leadership emergence, the Jr. Leader organization has a faulty premise and is conducted with a flawed rationale.
Traits of Leadership

Many theorists contend that certain traits make an individual a leader. C. Browne and Thomas Cohn collected studies and devised a list of leadership traits and how often each trait occurred in the studies. The traits they found include chronological age, height, weight, physique, energy, health, appearance, fluency of speech, intelligence, scholarship, knowledge, judgement and decision, insight, originality, adaptability, introversion-extroversion, dominance, initiative, responsibility, integrity, self-confidence, mood, emotional control, social and economic status, social activity and mobility, biosocial activity, social skills, popularity, and cooperation.22 Stodgill lists forty-three traits in his review of research.23

In the business world Professor J.E. Adair sees twenty-five qualities that chief executives possess. The top nine include ability to make decisions, leadership, integrity, enthusiasm, imagination, willingness to work, analytical ability, ability to spot opportunities, and ability to meet unpleasant situations. Dr. Adair also states that leadership is clearly teachable and the above qualities can develop in an individual.24 Another business professor, Rodger Collons, has identified eight traits that he believes appear in leadership research. The traits include verbal fluency, ability to solve problems, awareness of needs, flexibility, intelligence, acceptance of responsibility, social skills, and awareness of self and surroundings.25 The list of leadership traits is very extensive.
In the Jr. Leader organization those traits that stand out as indicators include enthusiasm, integrity, self-confidence, intelligence, adaptability, and cooperation. Each of these traits can be developed and nurtured in an individual through various means, thus relating back to Bennis's developmental theory. Research indicates a far broader span of traits that corresponds to leadership, but those stated above do emerge in many of the Jr. Leaders.

**Styles of Leadership**

Along with this list of leadership traits, an outline also exists of different leadership styles. The styles include autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership. The autocratic leader has a strong personality, tends to criticize, is domineering, and is aggressive. The democratic leader functions as a coach. He or she is a good communicator and a good listener, delegates responsibility, gives recognition, and has respect for team members. The laissez-faire leader lacks drive, resists change, is indecisive, and is introverted. The most desirable leader would be a democratic leader, but the other two styles do exist in our society.

Paul Wehman, Melvin Goldstein, and Jeral Williams conducted a study that involved the effect of the three leadership styles on individual risk-taking in groups. Prior research has shown that individuals are more likely to take risks in a group than alone. Research has also shown that individuals under democratic leadership were more creative, original, and willing to work.
In this study four categories of leadership styles—authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire, and no leadership—were varied to study the effects of individual risk taking. Eighty subjects from Illinois State University were divided into twenty groups of the four leadership styles. Each person was given ten risk oriented problems. A leader led the groups on these problems. Then each person was asked to fill out a questionnaire on the leader.28

It was found that people in the groups with democratic and authoritarian leadership styles were not nearly as willing to take risks. The individuals in the laissez-faire leadership or no leadership groups were much more willing to take risks. The results of this study were a little surprising to the researchers.29

The mission of the Jr. Leader organization is to develop the democratic leader by teaching those qualities related to this type of leader. The autocratic style of leadership does not generally appear, primarily, because of the Jr. Leaders' age. Young people usually do not possess the characteristics of the autocratic leader although they sometimes have some of the laissez-faire leader's style. Young people do lack drive and can be introverted at times; hopefully, as was stated in the risk-taking study, they will be more at ease with participation in the group setting.

Interaction of Leader and Group

Not only are the different traits and styles of leaders important but also the interaction of the leader with the group.
Julia Wood examined leaders in different situations to determine how the situations affected the leaders' behavior. She suggested that leaders must adapt their behavior appropriately to the dynamic and variable small group discussion. To conduct her research she collected data on the leaders at two meetings of the administrative committees at Pennsylvania State University. The first group had ten members and the second group had fifteen members both with designated leaders, X and Y respectively. The leaders statements were classified into four categories: task, procedural, interpersonal relations, and collective identity. Categories were compared across situations.

Results showed that the distributional structure of the leaders' comments were non-random, were consistent with the leaders' goals, and were responsive to failures in previous discussions. The second leader (Y) did engage in behavioral adaptations to different circumstances. So Wood's hypothesis was confirmed in this experiment that leaders in purposive discussion do engage in adaptive behavior.

Cal Downs and Terry Pickett conducted research to determine if the contingency relationship between leadership styles and group compatibility affected productivity and member satisfaction. There are two basic styles of leadership that affect group productivity and member satisfaction. One is task orientation or the need to have a clearly defined job and authority. The other style is people orientation or placing importance on the person.

The experiment was conducted with a very active women's civic organization. One week before the experiment the subjects were
mailed four articles to read that included topics on communication, achievement in groups, and compatibility in groups. The following week each member was given an objective test over each article, individually. They then took the test in groups and the answers to both tests were returned to the individuals.34

Leadership was constructed into three different styles, 9,9—equal emphasis on task and people, 9,1—primary emphasis upon task, and an unstructured situation with no formal leader. Female faculty members and graduate students were trained as confederates. The leadership data were collected from the group members and compiled. Three items were examined to determine group effectiveness: group potential, progressive overall satisfaction, and progressive itemized satisfaction.35

The leadership styles that are discussed in the study above are part of Robert Blake and Jane Mouton's managerial grid. They suggest that managerial style is composed of two factors, people and task. Managers range on the grid from 1,1, very unconcerned about either task or people to the 9,9 leader who sees a need to emphasize both task and people.36

The research clearly supported the contingency model and the hypothesis that leadership style and group compatibility interact in significant ways. The 9,9 leadership lead to the greatest productivity and satisfaction.37

David Kenny and Stephen Zaccaro investigated leadership traits through the use of rotation designs on other researchers data. In their study they reexamined Barnlund's study (1962) using the Social Relations Model. Barnlund's work through varying task and member
composition leadership emergence varied across group situations. Rotation designs are based on the hypothesis that if a person is a leader the same person will emerge as a leader even when the situation is varied. They examined three rotational designs. One held task constant and varied member composition. The second type of study kept member composition constant but varied the task. The last study varied both member composition and task.

The results of the study did not isolate any specific leadership trait. The researchers did conclude that leadership is fairly stable across different situations, thereby contradicting the theories of trait leadership and enforcing the idea of rotation designs.

Robert Anderson conducted research to determine the effect of leadership predictions on actual leadership emergence in small task groups. The Pygmalion effect would suggest that if subjects were told that they were good leaders, this would then become true. Anderson gave undergraduate students at Western Kentucky University a leadership questionnaire. One week later groups of pretested students were randomly selected to participate in the experiment. The students were not acquainted with each other. One group member was selected randomly to be the leader and was told he that was selected because of his score on the leadership questionnaire. Then each group was given a task to complete. Observers were positioned in the groups to evaluate the leaders preformance.

The data were then compiled and findings were based on leadership rankings of predicted leaders, interaction frequency of predicted leaders, comparison of intragroup rankings, and comparison
of predicted leader's rankings. The results confirmed the hypothesis. The predictions did have an effect on emergent leadership. The results did not indicate if the significance of the data was due to the Pygmalion effect or to the implications of an implied appointed leader.43

Carter, Haythorn, Shriver, and Lanzetta, conducted a study to determine the behaviors of leaders and other group members in small homogeneous groups. Their study was conducted to obtain descriptions of actual behavior of the members working on reasoning, mechanical assembly, and discussion tasks to determine concrete statements about the leader in that group.44 The subjects were forty NROTC junior students. The individuals were assigned to groups twice and several different meetings were held. The subjects were observed by two people who classified behavior into a coding system involving fifty-three categories which were not listed in the study. Some of the groups had an appointed leader and some had an emergent situation.45

The results of the study indicated that the leaders' behavior seemed to be associated with the task. The leaders in the emergent situations were more authoritarian than the other leaders. The behavior of the group members was determined by situational and task dictated processes.46

The interaction of the leader with the group is an important aspect of leadership to determine which style works best with a certain group. Wood's results showed that leaders will engage in adaptive behavior. Downs and Pickett's research focuses on concepts that deal with task and people orientation. Their research
concluded that productivity was greatest with equal emphasis upon task and people. David Kenny and Stephen Zaccaro contradict this finding on task and people. Their analysis did show exchange with the three rotational designs. Anderson's study gave some insight to those working with the Jr. Leader organization. Carter, Haythorn, Shriver, and Lanzetta showed task as a indicator of leader behavior.

Summary

In evaluating the effectiveness of the Jr. Leader program, the concepts and theories discussed in this chapter provide an important foundation for the project. Warren Bennis's theory of leadership really fits the Jr. Leader organization because of his position that leadership can be learned. This concept explains the rationale for the organization. The four factors, four themes, and the organization's identity all are important aspects of leadership. Edwin Hollander states that "Features of leadership can be learned just as a person can learn other skills, including many of those involved in social relationships."47

The other theories that exist do not fit the pattern of the Jr. Leader organization. The theories of situational leadership can explain some of the circumstances that occur but do not really fit the overall picture of the organization. The other theories, such as the Great Man and Humanistic theories, do not support the existence of Jr. Leaders. If the Great Man theory is true only a select number of individuals would even become involved in the Jr.
Leaders organization. They would be the only people who could demonstrate qualities of a leader.

Browne and Cohn's lists of traits present some situational problems, especially those traits that deal with physical characteristics, such as height, weight, and age. These are traits that vary considerably with different leaders. The other traits they discussed do have application to leadership, such as intelligence, confidence, social activity, and cooperation. Most of Adair's traits also fit into the scheme of the Jr. Leaders organization. Of the traits discussed several are included in the Michigan Leadership Scale that will be used to determine the young people's leadership skills. Those traits which apply to the scale include adaptability, dominance, initiative, cooperation, ability to meet unpleasant situations, flexibility, cooperation, and social skills.

The research on style and interaction also provides interesting findings on leadership. Of the three different styles, the democratic leader is the most desirable and is the style that the Jr. leader organization hopes to develop. Individuals in Jr. Leaders will do more risk-taking because they are in a group rather than alone as was stated in Wehman's prior research of his study.

Downs and Pickett's study indicates a leader is most effective when he or she puts equal emphasis on task and people and must exhibit flexibility. A person who works well with people and stays to the task makes the most effective leader. The Jr. Leader definitely needs to relate to people well, yet, if he or she cannot stay on task nothing gets accomplished.
Julia Wood's study also brings out the need for a leader to be flexible. This concept accurately describes the Jr. Leader because of the variety of situations in which he or she leads. The person must demonstrate the ability to change leadership in different circumstances. Kenny and Zaccaro's study gave a different view of leadership; they concluded that it is fairly stable across different situations. Their study would tend to contradict the purpose of the Jr. Leader organization.

Anderson's study is an important concept to the individuals working with the Jr. Leader organization. That person has a powerful position in regard to Anderson's findings. The adult in charge of the Jr. Leaders can really change each individual in the organization by using praise to encourage or negative comments to discourage the young person's development.

Carter, Haythorn, Shriver, and Lanzetta concluded in their study that the leader's behavior was associated with task. That conclusion would mean the leader is not as interested in working with the people as in finishing the job, again contradicting the basis of the Jr. Leader organization. One of the organization's goals is that the young people learn to work with peers and adults toward a common vision. The ability to work with other people is an important concept.

The Michigan leadership scale combines questions dealing with both task and people. The questions on task emphasize the autocratic style while the questions on people deal more with the democratic style.

The abundance of research suggests that many different
components exist in the concept of leadership, including leadership definitions, theories, traits, styles, and group interaction processes. Each segment constitutes an important aspect of the leadership research on the 4-H Jr. Leader organization.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The research involved three separate groups: members of Jr. Leaders (JL), members of 4-H but not Jr. Leaders (4-H), and non 4-H members (non-4-H). All three groups included young people from the ages of fourteen to eighteen. The subjects resided in rural areas and small town communities, not larger than twenty thousand in population. The Jr. Leader group was tested by comparing this group's traits against the other two groups which served as control groups. The groups were compared so tests could determine whether the development of the Jr. Leader's skills increased more than the skills of the control groups.

The Instrument

The instrument, which consisted of a leadership scale and a background information survey, was given to all three groups. The Michigan Leadership Scale was used to measure the dependent variable, leadership. The scale consisted of eighteen statements about leadership to which the individuals responded on a five point scale with 5 meaning "always," 4 meaning "frequently," 3 meaning "occasionally," 2 meaning "seldom," and 1 meaning "never." The scale measured the persons' skills in relation to both task and people orientation. The eighteen statements that form the leadership scale are listed in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would most likely act as the speaker of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I would allow members complete freedom in their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would encourage the use of uniform procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I would permit the members to use their own judgement in solving problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would needle members for greater effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I would let the members do their work the way they think best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would keep the work moving at a rapid pace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I would turn the members loose on a job and let them go to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I would settle conflicts when they occur in a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would be reluctant to allow members any freedom of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I would decide what shall be done and how it shall be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I would push for increased work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I would assign group members to particular tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would be willing to make changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would schedule the work to be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I would refuse to explain my actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I would persuade others that my ideas are the best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I would permit the group to set its own pace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An information sheet determined some other important components of the individual's background including number of years involved in 4-H and Jr. Leaders, grade point average, membership and extent of involvement in other organizations, age, year in school, and place of residency—farm, rural, or town. The complete instrument including cover letter is contained in the appendix.

Sampling

Sampling differed somewhat in each of the three groups. Thirty-five subjects from each of the five age groups, fourteen through eighteen years old, were chosen by systematically selecting every tenth name on lists of Jr. Leaders obtained from ten southwestern Indiana counties. The counties included Perry, Spencer, Warrick, Posey, Knox, Pike, Gibson, Daviess, Dubois, and Martin. The lists were obtained directly from other Youth Agents in the Extension Service. The names on the list were stratified by age groups before selection of the samples.

Selection of individuals in the 4-H group was similar to the Jr. Leader group. The samples were drawn from lists of 4-H members from three of the southwestern counties, Perry, Spencer, and Warrick, which have very similar populations. These three counties differed very little from the ten counties used in selecting the Jr. Leader group. Extension Agents supplied the names. Samples were stratified by age and then systematically chosen so that each age division, fourteen through eighteen, consisted of thirty-five individuals.
The non-4-H group was selected differently than the other two groups. This group was drawn from the Heritage Hills school system. The individuals attending this school system have similar demographic backgrounds as compared to the Jr. Leader and 4-H member groups. All students having a study hall were given the survey during that period. Many high school students have a study hall, thus the sample represented youth from varying intelligence levels, backgrounds, and leadership experiences. The subjects who completed the survey and did not report membership in 4-H served as the non-4-H member group.

Data Collection

The Jr. Leader group received the instrument through the mail. A cover letter explained the survey and asked each individual to return the papers in one week. Also included was a self-addressed, stamped envelope that made returning the forms easy for the respondents. A follow-up survey containing the same instrument and a new cover letter was sent out ten days after the first mailing to try to achieve a higher rate of return. Two hundred and twelve surveys were sent to the members. One hundred and forty-nine individuals responded for a seventy percent response rate.

The group of 4-H members received the research instrument through the mail in the same procedure as the Jr. Leaders. They received a cover letter, the leadership scale, an information sheet, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The first and second mailing went out the same time as the Jr. Leader mailing. One
hundred and seventy-five surveys were sent out to this group. One hundred and three individuals responded in this group for a seventy-eight percent response rate. The individuals responded very well in both the Jr. Leader and 4-H member groups.

The non-4-H group received the cover letter, information sheet, and the leadership scale from the teacher in the class. The students were asked to turn in the papers as soon as they were finished. The information was then collected from the school. One hundred and eighty-nine individual responses were collected. The responses from eighteen students who reported membership in 4-H were removed, leaving one hundred and seventy-one responses in the non-4-H group. A follow-up data collection was not required for this group.

Data Analysis

Multivariate analysis was used to compare the data from three groups. The f-test was used and also the t-test. The three separate groups were compared to determine if the Jr. Leader's leadership skills developed more rapidly than the control groups. The t-test was used to check differences between two groups; in this way each group was compared to the other two groups.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

First Analysis

The survey produced some interesting results on each of the three groups of subjects. Analysis of variance revealed a difference in group means on eight of the variables. Table 2 lists all of the variables and the means for each group separately. There were six variables on which the groups differed significantly (p < .05) that involved questions from the Michigan Leadership Scale. On some variables higher means indicated greater leadership abilities, on others lower means were desirable, and on some variables answers in the middle range of the scale were better indicators of leadership ability. Those cases are discussed in detail.

The means on six of the variables indicated differences between the groups. On variable number 1, "I would most likely act as the speaker of the group," a significant difference among groups was found. This question would indicate greater leadership qualities as the means increase. The means for each of the groups were 3.54 (JL), 3.23 (4-H), and 2.79 (Non-4-H), respectively. On variable number 3, "I would encourage the use of uniform procedures," a significant difference was found. The mean on this question should be toward the occasional answer, a score of 3, because a good leader would allow members some freedom but not so much as to create confusion. The means for each of the groups were 3.66 (JL), 3.51 (4-H), and 3.15 (Non-4-H), respectively. On variable number 4, "I
would permit the members to use their own judgement in solving problems," there was a significant difference in the means. To be an effective leader the person must let members decide how to work the problems out themselves but be aware and ready to help when they become frustrated. A mean closer to 3 would indicate better leadership. The means for the groups were 4.17 (JL), 4.18 (4-H), and 3.93 (Non-4-H).

"I would be reluctant to allow members any freedom of action," was variable number 10. Not allowing any freedom would cause friction in the workers and not present an effective leader. A mean of 3 would indicate better leadership. The means were significantly different: 2.26 (JL), 2.35 (4-H), and 2.56 (Non-4-H). On variable number 14, "I would be willing to make changes," group means were significantly different. Someone willing to make changes would demonstrate higher leadership skills, thus a mean closer to 5 would indicate better leadership abilities. The means for each group was 4.26 (JL), 4.25 (4-H), and 3.98 (Non-4-H), respectively. The last significantly different leadership variable was number 16, "I would refuse to explain my actions." A higher response to this question would imply the person is not concerned with subordinates and thus the higher mean indicates less leadership ability. This person would be demonstrating a autocratic leadership style if he or she is unwilling to explain his or her actions. The means for each group were 1.53 (JL), 1.54 (4-H), and 1.87 (Non-4-H), respectively.

The last two areas that were significantly different appeared on the background information sheet. These were grade point average and extent of involvement in other organizations. As the means on
the GPA data increased, the actual GPA decreased. For instance, a score of 2 represented an A, 5 represented a B, and 8 represented a C. Means for the three groups for GPA were 3.62 (JL), 3.89 (4-H), and 4.89 (Non-4-H). The involvement means increased as actual involvement increased. For instance, a mean of 0 indicates no involvement in organizations while a mean of 25 indicates a lot of involvement in five different organizations other than 4-H or Jr. Leaders. The involvement means were 9.46 (JL), 6.18 (4-H), 3.55 (Non-4-H). The means indicated that Jr. Leaders were by far the most actively involved in other organizations. The 4-H members were much more involved than the Non 4-H. Group means and results of the analysis of variance are presented in Table 2.

Second Analysis

The second test involved the f-test within each group individually to determine differences between ages and years. Those results helped to determine if age, year in school, and number of years in 4-H or Jr. Leaders had any effect on the leadership scores. Two such differences were found in the JL group, three were found in the 4-H groups, and ten were found in the Non-4-H group. Table 3 lists the groups and those variables that were significant (p < .05) and their means.

In the JL group two variables means were significant. On variable number 8, "I would turn the members loose on a job, and let them go," the means were significant between years in JL and school year. A good leader needs to have some control of his or her work
TABLE 2:

SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES FOR ALL LEADERSHIP SCALE QUESTIONS, GPA, AND INVOLVEMENT

F-test analysis includes means and significant variables in Jr. Leaders and two control groups for all scale questions, GPA, and Involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>JR. LEADERS</th>
<th>4-H</th>
<th>NON 4-H</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables 1-18 correspond to questions on the Michigan Leadership Scale, GPA stands for Grade Point Average, Involvement is the index of activity in organizations. Only those variables that were significant p < .05 are noted in the last column.
situation. The means should be toward the middle of the scale or a 3 to indicate some, but not total, freedom. The means for the years in JL were 2.93 (1 year), 2.91 (2 years), 3.48 (3 years), 2.69 (4 years), and 3.80 (5 years). Year in school means were 2.58 (Freshman), 3.27 (Sophomore), 3.35 (Junior), and 3.44 (Senior).

The means on variable 10 differed significantly on age. Variable 10 was "I would be reluctant to allow members any freedom of action." A good leader would allow some freedom but not a lack of supervision. A score of 3 would best fit this statement. The means were 3.07 (14), 2.30 (15), 2.13 (16), 2.33 (17), and 2.00 (18), respectively.

The 4-H group differed significantly on the means of three variables. Variable number 9, "I would settle conflicts in a group," would indicate strong leadership qualities. The means differed significantly according to years in 4-H: 4.00 (1 year), 3.68 (2-3 years), 3.83 (4-5 years), 3.46 (6-7 years), and 3.89 (8-9 years). On variable number 18, "I would allow the group to set its own pace," means were significantly different according to years in 4-H. Allowing the group to function at its own pace would help members accomplish the task if adequate supervision was provided to insure that they stayed on task. The ideal score would be a 3. The means were 2.43 (1 year), 3.37 (2-3 years), 3.83 (4-5 years), 3.46 (6-7 years), and 3.89 (8-9 years). The last variable on which 4-H members differed significantly was involvement in other organizations. The higher the means the more those members participated in other activities. According to the number of years in 4-H the means were 5.14 (1 year), 5.78 (2-3 years), 5.23 (4-5
years), 7.90 (6-7 years), and 10.77 (8-9 years).

In the Non-4-H group ten significant differences in means were found on six different variables. On variable number 2, "I would allow members complete freedom in their work," Non-4-H members differed significantly according to year in school. Allowing members complete freedom would indicate less control by the leader. The members of the group need some freedom but with some supervision. A score of 3 is desired. The means on this variable were 4.24 (Freshman), 3.79 (Sophomore), 4.04 (Junior), and 3.45 (Senior).

The means of the next four variables were significantly different on both year in school and age. Variable number 9, "I would settle conflicts when they occur in a group," again would indicate greater leadership the higher the means. The means for year in school were 4.01 (Freshman), 3.97 (Sophomore), 4.11 (Junior), and 3.95 (Senior). Age means were 4.15 (14), 4.00 (15), 3.97 (16), 3.90 (17), and 4.29 (18). Variable number 13, "I would assign group members to particular tasks," would indicate a leader who was willing to take charge and supervise the task. The means for year in school were 3.22 (Freshman), 3.63 (Sophomore), 3.61 (Junior), and 3.80 (Senior). Age means were 3.95 (14), 3.52 (15), 3.67 (16), 3.74 (17), and 3.70 (18). In variable number 14, "I would be willing to make changes," the indication would be the stronger the leader the higher the means. The means for year in school were 4.12 (Freshman), 3.55 (Sophomore), 3.97 (Junior), and 4.10 (Senior). The means for age were 4.15 (14), 3.97 (15), 3.75 (16), 3.69 (17), and 4.11 (18). The fourth variable was number 16,
"I would refuse to explain my action." This person would not be an effective leader; thus, the lower the means the greater the leadership ability. Means for year in school were 1.88 (Freshman), 2.11 (Sophomore), 1.71 (Junior), and 1.65 (Senior). The means for ages were 1.50 (14), 2.21 (15), 1.78 (16), 1.84 (17), and 1.65 (18).

The last variable on which the means differed significantly in the Non-4-H group was CPA. The lower the means on this variable the higher the CPA. The means according to year in school were 5.58 (Freshman), 4.50 (Sophomore), 5.34 (Junior), and 2.60 (Senior). Table 3 lists the variables that were significant in the groups relating to year and age differences.

Third Analysis

The third analysis that was run on the data was a series of t-tests which made direct comparisons between all three pairs of the three groups. The groups were compared as follows: 1) JL and 4-H, 2) JL and Non 4-H, and 3) 4-H and Non 4-H. All leadership variables as well as GPA and involvement in other organizations were tested. A total of eighteen significant differences in means were found including three differences between JL and 4-H groups, eight differences between JL and Non-4-H groups, and seven differences between 4-H and Non-4-H groups.

Means on variable 1, "I would most likely act as the speaker of the group," were significantly different between all three groups.
This table lists the variables that were significant in the groups relating to year and age differences. This analysis is within each group to demonstrate differences between years and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>IDEAL SCORE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YEARS IN JL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCHOOL YEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FRESHMAN</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>YEARS IN 4-H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YEARS IN 4-H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN Volvement 25</td>
<td>YEARS IN 4-H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>GPA 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR IN SCHOOL</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMAN</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the variables listed in this table were significant $p < .05$. 
A person who acts as speaker of a group would most likely be an effective leader. A higher mean would indicate higher leadership ability. The means were 3.54 (JL), 3.23 (4-H), and 2.79 (Non-4-H).

Means on variable number 3, "I would encourage the use of uniform procedures," were significantly different between JL and Non-4-H and between 4-H and Non-4-H. The leader needs to establish some uniform procedures without restricting the workers too much. A score closer to 3 indicates greater leadership. Those means were 3.66 (JL), 3.51 (4-H), and 3.15 (Non-4-H), respectively.

Means on variable number 4, "I would permit the members to use their own judgement in solving problems," were significantly different between JL and Non-4-H and between 4-H and Non-4-H. The workers need some flexibility in their work, but the leader must also have some control. The means should be toward the median answer of 3 on the questionnaire. The means were 4.17 (JL), 4.18 (4-H), and 3.95 (Non-4-H). On variable number seven, "I would keep the work moving at a rapid pace," means were significantly different between JL and 4-H and between JL and Non-4-H. The leader would want to keep the work moving so as to accomplish the task at hand. The means were 3.82 (JL), 3.58 (4-H), and 3.59 (Non-4-H).

On variable number 10, "I would be reluctant to allow members any freedom of action," means differed between the JL and Non-4-H. Not allowing members any degree of freedom would indicate poor leadership skills; thus, the lower the mean the higher the leadership ability. The means were 2.26 (JL) and 2.56 (Non-4-H). On variable number 11, "I would decide what shall be done and how it shall be done," means were significantly different between JL and
Non-4-H. This leader would allow very little flexibility with workers and in all likelihood would stifle creativity. The lower the mean the higher the leadership ability. The means were 2.79 (JL) and 3.05 (Non-4-H).

The means on variable number 14, "I would be willing to make changes," were different between the JL and Non-4-H and between 4-H and Non-4-H. A good leader would be willing to make changes, thus a higher mean would suggest higher leadership abilities. The means were 4.26 (JL), 4.25 (4-H), and 3.98 (Non-4-H). The means on variable number 16, "I would refuse to explain my actions," were significantly different between 4-H and Non-4-H and between JL and Non-4-H. A leader who would not explain his or her actions would probably be viewed as a dictator, so the lower the mean the greater the leadership ability. The means for the groups were 1.54 (JL), 1.54 (4-H) and 1.87 (Non-4-H).

GPA means were significant between the 4-H and Non 4-H and between JL and Non-4-H. The lower the means the higher the GPA. The means were 3.62 (JL), 3.89 (4-H) and 4.89 (Non-4-H) on a scale of 1 to 9 with 1 being the highest GPA. Involvement in other organizations was significantly different between all three groups. The highest possible score on involvement was twenty-five and the lowest was zero. The means were as follows: 9.46 (JL), 6.18 (4-H), and 3.55 (Non-4-H).

Table 4 reports the means on all variables for which the t-tests were significant. The table clearly demonstrates which of the three groups has the mean that indicates the higher leadership ability for each significant variable. There were eight variables
that were significant, GPA, and involvement in other organizations.

Table 5 lists the information given by the individuals from the background information sheet. The categories include years in Jr. Leaders, years in 4-H, year in school, residence, and age. This table summarizes the respondents and their backgrounds.
TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF EACH GROUP COMPARED AGAINST THE OTHER TWO GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>GROUPS AB</th>
<th></th>
<th>GROUPS AC</th>
<th></th>
<th>GROUPS BC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.54*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.54*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.15*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.79*</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.54*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.54*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.62*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.89*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.46*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.46*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A = Jr. Leader, Group B = 4-H, Group C = Non 4-H. Only t-tests that were < or = to .05 are listed in this table.

Note: The * denotes the group with the most desirable means for that variable.
The following table lists the demographic characteristics of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>JR. LEADER</th>
<th>4-H</th>
<th>NON-4-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Jr. Leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in 4-H</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural, not farm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in each column are the number of respondents in each of the three groups who gave that particular answer.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if the Jr. Leader organization increased leadership skills of the members. Three different analyses were used to determine if the data collected from the three groups were significantly different. An f-test was used to find differences between the three groups. This test indicated the variables that were significant. The second test conducted was an f-test to find differences in leadership skills according to number of years in Jr. Leaders, number of years in 4-H, number of years in school, and age. This analysis was performed within each of the three groups individually rather than comparing one group against the other two groups. The third test was a t-test that compared each group against the two other groups separately. Those results determined the variables that were significant when comparing each pair of groups.

The first f-test results determined that the Jr. Leaders scored closer to the ideal means that were significant in regard to leadership attitudes on four of the variables. The Non-4-H members scored closer to the ideal means on two variables that were significant. The 4-H had the highest means on GPA. Involvement in other organizations was much higher for the Jr. Leaders than the for 4-H members or the Non-4-H group.

The second f-test that compared ages and years within each group individually provided some interesting results. One would expect the older members in each group to excel in leadership
ability because of maturity although this was not the case on every statement. There was no consistent pattern to the data except in the variables that measured involvement in other organizations. Significant differences were found within the Jr. Leaders on only two of the twenty variables. In the 4-H group only three variables were significantly different. There were significant differences within the Non-4-H group on six of the variables. Based on these findings there was insufficient evidence of any real difference in the development over time of the Jr. Leaders relating to leadership ability.

The t-tests showed that the Jr. Leaders and the 4-H group differed on only two leadership items and in extent of involvement in other organizations. The Jr. Leaders did rate a little higher on leadership skills because of the difference on variables numbers one and seven. The largest difference occurred between the two 4-H groups and the Non-4-H group. The Jr. Leaders scored closer to the ideal means on eight of the ten variables that were significant as compared to the Non-4-H group. The 4-H group scored closer to the ideal means on five of the seven variables that were significant between these 4-H and Non-4-H groups. The analysis also confirmed a large difference between the groups concerning involvement in other organizations and GPA. The Jr. Leaders and the 4-H group were much higher on both the GPA and involvement variables than was the Non-4-H group.

The results of these analyses would confirm that the Jr. Leaders and 4-H groups were higher in leadership abilities than the Non-4-H group. The Jr. Leaders were just a little higher in regard
to leadership skills than 4-H members. The Non-4-H group had the lowest GPA and the least amount of involvement in other organizations. In almost all aspects of the study the Non-4-H group rated the lowest in all categories.

The involvement in other organizations is a very important aspect of the study. The Jr. Leaders were more involved in other activities than either of the other groups. The total involvement in the organizations would seem to lead to members' increased skills, relating back to Warren Bennis's theory that leadership is learned. The more that a person is involved in organizations the more likely his or her skills will increase. The same is true for the 4-H members. They were not as involved as the Jr. Leaders but more so than the Non 4-H group. The results would suggest that involvement in other organizations leads to increased leadership abilities.

The study did indicate that members in both Jr. Leaders and 4-H have increased skills in some aspects of leadership and are much more likely to be involved in other activities. These increased leadership skills cannot be attributed directly to the Jr. Leader organization because of the lack of significant differences in leadership scores between the Jr. Leaders and 4-H groups. There was not enough evidence to prove that the Jr. Leader organization directly affects leadership skills. Involvement in other organizations would seem to effect the leadership skills of that individual and would be an important component of the individual's development.
Implications

There are two implications that can be derived from this study. One, the Jr. Leader organization could be improved through implementation of a formal leadership training program. The effectiveness of the Jr. Leader organization could be enhanced by devising some type of leadership handbook. These two steps would be effective means of increasing leadership attitudes and skills of the members.

The organization at the time of this study did not have a specific leadership training program. Formal sessions would be an effective means of creating an awareness of leadership principles and increasing basic knowledge of leadership. Training sessions on leadership would also give the organization a more explicit reason for existence.

Devising some type of leadership handbook could directly relate to the formal training sessions that are set up for the meetings and could provide guidelines to follow and reference material that could be used not only in the Jr. Leader organization but in other organizations as well.

To improve the effectiveness of the Jr. Leader organization, two ideas were extracted from the results of this study. One would be to give the members formal instruction on leadership. The other would be to devise a handbook on leadership that would apply not only to the Jr. Leaders, but also to other organizations.
Limitations

There were three factors in this study that were potential limitations: the Michigan Leadership Scale, the Non-4-H respondents, and the differences in the groups' places of residence. Each of these factors could have affected the results. As with all studies there are ways in which the experimenter would have changed her methodology if possible.

The main problem with the Michigan Leadership Scale was the interpretation of each question. On some questions an answer of "Always"(5) indicated better leadership ability and other questions an "Occasionally"(3) or a "Never"(1) was the most desirable answer. This inconsistency made the data difficult to organize and also made it difficult for the reader to interpret the results. A scale of similar design with Likert Scaling but with uniform polarity of the most desirable answers would be much clearer, and would also permit cumulative scoring of the eighteen variables. If a scale were designed with 5 being the most desirable score, then a score of 90 would indicate the best leader.

Another problem with the scale was that the answers were self-reported on both the leadership questions, the GPA and involvement indexes. What the respondent thinks of his or her leadership ability and what is reality may be two separate entities. A scale that would measure a respondent on leadership ability that was not self-reported could give a clearer indication of that individual's leadership. The GPAs could possibly came directly from the school to avoid conflicts with differences in actual and self-reported
grades.

The second problem was that the Non-4-H group were all students at one high school and in a study hall. The GPA's of these students were much lower than those of the other two groups. The students in this high school with higher GPA's could possibly be enrolled in such a full schedule with college preparation classes or extra curricular courses that they were not taking a study hall. Usually students with higher GPA's are more involved in other activities. These students were probably not a representative sample of the students in the high school. The sample would have been more representative if the surveys had been handed out in a required course such as English.

The last potential problem was the differences in the groups' places of residence. In the Jr. Leader group fifty-three percent of the members were from farms and only twelve percent were from towns. The 4-H group was similar with forty-six percent from farms and only thirteen percent from towns. The Non-4-H group differed in that only fourteen percent came from farms and forty-three percent from towns. These results were somewhat surprising in that the high school, which was chosen for that reason in order to have a group similar to the other two groups, is in a very rural county. The largest percentage of Non-4-H members were from towns, whereas the Jr. Leaders and the 4-H members were primarily from farms. This fact may have had some effects on the results. Young people from farms have more responsibility and are usually more independent. Also 4-H in the rural communities is still closely tied to the farm families. Extension professionals have tried to branch out into the
urban areas and offer projects for these young people but have not been as successful in the rural areas.

Another small limitation in this study was the area in which the samples were drawn. If the samples could have been drawn from the entire state of Indiana or even nationwide, they would have included the larger urban areas. Because of financial limitations this was not feasible.

These three factors—the Michigan Leadership Scale, the selection of the Non-4-H group, and the place of residence—were limiting aspects of the study. Whether or not changes in these factors would change the results is a question that could not be answered without another intensive study.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to determine if members of the Jr. Leaders in ten southwestern Indiana counties excelled in leadership skills compared to two control groups, 4-H and Non-4-H. All three groups were administered the Michigan Leadership Scale and a background information sheet. The data on these two items were then compiled and tests conducted.

The analysis of the data involved three separate tests. The first test was a preliminary test to determine which if any of the variables from the Michigan Leadership Scale, GPA, or involvement were significant. The second f-test compared age and years in school, 4-H, and Jr. Leaders within each group. This test was conducted to determine if individuals developed due to maturity.
The last test, a t-test, compared the three groups in pairs. This test indicated the variables that were significant and which of the two groups had the most desirable means.

The results from all of the data revealed that the Jr. Leaders did prove to be closer to the ideal scores on more of the significant variables than the 4-H or Non-4-H groups. The Jr. Leaders were also much more involved in other organizations. The Jr. Leaders were not significantly better on enough of the variables to warrant attributing their skills directly to the organization. The study results were not conclusive on the effectiveness of the Jr. Leader organization.
APPENDICES
Appendix A
Letter to Non-4-H Students

March 23, 1987

Dear Friend,

Your teacher has given you a Group Participation Survey and a background information sheet. The information you provide will greatly benefit the programs for students in Indiana. Please fill out both forms completely and return them to your teacher as soon as you are finished.

Your help will greatly help programs for students. Thanks in advance for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Amy Manning
Appendix B
First Letter to Jr. Leader and 4-H Member Groups

March 23, 1987

Dear Friend,

Enclosed you will find a Group Participation survey and a background sheet. This information will be used to better the 4-H program in Indiana. You can help do your part by filling out both forms completely and returning them by April 1st. Please fill the sheets out as quickly as possible and return them in the self-addressed envelope.

Your help will greatly benefit the program and increase its effectiveness. Thanks in advance for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Amy Manning

Amy Manning
Second Letter to Jr. Leader and 4-H Member Groups

April 2, 1987

Dear Friend,

You will remember I sent you a Group Participation survey and a background information sheet about a week ago. I have not received those back yet and would greatly appreciate you filling out the two forms enclosed.

Please fill them out as soon as possible and mail them in the self-addressed envelope by April 8th. This information is very important in helping to better the 4-H program. You can do your part by returning the information.

If you have already mailed the forms in, please disregard this letter. Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Amy Manning
Appendix D

Group Participation Survey

This questionnaire is not a test. There are no "right" or wrong answers. Simply read each of the questions and then circle the response you choose. Choose the response to each question that BEST DESCRIBES how you WOULD USUALLY behave if you were leader of a work group in a formal organization. Circle whether you would be likely to behave in the described way: (A) Always, (F) Frequently, (O) Occasionally, (S) Seldom, or (N) Never.

If I were the leader of a work group......

1. I would most likely act as the speaker of the group. A F O S N
2. I would allow members complete freedom in their work. A F O S N
3. I would encourage the use of uniform procedures. A F O S N
4. I would permit the members to use their own judgement solving problems. A F O S N
5. I would needle members for greater effort. A F O S N
6. I would let the members do their work the way they think best. A F O S N
7. I would keep the work moving at a rapid pace. A F O S N
8. I would turn the members loose on a job, and let them go to it. A F O S N
9. I would settle conflicts when they occur in the group. A F O S N

10. I would be reluctant to allow members any freedom of action. A F O S N

11. I would decide what shall be done and how it shall be done. A F O S N

12. I would push for increased work. A F O S N

13. I would assign group members to particular tasks. A F O S N

14. I would be willing to make changes. A F O S N

15. I would schedule the work to be done. A F O S N

16. I would refuse to explain my actions. A F O S N

17. I would persuade others that my ideas are the best. A F O S N

18. I would permit the group to set its own pace. A F O S N
Appendix E

Background Information Sheet

Please fill out the following information about yourself.

20. Check one:
   ___ Jr. Leader (and 4-H member)
   ___ 4-H member only
   ___ non 4-H member

Number of years in:

21. ___ Jr. Leaders

22. ___ 4-H

23. What is your current grade point average?

   ___ A+    ___ B-
   ___ A     ___ C+
   ___ A-    ___ C
   ___ B+    ___ C-
   ___ B     ___ Below a C-

24-25 1. ____________________________

26-27 2. ____________________________

28-29 3. ____________________________

30-31 4. ____________________________

32-33 5. ____________________________

34. Check one;
   ___ Freshman
   ___ Sophomore
   ___ Junior
   ___ Senior
   ___ Other

35. Where do you live?
   ___ Farm
   ___ Rural, but not farm
   ___ Town

36-37. Please check your age.

   ___ 14      ___ 17
   ___ 15      ___ 18
   ___ 16

Please list other organization(s) you are involved in and indicate how active you are in these other organizations.

Very Much | Much | Somewhat | Little | Very Little
---|---|---|---|---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
ENDNOTES


3. Ibid


7. Ibid

8. Ibid, p. 675-676

9. Ibid, p. 678


11. Ibid, p. 47

12. Ibid, p. 50


15. Ibid


17. Ibid


20. Ibid


23. Stogdill, p. 74-75.


32. Ibid, p. 163.


34. Ibid, p. 221-222.

35. Ibid, p. 223-224.


37. Downs et al., p. 229


42. Ibid, p. 38-41.

43. Ibid, p. 62-64.


45. Ibid, p. 589-590.


BIBLIOGRAPHY


Nisbet, Micheal A. "The Leader- Boss or Coach." Canadian Banker 93 (February 1986), pp. 54-57.

