



1966

Attitude Change and Morale in Small Groups as Functions of Leadership Style

Joel Kaplan
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kaplan, Joel, "Attitude Change and Morale in Small Groups as Functions of Leadership Style" (1966).
Master's Theses. 1938.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1938

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.
Copyright © 1966 Joel Kaplan

ATTITUDE CHANGE AND MORALE IN SMALL GROUPS AS FUNCTIONS
OF LEADERSHIP STYLE

BY

JOEL R. KAPLAN

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

FEBRUARY

1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. Problem	1
II. Review of the Related Literature	7
III. Methodology	25
A. Subjects	25
B. Experimental Procedure	26
C. Statistics	33
IV. Results	35
V. Discussion	40
VI. Summary	43
Bibliography	45

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. The Number of Rhos Above and Below the Median Rho for Each Experimental Group	38
II. Responses of Each of the Experimental Groups to the Questionnaire	39

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM

This study was undertaken to answer two questions:

(1) Do different leadership styles lead to different degrees of attitude change? (2) Do different leadership styles lead to different levels of morale? In order to answer these questions, the effects of four types of leadership (participatory, authoritarian, supervisory, and laissez-faire) upon the attitudes and morale of members of small groups were studied. Also investigated were the effects of a leaderless group discussion upon attitude change and morale. The changing of attitudes through group discussions in which those attitudes were discussed was investigated, the independent variable being the leadership style employed by the person leading the discussion. Assuming, for the moment, that different leadership styles do lead to different levels of attitude change and morale, the problem then becomes one of determining the specific effects of specific types of leadership. This study, therefore, was designed to discover which specific types of leadership lead to the greatest degree

of attitude change, the smallest degree of attitude change, the highest level of morale, the lowest level of morale, and so on.

The term "attitude" is somewhat vague, as is the term "opinion," and, as far as this study is concerned, the term "opinion change" could be substituted for and could be used interchangeably with the term "attitude change." The term "morale" is also an ambiguous term, but for the purposes of this study, it may be considered to be the equivalent of the term "satisfaction," the satisfaction of the individual in the group rather than of the group as a whole.

Different experimenters have defined the leadership styles referred to above in somewhat different ways, the term "authoritarian leadership," for example, meaning somewhat different things to different experimenters. It is, therefore, necessary to specify the meanings of the terms used to designate the various leadership styles from the point of view of this particular study.

The leaders were selected at random from the subjects in each group and were given instructions, the specific instructions given being dependent upon the particular leadership style the leader was to employ.

The leaderless group discussions were simply discussions in which no leaders were appointed, although no attempt was made to prevent informal leaders from emerging.

In the laissez-faire condition, leaders were appointed, and the appointments were known to all members of the groups involved, but the leaders were told, in private, that they were leaders in name only. These leaders were, therefore, instructed to participate in the discussions but not to attempt to lead or supervise their groups in any way, being instructed, in short, to function only as ordinary members of their groups.

The supervisory leaders were given supervisory functions, e.g. seeing to it that the task was performed with reasonable expedition and efficiency, but they were instructed not to participate in the discussions, i.e. they were instructed not to express their personal opinions or preferences in regard to the subject of the discussions.

The participatory leaders were instructed both to supervise and participate in the group discussions. Their supervisory functions were identical with those of the supervisory leaders, the difference between the two leadership styles

consisting in the fact that the participatory leaders were instructed to participate in the discussions as well as to supervise them. The participatory leaders in this study functioned in ways basically similar to the ways in which democratic leaders have functioned in other studies. The participatory leaders were not asked to participate in the discussions to a greater extent than the other members of their groups. Their supervisory functions were not overly restrictive or authoritarian. The same applies to the supervisory functions of the supervisory leaders.

The authoritarian leaders were given the same supervisory functions as the supervisory and participatory leaders, with one important addition: they were given the responsibility of making the final decisions concerning the tasks on which their groups were working. They were also told that they were to participate in the discussions to a greater extent than the other members of their groups. Thus, what this study has chosen to call authoritarian leadership is roughly equivalent to what other studies have called autocratic, authoritarian, directive, or restrictive leadership.

Summarizing what has been said about the five experimental conditions, it may be said that: (1) The leaderless group discussions had no appointed leaders, but informal leaders were allowed to emerge; (2) the laissez-fair leaders were instructed to participate in the discussions but not to supervise them; (3) the supervisory leaders were instructed to supervise but not to participate; (4) the participatory leaders were instructed both to supervise and to participate; and (5) the authoritarian leaders were instructed to super-participate and to engage in rather directive supervision. The instructions given to the leaders are described in detail in the section on experimental procedure. However, it was necessary to empirically define, at the outset, the meaning of the terms used in this study in order to clarify this study's theoretical bases and to specify this study's use of terms which are rather vague and amorphous.

The relation of this study to the much discussed question of leadership in social groups and organizations in general and industrial organizations in particular is obvious. Changes in behavior, unless they are coerced, must always be preceded by changes in attitudes. A company, for example,

which introduces technological changes necessitating new work methods is faced with the task of inducing behavioral changes in its employees. These behavioral changes can be brought about most effectively by changing the attitudes of the employees involved by methods which induce the greatest attitude change with the greatest possible morale or satisfaction on the part of the employees. What has been said concerning industrial organizations is true of social organizations in general. Both the practical and theoretical significance of this study are therefore obvious.

The present study is closely related to a study by Preston and Heintz (1949), which also studied attitude change and morale as functions of leadership style, but which involved only two types of leadership: participatory and supervisory. The study by Preston and Heintz served as the model for the present study, despite the addition of three experimental conditions and despite a number of other differences between the two studies, especially as regards the measurement of morale and the statistical analysis of the data.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A number of studies which are related to the present study may now be considered. The methodology of those studies which had educational or academic settings differs somewhat from the non-educational studies, but the general principles are the same for in the educationally-oriented studies the teacher or instructor is the leader of the group. The educational studies are, therefore, quite relevant to the questions which are being considered. Below are presented, in chronological order, six non-educational studies which found differences in degree of attitude change due to differences in leadership style.

Preston and Heintz (1949) conducted a study of attitude change and morale in relation to leadership style. In this study 83 college students were asked to rank 12 potential presidential nominees in their own individual orders of preference. Groups of four or five subjects were then formed with either participatory or supervisory leaders. Group rankings, final individual rankings, and responses to a

questionnaire designed to measure morale were then secured. It was found that participatory leadership was more effective than supervisory leadership in changing attitudes and that participatory subjects had higher morale than did supervisory subjects.

Sheldon and Landsman (1950) divided 28 students in academic difficulty into two groups, one group being conducted in a nondirective manner and the other group being conducted in the traditional manner. It was found, at the end of the semester, that the nondirective group made better grades than the group which had received group therapy in the traditional manner and that, after one year, 25% of the nondirective group had left school, whereas 47% of the group conducted in the traditional manner had done so.

Levine and Butler (1952) conducted a study in which 29 supervisors were randomly divided into three groups of 9, 9 and 11. One of the groups was given a lecture on the subject of merit rating. The second group engaged in a group discussion dealing with the same subject. The third group, the control group, received no instruction. The instruction given to the two experimental groups was intended to change

the behavior of the supervisors in those groups in such a way that they would rate the employee rather than the job, as they had previously had a tendency to do. (More specifically, the tendency which the instruction was intended to correct involved giving a high merit rating to an employee performing a highly skilled job and a low merit rating to an employee performing a relatively unskilled job.) The effects of the different types of instruction were measured by comparing the average merit rating for each of the three groups before and after instruction. It was found that the supervisors in the discussion group changed their behavior to a greater extent than did the supervisors in the lecture group and that the behavior of the supervisors in the control group was virtually unchanged.

Hare (1953) conducted a study in which the effects of supervisory and participatory leadership on group judgment were compared. The subjects were 13-year-old boys divided into groups of five each. It was found that participatory leadership led to more attitude change than did supervisory leadership.

Torrance and Mason (1956) compared indigenous leaders to outsiders in regard to their effects on the production

of changes in attitudes and behavior. It was found that aircraft commanders, who served as indigenous leaders, were able to bring about a greater change in attitudes than could instructors, who were outsiders.

In a study by Kipnis (1958) 35 groups of four to eight fifth- and sixth-grade pupils met with a leader who tried to change their attitudes regarding comic books. Participatory leadership and a lecture style of leadership were employed. In some conditions the leader threatened to punish noncompliance. In all, there were six experimental conditions. Participatory leadership was found to induce more attitude change than lecture leadership. When the leader was associated with neutral power or power to reward compliance.

Rasmussen (1956) found differences in degree of attitude change due to differences in leadership style in an educationally-oriented study. In this study the effects of student-centered and instructor-centered learning situations were compared. Immediately after the course had ended, a questionnaire was administered. It was found that student-centered groups estimated that their attitudes had changed

more and that their classes had been more interesting. Six months after completion of the course, the student-centered groups estimated a greater degree of behavioral change as a result of having taken the course than did the instructor-centered groups.

Three studies were examined which did not find that the degree of attitude change was dependent upon leadership style. These studies are described below, the first two studies being non-educational studies, and the third study having an academic setting.

Bennett (1955) conducted an experiment in which there was an attempt to increase the willingness of psychology students to serve as subjects in psychological experiments. It was found that group discussion, public commitment, lectures, and non-committal statements all led to approximately the same degree of attitude change.

Beran, Albert, Loiseaux, Mayfield, and Wright (1958) conducted a study using two experimental groups of four jury panels, each with high and low leader prestige and autocratic and democratic leadership respectively. A mock trial of an accident case was conducted in order to determine

the effects of the prestige and leadership style of the jury foremen upon the decisions of the jury. It was found that all of the jury panels returned the same verdict.

DiVesta (1954) conducted a study in which instruction in human relations was given to two experimental groups, one group of which was taught by lectures, this being the instructor-centered group, and one group was taught through group discussions, this being the student-centered group. There was also a control group, which received no instruction. It was found that both experimental groups showed approximately the same degree of attitude change.

Most, but not all, of the studies which have been reviewed found that differences in leadership style led to differences in degree of attitude change. As for the studies which did not find differences in attitude change, it is quite possible that the experimental manipulation in these cases simply didn't work, i.e. the experiments were poorly designed. This explanation is quite tenable considering that significant differences were found in a wide variety of experimental situations which utilized a large number of different leadership styles, e.g. participatory, supervisory,

nondirective, lecture, student-centered, instructor-centered etc. It is, however, impossible, on the basis of previous studies, to formulate hypotheses concerning the precise ranks of the different types of leadership in regard to degree of attitude change. In other words, there is not sufficient data to formulate hypotheses as to which leadership style leads to the greatest degree of attitude change, the second greatest degree of attitude change, and so on. This is especially true when one considers that the leadership styles employed in the present study are not equivalent to the leadership styles employed in previous studies of attitude change. Thus, the evidence provided by previous studies appears to indicate that different types of leadership lead to different degrees of attitude change, but the evidence does not permit the formulation of hypotheses concerning comparisons of the relative effects of specific leadership styles on degree of attitude change. It is, therefore, not possible to hypothesize, for example, that laissez-faire leadership leads to a greater degree of attitude change than authoritarian leadership. With these considerations in mind, the following hypothesis may be stated: Different

leadership styles result in differences in degree of attitude change.

Having considered the question of attitude change in relation to leadership style, it is now necessary to consider the question of morale and leadership style. Two studies which dealt with attitude change also dealt with morale, namely the studies by Preston and Heintz (1949) and Rasmussen (1956). These studies have already been reviewed, and it would now be well to pass on to a consideration of those studies which dealt with morale only in relation to leadership style. Before describing these studies, it must be noted that a number of these studies can be considered as concerning themselves with "morale" only if that term is rather broadly defined, at least as broadly defined as is the term "satisfaction."

A number of non-educational studies which found differences in morale due to differences in leadership style may now be considered. (in chronological order)

Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) studies five groups of 10-year-old children who were placed successively under autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership. It

was found that aggression, apathy, and hostility were much greater in the autocratic condition than in the other two conditions.

Lippitt (1940) studies two groups consisting of five members each of fifth- and sixth-grade children and an adult leader. In one group the leader functioned in an authoritarian manner, and in the other group the leader functioned in a democratic manner. Members of the authoritarian group attempted to resist the leader's power, and it was found that there was a significantly greater degree of hostility and conflict between members of the authoritarian group than between members of the democratic group.

Bavelas (1942) conducted a study in which a number of persons were trained for three weeks in leadership techniques. These leaders shifted from authoritarian to democratic leadership methods. This shift produced in the members of their groups greater cooperation, enthusiasm, self-discipline, and efficiency. The shift from authoritarian to democratic leadership also improved the morale of the leaders, producing in them greater enthusiasm and a greater feeling of solidarity with the group. It was concluded that, because the leader

is an important part of the group. changes in leadership behavior affect the morale of the group as a whole.

Lippitt and White (1943) studies four groups of 10-year-old boys, five members in each group. These groups were clubs which met to engage in hobby activities. Four adult leaders were used, these leaders being shifted from one group to another every six weeks, each leader changing his leadership style at the time of his transition. Authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership were the leadership styles employed. Greater amounts of discontent and aggressiveness were found in the authoritarian condition than in the other two conditions, and a greater degree of friendliness was found in the democratic condition than in the other two conditions.

Bovard (1951) found that group-centered leadership, where verbal interaction was maximized, led to a higher level of interpersonal affect, as measured by a rating scale for affect, than did leader-centered leadership, where verbal interaction was minimized.

A second study by Bovard (1952) also dealt with the question of the effects of group-centered and leader-centered

leadership in small groups. Once again verbal interaction was maximized in the group-centered group and minimized in the leader-centered group. It was concluded that the group-centered process produced more identification with others, greater clinical insight into personality dynamics, and greater communication of feeling than did the leader-centered process.

Weschler, Kahane, and Tannenbaum (1952) conducted a study of a naval research laboratory, one division of which was headed by a permissive leader, the other division being headed by a restrictive leader. Interviews were held with a number of members of the staff and administration, and persons working in the two divisions participated in an intensive sociometric questionnaire. The persons in the division headed by the permissive leader had higher ratings than the restrictive group as regards job satisfaction and perceived morale.

Halpin (1953) conducted a study of the relationship between two dimensions of 89 aircraft commanders' leadership behavior (Consideration and Initiating Structure) and evaluations made by (1) members of their own crews, and (2) their

administrative superiors. Crew members tended to rate favorably those aircraft commanders who were high on the Consideration dimension, while administrative superiors tended to rate favorably those aircraft commanders who were high on the Initiating Structure dimension. Aircraft commanders who were high on the Consideration dimension were rated highest by their crew members on friendship and cooperation and were preferred by the crew members as their aircraft commanders.

A second study by Halpin (1954) also dealt with the relationship between the leadership dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure and evaluations of leadership behavior of aircraft commanders by their own crew members and by their administrative superiors. Once again it was found that crew members tended to rate favorably those aircraft commanders who had high Consideration Scores (as measured by a Satisfaction Index), while administrative superiors tended to rate favorably those aircraft commanders with high Initiating Structure scores.

In a study by Singer and Goldman (1954) two groups of ten reasonably matched schizophrenic patients met for weekly therapeutic sessions for a period of five months. One of the

groups was conducted in an authoritarian manner, with lectures, and the other group was conducted in a democratic manner, where free expression and group participation in interpretations and decisions were encouraged. It was found that the democratic group was characterized by higher morale and greater group cohesiveness than the authoritarian group as regards both actions and verbalization.

Wischmeier (1955) investigated group-centered vs. leader-centered leadership in a study in which 40 subjects of approximately equal ability in discussions were divided into eight discussion groups, each group meeting for two sessions with the same leader. Each of the groups was either group-centered or leader-centered. It was concluded that group-centered groups were characterized by greater cooperation, greater member involvement, and a friendlier atmosphere than were leader-centered groups.

Shaw (1955) compared the effects of authoritarian and non-authoritarian leadership in various communication nets. It was found that authoritarian leadership produced better performance and lower morale than did nonauthoritarian leadership.

Baumgartel (1956) made an empirical study of the relationship of the morale of scientists working in a research laboratory and three styles of leadership. It was found that attitudes towards relatively unproductive leaders were approximately the same as attitudes towards more productive leaders. Scientists working under participatory leadership were found to hold more favorable attitudes towards their leaders than scientists working under the two other types of leadership.

Baumgartel (1957) investigated the relationship between the leadership styles of laboratory directors in a government research organization and the attitudes of scientists working under those laboratory directors. Directive, laissez-faire, and participatory leadership were identified empirically as the three leadership styles employed. It was found that scientists working under participatory leadership held more favorable attitudes than scientists working under directive leadership.

Ziller (1957) compared four techniques of group decision-making: authoritarian, census, chairman, and leader suggestion. The subjects were members of 45 aircrews. The authoritarian technique of decision-making was found to be the

technique least preferred by the subjects.

Described below, in chronological order, are four educationally-oriented studies which found differences in morale due to differences in the types of leadership employed.

Faw (1949) studies 102 students taking a general psychology course, who were divided into a student-centered group, an instructor-centered group, and an alternating-method group. It was found that in the student-centered group there was a greater amount of participation of a personalized nature than in the other two groups.

Flanders (1951) investigated social anxiety in experimental learning situations. He studies the behavior of students who were working on an achievement task, his data consisting of records of the students' positive or negative feelings, their verbal statements, and pulse and palmar skin resistance. Behavior by the teacher was either teacher-centered or learner-centered. Considerable anxiety was elicited by teacher-centered behavior, this anxiety being expressed in the form of apathy, withdrawal, and hostility. It was also found that learner-centered behavior led to less anxiety and a greater amount of problem-solving behavior.

Wispe (1951) conducted a study in which students taking a social science course were divided into two groups: (1) a directive group, where the learning situation was highly structured and oriented toward the subject matter; and (2) a permissive group, which was student-centered and relatively unstructured. After completion of the course, a questionnaire, a Sentence Completion Test, and a TAT-type test were administered to the students. It was found that while the students preferred being taught by directive methods, they enjoyed permissive methods more.

Bills (1952) conducted a study in which one group of general psychology students was taught by student-centered methods, and a matched group of general psychology students was taught by lecture-discussion methods. The students evaluated the course at the end of the semester, and it was found that the student-centered group had significantly more positive attitudes towards psychology than the lecture-discussion group.

No studies could be found that failed to find differences in morale due to differences in leadership style. Thus, the evidence provided by previous studies justifies the following

hypothesis: Differences in leadership styles result in differences in the level of morale. Can more specific hypotheses be formulated on the basis of the evidence of previous studies? The studies reviewed were virtually unanimous in concluding that the more authoritarian leadership styles studied by previous investigators were called restrictive, directive, leader-centered, autocratic, etc. The less authoritarian, more democratic, leadership styles were called participatory, group-centered, student-centered, permissive, etc. Whatever the terms employed, however, all of the studies found that the more authoritarian leadership styles lead to lower levels of morale than the less authoritarian leadership styles. The following hypothesis can therefore be stated: Authoritarian leadership leads to a lower level of morale than the other types of leadership, namely participatory leadership, supervisory leadership, laissez-faire leadership, and leaderless group discussion. Hypotheses concerning the specific effects on morale of all the leadership styles employed in the present study cannot be formulated, for the evidence is too scanty as regards the comparative effects of these leadership styles. Additional

hypotheses in regard to morale in relation to leadership style would therefore necessitate going beyond the evidence provided by previous studies.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

SUBJECTS

The subjects in the present study were undergraduate students taking an introductory psychology course at the Lake Shore Campus of Loyola University. The majority of the subjects were 18 years of age and freshmen, although some were slightly older and were sophomores or juniors. One hundred twenty-nine subjects were used in all. Every attempt was made to have approximately the same number of subjects in each of the five conditions and approximately the same proportion of males to females in each condition. This attempt was, for the most part, successful. There were five groups in each condition; two all-male groups and three all-female groups, each group consisting of four to six subjects. The distribution of subjects among the five conditions was as follows: 22 subjects in the supervisory condition (10 males and 12 females); 28 subjects in the authoritarian condition (11 males and 17 females); 26 subjects in the participatory condition (11 males and 16 females); and 26 subjects in the laissez-faire condition (12 males and

14 females). Except for the fact that the groups were either all-male or all-female, there was a random selection of subjects.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

The experimenter was present during the meetings of each of the groups. He explained the nature of the task to the subjects and gave instructions to the leaders, but did not in any way take part in the discussions.

A leader was selected at random from the subjects in each group except in the leaderless groups. The subjects in each group were then presented with a list of the names of ten prominent political figures and were asked to place these names in an order of preference for President of the United States. First place was to be given to the man the subject most desired for President if an election were to be held that day and the man were to be elected to a four year term; second place was to be given to the man who was the subject's second preference, and so on for each of the ten men. The names given to the subjects were as follows: Barry Goldwater, Hubert Humphrey, Lyndon Johnson, Robert Kennedy, Richard Nixon, Nelson Rockefeller, George Romney,

William Scranton, Adlai Stevenson, and Robert Taft, Jr.

The subjects were asked to sign their names on the rankings, and the rankings were collected.

In those groups in which a leader had been appointed, the leader was taken into another room and given instructions on how he was to lead the group discussion, the instructions given being dependent on the leadership style he was to employ.

The instructions given to the laissez-faire leaders were as follows: You are a leader in name only. Therefore, you are not to attempt to lead or supervise the group in any way. However, you are to participate in the group discussion, i.e. you are to offer your own opinions and preferences regarding the ten political figures.

The instructions given to the supervisory leaders were:

1. Have your group agree upon an order of preference of the ten prominent political figures in a thirty minute group discussion.
2. Do not let your group decide doubtful cases by resorting to the use of chance, e.g. by tossing coins.
3. Be sure that each of the political figures receives a reasonable amount of consideration by the group.

4. Do not let any member of the group speak without first being recognized by you.
5. Try to include all members of the group in the group discussion. You are to call on members of the group you feel are not participating enough in the group discussion.
6. You are to see to it that the task is performed with reasonable expedition and with the greatest possible efficiency. Bring the group back to its task if it wanders away from the subject.
7. You are only to supervise the discussion. You are not to participate in it. Therefore, you are not to offer your own opinions or preferences regarding the political figures.

The instructions given to the participatory leaders were:

1. Have your group agree upon an order of preference of the ten prominent political figures in a thirty minute group discussion.
2. Do not let your group decide doubtful cases by resorting to the use of chance, e.g. by tossing coins.
3. Be sure that each of the political figures receives a reasonable amount of consideration by the group.

4. Do not let any member of the group speak without first being recognized by you.
 5. Try to include all members of the group in the group discussion. You are to call on members of the group you feel are not participating enough in the group discussion.
 6. You are to see to it that the task is performed with reasonable expedition and with the greatest possible efficiency. Bring the group back to its task if it wanders away from the subject.
 7. You are both to supervise and participate in the group discussion. You are therefore to offer your own opinions and preferences regarding the political figures.
- The instructions given to the authoritarian leaders were:
1. Have your group agree upon an order of preference of the ten prominent political figures in a thirty minute group discussion.
 2. Do not let your group decide doubtful cases by resorting to the use of chance, e.g. by tossing coins.
 3. Be sure that each of the political figures receives a reasonable amount of consideration by the group.

4. Do not let any member of the group speak without first being recognized by you.
5. Try to include all members of the group in the group discussion. You are to call on members of the group you feel are not participating enough in the group discussion.
6. You are to see to it that the task is performed with reasonable expedition and with the greatest possible efficiency. Bring the group back to its task if it wanders away from the subject.
7. You are both to supervise and participate in the group discussion. Therefore, you are to offer your own opinions and preferences regarding the political figures.
8. You are expected as leader to participate in the group discussion to a greater extent than the other members of the group.
9. You are to make the final decisions as to the ranking of each of the political figures during the group discussion based upon your estimate of the preferences of the group members (including your own preferences).

The leader was asked to reveal as little as possible of the instructions to the other group members. The last two points of the authoritarian leaders' instructions were revealed to the members of the authoritarian groups, for their cooperation was necessary in this matter.

After the leader had returned to the group, the group was asked to agree upon an order of preference of the ten political figures in a half hour group discussion. For the leaderless groups there was, of course, no leader, and the group discussion began immediately after the initial individual rankings were collected. During the group discussion each member of the group wrote down the rank of each political figure as it was decided upon. The subjects signed their names to the group rankings, and these rankings were collected at the termination of the group discussion.

The members of each group were then asked for final individual rankings, being asked to rank the names according to their personal preferences, just as they did for the initial individual rankings. After the subjects had ranked these names and signed their rankings, the rankings were collected.

The subjects in each group were then asked to answer a questionnaire designed to measure morale containing seven questions, which are as follows:

1. Were you satisfied with the group ranking? (a) Yes
(b) No.
2. Was the task interesting for you? (a) Yes (b) No.
3. Do you believe the task was worthwhile? (a) Yes (b) No.
4. Did you enjoy the task? (a) Yes (b) No.
5. Would you describe your discussion as being, on the whole:
(a) friendly (b) hostile and antagonistic.
6. Would you describe your group as being, on the whole:
(a) interested in the task (b) indifferent to the task.
7. Would you describe your group as being generally:
(a) efficient and productive (b) inefficient and un-productive.

The questionnaires were then signed by the subjects and were collected.

It was believed that these questions were self-evident indicators of the subjects' morale or satisfaction, although other, equally good questions could have been asked which would have served the same purpose. Questions having two

rather than three alternatives were used because it was believed that an overwhelming majority of the subjects would have chosen the "middle" alternative had there been one. (Just as most people answer "middle class" when asked if they belong to the upper, middle, or lower class). The use of more than three alternatives would have been obviously inappropriate for most of the questions and would also have made the statistical analysis of the data exceedingly difficult.

STATISTICS

Each question in the questionnaire was analyzed by the use of a chi square for a two by five table in order to determine whether significant differences existed between the responses of the subjects in the five experimental conditions. Spearman rank-difference correlation coefficients (ρ s) between the initial individual ranking and the final individual ranking were then computed for each of the 129 subjects. After the ρ s had been computed, the median test was used in order to determine whether significant differences in attitude change existed between the subjects in the five conditions. The median test involves ranking the ρ s

from highest to lowest, finding the median rho, in this case the sixty-fifth highest rho, computing the frequencies with which the rhos in each condition fall above or below the median rho, and then comparing these observed frequencies with the expected frequencies in order to determine whether significant differences exist between the experimental groups. (Siegel, 1956)

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the number of rhos above and below the median rho for each of the experimental groups. The median test revealed that the probability of actual or non-chance differences between the five experimental groups was between .70 and .50. Thus, there were no statistically significant differences between the five experimental groups as regards attitude change.

Table 2 presents the responses of the five experimental groups to the questionnaire designed to measure morale. The items are numbered as they were numbered in the section on experimental procedure. It must be noted that an "a" response indicates high morale, and that a "b" response indicates low morale, as can be seen by glancing at the list of questions in the section on experimental procedure.

The first question on the questionnaire designed to measure the subjects' morale was: Were you satisfied with the group ranking? (a) Yes (b) No. For this question the probability of real, i.e. non-chance differences between the five experimental groups was found to be between .50 and .30.

The second question was: Was the task interesting for you? (a) Yes (b) No. For this question the probability of real differences was found to be between .20 and .10. The third question was: Do you believe the task was worthwhile? (a) Yes (b) No. For this question the probability of real differences was found to be between .50 and .30. The fourth question was: Did you enjoy the task? (a) Yes (b) No. For this question the probability of real differences was found to be between .30 and .20. The fifth question was: Would you describe your discussion as being, on the whole: (a) friendly (b) hostile and antagonistic. For this question the probability of real differences was found to be between .30 and .20. The sixth question was: Would you describe your group as being, on the whole: (a) interested in the task (b) indifferent to the task. For this question the probability of real differences was found to be between .50 and .30. The seventh and last question was: Would you describe your group as being generally: (a) efficient and productive (b) inefficient and unproductive. For this question the probability of real differences was found to be between .50 and .30. Thus, there were no statistically significant differences between the five

experimental groups as regards morale as measured by the questionnaire.

Table 1

The Number of Rhos Above and Below the Median Rho for Each
Experimental Group

	Laissez- Faire	Authoritarian	Supervisory	Participatory	Leader- less
Above	15	11	10	14	14
Below	11	17	12	13	12

Table 2

**Responses of Each of the Experimental Groups to the
Questionnaire**

Responses	Laissez-Faire	Authoritarian	Supervisory	Participatory	Leaderless
1a	9	16	12	16	14
1b	17	12	10	11	12
2a	25	23	20	23	26
2b	1	5	2	4	0
3a	23	19	16	22	21
3b	3	9	6	5	5
4a	25	22	19	20	22
4b	1	6	3	7	4
5a	26	26	22	26	23
5b	0	2	0	1	3
6a	25	21	18	23	21
6b	1	7	4	4	5
7a	21	18	14	22	20
7b	5	10	8	5	6

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The experimenter proposed the following three hypotheses:

(1) Different leadership styles result in differences in degree of attitude change. (2) Differences in leadership styles result in differences in the level of morale. (3) Authoritarian leadership leads to a lower level of morale than the other types of leadership, namely participatory leadership, supervisory leadership, laissez-faire leadership, and leaderless group discussion. These are the results that one would expect to find on the basis of previous studies, but the present study failed to find these results, finding instead that no significant differences existed between the five experimental groups as regards degree of attitude change and level of morale. The most probable reason for the failure of the present study to find significant differences is that the experimental manipulation of the subjects simply didn't work. Had there been a few minor changes in the design of the experiment, it is very likely that significant differences would have been found. This statement has the support of

previous studies, which found significant differences. What changes in experimental design would be necessary in order to find significant differences is a rather speculative question, but some possible answers may be suggested. Whether an individual can be made into a certain type of leader merely by giving him certain instructions is very questionable. Not all of those appointed as supervisory leaders, for example, may actually have been acting as supervisory leaders. It is quite possible that some were acting in an authoritarian manner, while others were acting in a participatory fashion, while still others were acting as one would expect laissez-faire leaders to act. The same principle applies to all the types of leadership employed in the present study. One cannot be sure that the leaders really acted the parts or roles they were expected to take.

Assuming that many or even most of the leaders did not function in the ways they were expected to function, the question may be raised as to why this deviation from expected roles occurred. Some leaders may have disregarded instructions out of sheer laziness, others because of a lack of understanding of the instructions, and still others because they resented

the roles they were called upon to play. Some leaders may have attempted to adhere to the instructions, but may have found themselves unable to assume the type of leadership they were asked to assume because of their own personality traits. It is also possible that the instructions themselves did not clearly distinguish between the various leadership styles. It might be well for future studies of leadership to use one or more observers to identify empirically the leadership styles employed. If this were done, one would not be limited to knowing that a particular individual had been instructed to employ a particular type of leadership; one would also know whether or not that particular type of leadership had actually been employed.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

An experiment was conducted in order to study attitude change and morale in small groups in relation to leadership style. Three hypotheses were formulated, which were:

(1) Different leadership styles result in differences in degree of attitude change. (2) Differences in leadership styles result in differences in the level of morale. (3) Authoritarian leadership leads to a lower level of morale than the other types of leadership employed in the present study. Five experimental conditions were established: a participatory condition, a leaderless condition, a supervisory condition, an authoritarian condition, and a laissez-faire condition. The subjects were 129 Loyola University undergraduates of both sexes. They were divided, by random selection, in approximately equal numbers, into the five experimental conditions. There were five groups, each group consisting of four to six subjects, in each condition, the groups being either all-male or all-female. A leader was appointed in each group, except in the leaderless groups, and was given instructions as to the leadership style he was to

employ with his group, the particular instructions given being dependent on the particular leadership style he was to employ. The subjects in each group were then asked to rank ten prominent political figures in an order of preference for President of the United States. After the initial individual rankings had been collected, the subjects in each group produced group rankings of the political figures during a thirty minute group discussion. After the group discussion, the subjects wrote final individual rankings and answered a questionnaire designed to measure morale. The questionnaire data were analyzed by chi squares. Spearman rank-difference correlation coefficients (ρ s) between the initial individual ranking and the final individual ranking were computed for each of the 129 subjects, and the median test was then used to determine whether or not significant differences existed. It was found that there were no statistically significant differences between the subjects in the five experimental conditions as regards degree of attitude change and level of morale. It was concluded that the most probable reason for the failure of the present study to find significant differences was that the experimental design was not adequate in some respects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baumgartel, Howard. "Leadership, Motivations, and Attitudes in Research Laboratories," Journal of Social Issues, 12 (2) (1956), 24-31.
- Baumgartel, Howard. "Leadership Style as a Variable in Research Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957), 344-360.
- Bavelas, A. "Morale and the Training of Leaders," In Watson, G. Civilian Morale. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, (1942) 143-165.
- Bennett, Edith Becker. "Discussion, Decision, Commitment and Consensus in Group Decision," Human Relations, 8 (1955), 251-273.
- Beran et al. "Jury Behavior as a Function of the Prestige of the Foreman and the Nature of Leadership," Journal of Public Law, 7 (1958), 419-449.
- Bills, Robert E. "An Investigation of Student Centered Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, 46 (1952), 313-319.
- Bovard, Everett W., Jr. "The Experimental Production of Interpersonal Affect," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46 (1951), 521-528.
- Bovard, Everett W., Jr. "Clinical Insight as a Function of Group Process," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47 (1952), 534-539.
- DiVesta, Francis J. "Instructor-Centered and Student-Centered Approaches in Teaching a Human Relations Course," Journal of Applied Psychology, 38 (1954), 329-335.

- Faw, Volney. "A Psychotherapeutic Method of Teaching Psychology," American Psychologist, 4 (1954), 104-109.
- Flanders, Ned A. "Personal-Social Anxiety as a Factor in Experimental Learning Situations," Journal of Educational Research, 45 (1951), 100-110.
- Halpin, Andrew W. "Studies in Aircrew Composition LLI: The Combat Leader Behavior of B-29 Aircraft Commanders," USAF, HFORL Memo., TN-54-7 (1953), 24
- Hare, A. Paul. "Small Group Discussions with Participatory and Supervisory Leadership," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48 (1953), 273-275.
- Kipnis, David "The Effects of Leadership Style and Leadership Power upon the Inducement of an Attitude Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 57 (1958), 173-180.
- Levine, Jacob and Butler, John. "Lecture vs. Group Decision in Changing Behavior," Journal of Applied Psychology, 36 (1952), 29-33.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., and White, R. K. "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates,'" Journal of Social Psychology, 10 (1939) 271-299.
- Lippitt, R. "An Experimental Study of the Effect of Democratic and Authoritarian Group Atmospheres," University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, 16 (1940), 43-195.
- Lippitt, R. and White, R. "The 'Social Climate' of Children's Groups," in R. G. Barker, J. Lounin, H. Wright (eds.) Child Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill, (1943), 485-508.
- Preston, Malcolm G. and Heintz, Roy K, "Effects of Participatory vs. Supervisory Leadership on Group Judgment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44 (1949), 345.355.

Rasmussen, Glen R. "An Evaluation of a Student-Centered and Instructor-Centered Method of Conducting a Graduate Course in Education," Journal of Educational Psychology, 47 (1956), 449-461.

Shaw, Marvin E. "A Comparison of Two Types of Leadership in Various Communication Nets," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50 (1955), 127-134.

Sheldon, William D. and Landsman, Theodore. "An Investigation of Non-Directive Group Therapy with Students in Academic Difficulty," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14 (1950), 212-215.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Joel R. Kaplan has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Psychology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

July 14, 1965
Date

Edmund P. Marx
Signature of Adviser