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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to evaluate the effects on followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness and leader flexibility after training the leaders of such followers in general semantics and/or situational leadership theory. The experiment involved female volunteer leaders from three Louisiana service organizations.

A 21 hour course in general semantics and situational leadership theory was taught to a research group numbering 18. A control group of 17 leaders participated in an eight hour presentation of situational leadership theory, with no reference to general semantics.

Pre- and post-measurements were taken using the semantic differential and Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD-Other. Leaders were rated before training and four months after training by a research group of 42 and a control group of 35 members.

Data interpretation from the LEAD-Other indicated followers' rating of leader effectiveness did not increase within the control group after training. Favorable ratings significantly increased in the research group, however. When measuring between the two groups, changes in leader effectiveness, once again, were not significant. The LEAD-Other, however, must be interpreted with caution. This instrument was perceived by the followers in this study as vague and cumbersome; and Hersey and Blanchard indicate no correlation between LEAD-Other effectiveness scores and actual performance.
The semantic differential, on the other hand, showed consistent trends of significant changes in leader effectiveness as perceived by followers after training. This interpretation holds for analyses within the control group, within the research group, and between groups. The investigator warns, however, that strong personal feelings between volunteers may have affected members' rating of one another. In addition, the researcher observed that high pre-test scores were followed by high post-test scores—which indicates little variation and could account for high significance.

Flexibility also increased within the control group, within the research groups, and between groups, after training. This interpretation is based on analyses of the LEAD-Other and the semantic differential.

The researcher concluded that general semantics reinforces situational leadership theory. Also, volunteer organizations provide a practical lab for learning which can be transferred to business. The importance of volunteer service may be more obvious in an economy of escalating prices. Thus, future studies in training volunteers in a totally integrated course in general semantics and situation leadership theory may prove helpful—especially if a follow-up course is included to reinforce learning over time.
Chapter I

ORIENTATION TO AN INTEGRATION OF
GENERAL SEMANTICS AND SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY

That general semantics, when combined with the situational theory of leadership, may prove an effective training tool for female volunteer leaders is the subject of this dissertation.

The commonality of elements to general semantics, a communications discipline, and situational leadership theory will become apparent as one examines communications, general semantics, leadership theory (especially situational), and leadership effectiveness.

Leaders and Followers in a World of Words

That leaders and followers are born into a world of words and their characters molded by this world appears indisputable. Says Alfred Fleishman,

"We live in a world of words and no computers, mechanization, or new discoveries are going to change that--not in the forseeable future anyway.... Words are the most important tool man has" (25).

"We are born into an environment of words just as much as we are born into a home," declares Bess Sondel. "Words determine, from birth, the nature of the ideas and ideals in which we live" (69).

Communication thus makes human society possible. If one views society, the family, the government, the club, or his own individual
relationships with those around him, he is viewing communication networks. "The basic fact about organization," according to Wendell Johnson, "is communication.... What matter and energy are to the physical sciences, symbolizing and communicating are to social sciences" (39).

Norbert Weiner, in The Human Use of Human Beings, further suggests that a society can be understood only through a study of the messages and communication facilities in its structure. Weiner argues, as does Johnson, that receiving and using information is the process of adjusting to the contingencies of the outer environment and of living effectively within that environment (80).

Gregory Bateson also stresses adjustment as he postulates that successful communication means continuous evaluation, adaptation, and acquisition of appropriate techniques (6). The reader will find the process of "appropriate adaptation" pointedly emphasized in both the theories of general semantics and of situational leadership.

Although the researcher will chiefly be concerned with the world of words, communication does not point to language alone. Ruesch and Bateson assert:

Communication does not refer to verbal, explicit, and intentional transmission of messages alone.... The concept of communication would include all those processes by which people influence one another.... This definition is based upon the premise that all actions and events have communicative aspects, as soon as they are perceived by a human being; it implies, furthermore, that such perception changes the information which an individual possesses and therefore influences him (6).

In a 1968 study by Robert Minter, this definition ranked first in the choices of 150 national communication experts (55). Communication as
influence will be recalled for the reader in the future linking of communication theory to leadership theory.

Having given a definition of communication which encompasses all aspects, the writer must return to verbal concerns. Man is a "verbalizing" animal. It is with language that this study, for instance, is being designed and through which the training of the subjects will primarily be accomplished. With such importance stated, one can understand Johnson's frustration at what he calls a "bizarre delusion of western culture" that "Sticks and stones may break my bones but words can never hurt me" (39).

Names broadly understood as the cogs and pulleys of a great relentless, grinding, thoughtless machine that does our thinking for us can maim and kill. Language, used without awareness of its structure and effects, is the mechanism of mass cruelty (39).

If one learns to understand and control it wisely, language becomes creative, mature, useful. General Semantics, this researcher proposes, can give the leader such understanding and control.

General Semantics as a Tool of Proper Evaluation

"What a gulf between impression and expression!" says Aldous Huxley. "That's our ironic fate--to have Shakespearian feelings and... to talk about them like automobile salesmen or teenagers or college professors."

"We practice alchemy in reverse--touch gold and it turns to lead; touch the pure lyrics of experience and they turn into the verbal equivalents of tripe and hogwash" (13). This "gulf" between language
and experience and its effect on leaders and followers is what concerns this writer.

Benjamin Lee Whorf ascribes three main functions to the complex system of language:

1. To communicate with other persons
2. To communicate with oneself, or think.
3. To mold one's whole outlook on life (18).

Whorf is quoted by Stuart Chase, who also quotes Trager and Smith on this study of language, as follows: Such a study "deals not only with what people talk about and why but also how they use the system and how they react to its use" (18). This definition of the study of language encompasses the writer's own definition and points to the discipline to be examined, general semantics.

Focusing on the words general semantics, one must distinguish between this term and the often used word semantics. The Frenchman, Michel Briat, coined the word semantics in his book *Essai de Semantique* (Science des significations) in 1897. The word derives from the Greek semantikos, "significant," from semainien, "to signify," "to mean," etc.

Semantics is now considered a social science which studies the mastery of words to achieve human goals. According to Sondel, "The shackling power of words is great. We can save ourselves from their domination only as we can dominate them" (69). In this vein, she limits semantics to the study of techniques by which to accomplish purposes through the use of words. While specifying the scope of semantics, Sondel acknowledges that the objectives of Count Alfred
Korzybski's general semantics are broader than those of semantics. She describes general semantics as a method to promote sanity of the individual and society through principles extracted from the exact sciences.

Johnson regards general semantics as a systematic attempt to formulate the general method of science in such a way that it might be applied generally in daily life. He says the discipline concerns science as a "...basic orientation, as a generalized way of solving problems--and with due regard for the language of science" (38).

As defined by the International Society for General Semantics, the discipline is a systematic study of meaning. Furthermore, it encompasses "...the study and improvement of human evaluative processes with special emphasis on the relation to signs and symbols, including language" (18).

Count Alfred Korzybski, the founder of general semantics, defines his theory a little more vaguely than his popularizers. According to Korzybski, general semantics studies "the unique capacity of man to preserve experience and knowledge through the language function of time-bindings" (69).

"Time-binding" which seems to have been the "buzz" word of the Polish born Korzybski's intellectual circle, was the thesis of his chief claim to fame, *Science and Sanity*. In this 1933 book, the author proposes that man is distinguished from the rest of earth's creatures by his language and the ability to pass down what he learns from one generation to the next. This passing-down process he calls time-binding.
For his overemphasis on time-binding and his overlengthy and complex communication, Korzybski (1879-1950) has been strongly criticized. In addition, he has been labeled as an incompetent teacher, rude, and overbearing (63). Yet, he must be given credit for having pointed out the power and dangers from "language pollution" to the human environment. It is to his popularizers (S. I. Hayakawa, Irving Lee, Wendell Johnson, Anatol Rapoport, Stuart Chase, etc.) that proper acknowledgment must go for the development of general semantics and to whom the researcher will turn for her training material during this investigation.

One might ask, "Why study general semantics?" Even on a broad plain, the answer is clear according to S. I. Hayakawa. The basic assumption of his works is "that wide-spread intraspecific cooperation through the use of language is the fundamental mechanism of human survival." A parallel assumption is that when the use of language results, as it often does, in the creation or aggravation of disagreements and conflicts, there is something linguistically wrong with the speaker, the listener, or both (33).

Bateson and Reusch also stress the importance of effective communication in determining whether cooperation or hostility "should" exist:

Not only the premises of smooth interpersonal relationships but also the premises of hostility are carried upon the stream of more objective communication and action; what is true of persons applies even to interpersonal relations. A breakdown in communication between two countries can lead ultimately to bitter agreement upon the use of force. This agreement, however, has the same degree of reality or unreality--the same degree of abstractness--that is characteristic of all those truths whose validity is a function of man's
belief in them. If, of two nations or people, each comes to believe in the hostility of the other, the hostility is real to this extent, that each acts upon its belief. But it is also unreal in so far as the belief is conceivably reversible. "Tweedledum and Tweedledee Agreed to Have a Battle" (6).

The importance of studying general semantics is expressed by Rapoport as follows:

Bad use of language leads to unresolved controversies. Unresolved controversies are always a waste of time and often lead to destructive conflicts.

To resolve controversies, there must be a desire to agree.

A desire to agree arises if we become concerned with truth.

The concern with truth involves "symbolic experience," hence language.

It also involves the question of the source of knowledge. Agreement might be expected if it were understood that experience is the only ultimate source of knowledge.

But experience is not transmissible as such.

It is transmissible only through communication.

Malfunctioning of language often results from our ignorance concerning its structure and function.

Semantics (general semantics) is concerned with the effective function of language and, incidentally, with its structure, since the latter sheds light on the former.

If experience is to be transmitted by language, then language must be the carrier of something significant.

To that something, we give the name meaning (62).

Thus, one studies general semantics because it is an aid to cooperation, to agreement, to understanding. Having looked at the "why" of general semantics, one should examine the "what" of this discipline for a more complete picture.
What does general semantics do? The aims and goals of general semantics have been stated in many ways. To train people in proper evaluation is one goal which seems to head the list, espoused by Korzybski, Hayakawa, Chase, Rapoport, Johnson, etc. To aid in clearing up mental illness is a goal cited by Chase. Johnson calls this goal adaptability needed to cope with reality. (The works of these authors have already been cited.)

Philip Lewis, in a recent overview of the general semantics training philosophy, cites flexibility in reacting as central to the theory and application of general semantics. The general semantics approach to life helps one "a) logically anticipate the future, b) achieve according to capabilities, and c) adjust his behavior to the environment" (48).

To this "what" of general semantics must be added the "how" of achieving such goals. Learning general semantics, or learning how to be scientific and flexible in everyday life, is "learning to do nothing that will keep you from achieving and maintaining optimal adjustment," says Johnson. Such learning is largely a matter of unlearning. Johnson continues that one often doesn't realize the extent to which we learn misinformation and adopt unsound theories. A bright child can be trained to act quite stupidly. It may be true that we cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear..., but it is all too true that we can make a sow's ear out of a silk purse. There is such a thing as trained inefficiency or cultivated confusion.... For such people, the better part of further learning is forgetting... (38).

Learning the obvious, of course, is also required. Reactions to what one labels as obvious are often that one feels he has always
known "it" since it is difficult to face that he has overlooked "it." Also, one tends to brush the obvious aside because "it" must be unimportant because it is so easy to understand. The "obvious" and the principles to be learned and the methods of unlearning in general semantics will constitute the course material for this study and are attached. Some basics of and underlying the training should now be presented, however.

The Basics of General Semantics

Using an object of experience, Korzybski explains the characteristics of reality on which general semantics is based:

If we take something, anything, let us say the object... called pencil and inquire what it represents, according to science 1933, we find that the scientific "object" represents an "event," a mad dance of "electrons," which is different every instant, which never repeats itself, which is known to consist of extremely complex dynamic processes of very fine structure, acted upon by and reacting upon, the rest of the universe, inextricably connected with everything else and dependent on everything else. If we inquire how many characteristics we ascribe to such an event, the only possible answer... is that we should ascribe to an event infinite number of characteristics... (44).

Thus, the reader has the characteristics of reality: process, uniqueness, infinity, and relatedness. It is man's responsibility to try to fit the structure of his language, the nature of which is, for practical purposes, the opposite of the nature of reality, to the structure of reality. The result is often miscommunication, maladjustment, disorder.

The most common and serious disorder observed by general semanticists is a disorder of the abstraction process, called lack
Start reading from the bottom UP.

8. "wealth"

8. Word "wealth" at extremely high level of inference, omitting almost all reference to Bessie.

7. "asset"

7. Word "asset" leaves out more characteristics of Bessie at Level 2; level of inference.

6. "farm assets"

6. "Farm asset" refers to what Bessie has in common with other salable items on farm, level of inference.

5. "livestock"

5. "Livestock" refers to characteristics of Bessie in common with pigs, chickens, etc.; level of inference.

4. "cow"

4. Word "cow" stands for characteristics abstracted from cow 1, cow 2, cow 3... cow n; level of inference.

3. "Bessie" (verbal levels)

3. Word "Bessie" (cow 1) is name given to object of experience; symbol and not object; level of description, of factual statement.

2. (non-verbal level)

2. Cow as perceived; object of experience abstracted from totality of "process" cow by nervous system; level of fact-extensional.

1. Cow known to science: infinite unique, in process; electrons, atoms non verbal level; "Process" Cow known by scientific inference.

Source: S. I. Hayakawa, Language in Thought and Action

Figure 1

Abstraction Ladder
of or confusion in differentiation of levels. The notion of abstraction is a fundamental of general semantics.

Abstracting is a process of selecting out certain characteristics from an object, so that one may classify it with other objects of similar characteristics. This process is a necessary convenience through which language is formed. Since reality is infinite and continuously changing, and since each object is actually different from every other, man, with his limited abilities, cannot focus on all characteristics of an object of situation. Thus, he selects out certain similar characteristics in objects, leaving out the differences--so that he may find a common label for such objects. The abstraction process is depicted in Figure 1 through Hayakawa's abstraction ladder, which was derived from Korzybski's diagram explaining abstraction, called the structural differential. Although abstraction is a necessary convenience to form language, one must be aware of the danger in ignoring differences, or the uniqueness of reality.

By referring to the ladder in Figure 1, one can see that the abstraction disorder refers to one's talking about feelings, judgments, and inferences (verbal levels) as though he were describing something outside (the object or experience level) that could be observed and documented. One finds himself talking about "sameness," although no two things are the same. Overgeneralizing, oversimplifying, lumping events and people together are symptoms. The disorder has one acting as though what he says about the world is what he observes--when each, in reality, is on a different level.
To foster awareness of abstraction, Korzybski designed the structural differential (a vertical index), popularly depicted in the previously examined abstraction ladder. To foster awareness of the characteristics of reality, Korzybski formulated semantic devices, mental devices which are explained as follows by Chase.

"We usually have sense enough to fit our shoes to our feet, but not sense enough to revise older methods of orientation," says Chase (18).

General semantics warning signals which aid in revising older methods are these:

1) the symbol "etc."--to remind us of characteristics left out (infinity)
2) index numbers--to break up false identifications (uniqueness)
3) dates--to remind us that objects are in process (process nature)
4) hyphens--to show that events are connected and nature is all of a piece (relatedness)
5) quotes--to remind us that terms being used are high up the abstraction ladder, and so, "Beware, it's loaded" (18).

Chase also appears to neatly summarize the principles of general semantics as given by Korzybski in *Science and Sanity*:

1. No two events in nature are identical.
3. Events flow into one another in nature by insensible degrees.
4. Nature is best understood in terms of structure, order, relationships.
5. Events in nature are four-dimensional.
6. Events have infinite characteristics.
7. There is no simultaneity in nature.
8. There are no abstract qualities outside our heads.
9. Natural laws are at best only high probabilities.
10. Multivaried logic is essential to understanding and explaining nature.
11. A word is not a thing but an artificial symbol.
12. A fact is not an inference: an inference is not a value judgment.
13. A map is not the territory.
14. The language of mathematics contains structures which correspond to the structure of nature.
15. "Reality" is apperceived on three levels: macroscopic, microscopic, submicroscopic.
16. The systems of Aristotle, Euclid, and Newton are now special cases and outmoded as general systems.
17. Extensional, or objective, thinking is clearer and more accurate than intensional, or thinking inside one's head.
18. At the end of all verbal behavior are undefined terms.
19. Language is self-reflexive.
20. Man, alone among earth's creatures, "binds time," that is, profits by the experience of past generations.
21. The nervous system can be consciously reoriented to improve evaluations (18).

From the previous discussion, one may determine the boundaries needed in terms of the researcher's study. She will not be concerned with the great part of communication that primarily serves purposes
of sociability. Also, she will not be concerned with game language that is part of a rule book but which has no particular meaning in reality. Neither will the researcher be concerned with teaching grammar, spelling, or vocabulary per se.

The investigator will serve as a language teacher, however, in the sense of a behavior teacher. The objective will be for the students (leaders) to become aware of themselves in the special sense of transforming experience into symbols: symbol creators, symbol users, symbol modifiers, symbol-adapting creatures. Language, for the researcher, is a process, a means of interaction and transaction, a mechanism of thinking, feeling, understanding, cooperation. The aim of this study, to be stated formally later in the discussion, is to test the potential of helping female volunteer leaders use language to increase their effectiveness.

Use of General Semantics in Investigations

Although never used in leadership training, general semantics has proved useful in improving language skills, composition, creativity, and critical reading.

Research of the 1970's also suggests the importance of grammar on attitudes, especially sexism and prejudice, according to Donald MacKay. MacKay cites research by R. Lakoff ("Language and Women's Place in Language in Society, 1973, pp. 45-80); J. Grewitz ("Another Place for E" in APA Monitor, August, 1978); and C. Miller and K. Swift (Words and Women: New Language in New Times). These, along with his own work, propose that masculine terms when replacing feminine terms
"are loaded terms with subtle and powerful effects on self concepts and attitudes of both men and women." He further states that such research "clearly raises issues that are central to theories of thought and attitudes as well as to theories of language behavior" (53).

General semantics research conducted by Darrel Edwards (22) has indicated training in semantic awareness increases problem solving ability, evidence supportive of the use of general semantics in leadership training. If subjects are to profit from training, concludes Edwards, something must carry from training to problem solving situations that will effect their performance. Such is called a transfer effect.

The results of Edwards' study supported the notion of a general transfer effect. The training was designed to lead each subject to reflect on his problem solving processes and habits of thought. Principles emphasized were abstracting, words versus things, multi-varied interpretation of data, and blinder (22).

Training in general semantics and its effects on personality adjustment have already proved successful with children. Ruth Ralph developed an instrument to test training in general semantics in children 8-12. Her course material was that of Hayakawa, Rapoport, and Johnson. Results showed that children trained in general semantics had better personality adjustment than those not trained. Ralph's work supported, too, Korzybski's statement that general semantics is psychologically beneficial to all age groups and that there is really no difficulty in one's understanding what has been said about language structure and training himself in appropriate semantic reactions (61).
From what this researcher has found, there are no published studies in the area of psychology, management, communications, or general semantics using general semantics as a tool of leadership training--much less with female volunteer groups. The writer is aware, however, of an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Bobby Wooten, studying general semantics as a management tool in a hospital environment.

General semantics principles taught in Wooten's ten-hour classroom program were the structural differential and abstraction ladder, Aristotelian language structure, Lesikar's filter of the mind concept, and extensional-intensional orientation. The study suggested that training in general semantics to supervisors may have an impact on attitudes of subordinates in the long run but not in the short run. Training in general semantics did improve subordinates' satisfaction with the hospital as a place of employment, however, states Wooten (82).

Wooten's 1975 study treated general semantics in isolation, not in conjunction with another theory such as that of leadership. The subjects trained were also those of a business rather than those of a volunteer organization. These points will differentiate the present study from Wooten's when the hypotheses of the researcher are stated.

That the investigator plans to integrate general semantics and situational leadership theory into one training program suggests an examination of leadership theory and the basis for such integration.
Situational Leadership Theory
As a Corollary of Proper Evaluation

One might ask what is meant by leadership? To which the answers appear to be infinite. In a review of the literature, Ralph Stogdill (1948) indicates that leadership has been viewed as a focus of group processes (C. H. Cooley, D. Kretch, and R. L. Crutchfield); a set of personality characteristics (L. L. Bernard, E. S. Bogardus, O. Tead); the art of inducing compliance (F. H. Allport, W. H. Bennis); the exercise of influence (D. Katz and R. L. Kahn, R. M. Stogdill); an act or behavior (J. K. Hemphill); a power relation (J. R. P. French); an instrument of goal achievement (R. B. Cattell, W. H. Cowley); an effect of interaction (E. S. Bogardus, H. H. Jennings); a differentiated role (M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif); the initiation of structure (J. K. Hemphill, G. C. Homans, R. M. Stogdill) (71).

The researcher has chosen to label leadership as a process of influence as did Stogdill in 1948; George Terry in 1960 (76); Robert Tannenbaum, Irving Weschler, and Fred Massarik in 1961 (74); Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard in 1977 (37); and Jeffrey Barrow in 1977 (4).

Tannenbaum's definition seems to encompass the researcher's own meaning of leadership as follows:

interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals. Leadership always involves attempts on the part of a leader (influencer) to affect (influence) the behavior of a follower (influenceree) or followers in situation (74).

Leadership is thus treated as a process rather than a function.
The Importance of Communications to Leaders

That Tannenbaum (and his associates) continuously asserts the importance of effective communication skills is significant in relation to the researcher's aim to integrate the two disciplines into one training program. Leadership is defined by these experts as influence just as Jurgen and Reusch describe communication as influence in the writer's earlier discussion. Leadership is also described in terms of process—a term used by Korzybski and his followers to characterize the nature of reality and communication.

Tannenbaum further notes that the leader must complete the cognitive perceptual structuring of the follower and situation. He likens the end result of this structuring process to a psychological map. It is thus interesting that Korzybski's analogy of the structuring of language to fit the structure of reality is that of structuring a map to a territory.

Regardless of the particular leadership theory, communication and elements germane to general semantics crop up continuously as important to effective leadership.

For example, the social scientist, Dorwin Cartwright, points to specifications for a good society. As though Cartwright were resounding the sentiments of Korzybski, Hayakawa, and Rapoport, he says the "survival of civilization...will depend on social inventions capable of harnessing...the vast physical energies not at man's disposal." To do so, people must be trained "so that they respect people of different culture, religion, race, policies, etc.; that
nations can exist without war" (15). Cartwright strongly points out the perceptions of group members and of breaking down barriers of communication.

Abraham Zaleznik, in speaking of effective leadership relative to conflict resolution, also stresses the importance of communication. Referring to the problems of leaders, he speaks the language of general semantics. According to Zaleznik, most leaders are accustomed by training and orientation to externalize conflicts and dilemmas. This generalized tendency to place conflicts in the outside world is part of the well known mechanism called "projection." A person projects when, unknown to himself, he takes an attitude of his own and attributes it to someone else. Zaleznik continues that in managing inner conflicts, "awareness of reactions is important to flexibility in thinking and action and thus to effective leadership" (83).

From Trait Theories to Situational Theories

Looking toward particular theories of leadership, one finds early leadership studies concentrated on personality characteristics of leaders. This researcher found such studies dating from 1902 into the 1940's. This "great man" theory of leadership, such as T. Carlyle's 1910 study of hero worship, assumes that the individual achievements of great persons are the causal factors of progress. What the leader "is" is more important than what he does in such a theory. (The mere statement of this theory reads like a semantic disorder.) Thus, personality traits, social traits, and physical characteristics become
criteria for distinguishing leaders from non-leaders (4). Supporters include Bernard (7), Bogarus (10), Tead (75), and Gibb (28), etc.

With the fall of the traitists, says Fillmore Sanford, situationists came to the forefront. Early well known figures include Stogdill in 1948 (71), Tannenbaum in 1958 (73), and Sanford in 1952 (67).

In support of the situationists, Alvin Goulder wrote in 1950, "At this time there is no reliable evidence concerning the existence of universal leadership traits" (30).

Sanford then stated, in 1952, factors which have been important to situationists and contingency theory supporters:

It now looks as if any comprehensive theory of leadership will have to find a way of dealing, in terms of one consistent set of rubics, with the delineable facets of the leadership phenomenon:

1) the leader and his psychological attitudes

2) The followers with his problems, attitudes, and needs and

3) the group situation.

To concentrate on any one of these facets of the problem represents oversimplification of an intricate phenomenon (67).

Additional support comes from Stogdill who, after examining a large number of studies aimed at isolating traits of effective leaders, noted that "the qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader" (71).

Many situationists have focused on dimensions of leader behavior, hypothesizing a particular style (the ideal style) to be
more effective across all or most situations. These have included the Ohio State University studies (Stogdill (71), Fleishman (25), Hemphill (36), etc.); the Michigan State University studies (Cartwright and Zander (17), Katz and Kahn (41), etc.) as well as those of Likert (49), and Blake and Mouton (9), etc.

Numerous theorists have also pleaded for adaptive approaches to leadership. Some have specified leader sensitivity across all situations; others, certain variables and situations which prescribe a normative style of effective leadership. Among these researchers have been Tannenbaum (74), Fiedler (24), Reddin (64), and Hersey and Blanchard (37).

A theorist of the ideal style of leadership, Rensis Likert has argued that attitudes of the organization's participants contribute directly at least, in the long run, to organizational effectiveness. Likert advocates participatory management (which he labels Systems 4) for developing favorable attitudes and increasing the value of human assets.

Walter Nord agrees that Likert's argument for human resource accounting has merit but considers it unwise to depend on anything as specific as Systems 4. A more fruitful approach, he explains, would be some type of situational thinking or a true systems view (a theory also espoused by the general semanticist, Rapoport). Such a systems view would include simultaneously the state of the individual's needs, his perceptions, the organization structure, and other variables. Leadership must be adaptive to develop attitudes
and behavior consistent with needs of individuals and organizations if leadership is to foster an increase in organizational worth (56).

Convincing evidence is also given by A. K. Korman of the situational nature of effective leadership. In his review of 25 studies, he examined relationships between Ohio State's initiating structure and consideration and various measures of effectiveness, including group productivity, salary, performance under stress, administrative reputation, grievances, absenteeism, and turnover. Leader opinion questionnaires and leader behavior description questionnaires were measuring instruments. Korman concluded that consideration and initiating structure had no predictive value in terms of effectiveness, suggesting that since situations differ, so must the leader's style (43).

Believing in a situational approach, Fred Fiedler researched his contingency model of leadership for 16 years (1951-1967). He concluded that both task oriented leaders and human relations oriented leaders are successful under some conditions (24). His work has received both support and challenge. To this researcher, Fiedler's specificity as to the variables to be diagnosed and as to "situation favorableness" appears too limiting as compared to the theories of others.

Tannenbaum's situational proposal of a needed sensitivity and ability of the leader to adapt to changing conditions relative to the leader, the followers, and the situation appears "realistic" but perhaps somewhat "unmanageable," a point to which the writer will refer shortly. In addition, Tannenbaum tends to reflect leadership
in terms of "either-or" styles on a continuum rather than in terms of degrees (a graphic presentation) such as in the work of Hersey and Blanchard. Tannenbaum, however, does amply call attention to the need for flexibility which is so much a part of a situational theory of leadership and of general semantics.

That people should understand people is another major emphasis of Tannenbaum in leadership training. In his discussion, he often uses the language of general semantics, speaking of unhealthy personalities and their thinking in "either-or" terms, while the world is more accurately described in "shades of gray." He talks of extreme personalities, including those who think that "nothing is definite; all is a matter of shading." Stereotyping, as inaccurate perception, is stressed. The healthy personality, Tannenbaum explains,

relied on an openness to experience, a willingness to respond realistically to relevant cues; it exhibits a lack of dogmatism and a capacity for responding to the world flexibly and dynamically (74).

According to Tannenbaum, leadership is influence, and communication serves as the process through which influence is exerted. Certain communication behaviors are therefore judged appropriate by the leader and selected, and others are judged inappropriate and rejected. The degree to which the leader's behavior is actually appropriate, that is, succeeds in moving the follower toward attainment of the specified goal, is a measure of leadership effectiveness.
Effectiveness and appropriate leader behavior are also central to the theory which were part of the leadership training program of this study, the situation leadership theory of Hersey and Blanchard.

**Situational Leadership Theory as Used In this Research**

Hersey and Blanchard's theory evolved from the work of William J. Reddin who, in his 3-D Management Style theory, was the first to theorize that effectiveness depends upon the appropriateness of a leader's style to the situation in which it is used. Training, he felt, must thus aim at flexibility (64). Mention should be made, however, that basics of situational leadership theory seem to have been first stated by Tannenbaum and associates, who are often quoted by other researchers.

Hersey and Blanchard, as do Tannenbaum and others, discuss the importance of the many variables relating to the leader (such as his personality, physical characteristics, needs, etc.), the followers (their personalities, expectations, etc.) and the situation (the task, time, demands, resources, etc.).

Jeff Harris, in adhering to adaptive leadership, adds a fourth category of analysis to determine style appropriateness, that of organizational environment. "Factors within the organization provide the framework for all managerial action," says Harris. Within his diagnosis of organizational variables, he, too, clearly emphasizes communication. In addition, Harris' fourth category is a definite clarification that the "situation variables" involve more than just task, time, or money (35).
The importance of the trainees being able to evaluate the above mentioned factors, "when significant," was stressed in this researcher's training program. A style based upon so many situational factors must necessarily be flexible, adaptive—a goal of both situational leadership theory and general semantics. Yet, says Hersey and Blanchard, flexibility does not ensure effectiveness; flexibility only makes effectiveness more probable. Appropriateness of the leadership style to the situation in which it is used determines effectiveness (37).

This point is obvious, too, in the theory of general semantics. Thus, flexibility (or adaptation) and skillful diagnostic ability (or proper evaluation) are goals of both situational leadership theory and general semantics.

Hersey and Blanchard, however, note (as do general semanticists) the limitations of leaders in auditing an environment of multiple variables hour to hour or day to day to determine an appropriate leadership style. Thus, their research has been aimed toward making one's situation more manageable by selecting out (abstracting) "key variables" to help determine behavior. The theorists do warn that the "other variables" must not be completely discarded, for they will prove significant in some decisions. (General semanticists also warn that abstraction is a necessary convenience because reality is infinite and one's sensory receptors are limited. Yet, differences, when significant, must not be ignored.)
The situational leadership theory adhered to in this study singles out as key variables the behavior of a leader in relation to followers, although it does recognize the importance of all situational variables.

Hersey and Blanchard theorize that the maturity of the followers, in relation to the specific task to be performed, is diagnosed to determine leadership style. Maturity is defined in terms of achievement-motivation, willingness and ability to take responsibility, and education, and/or experience of the followers (37).

Flexibility and proper evaluation are obviously still of major importance in determining style appropriateness. Also, it remains clear that effective communication (including perception, evaluation, and reaction) is still the necessary vehicle for influence and for effective leadership. (For a detailed outline of situational leadership theory, refer to class lectures attached.)

Thus, the researcher will hypothesize benefits to be gained from a training program which incorporates general semantics and situational leadership theory, using general semantics to reinforce internalization of the other.
Chapter II

THE TESTING OF AN INTEGRATED TRAINING PROGRAM

In reviewing the theory and studies on general semantics and situational leadership, the purpose of this research was stated generally. The objective can be divided as follows:

1) To test the integration of general semantics and situational leadership theory in a training situation.

2) To test whether such training would increase leader style flexibility.

3) To test whether such training would increase leader effectiveness.

4) To involve only leaders in volunteer organizations in such training.

5) To involve only female leaders in such training.

Stated formally, one has the following null hypotheses under consideration:

1) That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perception of their effectiveness as leaders.

2) That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders.
3) That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness more significantly than would training leaders in only situational leadership theory.

4) That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

5) That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

6) That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader flexibility more significantly than would training leaders in only situational leadership theory.

Scope of this Research

Subjects trained in this program were from community volunteer groups. Specifically, courses were offered to twenty leaders from the Louisiana Jaycee Jaynes and Louisiana Federation of Women's Club and to twenty leaders from the Junior League in South Louisiana.

The study was limited to these groups because each is a service organization in which leadership training is one of its goals. Thus, training programs are expected and better accepted by these volunteers.
In addition, the organizations are local chapters of state and national organizations. The organizational structures, types of projects, and values of members are considered to be relatively similar across the United States.

In Louisiana, the writer's own research (surveys, 1975-1977) showed differences in the economic, cultural and educational background of the members to be greatest among Jaycee Jaynes than the other two groups. The results suggest The Woman's Club and Junior League tend to look for members who have a college degree and/or professional background, are middle class or above, have community status, and who wish to promote volunteerism.

The Jaycee Jaynes are more open in their membership, having no prescribed selection procedures as are often found in the other two groups. Overall, the researcher found women whose education varied from high school (or less) to college degrees (but virtually few degrees above B.S., and even first degrees were minimal in number). In 1977, the median range of income for the Jaycee family unit was computed at $15,000-$18,000. Concern for dress codes, for status, etc. has also been found to be less than in the other two groups.

Yet, in this 1981 study, the Jaycee Jaynes selected did have similar socio-economic backgrounds as do members of the other two organizations. This is apparent from the analysis of demographic data in Chapter IV. One apparent reason is that the only active young man's group in the partially rural community from which the sample was drawn is the Jaycees, having a membership of professionals.
(especially lawyers, educators, dentists, and managers). The wives of these young men comprise the Jaycee Jaynes—and they, too, are well educated; and many are professionals, etc.

The Jaycee Jaynes and Woman's Club leaders, together, comprised the control group and were taught only situational leadership theory. The Junior League women were labeled the research group and were trained in both general semantics and situational leadership theory.

The question of which group would be taught both disciplines was answered by the Junior League's requesting of a three day workshop, while the other two groups were not willing to allocate as much time to training.

Limitations in the Investigation

The selection of the particular groups mentioned above from volunteer groups available was determined by their interaction as a measure of reliable results.

Although interaction is not daily for most members of volunteer groups (as in business and some educational groups), interaction in these selected organizations is above that of many such groups. If volunteer groups are to be studied, however, the problem of less frequent interaction is a reality with which researchers must live.

The investigator notes from her own experiences, however, that the sample groups are active--and thus she believes they can be reliably measured. The Junior League requires members to donate a minimum number of service hours per week. The participating group researches and prints a nationally sold cook book. As of September,
1980, the group had also begun working daily on the setting-up of a miniature Christmas city. In addition, these Junior Leaguers work together with reading programs, criminal justice programs, community public relations, study and research projects, intraorganizational projects, etc.

The Jaycee Jaynes' numerous activities include monthly visits to nursing homes, training programs for children in skills of football and baseball, shooter and bicycle education programs, dance-a-thons, skate-a-thons, tele-a-thons, fund raising drives, community dinners, casino nights, etc.

Among that which keeps Woman's Club members busy are community fashion fairs, card luncheons, teas, face painting days for fairs and schools, printing and distributing of personal planners, school marionette programs, bake sales, etc.

Even in service groups which formally meet at least monthly as a whole (and, as previously indicated, more frequently in committee and project groups), interaction between a leader and all followers may prove a limitation in any volunteer group. Volunteers often "volunteer" within the organization for projects and committees on which they wish to work—unless appointed by a board or leader. In case of the former, there develop patterns in which the "same" volunteers usually work together. Thus, some ratings of leader effectiveness could be based on minimum interaction between a leader and such volunteers. Yet, as the writer will point out in her justification of the research, she believes the study of volunteer organizations important, despite such a limitation.
The notion of a volunteer group's expectations and wants relative to training is important. These groups must be differentiated from the usually researched student groups in universities or business leaders on the job. Whatever time volunteers put into service projects and/or training is "time given" because they are "willing." There are no major threats or "important" feelings of responsibility hanging over volunteers' heads as may be deemed probable in the other groups. (The "threats" to volunteers lie in certain peer pressures or required prescriptions for group membership, which have proved realistically unrelated to training.) In fact, there is often pressure from family and outsiders "not to perform" because one's time should be allocated to other priorities. Motivation for the volunteer often stems from personal interest in a project and some need for achievement and/or status.*

That only females are being used in this research is a necessary limitation. Most volunteer service groups are divided as to sex. Yet, leaders from both male and female groups do interact, as in an Interorganizational Council--such as one in Thibodaux chartered by the researcher. Interaction is minimal, however. Since the literature appears void of leadership training which concentrates on females (except in terms of high school of college students), the researcher thus chose female volunteers for her study.

*The researcher has been an active volunteer on the local and state level of numerous organizations since 1960. She has held at least 30 #1 positions and every board position and chairmanship of such groups. In such capacities she has made recorded observations and conducted written surveys within the groups since 1972.
The writer should note that cultural and educational volunteer groups have more heterosexual memberships, but the goals of the cultural organizations known to the researcher do not include leadership training. Their educational pursuits appear to be in the areas of the arts and history.

The membership of the educational groups is also too scattered geographically to make training feasible. In addition, the educational groups meet infrequently, and interaction is thus minimal.

Because volunteers value their time highly, the length and number of training sessions had to be limited, a necessary shortcoming of the study. A three day seminar or lab appears to be the upper limit of what the volunteer will consider, in this researcher's experience. Such a session would give one approximately 20 to 24 hours of intensive training. Another alternative is a possible 12 to 15 hours spread over a week (3 or 4 hours per night for 5 or 4 nights). Volunteers appear unwilling to commit themselves over a longer period of time. The researcher thus used a three day seminar for the research group and a two day program for the control group.

Absences during training proved another limitation. Although the groups themselves attempted to motivate leaders to attend all sessions, one must realize that the researcher was vying for the volunteer's time along with family, friends, other volunteer organizations, her work group and/or work, and other priorities. Thus, the number of leaders who began and completed training differed, as the researcher has noted.
Relative to the above problem, training must be viewed not only as helpful but also as interesting—and in the words of volunteers, even "entertaining." The trainer was challenged to present information objectively and clearly but enthusiastically. This point will be touched upon in discussing the training methodology.

That the material presented to the trainees was received as the researcher intended suggests a possible limitation. The trainer has been teaching general semantics in academia since 1972. She has been training volunteers in general semantics and adaptive leadership since 1974. Thus, she is well aware of the necessity of clarifying and questioning to insure understanding—and she attempted to make provisions for this uncertainly as discussed in the training methodology.

The use of a small sample and female volunteers naturally limits the generalizing of conclusions from the study. Yet, the lack of research or theory on volunteer groups underestimates the learning value of interaction in such groups and justifies the use of volunteer groups in research.

The Why of Undertaking this Research

The justification for this study has actually been pointed out in the writer's review of the literature on general semantics and situational leadership theory.

The importance of leadership training has been well accepted by both business and volunteer organizations. Kolb says, for instance,
Today's highly successful manager of administrator is distinguished not so much by any single set of knowledge or skills but by his ability to adapt to and master the changing demands of his job and career by his ability to learn (42).

That the goals and principles of general semantics are supportive of and reinforcing to the theory of situational leadership suggests the integration of the two theories into one training program.

The importance to business and non profit professionals of volunteer organizations as a lab for leadership development, however, seems to have been slighted in the literature. The researcher's personal experiences of twenty years in volunteer groups have been evidence to her of the value to self development from trial and error interaction and reaction and from observations made and recorded while in positions of leadership. Training of volunteers, it seems probable, would certainly enhance such potential for growth as leaders, learning which would be transferable to other situations.

One supporter of the researcher's argument is Christopher Quartly, District Manager of Pacific Telephone and Telegraph, San Diego. Quartly states that

outside volunteer organization...are usually underestimated and sometimes misinterpreted as a source of developmental opportunities. Volunteer organizations are included in the development list under labels such as "community activities or professional societies," but they can provide plenty of developmental opportunities for the person who is interested. This can be the laboratory for leadership (60).

That volunteer organizations might provide such a training center for leadership is even suggested in a statement by Bernard
Bass: "No leadership situation stands entirely alone. An outstanding leader is one who has mastered many types of social situation" (5).

According to Quartly, one must accept the premise that all real development is self development. No one can actually develop another significantly, he contends--not a company, not a volunteer organization. But these groups can provide the climate, an opportunity (which would include training) for people to improve their own capabilities (60).

George Odiorne provides support for such a statement when he says, "The job environment of the individual is the most important variable affecting his development" (58). Thus, the volunteer organization (as does a business organization) provides the environment for practicing the concept of management. The researcher notes from experience and observation that the learning and use of the functions of management (planning, organizing, directing, staffing, and controlling) are a large part of the service volunteer's training and tools. Dictates for training from the national organizations of the service groups involved in this investigation actually listed courses in management conflict, motivation, implementation of change, membership loss or turnover, etc. as necessary.

Volunteer organizations often prove to be tough testing grounds for leadership. It is much easier to prove in volunteer groups that final authority is vested in the membership (an inverted pyramid). One can more easily "buck" the volunteer leader, if dissatisfied, or even leave the organization.
In Quarty's words:

If the person in a volunteer organization doesn't have a positive effect on other people, than his leadership is going to be ineffective in the results he produces. People usually belong to a volunteer group because they want to. Therefore, such groups provide ideal situations for testing your ability to work through others. You don't have titles, desks, secretaries, etc. to hide behind as things get rough. Your fellow members just don't have to listen to you or put up with you if your leadership style turns them off (60).

Thus, the researcher believes volunteer groups are capable of providing effective training grounds for potential business leaders. For active professionals, volunteer organizations can be a supportive training ground, if the leadership environment is healthy, to the business training ground. Therefore, the testing of the integrated theories of general semantics and situational leadership to female volunteers seems justifiable.
Chapter III

THE METHODOLOGY IN EXPERIMENTAL TRAINING
OF FEMALE VOLUNTEER LEADERS

If there is justification for training female volunteer leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory, then it follows (from the goals and limitations discussed) that the training must be 1) comprehensive but within the time limitations; 2) objective; 3) clear or understandable; 4) challenging or motivating and 5) interesting.

Proposed training was discussed in August, 1980, with leaders of each of the sample groups. In March, 1981, ten members from a chapter of Louisiana Jaycee Jaynes and ten members from a chapter of Louisiana Federation of Woman's Club comprised the control group and were taught situational leadership theory with no reference to general semantics. An integrated program of situational leadership theory and general semantics was taught to 20 leaders from the Junior League. Although the groups began training with the number of leaders indicated, the actual number of leaders completing each entire training program numbered 17 for the control group and 18 for the research group.

Each group is expected by its state or national organizations to have training programs during the club year for all or part of the membership. Because each group is aware of the researcher's work in training volunteers, two groups (the Jaycee Jaynes and the Junior...
League) requested programs of this trainer. The trainer, however, approached the Louisiana Federation of Woman's Club with an offer of a leadership lab. Limiting the workshops to boards and some project chairmen was the suggestion of the researcher.

Each board was aware that there would be a survey of the membership before and after training to evaluate leader effectiveness. The purpose of such a survey, they were told, was to help the trainer in determining their training needs and to provide feedback for participants. This survey, prior to training, served as the pre-test and was administered to 35 followers in the control group and to 42 followers in the research group.

Each follower of the trainees rated her perceptions of ten leaders prior to training. Directions were given at the regular organizational meeting preceding training, and one rating form (of each type of evaluation) was completed by each member at that meeting. In the interest of meeting time, the other forms (for each type of evaluation) were completed at home and mailed to the researcher in a stamped, addressed envelope given to each member at the group meeting—or picked up by the researcher or her volunteer assistant in each organization.

Although meeting attendance is a requirement for membership in each group, members were absent from the meeting prior to training. Evaluation forms were mailed to or delivered to each of the absent members along with specific directions. The trainer and/or her assistant volunteers followed up the mailing with a phone call to
clarify directions and insure cooperation. Returns were received from 27 members of the control group and from 35 in the research group.

The Training Program

Past experience of the instructor with each group has shown a need for a relaxed classroom atmosphere. The longer the training session, the more the above statement applies. The "housewife" in these volunteer organizations has contended, in reference to training labs, that she would enroll once again in college if she actually wanted to function in a classroom atmosphere. The "professional," in the same vein, has argued that her days "on the job" are already filled with too much formality. Thus, a home with a large den often qualifies as a good classroom: it was this type of environment which was used for training both the control group and the research group in this experiment.

In the research group, general semantics was presented first. The principles emphasized included communication and cooperation, perception, the filter of the mind, the characteristics of reality, abstraction and language, the abstraction ladder, seven major miscommunications and correctives, and listening. Materials were abstracted from the writings or training programs of Hayakawa (33), Johnson (38), Fleishman (25), Lee (45), Weinberg (79), Rapoport (62), Haney (32), Chase (18), and Lesikar (47). This lab and lecture were structured to last approximately 13 classroom hours. A detailed breakdown of lessons and the time involved for each is attached.
A laboratory approach to teaching was used by the trainer. The general semantics principles were taught through 1) the participation of all in games, 2) lectures reinforcing principles taught through games, 3) questions and answer periods, 4) discussion of "extensional" application (examples) of theory presented.

Using games, humorous, serious, and/or practical experiences (as the trainer did) to stimulate discussion seems in line with individualization of instruction—designing a program to fit the learner, as Fantini suggests. "No one method (of teaching) can be considered superior to the other except as it contributes to the learning of the individual" (23). The game method, for instance, appeared necessary to meet some of the needs and expectations of the particular trainees in this particular learning situation.

Feedback to this researcher (personal surveys 1974-1981) on the use of games, etc., followed by lecture and discussion, has been favorable with these and other volunteer groups. A volunteer's reason for attending a workshop or lab is his willingness and/or desire for self development—and this willingness and desire must be strengthened by the trainer. The volunteer wants to be challenged, to be perked up, to be given useful information in what she considers an interesting way.

A survey of a three day lab and workshop on general semantics and situational leadership presented by the researcher in September, 1980, to leaders of the Louisiana Jaycee Jaynes increased support for this proposition. The games and analysis of humorous, as well as
serious, situations were labeled by the group as "exciting," "interest arousing," "making learning fun," etc. Lectures and discussion re-emphasized and clarified the principles which were introduced through games, etc. Retention scores, after training, averaged approximately 90 percent.

A review of research on games by Cruickshank and Telfer has shown this tool to be helpful in learning but to no greater degree than any other medium of instruction. Students do appear to acquire equal knowledge and skills as they would in other learning situations. Discussion after games, the authors contend, adds to interest and satisfaction (19).

The general semantics training program was divided into approximately three hour sessions with a specified number of lessons per session as shown in the outline of lessons in Appendix A. Questions and answers were used during and at the end of each session to determine students' recall of material covered. Each lesson was followed by some application of general semantics principles such as 1) students volunteering knowledge of operational definitions of specified terms; 2) students arranging statements in order from low to high abstraction; 3) students relating humorous or harmful examples of miscommunication such as projection, following instructions without reference to context, reacting to words, etc. Trainees were given a final quiz at the end of the general semantics lectures to test 1) students' recall of general semantics terms and/or 2) their ability to select the evaluation most appropriate to a situation from among alternatives, using general semantics knowledge.
Training in general semantics was followed by a presentation of the situational theory of leadership. For the control group, this presentation marked the beginning of their training. This series of sessions was conducted through lectures, question and answer periods, cases, and relating of practical and humorous situations. No reference to general semantics was made in the control group.

In both the research and control groups, leadership was discussed in terms of the following: its meaning; a review of the different theories of leadership style, beginning with the "traitist;" a concentration of the general situational approach to leadership; analysis of the variables to be diagnosed by a leader; the improvement of diagnostic abilities; the Hersey-Blanchard "key variables" approach to leader effectiveness; the responsibility to direct followers toward maturity. Theory and techniques of the following authors were stressed by the trainer: Robert Tannenbaum and others (74), Jeff Barrow (41), O. Jeff Harris (35), and Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (37).

Trainees in both groups were given the Hersey and Blanchard "Lead-Self" directly before the sessions on leadership theory began. In each program, the questions and answers of the "Lead-Self" were analyzed by trainer and participants after the conclusion of all lectures. A simple test to measure recall of concepts or principles stressed as "basic" was also used.

In each group, the trainer concluded with a summary of points emphasized and the benefits to be reaped if principles learned are internalized and applied.
Designing and Implementing the Measuring Instruments

With the integrated training program unfolded before the reader, the primary goal of the researcher materializes: to measure the significance of such training by testing followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness before and after the training. Measurement was possible through two instruments: 1) the semantic differential and 2) Hersey and Blanchard's "LEAD-Other" (Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description).

The Semantic Differential

The use of the semantic differential was suggested to the researcher in her review of Wooten's investigation of general semantics as a management tool in a hospital environment. Wooten used the semantic differential to measure subordinate attitude change following training of supervisors (82).

The semantic differential was devised by Osgood, Succi, and Tannenbaum to measure the "psychological aspect of meaning" in behavior--

that process or state in the behavior of a sign-using organism which is assumed to be a necessary consequence of the reception of sign-stimuli and a necessary antecedent for the production of sign responses (59).

This measuring device is considered a general way of obtaining a certain type of information. Thus, the instrument must be adapted to the requirement of each research problem to which it is applied.
Some of the language of the semantic differential is as follows:

1. "Concept" refers to that which is being measured.

2. "Factors" are "the dimensions of the semantic space" or the categories into which the authors place scales of judgment.

3. "Scales of judgment" encompass the bi-polar adjectives which represent the factors and which are relevant to the rater's judging of concept (59).

In this investigation, the concepts to be judged were leader effectiveness and leader flexibility. Both concepts meet the selection criteria of "good judgment" suggested by Osgood and others:

   a) Select concepts, the meanings for which one can expect considerable differences.

   b) Select concepts having a single unitary meaning for the rater. (This investigator provided concept definitions.)

   c) Select concepts which are familiar to the rater (59).

Scale selection is a little more structured than concept selection. In The Measurement of Meaning, there are provided 76 scales which are categorized under the following factors: evalutative factor, potency, oriented activity, tautness, novelty, receptivity, and aggressiveness (59).

Although Osgood merely gives guidelines for the selection of the scales for any study, the researcher has followed Wooten's lead of having groups select relevant adjectives which best fit the needs of the study. Using 25 subjects from volunteer organizations, the investigator submitted Osgood's 76 scales, plus twelve other
scales, to these subjects in small groups in September, 1980. The subjects were asked to mark the bi-polar adjectives which one would use in evaluating 1) the effectiveness and 2) the flexibility of female volunteer leaders.

From the group's selections of judgment scales, a list of 35 bi-polar adjectives were derived for the form measuring leader effectiveness. Adjectives describing flexibility numbered ten.

The researcher then pre-tested the crude semantic differential on the trainees in her previously mentioned "trial run" training in September, 1980. For each concept to be measured (leader effectiveness and leader flexibility), the trainees were given ten forms--each containing the name of a peer leader. Each participant was asked to rate the leader named, using the semantic differential.

Instructions were read to the lab members and questions were encouraged and answered. The instructions directed each rater to leave blank any scale she did not find relevant to the evaluation of effectiveness (and then to flexibility) in her peer leader. This test resulted in a semantic differential of 20 judgment scales to measure the concept of effectiveness and seven to measure the concept of flexibility.

During the researcher's defense of her proposal, she was made aware that the semantic differential, as presented to her committee, did not measure leader effectiveness as defined in this study. As previously defined on page 25 of this dissertation, Hersey and Blanchard's leader effectiveness refers to the appropriateness-
inappropriateness of the leadership style to the situation in which it is used. Thus, the researcher added appropriateness scales to the semantic differential.

To add an appropriateness dimension to the measuring instrument, the researcher had to reduce the number of scales from 20 judgment scales to 10. A second pre-test, as suggested in the researcher's proposed study, was conducted in February, 1981. The subjects, members of the Louisiana Federation of Woman's Clubs, were asked to list the 20 adjectives on the semantic differential in order of preference as to their perception of how well the adjective could be used to describe leader effectiveness. Furthermore, they were instructed to leave off of their lists any adjective they would not use relative to leader effectiveness. From this second pre-test, the researcher was able to select 10 adjectives, each of which was to be followed by an appropriateness scale when the new instrument was prepared. A second pre-test of the semantic differential measuring flexibility yielded three judgment scales.

Having prepared the new instrument to measure leader effectiveness with judgment scales of 10 bi-polar adjectives and an appropriateness-inappropriateness dimension for each adjective, the researcher tested the new semantic differential for clarity or understanding. Using 10 volunteer leaders from her community, she found the new measuring instrument for leader effectiveness to be easily understood by all of the 10 volunteers. Clarity was also obvious with reference to the semantic differential measuring flexibility
when it was re-tested with this group. The reader may refer to the appendix for an examination of the semantic differentials used in this study.

A look at the semantic differentials will show that the bi-polar adjectives of each judgment scale are separated by a continuum divided into seven segments. Each segment is to represent one step in moving from one adjective at one end of the continuum to the meaning at the opposite end of the continuum. Each selected bi-polar adjective is to receive numerical evaluations of one to seven, the number "one" representing the segment considered least favorable; the number "two" to be given to the segment next to the least in favorableness--up to the number "seven" for the most favorable.

The "LEAD-Other"

In addition to the semantic differential, the investigator chose, as a measuring device, Hersey and Blanchard's "LEAD-Other" (Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description). As described by the authors, the "LEAD-Other" measures followers' perceptions of leaders' style: style range (flexibility) and style effectiveness (37).

The "LEAD-Other" was also administered to those involved in the September, 1980, training program. The trainees were given five forms, each form containing the name of a leader to be evaluated. The investigator directed the group to evaluate the situation described on each form in terms of how the raters perceived the leader named on the form would behave.
Although Hersey and Blanchard have tested this instrument throughout the USA, the researcher administered the test to determine any difficulty with the test she, or the participants, might have. The participants' questions, relative to the "LEAD-Other," pertained to clarifying instructions. The group members were able, too, to select an answer in each of the twelve situations on the questionnaire. The reader will find a copy of the "LEAD-Other" also attached.

As previously stated, the measuring instruments were administered to members of the participating organizations at each organizational meeting before the leadership workshops held in March, 1981. Post-testing of the followers of the leaders completing the training programs was conducted in the first week of August, 1981.
Chapter IV

RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

Before the investigator could analyze the effects of the methods of training used in this study, she had to determine if the followers in the control group (Group 1) were comparable to the followers in the research group (Group 2) for test purposes. Demographic data of the control group was thus compared to that of the research group to determine if there was any significant difference between the two groups.

The t-test was used to test for significance with data concerning age and children. If the probability of t is less than .05, there would be indicated a significant difference between the two groups. As shown in the tables below, there was no significant difference in the ages or number of children of members of the control group as compared to the research group.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.952</td>
<td>22.000</td>
<td>38.000</td>
<td>-0.5573</td>
<td>0.5799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.551</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>37.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The probability of $t$ is shown to be greater than .05. Thus, one can assume there was no significant difference in the ages of the members of each group. An evaluation of Table 2 gives further proof that the groups were comparable for test purposes.

Table 2

Number of Children of Control Group Relative to Research Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable:</th>
<th>Children Group N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. $&gt; /t/$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1904</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7620</td>
<td>0.0884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.6551</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the probability of $t$ is greater than .05 once again gives evidence of no significant difference between the research and the control group for this particular variable.

Other data used to compare the two groups were education, income, and occupation. The analysis used here was that of the chi-square. If the probability of the chi-square is less than .05, there is indicated a significant difference between the control group and the research group. In each of the categories analyzed, the chi-square was greater than .05, suggesting there was no significant difference between the groups relative to education, income, or occupation. The statistical data can be reviewed by the reader in Tables 3, 4, and 5.
Table 3
Analysis of Differences in Educational Levels Between Research and Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Educational Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 7.356
Probability = 0.0614

A probability of .0614 is greater than .05, indicating the educational levels of the two groups are similar or not significantly different.

The writer must warn the reader that, with a small sample size, the chi-square may not always be a valid test. Yet, because this analysis is the best available for purposes of evaluation, the researcher will assume that the control group and research group were comparable groups relative to this variable.

Similar results concerning income differences are obtained by reviewing Table 4.
Table 4
Comparison of Income Levels in Control Group Relative to Research Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Income Levels</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000 to 35,000</td>
<td>35,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>over 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 5.277
Probability = 0.715

Once again, the investigator's results show probability greater than .05, suggesting trends were the same in both groups. However, with a small sample, one must keep in mind the warning that the chi-square may not be a valid test. The reader should note, too, that although the table shows three income levels, the investigator did use four income levels in her study. The statistician combined income classifications of $15,000-$25,000 and $25,000-$35,000 into one category in the computer analysis.

From a look at Table 5, one can see that the groups also remained comparable with reference to occupational classifications.
Table 5
Comparison of Occupations of Control Group to Those of Research Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Frequency</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>Occupation Classifications</th>
<th>Non-Professional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 4.280
Probability = 0.1177

The chi-square obtained from this analysis is not significant, given a probability of 0.1177. Thus, the researcher may conclude the control group was comparable to the research group in reference to occupations of the members. The reader is again warned of the danger of expecting the test to be absolutely valid because of the small sample size.

Analysis of demographic data using the t-test and the chi-square allows the researcher to assume that the control group (Group 1) was comparable to the research group (Group 2) for purposes of this investigation.

Testing the Hypothesis

As previously discussed, followers of the leaders trained in both the control group and research group rated the leaders in late
February before the March, 1981, training sessions. These followers again rated the leaders in late July and early August, 1981. The instruments used in this measurement were the LEAD-Other, designed by Hersey and Blanchard, and two semantic differentials designed with the help of three pre-tests.

The LEAD-Other, as described by Hersey and Blanchard, measures style range or the extent to which a leader is able to vary her style to different situations (flexibility). The authors contend flexible leaders have more potential to be effective in a number of situations (37).

The number of different styles used, of the four possibilities presented in the theory, determines the style range. Because of its technical nature, the actual measuring of scoring of flexibility with the LEAD-Other will be discussed under Leader Flexibility.

In addition, the LEAD-Other measures style adaptability which is defined as the degree to which a leader is able to vary her style appropriately to the demands of the given situation. Thus, it is style adaptability which is more relevant to effectiveness, according to the authors. Flexibility does not guarantee effectiveness, although it makes it more likely (37).

The effectiveness range on the LEAD-Other increases as a leader goes from scores of +1 to +24. A negative score from (-1) to (-24) indicates ineffective leadership style(s). With the LEAD-Other, composite scores were thus used in the analysis of leader effectiveness.
As pointed out, the semantic differential was the second type of measuring instrument. One semantic differential used ten bi-polar adjectives, with an appropriateness-inappropriateness measurement for each pair of scales, to test followers' perception of each leader's effectiveness. The second semantic differential used three bi-polar adjectives scales to measure followers' perception of leader flexibility.

In determining whether to accept or reject the hypothesis, the semantic differential measuring effectiveness had to first be analyzed according to each individual scale. The attitude scales were scored by numbers of 1 through 7, the number 1 indicating the most negative perception and the number 7 indicating the most positive perception. On each appropriateness-inappropriateness scale, the number 1 determined inappropriateness while appropriateness was measured by the number 7. A composite score was also analyzed for 10 sets of bi-polar adjectives followed by the analysis of a composite score for the appropriateness-inappropriateness scales. Composite scores could range for a high of 70 to a low of 7.

For the semantic differential measuring flexibility, the number 1 on each of the three scales indicated a perception pertaining to less ability to vary behavior while a score of 7 on a scale was determined to mean a wide range of behavior adaptability. Composite scores were compiled for this test. A score of 21 was the highest score one could obtain while a score of 3 was the most negative rating a leader could receive.
Leader Effectiveness within Groups

In interpreting the data relevant to leader effectiveness, the researcher will begin with the statistical analysis of pre- and post-test scores within each group. The paried t-test was employed as the evaluation technique.

As the reader will note, the researcher first evaluated scores of followers in the control group, beginning with the analysis of the LEAD-Other's measurement. Continuing with an interpretation of the LEAD-Other, she then reviewed data obtained from the followers in the research group. The researcher's findings are thus presented below.

As shown in Table 6, no significant difference was noted between pre- and post-tests for the LEAD-Other effectiveness measurement in the control group.

Table 6
Analysis of Differences in Pre- and Post-Effectiveness Scores for LEAD-Other within Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Difference in Effect. Scores</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4074 108 1.38 0.1694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the probability of t is greater than .05, training of leaders does not appear to have resulted in any significant difference in leader effectiveness as perceived by followers on scoring of the LEAD-Other. The LEAD-Other, the reader must remember, was developed by Hersey and Blanchard for use with the teaching of the situational
theory of leadership. The control group, it has been stated, was taught only situational leadership theory.

According to data analysis from the LEAD-Other, the following null hypothesis would appear to be accepted:

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders.

This interpretation indicates that the alternative hypothesis as stated below would be rejected:

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will improve followers' perception of their effectiveness as leaders.

Analysis of the pre- and post-scores on the LEAD-Other within the research group gives the investigator the results shown in the following table.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Effect. Scores</td>
<td>0.8333</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.0072 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level

With a probability of t less than .01, it appears a highly significant difference that is not related to chance exists between the pre-test and post-test scores of members of the research group.
who completed the LEAD-Other. Perception of leader effectiveness by
the followers thus appears to have improved as a result of training
the leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory.

This interpretation, with reference to the research group,
indicates the rejection of the following null hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in
general semantics and situational leadership theory
will not improve followers' perceptions of their
effectiveness as leaders.

Rejection of this null hypothesis, with reference to the
research group alone, is the acceptance of the alternate hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in
general semantics and situational leadership theory
will improve followers' perceptions of their
effectiveness.

Of course, there are qualifications to these conclusions
reached through use of the LEAD-Other. One fact which the researcher
might now introduce is the lack of popularity among members of the
control group (and the research group) in completing the LEAD-Other.
Although cooperation was more favorable during the pre-test, the
number of responses declined by 42 (control group) and by 19
(research group) for the post-test, thus requiring that fewer
responses be used in the analyses.

Especially in the control group did the researcher receive
complaints that the LEAD-Other was too cumbersome as a rating
instrument when one had to rate more than one leader. The rating
of more than one leader by followers in a volunteer service group is,
of course, a necessity in order to obtain a sufficient number of
responses. Other negative remarks about the LEAD-Other, verbalized
more by the followers in the control group than by those in the research group, included the tendency to look for the "correct" answer, the tendency to place one's self in the situation, and the tendency to lose one's power of concentration. Verbalized to an "extreme" degree by both groups was that the situations in the LEAD-Other were too vague for confidence in the accuracy of one's scoring. In other words, there were often too many "ifs" which confused followers' perceptions of the leader in the situations.

In contrast to the LEAD-Other, the semantic differential was well received by respondents in the investigation. With reference to the semantic differential's measurement of leader effectiveness in the control group, differences in pre- and post-test scores showed highly significant differences in nine of the ten bi-polar adjective scales. Only in the category labeled unorganized-organized was there no difference shown in pre- and post-test scores for the control group—as shown in Table 8.

Table 8
Comparison of Differences in Pre- and Post-Scaling of Bi-polar Adjectives within Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable-Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pessimistic-optimistic</td>
<td>0.6760</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly-unfriendly</td>
<td>0.1338</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.0002 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungling-skillful</td>
<td>0.1901</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful-unsuccessful</td>
<td>0.2676</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.0002 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable-Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nervous-calm</td>
<td>0.2183</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated-aimless</td>
<td>0.4929</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature-mature</td>
<td>0.1549</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-unaggressive</td>
<td>0.2253</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized-organized</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.3190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent-inconsistent</td>
<td>0.2605</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

It is important to note that, in interpretation, the bigger the mean, the more different the responses were from pre-testing to post-testing. Thus, she added that scale number 9, with a mean of .0281, showed less difference in pre- and post-responses than any of the other scales. Probability of t for scale number 9 is, as shown in the table, also greater than .05.

It would appear, however, that the difference in pre- and post-scores on the appropriateness scales suggest some caution in conclusions. An evaluation of Table 9 indicated two appropriateness scales (each of which corresponds with the same numerical adjective scale) to show no significant differences in scores.
Table 9
Comparison of Differences in Pre- and Post-Scales of Appropriateness-Inappropriateness Scales within Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Differences Approx.-Inapprox. (A)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>0.6619</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>0.1126</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.0178*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>0.1478</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>0.2605</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>0.0704</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.2052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td>0.4718</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>0.1690</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.0069**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>0.5985</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>0.0704</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.0957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>0.2816</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.

*Significant at .05 level.

Once again, scale number 9 shows no significant difference in perceptions of the appropriateness or inappropriateness of such behavior following training. No significant difference in pre- and post-ratings on the appropriateness scale was also found in scale number 5, maturity-immaturity.

Although each bi-polar adjective scale and each appropriateness-inappropriateness scale has been viewed individually in the two preceding tables, the investigator also obtained composite scores for
the ten bi-polar adjectives as well a composite score for the corresponding appropriateness scales. According to the statistical analysis of the difference in cumulative scores (pre- and post-tests of the bi-polar adjectives), the difference was highly significant as depicted in the following table.

Table 10

Comparison of Difference in Cumulative Scores of Bi-Polar Adjective Scaling within Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Adj. (Cumulative)</td>
<td>2.6478</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.

Highly significant results were also obtained from the analysis of the cumulative pre- and post-scores of the appropriateness scales for the control group.

Table 11

Comparison of Difference in Cumulative Scores of Appropriateness-Inappropriateness Scaling within Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diff. A</td>
<td>2.8450</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.
These findings, from the composite scores of each set of scales, suggest a positive evaluation of the difference in leader effectiveness in the control group after training. As the reader is aware, these results are indicated by data analyses from the semantic differentials. It would appear, therefore, that measurement with the semantic differential for leader effectiveness suggests the rejection of the null hypothesis for the control group.

That training female service volunteer leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perception of their effectiveness as leaders.

Such an interpretation contradicts the previous acceptance of the null hypothesis for the control group after an analysis of data from the LEAD-Other. Thus, the researcher must exercise caution in accepting the hypothesis that training in situation leadership theory (only) improved leader effectiveness in the control group. Such caution is reinforced by the insignificant findings in "part" of the appropriateness dimension of the semantic differential when the scales were treated on an individual basis.

In any increase in leader effectiveness in the research group, the reader can readily see that all measuring instruments indicated highly significant differences in the pre- and post-scores. In other words, results are comparable for the LEAD-Other; individual attitude (bi-polar adjectives); appropriateness-inappropriateness scales; and cumulative scores for each "set" of scales (attitude and appropriateness) for the semantic differential. The complete table of data analysis is given on the following page.
### Table 12
Comparison of Pre- and Post-Leader Effectiveness Scores on Pre- and Post-Measuring Instruments within Research Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable-Differences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAD-Other</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.8333</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.0072 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimistic-optimistic</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.6622</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly-unfriendly</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungling-skillful</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.4701</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful-unsuccessful</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2847</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous-calm</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2450</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated-aimless</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.7483</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature-mature</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-unaggressive</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.4701</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized-organized</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent-inconsistent</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1986</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative (Adj.)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.5894</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appro.-Inappro. (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.5165</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1258</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.0035 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.4635</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.3112</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2582</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.8278</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1788</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.6754</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2052</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative (A)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.7284</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level.

These findings thus suggest, that when evaluating the research group alone, the null hypothesis which is stated below must be rejected:
That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perception of their effectiveness as leaders.

To reject this hypothesis is to accept the alternative that training female service volunteer leaders in situational leadership theory and general semantics improved followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness.

Although such a conclusion appears confirmed by all measuring instruments, the researcher must remind the reader that the analysis thus far has been in terms of the control group alone and in terms of the research group alone--without a comparison of analytic data between the two groups. In addition, it should be noted that high ratings on the pre-tests of both groups, which the researcher observed, would indicate little variation and could explain why the value of t is consistently larger.

Caution in conclusions is suggested, too, in that strong personal relationships between members of volunteer groups might affect members' ratings of leaders. There tends to be a natural fear that negative ratings or comments about a member who has become one's friend may have a negative effect on that friendship.

Before analyzing the control group's results as compared to the research group's results, the writer should mention that seven of the ten bi-polar adjectives used on the semantic differential in this experiment measuring effectiveness are comparable to seven scales on Fiedler's "Least Preferred Co-Worker" measuring instrument (24).
Evaluation of Effectiveness Scores Between Groups

The comparison of data between the two groups requires the use of a different statistical techniques—the unpaired t-test and the F-test. There was no significance difference in leader's effectiveness scores for the control group compared to that of the research group, as described in Table 13.

Table 13
Comparison of Difference in Scores of Control Group and Research Group for LEAD-Other Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Difference LEAD-Other</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.0407</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-1.0025</td>
<td>0.3170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.8333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table, and those which follow, the F-test allows one to examine difference in variances. The value of t is calculated differently, depending upon whether variances between the two groups are equal or unequal. If the probability of F is less than .05, as shown in Table 13, the researcher will use data generated for unequal variances.

In Table 13, the probability of t, calculated for unequal variances, is seen to be greater than .05. On the basis of this analysis of scores from the LEAD-Other, one must accept the following null hypothesis on leader effectiveness:
That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness more significantly than would training leaders in only leadership theory.

Once again, the researcher must warn that there is evidence that the LEAD-Other may not have been completed as carefully or accurately as was the semantic differential. Such evidence exists in complaints of raters previously described as well as in the difference in the number of forms submitted. The latter difference was greater in the control group, with the returns on the post-test numbering 42 less than that of the research group. (Naturally, only responses received for both pre- and post-tests could be used in the analysis.)

Hersey and Blanchard add further caution as to conclusions from the effectiveness score on the LEAD-Other. The authors reason that there is no correlation between the score one gets on the effectiveness dimension and how effective one is in terms of his present position. What they have found in their work is that many times a leader may deal with only one or two levels of maturity in his organizational assignment. Yet, the instrument is designed to give one the opportunity to rate leaders in making decisions on all levels of maturity (37).

The LEAD-Other was designed, however, for business organizations. Although the preceding caution may also hold for volunteer organizations, it appears that volunteers may have more opportunities to deal with all of the four levels of maturity in their followers,
as described in the Hersey and Blanchard literature (37). This is the result of volunteers being able to choose those with whom they will work and the projects on which they will work.

Leader effectiveness scores, as measured by the semantic differential, give more overall support to the alternative hypothesis—as the researcher will now show.

A look at the first two variables on the semantic differential shows there to be no significant difference in scores of the research group as compared to that of the control group. The reader may refer to Tables 14 and 15 to justify this interpretation.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Pessimistic-optimistic</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.6760</td>
<td>0.0939</td>
<td>Equal 0.1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.6622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Friendly-unfriendly</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt;</th>
<th>t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1338</td>
<td>0.4484</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-0.7624</td>
<td>0.4465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With probabilities of t greater than .05, the reader can see there appears no significant differences in measurement of the two groups on the semantic differential, relative to these two variables.

A look at measurement of the third bi-polar adjective scale (bungling-skillful) shows a different picture in terms of significance.

Table 16

Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Bungling-skillful</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt;</th>
<th>t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1901</td>
<td>0.0209</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-4.8624</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.4701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.
Followers' perceptions of leader skillfulness after training appears to be greater in the research group taught general semantics and situational leadership theory than in the control group taught only situational leadership theory.

The researcher finds, however, that in terms of the fourth and fifth adjective scales, there is no significant differences indicated in measurement of the two groups, as can be seen in the following tables.

Table 17
Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Successful-unsuccesful</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2676</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2489</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-0.2825</td>
<td>0.7777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18
Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Nervous-calm</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2183</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3654</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-0.3211</td>
<td>0.7489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the preceding analyses, the reader finds probabilities of $t$, (0.777) and (0.7489) respectively, to be much larger than .05.

With the sixth bi-polar adjective, one again finds indication of significant difference between scores of the control group and research group.

Table 19
Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Motivated-aimless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group N Mean Prob. F Variances t Prob. $&gt; /t/$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 142 0.4929 0.0037 Unequal -2.6988 0.0074 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 156 0.7483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.

Motivation, just as skillfulness was, seems to be greater for the control group than for the research group after training.

For the immaturity-maturity scale, the researcher's interpretation of data shows no significant difference in measurement of the control group and research group, as shown by the probability of $t$ (0.7605) which is greater than .05.
Table 20

Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Immature-mature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the scales measuring aggressiveness and organization, the investigator's analysis shows significant differences to exist between the scores of the research and control group.

Table 21

Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Aggressive-unaggressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.
**Table 22**

**Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-3.0215</td>
<td>0.0027 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.**

Aggressiveness and organization, as well as the other two significant scales of skillfulness and motivation, are descriptive adjectives that were associated 100 percent with leadership by all club women participating in the pre-test determination of scales. Only one other scale, successful-unsuccessful, fell in this category of 100 percent association with leadership. The other scales were marked by over 75 percent of the respondents, but not by 100 percent.

The last bi-polar adjectives (consistency scale) are shown to be insignificant when measuring differences between the control group and the research group, as shown by a probability of t of 0.3275. The reader may refer to Table 23.
### Table 23

**Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Consistent-inconsistent</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2605</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>0.9810</td>
<td>0.3275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To enable the reader to better see the significance of the scores of the research group relative to the control group, the investigator has provided a table summarizing the results:

### Table 24

**Summary of Difference Between Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pessimistic-optimistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.6760</td>
<td>0.1488</td>
<td>0.8739 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.6622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly-unfriendly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1338</td>
<td>-0.7624</td>
<td>0.4465 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bungling-skillful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1901</td>
<td>-4.8624</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.4701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful-unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2676</td>
<td>-0.2825</td>
<td>0.7777 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous-calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2183</td>
<td>-0.3211</td>
<td>0.7489 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated-aimless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.4929</td>
<td>-2.6988</td>
<td>0.0074 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.7483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature-mature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1549</td>
<td>-0.3051</td>
<td>0.7605 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-unaggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2253</td>
<td>-3.2035</td>
<td>0.0015 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.4701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized-organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>-3.0215</td>
<td>0.0027 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent-inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2605</td>
<td>0.9810</td>
<td>0.3275 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level. 
(NS) Not significant.

Although 40% of the adjective scales proved to be more favorably perceived by followers of the research group relative to followers
of the control group, the reader must look at the difference in the composite scores between the two groups for a clearer interpretation.

In looking at the composite score (difference = Post summed - Pre summed), the reader finds that measurement on the bi-polar adjective scales gives further proof that training increased leader effectiveness of the research group more than that of the control group.

Table 25
Difference Between Composite Scores of Control Group and Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Difference (adj.)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.6478</td>
<td>0.7094</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-4.0464</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.5894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.

From the analysis of the bi-polar adjective scales, it appears, that although some scales showed no significant difference when interpreted individually, the overall evaluation suggests rejection of the following null hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness more significantly than would training leaders in only situational leadership theory.

Before wholeheartedly accepting this conclusion, the researcher must turn to the appropriateness-inappropriateness dimension of the
semantic differential. Hersey and Blanchard, the reader may remember, described leadership effectiveness in terms of behavior appropriate to the situation. Thus, one must determine if the appropriateness dimension of the semantic differential reinforces the interpretation from the analysis of the bi-polar adjective scales.

Table 26 gives one a picture of all the appropriateness-inappropriateness dimensions relative to the bi-polar adjective scales already discussed. In this table, the letter A stands for each appropriateness-inappropriateness scale, while the numbers 1, 2, 3, ... 10, refer to the adjectives as numbered on the semantic differential in Appendix B.

**Table 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: (appropriateness-inappropriateness) A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt;</th>
<th>/t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.6619</td>
<td>0.0900</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>1.5666</td>
<td>0.1183 (NS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.5165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1126</td>
<td>0.3767</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-0.2084</td>
<td>0.8351 (NS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1478</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-5.6658</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.4635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 26 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: (appropriateness-inappropriateness)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt;/t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2605</td>
<td>0.7285</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-8.8085</td>
<td>0.4195</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.3112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.0704</td>
<td>0.0465</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-2.2332</td>
<td>0.0263</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.4718</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-3.7436</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.8278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.1690</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-0.1313</td>
<td>0.8957</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.5985</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-0.6795</td>
<td>0.4974</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.6754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.0704</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-1.7520</td>
<td>0.0809</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.2816</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>-1.1097</td>
<td>0.2681</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.2052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.**

*Significant at .05 level.

(NS) Not significant.

In an individual evaluation, seven of the ten appropriateness scales measure no significance between scores of the control group and
research group. The following scales are included: friendliness, optimism, successfullness, maturity, aggressiveness, organization, and consistency.

Of these adjective scales, those measuring friendliness, optimism, successfullness, maturity, and consistency are also measured as not significant on the bi-polar adjectives scales.

Thus, one might exercise caution with respect to the conclusion that training in general semantics and situational leadership will produce more significant leader effectiveness than training in only situational leadership theory. However, an evaluation of data in Table 27 suggests, for the second time, that this conclusion may be warranted. (In Table 27, difference = Post summed - Pre summed.)

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Difference Appro.-Inappro.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.8450</td>
<td>0.2634</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-2.9904</td>
<td>0.0030 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.7284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level.

With differences in composite scores significant at the .01 level, it is suggested that the null hypothesis stated below be rejected:
That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness more significantly than would training leaders in only situational leadership theory.

With so much statistical data filling the pages, the researcher will summarize the analyses in Chapter V--after a discussion of the measurement of leader flexibility.

**Interpretation of Leader Flexibility**

To measure flexibility in terms of the LEAD-Other, one must mark the style of leadership used in each situation, and then she must count the number of times her style is counted into each of the four categories given by Hersey and Blanchard. These categories are high relationship, low task; high task, high relationship; low relationship, low task; and high task, low relationship. According to Hersey and Blanchard, one would have a high score in effectiveness and be a flexible leader if she used the appropriate style for each of the three situations in which it is warranted (according to the answer code determined by the authors). One could also be a flexible leader although she was not rated as using the most appropriate style in each situation. Refer to Figure 2 for an example of the latter.
In reference to the LEAD-Other, one measures the significance of differences within the groups or between the groups by the use of the chi-square analysis.
In the control group, there is shown to be a significant difference between the scores in leader flexibility before and after training as shown by the probability of the chi-square. The investigator will again refer to the control group as Group 1 while the research group will be labeled Group 2. In the tables, T will refer to Task; and R will refer to Relationship.

Table 28
Difference in Flexibility Scores within Control Group as Measured by LEAD-Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Frequency</th>
<th>Leader Style Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High T Low R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 6.369
Probability = 0.0414

With the probability of the chi-square indicated to be less than .05, the null hypothesis in reference to flexibility within the control group appears to be rejected:

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perception of their flexibility as leaders.

This conclusion will be reinforced as one looks at the data on the semantic differential a little later.
Relative to the research group, one finds a comparable interpretation using the LEAD-Other to measure changes in leader flexibility.

Table 29
Difference in Flexibility Scores within Research Group as Measured by LEAD-Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Leader Style Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High T Low R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 6.369
Probability = 0.0297

In the above table, one again finds the probability to be less than .05, suggesting the rejection of the null hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

As previously done with the evaluation of leader effectiveness, the semantic differential was also used in addition to the LEAD-Other to measure leader flexibility. Using the semantic differential to measure perception of flexibility in the control group, the researcher's results show a highly significant (P .01) difference
in the followers' perception of leader flexibility following training.

The test used for analysis of the semantic differential was the t-test.

**Table 30**

**Difference in Flexibility Scores within Control Group as Measured by Semantic Differential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Flexibility</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.**

A look at Table 30 shows that the probability of t is less than .01, indicating a highly significant difference between pre- and post-test scores for the control group.

The null hypothesis, in reference to the control group stated:

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

After the analysis of scores from the semantic differential and the LEAD-Other for the control group, the null hypothesis would appear to be rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.
According to measurement with the semantic differential, the followers' perceptions of leader flexibility within the research group have also seemed to increase after training.

Table 31
Difference in Flexibility Scores within Research Group as Measured by Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt; /t/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Flexibility</td>
<td>1.5493</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>0.0001 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.

With the probability t less than .01 for the research group, the null hypothesis appears to be rejected. This hypothesis states:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

That this conclusion is reinforced by a preceding interpretation of the LEAD-Other suggests that the alternative hypothesis be accepted:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

The investigator must now look at differences in flexibility as measured between the control group (Group 1) and the research group (Group 2). An analysis of data from the LEAD-Other
again requires use of the chi-square. The reader will recall that T refers to Task, while R is the label for Relationship.

Table 32
Comparison of Difference in Scores of Control Group and Research Group
LEAD-Other Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Frequency</th>
<th>LEADER Style Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High T Low R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High T</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High R</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low T</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low R</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High T</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High R</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low T</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low R</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 727 1277 1126 418

Chi-Square = 13.277
Probability = 0.01

With the probability of chi-square less than .05 for the difference in LEAD-Other scores between the two groups, the investigator suggests the null hypothesis as given below is rejected:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader flexibility more significantly than would training leaders in only situational leadership theory.

The rejection of this hypothesis is also indicated by analysis of data from the semantic differential, using the unpaired t-test.
Table 33
Comparison of Difference in Flexibility Scores of Control Group and Research Group Using Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Difference in Flexibility</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob. &gt;</th>
<th>( /t/ )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.5211</td>
<td>0.7719</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>-7.3151</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.5493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.

The semantic differential shows flexibility differences in the research group, relative to control group, are highly significant. Such an interpretation (along with that of the LEAD-Other) suggests acceptance of the alternative hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will improve followers' perceptions of leader flexibility more significantly than would training in only situational leadership theory.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

That both the control group and research group are comparable groups for test purposes was the researcher's first concern. Using the t-test and chi-square analyses on data collected, she proved the groups were comparable relative to member's age, number of children, education, income, and occupation.

Leader Effectiveness

Hypothesis testing involved data interpretation within groups and data interpretation between groups. Within the control group, the researcher first found support for the null hypothesis relative to effectiveness as measured by the LEAD-Other.

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders.

Within the research group, measurement on the LEAD-Other has shown highly significant differences exist between pre- and post-scores for leader effectiveness. Thus, one tends to reject the null hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership will not improve followers' perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders.
Qualifications have also been made by the researcher regarding the use of the LEAD-Other as a measuring instrument. These concerns have referred to numerous complaints about the vagueness of the LEAD-Other, the cumbersomeness of the LEAD-Other, the tendency for a rater to look for the correct answer, or to lose power of concentration, etc. In addition, Hersey and Blanchard, who developed the LEAD-Other, have indicated that there is no correlation between effectiveness on the LEAD-Other and effectiveness in one's present position.

Measurement with the semantic differential has provided a re-testing of the null hypothesis stated on page 89 (first stated on page 27 and page 58).

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders.

The results of this interpretation are that highly significant differences exist between pre- and post-test effectiveness scores on the semantic differential for the control group. Using this data, the null hypothesis would be rejected.

The researcher has previously pointed out that the rejection of this null hypothesis because of the analysis of the semantic differential contradicts the previous acceptance of the null hypothesis for the control group following analysis of data from the LEAD-Other. Thus, the reader is cautioned in accepting the alternate hypothesis that training in only situational leadership theory improved leader effectiveness in the control group.
Within the research group, measurement by all instruments have shown highly significant differences in the pre- and post-scores relative to effectiveness. As presented on page 65, the results are highly significant, with a probability of t of less than .01. The null hypothesis appears to be rejected:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders.

Thus, the alternate hypothesis seems to be accepted:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will improve followers' perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders.

The reader is reminded that these interpretations have been in terms of the control group only and in terms of the research group only. The researcher has warned, too, that strong personal feelings between members in a volunteer group may affect members' ratings of one another. Thus, some caution should be exercised in the acceptance of any interpretation.

Data interpretations between the research group and the control group, relative to the LEAD-Other, has also shown (with a probability of t of .3170) that acceptance of the null hypothesis is suggested:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness more significantly than would training leaders in only situational leadership theory.
The reader, however, is again warned of possible limitations in drawing conclusions from the LEAD-Other because of complaints received from raters and because of the caution expressed previously by Hersey and Blanchard.

Leader effectiveness scores, as measured by the semantic differential, give more overall support to the alternate hypothesis rather than to the preceding null hypothesis.

Several bi-polar adjectives or attitude scales have been shown to have no significant difference between scores of the research group as compared to that of the control group. These scales include the following: pessimistic-optimistic; friendly-unfriendly; successful-unsuccessful; nervous-calm; immature-mature; consistent-inconsistent.

Highly significant differences (probability of t is less than .01) have been shown for the following adjective scales: bungling-skilful; motivated-aimless; aggressive-unaggressive; and unorganized-organized. The overall difference in composite scores of the control and research groups has also been shown to be highly significant at the .01 level.

Thus, it appears that one would accept the alternate hypothesis:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will improve followers' perceptions of leader effectiveness more significantly than would training in only situational leadership theory.

Caution is warranted, however, until the investigator can reinforce the bi-polar adjective measurement with the analysis of the
the appropriateness-inappropriateness scales for each adjective scale.

Appropriateness scales which measure no significance include: friendliness; optimism; successfulness; maturity; aggressiveness; organization; and consistency. By referring to pages 69-78, as well as page 92, the reader can see that, of these adjective scales, those measuring friendliness, optimism, successfulness, maturity and consistency are also measured as not significant on the bi-polar adjective scale. From an evaluation of individual scales, it appears caution may be warranted in concluding that general semantics and situational leadership theory will produce more significant leader effectiveness than training in only situational leadership theory. However, the analysis of the difference in composite scores of the control group and research group, as previously given on page 80, suggests for the second time that such a conclusion may hold. The probability of \( t \), relative to these composite scores, is 0.0030 and thus less than .01.

**Leader Flexibility**

The measurement of flexibility has resulted in consistent findings for each instrument used: the LEAD-Other and the semantic differential. Within the control group, measurement by the LEAD-Other has shown significant differences at the .05 level between pre- and post-test scores. Also, for the LEAD-Other, measurement within the research group has resulted in significant scores at the .05 level.
Thus, the null hypothesis relative to the control group appears to be rejected:

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

For the research group, the null hypothesis also appears to be rejected:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

The measurements from the semantic differential give further support to rejection of the preceding null hypotheses. The difference in flexibility scores for the control group is seen on page 85 to be highly significant at the .01 level. For the research group, as seen on page 86, the difference in flexibility scores is also highly significant at the .01 level.

Because both the LEAD-Other and the semantic differential give evidence in support of rejecting the null hypothesis, the researcher assumes the alternate hypotheses for the control and research groups may be accepted:

That training female volunteer service leaders in situational leadership theory will improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will improve followers' perceptions of their flexibility as leaders.

Evaluation of the research group relative to the control group gives comparable results for both the LEAD-Other and the
semantic differential. Analysis of the LEAD-Other, as shown on page 87, gives a probability of less than .05. Data from the semantic differential (page 88) is significant at .01 level.

With supporting data from both instruments, the null hypothesis appears to be rejected:

That training female volunteer service leaders in general semantics and situational leadership theory will not improve followers' perceptions of leader flexibility more significantly than would training leaders in only situational leadership theory.

Conclusions

Training in an integrated theory of general semantics and situational leadership appears to merit further consideration, as indicated by the results of this investigation. Training in situational leadership theory alone has also shown merit, but the researcher believes the results of this study suggest the integrated training may be more beneficial.

With regard to LEAD-Other measurements, results have been mixed for leader effectiveness. Within the control group, there has been no significant difference relative to leader effectiveness. Yet, the research group has shown highly significant differences in pre- and post-scores when measuring leader effectiveness on the LEAD-Other. When measurements have been taken between the research and control groups, there once again has been no significant difference in scores. (The student reminds the reader of the cautions indicated with the LEAD-Other, especially the effectiveness dimension.) In
reference to flexibility, the LEAD-Other has been consistent in showing a significant difference between pre- and post-scores.

Measurement by the semantic differential has resulted in consistent significant differences in pre- and post-test scores both within groups and between groups. These results, often highly significant, appear to hold for both leader effectiveness and for leader flexibility. Thus, the null hypotheses, relative to leader effectiveness and leader flexibility, have continuously been rejected.

It appears to the researcher, therefore, that general semantics can be shown to reinforce situational leadership theory. This seems obvious from the investigation undertaken as well as from an evaluation of the basic theory of general semantics relative to the basic theory of situational leadership, as shown in the review of the literature, page 1 and page 16. The writer further concludes that general semantics may be reinforcing to situational leadership theory, whether one uses the approaches of Fiedler, House, Hersey and Blanchard, or Vroom.

Also, it appears that training volunteer leaders in such theories may be necessary in the future. Many organizations are now managed by volunteers: Project Hope, Project Concern, The Peace Corp, Red Cross, etc. The use of volunteers in many areas, especially in government and in the community, may become a necessity if communities are to maintain their standards of living in an era of escalating prices.

In addition, business should be aware of the services volunteer organizations perform and of the training lab available
to their employees through activities in a volunteer organization. Volunteer organizations are a good testing ground for theories of motivation. Motivation and/or influence are the major tools a volunteer has to move members to work. (The researcher considers self-satisfaction or self-achievement to be included under motivation theories.) There is usually nothing "hanging" over a volunteer's head (such as termination, loss of salary), except for peer pressure in some instances, and a "threatened" need to belong. However, peer pressure, etc. is at a higher need level than physical and security needs satisfied through maintaining gainful employment. What is learned in the volunteer organization can be transferred to the business organization. Such learning may also be useful if more full-time commitments must be met in the economy through volunteer service.

Because women, as suggested by the ERA "battle" and by the media, are seeking employment in greater numbers--it may be that there are included many women looking for individual development, achievement, affiliation. Such women are prime candidates for volunteer service--especially, if the woman is married to a gainfully employed man. Then, she may find her higher order needs require more satisfaction than her lower level needs. Such satisfaction is, usually, one primary purpose of a volunteer organization.

Recommendations

That the results of the investigation were consistently more positive than negative relative to the teaching of general semantics
and situational leadership theory allows the researcher to propose further study in this area, for male subjects as well as female.

The researcher suggests that a study, in which general semantics is used to actually reinforce situational leadership theory through the recall of general semantics during specified lessons in situational leadership, may provide even more significant results.

In addition, the student recommends that general semantics and situational leadership theory be studied in a situation in which learning can be reinforced over a period of time--such as with a follow-up course six months after initial training.

With volunteers, however, the researcher may run into problems already encountered by this writer: that of influencing the volunteer to give up her time in order to attend each training session. Thus, the researcher must attempt to make certain the volunteer understands the information, that she considers it useful, and that she considers the training sessions interesting and/or motivating. These are not always easy goals when one is dealing with volunteers. After all, they are not even getting three hours of college credit for sitting through the trainer's class!
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APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF LESSONS FOR INVESTIGATION

General Semantics
(Taught to Research Group)

Session

I.  A. Let's Cooperate, But How: 60 min.
    NASA's game of cooperation
    Cooperation and communication
    Intentional and unintentional communication

    B. Reality is Relative; Reality is Personal: 60 min.
        Situation for discussion: "What actually happened in the square?"
        Characteristics of reality
        Perception and meaning: "The Filter of the Mind"
        Selective perception
        Limitations of the sensory receptors

    C. I'd Rather Fight And Switch: 30 min.
        The semantic devices

II. A. Whatever I Say It Is, It Is Not: 120 min.
    The word is not the thing
    Abstraction and language
    "The Abstraction Ladder"
    Extensional versus intensional orientation
    "The map is not the territory."
    The "Is of Identity"

        (Written quiz 30 min.)

    B. Do I Know My Facts?
        Situations for testing evaluations:
        1) The incident at the grocery store
        2) The silverware is missing
        Distinguishing between fact and inference
        Limitations of a fact
        Correctives for fact-inference confusion

        (Oral quiz 15 min.)
Session III. A. I Know What I Know: 45 min.
Situation for discussion: The minnows and the pike
Are you guilty of a closed mind?
Reinforcement: The nature of reality and the limitations of man
Correctives for a closed mind

B. What Do You Mean: 50 min.
Situation for discussion: How I See Mary
A fallacy: meaning is in words
Projection or bypassing
Meaning is in the mind
Situation for discussion: The tragedy of "Mokusatsu"
Correctives for bypassing

(Oral quiz 15 min.

C. The Answer Is In the Definition: 30 min.
Problem Solving: Connect all nine dots
Problem Solving: How far did the fly fly?
Defining the problem
Blinding
Steps in problem solving
Correctives for blinding

Session IV. A. Show Me The Way
Exercise: Instruct me how to draw a triangle!
No instruction cannot be misunderstood
Develop a "Show Me" Attitude

B. Did I Say That 60 min.
Exercise: Tell your friend what you saw in that picture, please!
Errors made in passing information from one to another

C. Did I Hear That? 60 min.
The importance of listening
Techniques of listening

Group testing

Approximately 13 hrs.
Situational Leadership
(Taught to Research Group and Control Group)

Testing: "Lead Self" 30 min.

Session I. Definition of leadership 60 min.
Can traits determine the leader?

Session II. Review of leadership theory 90 min.
Is there an ideal style of leadership?
Leadership and adaptability
Analysis of variables to be diagnosed
by leader

Session III. The Hersey-Blanchard "key" variables 180 min.
approach
Leader styles and maturity of followers
Improving diagnostic abilities
Moving followers toward maturity

Analysis of "Lead Self" 90 min.
Group testing 60 min.

Approximately 7.5 hrs.

Research Group 20.5 hours
Control Group 7.5 hours
CONFIDENTIAL

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ANYWHERE

INSTRUCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study is to measure the meaning of certain things to various people by having them judge against a series of descriptive scales. Make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you.

HERE ARE EXAMPLES OF HOW TO USE THESE SCALES. (THIS IS NOT PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.)

EXAMPLE A:

If you feel that your membership requirements in this organization are very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your X as follows:

fair X :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: unfair

OR

fair :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: X: unfair

EXAMPLE B:

If you feel your membership requirements in this organization seem quite closely related to one side of the scales as opposed to the other side (but not extremely), then you should place your X as follows:

fair :X:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: unfair

OR

fair :_____:_____:_____:_____:X:_____ unfair
EXAMPLE C:

If you feel your membership requirements in this organization seem only slightly related to one side of the scale as opposed to the other side (but are not really neutral), then you should place your X as follows:

fair _____:_____: X:_____:_____:_____ unfair

OR

fair _____:_____:_____:_____:X:_____:_____ unfair

EXAMPLE D:

If you consider your membership requirements in this organization to be neutral on the scale or unrelated, then you should place your X in the middle space, as follows:

fair _____:_____:_____:X:_____:_____:_____ unfair

IMPORTANT: Be sure you mark the scale for every concept, but never put more than one X on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you have had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so please do not look back and forth through the items. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

I would like to assure you that all responses will be held in strictest confidence and that no names will be used. Results of this survey will appear only as statistical information.

THANK YOU.

PLEASE PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE
There are 20 descriptive word scales below. For each numbered pair of adjectives, indicate your perception of the behavior of the leader named by placing an X in the appropriate space. On the line below each pair of adjectives indicate how appropriate or inappropriate you perceive behavior described by the preceding adjectives to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Very close</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>Very close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. pessimistic</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are 3 descriptive word-scales below. Place an X in the blank which best describes how you perceive the flexibility of ___________. Flexibility refers to the leader's ability to vary her style of leadership in different situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>untimely</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>very close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>successful</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>very close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>infrequently</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>close</th>
<th>very close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

LEAD-Other

Describe the way in which you feel the leader named above would actually behave in each situation by circling the letter of the action this leader would take under Alternative Actions.

The Leader Would:

SITUATION

1. Subordinates are not responding lately to friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Their performance is declining rapidly.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity for task accomplishment.
B. Make herself available for discussion but don't push her involvement.
C. Talk with subordinates and then set goals.
D. Intentionally do not intervene.

SITUATION

2. The observable performance of the group is increasing. The leader has been making sure that all members were aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Engage in friendly interaction, but continue to make sure that all members are aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.
B. Take no definite action.
C. Do what she can to make the group feel important and involved.
D. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
SITUATION

3. Members of the group are unable to solve a problem themselves. The leader has normally left them alone. Group performance and interpersonal relations have been good.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Work with the group and together engage in problem-solving.
B. Let the group work it out.
C. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
D. Encourage group to work on problem and be supportive of their efforts.

SITUATION

4. The leader is considering a change. Subordinates have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Allow group involvement in developing the change, but don't be too directive.
B. Announce changes and then implement with close supervision.
C. Allow group to formulate its own direction.
D. Incorporate group recommendations, but direct the change.

SITUATION

5. The performance of the group has been dropping during the last few months. Members have been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Redefining roles and responsibilities has helped in the past. They have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Allow group to formulate its own direction.
B. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
C. Redefine roles and responsibilities and supervise carefully.
D. Allow group involvement in determining roles and responsibilities but don't be too directive.

SITUATION

6. The leader stepped into an efficiently run organization. The previous administrator tightly controlled the situation. The leader wants to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Do what she can to make group feel important and involved.
B. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
C. Intentionally do not intervene.
D. Get group involved in decision-making, but see that objectives are met.
SITUATION

7. The leader is considering changing to a structure that will be new to your group. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The group has been productive and demonstrated flexibility in its operations.

SITUATION

8. Group performance and interpersonal relations are good. The leader feels somewhat unsure about the lack of direction of the group given by the leader.

SITUATION

9. Another leader has appointed this leader to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Define the change and supervise carefully.
B. Participate with the group in developing the change but allow members to organize the implementation.
C. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain control of implementation.
D. Avoid confrontation; leave things alone.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Leave the group alone.
B. Discuss the situation with the group and then initiate necessary changes.
C. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.
D. Be supportive in discussing the situation with the group but not too directive.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

A. Let the group work out its problems.
B. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
C. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
D. Allow group involvement in setting goals, but don't push.
SITUATION
10. Subordinates, usually able to take responsibility, are not responding to recent redefining of standards.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Allow group involvement in redefining standards, but don't take control.
B. Redefine standards and supervise carefully.
C. Avoid confrontation by not applying pressure; leave situation alone.
D. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that new standards are met.

SITUATION
11. The leader has been promoted to a new position. The previous supervisor was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has adequately handled its tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.
B. Involve subordinates in decision-making and reinforce good contributions.
C. Discuss past performance with group and then examine the need for new practices.
D. Continue to leave group alone.

SITUATION
12. Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among subordinates. The group has a remarkable record of accomplishment. Members have effectively maintained long-range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Try out her solution with subordinates and examine the need for new practices.
B. Allow group members to work it out themselves.
C. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
D. Participate in problem discussion while providing support for subordinates.
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