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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Due to the greater role of the public schools in society there has developed an increasing concern about the nature of leadership of school administrators. Recognizing this need the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has supported eight cooperating centers throughout the country to conduct and report significant research on this problem. One of these cooperating centers is the School-Community Development Study at Ohio State University which has been especially concerned about the nature of administrative behaviors. Through research at field centers and interpretations of this research in the light of writings by others, several areas of behavior have been identified which seem to determine whether an administrator is effective or ineffective. Certain hypotheses have developed which need to be tested before these ideas are accepted or rejected.

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of this study were: (1) to determine whether a given set of categories of behaviors included all of the administrative behavior of high school principals and (2) to determine whether these categories of behavior were useful in discriminating between effective and ineffective high school principals. The categories of behavior were as follows:
1. Setting goals
2. Making policy
3. Determining roles
4. Communicating
5. Using educational resources of the community
6. Working with community leadership
7. Involving people
8. Coordinating administrative functions and structure
9. Appraising effectiveness

The specific hypotheses of the study were: (1) that the nine categories of behavior listed above included all of the administrative behavior of high school principals and (2) that these categories constituted dimensions of behavior upon which effective and ineffective high school principals differed.

In the event that new categories were necessary to include or describe all of the administrative behavior these new categories were to be named and tested.

Definition of Terms

Administrators were defined as executives of schools not regularly engaged in classroom teaching. This term included principals, superintendents, assistant superintendents, and executive heads.

High school principals were defined as school administrators under the jurisdiction of a chief executive
of the school system or superintendent and directly in
charge of a secondary school, either junior high or senior
high, and freed from teaching at least three-fourths of
the day.

*Administrative behaviors* were those actions or
responses engaged in by the administrator related to his
administrative functions. This did not include the behav-
iors which he would engage in if he were not an administra-
tor, such as eating.

*Critical* meant decisive or discriminating between
effective and ineffective administrators.

*Jury* was the term applied to the group of educators
chosen to rate principals in quartiles on the basis of an
over-all estimate of effectiveness as described in greater
detail in a later chapter.

*Effective* meant those administrators or principals
judged to be generally effective by the independent jury
as described later in this chapter. This group included
only persons almost unanimously placed in the fourth
quartile.

*Ineffective* administrators were those administra-
tors or principals judged to be generally ineffective by
an independent jury as described later in this chapter.
This group included only those persons almost unanimously
placed in the first quartile. It must be remembered how-
ever, that these principals were ineffective only when
compared with the others. These so-called ineffective ones were successful administrators to a great extent or they would not have been placed in these very responsible positions which are desired by many other persons, nor could they have held these positions without considerable ability.

The School-Community Development Study was affiliated with The Ohio State University and was one of the CPEA (Cooperative Program in Education Administration) Centers financed by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for the purpose of doing research on educational administration.

Significance of the Problem

In spite of the increased complexity of the role of the school in the social order and increased theory for educational administration there was little administrative theory based upon behavior which had been verified. Until very recently, administration had been described not in terms of action or behavior but in terms of understanding the commodities involved: the personnel, the materials, and the capital; or in terms of an authoritarian or democratic philosophy. Presumably, an understanding of the commodities and the philosophy automatically resulted in good administration.

Many administrators are already familiar with behavioristic terms in relation to evaluating a pupil's meeting of an educational objective but this approach had not been
applied to the discharge of their own functions. Writers on curriculum, such as Smith, Stanley and Shores, have stated that educational objectives must be "capable of reduction to behavioristic terms." Also, Kearney emphasized the importance of the "action pattern" or "disposition to do" in supplementing other levels of objectives.

Presumably the understanding of the commodities and the philosophy of education automatically resulted in good administration. The writer did not challenge the idea that the administrator must understand the commodities or philosophy but the writer assumed that this understanding was not enough. He believed that the administrator must act and that these actions were the significant part of administration even though he must behave largely in relation to the commodities and ideology of the situation.

It was not outrageous to assume that some behaviors were probably more important than others so this study attempted to identify the more important behaviors. If one assumed that administrators should learn to understand and practice the behaviors which were critical, then this study was presumably significant to practicing administrators, students of administration, and professors of admin-


As indicated, many situational and personal factors were thought to be affecting administration, but their effect upon administration could not be tested until the administrative response, the behavior, was defined which constituted effectiveness. If very specific behaviors were sought, such behaviors would vary from one situation to another, but this study aimed to consider categories of behavior found in all schools where good administration was found. Then the general behaviors found to be critical in this study were expected to be used in other studies as indicators of the relative influence of other factors such as personal and situational ones.

The few writers in administration who did deal with behaviors seemed to imply an infinite range of specific behaviors essential for the administrator in coping with the complex commodities and philosophy. Even if a long list were shown to be critical after adequate research, such a long list would not be very useful to the student of administration because he could not remember and incorporate into his practice all of the behaviors in the long list. There seemed to be a need for a manageable list of tested behaviors. This study was an attempt to bring some order to the wide range of possible behaviors by searching for the more prevalent ones. It was inferred from writers
in other fields that after much research the range of administrative behavior could be simplified and at the same time made more accurate as suggested below:

As a science matures, its theories reduce in number but broaden in scope. Small areas of research which at first generate their own ad hoc explanatory concepts come later to be recognized as special cases, variations, or different levels of organization of a general class of phenomena capable of being systematically related and adequately accounted for by a more economical set of ordering principles. This integrating tendency, as it progresses not only within a given science but also among its bordering disciplines, gives substance to the hope of an eventually unified science and a richer understanding of ourselves and the world.3

Origin of the Problem

This problem emerged from attempts by the School-Community Development Study at The Ohio State University to discover what educational administration is and what affects it. In the field studies some administrators were found to be effective and some were found to be ineffective. Thus the problem developed of describing effective administration. It seemed preferable to use observable behaviors rather than to use value judgments or value characteristics not observable.

It was commonly held that many different things or factors affect administration. The problem in this study was to find what these factors affect. Presumably, not

all administrators in the same situation would respond the same way. Some responses were more appropriate than others. What responses or behaviors were the best?

The emphasis upon the behavioral approach and leadership acts in the recent Ohio State University Personnel Research Board studies also gave impetus to this study.

Companion Studies

The staff of the School-Community Development Study considered the problem of identifying the critical administrative behaviors, a task significant enough to require the efforts of several persons. While administration is considered somewhat similar at the positions of the elementary principalship, the high school principalship, the executive headship, and the superintendency, behaviors may be manifested in somewhat different fashions in these positions. It was deemed necessary to actually test any presumption of similarity of behavior.

Four doctoral students at The Ohio State University with appropriate familiarity with the respective administrative positions undertook parallel studies of administrative behavior. In addition to the study of high school principals, Mr. Odean Hess made a study of elementary school principals, Mr. David Rosenberger made a study of executive heads (administrative heads of local school systems under the supervision of a local school board and the county superintendent representing the intermediate unit),
and Mr. John Hartzler made a study of city superintendents. The two studies of principals, covering the elementary school and the secondary school principalships, were not presumed to cover the whole range of principalships, such as from very small ones to very large ones, but the studies did cover common types of principalships. The study of executive heads covered a common type of administrative position in the small schools in Ohio and the study of city superintendents covered a common type of administrative positions in larger schools in Ohio. However, none of these studies were presumed to contain an exact representative sample of the whole range of respective administrative positions.

The four studies just described employed similar assumptions, designs, definitions, and methodology in order that results could be compared and used in further research. However, due to differences in the nature of the problems in the different positions, methodology in the treatment of data was not identical to all four. Also, differences in the background of the researchers probably caused them to employ slightly different methods of analysis of data.

The four researchers worked as a team during the time the studies were being formulated, during the selection of a sample, and during the early part of the time the data were being analyzed. Some of the reports of
deliberations of the team, with various advisors of the team and members of the School-Community Development Study staff, are included in Appendix A. Each member of the team applied reliability checks to the data of the other three as described in the later chapter dealing with the classification of data.

General Design of the Study

Since the unifying theme of the two hypotheses was the identification of behaviors associated with effective administration, the problem of determining effective administration was imperative. This problem of definition could have been a study itself but as a point of departure for this dissertation it was decided that effective administration was the behavior of effective administrators. For purposes of objectivity, the problem of naming effective or ineffective administrators was not attempted by the writer but was done by persons in a position to do so. Ratings of these persons served as a validating outside criterion with which observed behavioral data were grouped and compared. This independent jury, each member of which acting independently of the other, made a selection of five high school principals which they considered to be effective and five high school principals which they considered to be ineffective.

The researcher, who was deliberately unaware of the jury ratings of the effectiveness of the principals
selected for his sample, made periodic unstructured observations of the behavior of the subjects and recorded each behavior he saw. The descriptions of the behaviors were classified and counted. The frequency of various behaviors of the effective administrators was compared with the frequency of the ineffective administrators. Other analyses and comparisons were made. A more detailed step by step explanation of the procedures used will be found in Chapters III and IV.

Assumptions

The hypotheses and methodology of this study are based upon certain assumptions which are as follows:

1. The behaviors of high school principals are associated with their effectiveness.
2. The behaviors of principals were observable.
3. The behavior observed was approximately representative of the principal's general administrative behavior.
4. Experienced educators could rank high school principals into four groups on the basis of the principals' over-all administrative effectiveness.

Limitations of the Study

The smallness of the sample prevented generalizations, based on the conclusions of this study, about other administrators. The sample was necessarily small in order that, within the physical and financial limitations for
the whole study, more time could be spent with the ones actually selected. A larger sample would have resulted in fewer observations of those principals chosen.

The lack of a structured instrument for the recording of data resulted in the use of anecdotal descriptions which, in spite of considered precautions, may not be reliable.

Human error and these limitations in technique must be considered before the findings of this study are applied to other situations.

Organization of the Study

A brief but over-all view has been given of the problem, hypotheses, and methodology. Elaborations of concepts and methodology will follow plus findings and interpretations. Chapter II contains a review of the related literature which expands on the theoretical concepts and their origins. Chapter III deals with the methods used to collect data and Chapter IV deals with the complex problem and methods of placing the data in the various categories contained in the hypotheses. The findings and statistical analysis are presented in Chapter V and these findings are summarized, discussed, and interpreted in Chapter VI. Implications and recommendations for practice, training, and research are contained in Chapter VII and conclude the study.
Whereas the preceding chapter gave an over-view of the background of the study, this chapter contains a more elaborate review of the literature on leadership pertinent to this study. Such literature provides a point of departure for this study by suggesting which areas of investigation are worthwhile and which are not worthwhile. Also, it provides a setting in which this particular study can be compared, interpreted, and evaluated.

Relationships can be seen between this project and many others because this study deals with people and what administrators should do in relation to people: the teachers, the pupils, the community members, and the superiors. Thus, all of the knowledge and concepts of the behavioral sciences may have some relationship since society acknowledges no one group of people or scientific discipline the sole privilege of saying what is right or what should be done in these relationships. Each discipline and sub-group within each discipline offers ideas which may or may not be workable or acceptable. The task of examining the relationships of each discipline to this specific problem would indeed be so appalling that the significance of the hypotheses of this study would be obscured. However, the relationship of this study to some of the striking devel-
opments in administration and the study of leadership will be discussed after a brief consideration of the emergence of educational administration as a field of study.

The Development of Educational Administration

This study derived a part of its significance from the fact that there was a field called educational administration which many were endeavoring to develop and promote into a more exact science and art. There were not only professors and textbooks in the field but also considerable data in certain areas such as finance, accounting, public relations, personnel, plant, and curriculum.

The principalship and other administrative positions in education developed as schools and districts increased in size and complexity as a consequence of the growth of industry and population centers. The process of production and its administration became a subject for systematic investigation by persons such as Henri Fayol and Frederick W. Taylor. As the need for industrial and municipal management developed so did the need for educational management. Since accounting and controlling were prominent functions of the early educational administrators, it was suspected that the functions of business management were hastily copied without much thought concerning the unique purpose of the school as an institution and any administrator's differential role necessitated by this uniqueness.
The early principals or headmasters were usually at least former teachers to whom were given the additional functions of inspecting, accounting and controlling, possibly because of the expenditures for fuel and other school supplies.

As these functions of management became accepted, expertness developed, then the very function of the school, the educative process itself, became a matter to study as witnessed by literature concerning associative and then organismic learning. Eventually, developments in the instructional methodology caused the emergence of the function of the supervisor of instruction, often performed by a person with the title of supervisor. American ideals of democracy, more acute in the schools because of the concepts of academic freedom, provoked the concept that educational administration must be democratic. This had been and continued to be one of the most dominant themes in educational administration.

As additional social and applied sciences developed such as sociology, social administration, and political science, the concept of democratic social engineering became possible and was believed to be a function of the schools because the citizens of the future day were then in the schools and because no other institution contained as complete a cross section of the community. Such an important function required additional involvement of the
citizens because any planning was often suspected as being a threat to the existing order and because educational programs required vast expenditures of financial resources dependent upon the approval of the citizens. Public relations skills became urgently necessary for school administrators.

Another complicating factor making effective administration even more necessary was the increasing complexity of society, making it more difficult for a segmented society to understand a curriculum which was more complex. As citizens became more educated to fit into their peculiar niches, they became less capable of having perspective enough to objectively view other niches others advocated for the curriculum. Perhaps Thorstein Veblin's concept of the trained incapacity of specialists describes this dilemma well.

An unprecedented increasing tide of students currently accentuated the competition for staff, facilities, and finances. Increased revenues for schools accompanied by unprecedented taxation for other governmental functions stimulated proposals to eliminate the so-called frills, that is, the educational functions considered the least important. Administrators conscious of the importance of public relations found it difficult to eliminate functions without alienating potential supporters.

The new problems prompted new bodies of specialized
knowledge. Throughout the development of administration the dominant tendency was to abstract specialized kinds of information from the human setting in which they occurred. An entirely different approach was developing skill in studying each unique situation instead of developing specialized skills and knowledge. Thus science can be thought of as a method as well as a body of knowledge.

The idea that synthesis may be a major, perhaps even the main, task of advancing science was comparatively new and undeveloped. Yet the notion of synthesis, of seeing and acting in relation to diverse kinds of human and other phenomena inherent in administrative situations, would seem to be quite basic to the idea of administration itself. However, this approach was relatively undeveloped. In a sense this study dealt with this problem because it dealt with behaviors such as communicating and setting goals which may have facilitated the solving of problems regardless of the nature of the problems.

Since the posts of educational administrators embodied unresolved contradictions demanding tremendous responsibilities and insights, high standards of preparation were developed requiring not only experience in teaching but also additional training in educational purpose

and technique. Rewards included the satisfaction of serving as a leader in a significant community enterprise, considerable status, and the highest pay in the educational profession.

Since the administrator had considerable responsibility, status, and pay, few would deny him the right to be called a leader. Thus leadership studies seemed to be pertinent to the understanding of this position and the improvement of its incumbents.

Various Definitions of Leadership

Leadership was a matter of concern for many centuries and was originally considered a trait or traits. The language contained numerous phrases such as "leadership traits" and the culture contained many ideals or norms expected of so-called leaders which were based on the assumption that leadership traits existed. Formerly, these traits were usually considered supernatural or hereditary in origin and nature. Even today, monarchial heads of state, such as the ones in England, are assumed to be superior in certain traits which are presumably hereditary in nature. Many of the traits are invisible or are couched in moralistic terms such as "inviolable", "gracious", etc., which deter scientific inquiry. Due to the weaknesses of this notion of leadership other concepts have been developed. A report of the investigation of traits will follow a brief inspection of these other concepts of leadership.
Another popular assumption concerning leadership was that almost anyone could willfully exert leadership. Perhaps this notion was related to the development of democratic ideals. Another particular conception of leadership was Gibb's which defined leadership as the persons who exercised influence over others.

Whenever two or more persons interact in the pursuit of a common goal, the relation of leadership and fellowship soon becomes evident. It is equally evident, however, that this relationship does not necessarily take, persistently and continuously, the same direction. Everybody has known friendship in which one of the friends was persistently the leader while the other willingly followed. But, equally, one can recall friendship in which now one friend and then the other assumed the role of leader.2

Such a conception did not necessarily imply the study of the designated leader. It involved the study of all persons in the situation. Bales also assumed that this social centrality was the essence of leadership. In a school setting this approach would necessitate the involved study of teachers and pupils as well as principals.

There were several other notions or definitions of leadership. A quite different approach, based on the work of Freud (1922), was made by Redl (1942). If leadership was regarded as a relation, then the types of leadership generally identified should have been recognizable as ex-

pressions of different kinds of relationship. Redl introduced the concept of "central person" and distinguished the different types of emotional relationship between the central person and other group members. Redl used the term "leader" for only one type of relation, giving different names to the other types. The term leader was restricted to that relationship which was characterized by love of the members for the central person, leading to incorporation of the personality of the central person in the ego ideal of the followers, i.e., they wish to become the kind of person he is.\(^3\) Such an approach involved psychiatric concepts and techniques not usable by most investigators or understandable by most school administrators.

Jennings, Moreno, and others focused their attention on the sociometric choice and have developed a field called sociometry. This concept dealt with the popularity of persons on various dimensions which other studies have shown are not necessarily correlated with administrative leadership, the central focus of this study.

Hemphill defined leadership in terms of leadership behavior and anyone who frequently participated in these behaviors was considered a leader.\(^4\) This approach, also, 

\(^{3}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 881.}\)

\(^{4}\text{Ibid.}\)
did not focus on the designated leader and it ignored the special problems and position of the administrator.

Shartle and Stogdill used the individual in a given office as a point of departure. This simplified the problem considerably because positions were designated and fairly readily identifiable in an organization such as a public school system.

If leadership is concerned with goal oriented group activities, it seems appropriate to study those members of an organization who determine goals and objectives and who control the means by which these goals are attained. It is thus assumed that leadership in some form exists in top administrative positions, as well as at other levels in the organization. The question as to whether leaders or executives are being studied appears to be a problem at the verbal level only.\(^5\)

This point of departure was useful for attacking the problem in the field of education because administrators were recognizably delineated from other educators by title, functions, and certain other traditions. That was one reason why this conception of leadership was used in this study. Convenience alone, however, was not the only criterion by which the concept was chosen since the usefulness of a concept in producing reliable findings was considered.

The various concepts of leadership were briefly

described. Particular investigations of leadership from these various points of view will next be discussed.

Studies Regarding Leadership Traits

Since leadership was popularly perceived as being a trait there were persistent searches for the identification of these traits. Some of the traits which were studied by many different investigators, especially psychologists, in many different situations, are height, weight, physique, energy, health, appearance, intelligence, self-confidence, sociability, will-initiation, persistence, ambition, dominance, and surgency. Some of these traits such as height and sociability correlated positively with leadership but the degree of correlation was so slight that the investigators consider the traits rather insignificant. Also, the results of an investigator were not verified by other investigators. For instance, nine studies found leaders to be taller, two found them shorter, while Caldwell and Willaman suggested that the relation varies with the type of leadership activity.

Gibb summarized his impressive review of studies of leadership traits with the following conclusions:

a. The reviews reveal that numerous studies of personalities of leaders have failed to find any

---

6Gibb, loc. cit.

7Ibid., p. 884.
consistent pattern of traits which characterize leaders.

b. There is abundant evidence that member personalities do make a difference to group performance, and there is every reason to believe that they do affect that aspect of the group's behavior to which the leadership concept applies.

c. There may be a number of reasons that many researches have failed to establish a definite relationship between personality and leadership:

1). Personality description and measurement themselves are not yet adequate.
2). Groups studied are usually markedly different.
3). Leadership itself is known to be a complex, and probably not consistent, pattern of functional roles.  

Thus, Gibb did not rule out the existence of certain traits but concluded that the present definitions, methods, and assumptions may obscure these traits. He implied a "complex pattern of functional roles".  

Studies Regarding Leadership as a Function or Process

Several writers in the fields of public administration and school administration emphasized the importance of performing certain functions for the agency or group. Emphasis was not upon the trait of the administrator unless this trait was usefulness to the job of the group. Thus, leadership was said to be a function. In describing a function, such as "coordination" or "evaluation", the term
referred to no particular attribute of the leader or administrator but referred to an aspect of the job to be done. When leadership traits were considered, the criterion of effectiveness of a leader was whether he was followed, but when leadership functions were considered, the criterion of effectiveness of a leader was whether the group job was performed regardless of who did it.

One list of administrative functions included: planning, communication, coordination, problem-solving, and evaluation. These functions concerned the organization of the efforts of others. Another list included: improving the human relations within the group, furnishing expertness along certain lines, generating leadership in others, and coordinating the efforts of others.

When these leadership or administrative functions were arranged in a chronological order, that is, a function was identified which should precede the other functions and these other functions were listed in an orderly succession, the functions were often called component parts of the administration process. The 1955 yearbook of the American Association of School Administrations stated that the process of administration had many consti-


tuent functions and listed the more crucial ones as follows: planning, allocation, stimulation, coordination, and evaluation.¹²

There were also many other lists of administrative functions which seem just as valid. The beginning and end functions of each list were often similar but the other functions listed between the beginning and end ones were usually in a different order or of a different character. Also, administrators seemed to engage in several of the processes at the same time. Perhaps the functions were too broad to be viewed similarly by different persons. Different persons viewing the administrative process saw aspects of several functions at the same time. This overlapping produced confusion and prohibited adequate research based upon these concepts.

However, the search for functions embodied in leadership resulted in findings in group dynamics and sociometrics which were useful to school administrators. Especially significant were the principles about the nature of group needs and the conditions for changing group behavior. This knowledge about groups was helpful to the understanding of school staffs under the jurisdiction of the administrators alone since there had been a transition from man-

agement by an administrator to management by an administra-
tration - a group or cluster of administrators. 13

The clusters of administrators presented additional problems to those who would define the functions of a par-
ticular administrator because of the supplemental rela-
tionship of the cluster. The supplementing of abilities seemed to be determined by the particular personalities of administrators in a given school system and thus few generalizations could be drawn for other situations.

If the individual leader was to improve his leadership, perhaps leadership should have been couched in terms of consciously controlled behavior of the leader himself. The administrative functions, group functions, or social functions seemed to refer only to interpretations drawn by a detached third person observing the various effects of the leader on the other members of the group. However, any given administrator or trainer or administrators wondered what behavior of the doer was needed to bring about these correct effects upon others.

Studies of the Leadership Act or Behavior

Even if the administrative functions, just discussed, were identified, appropriate methods, means, or behaviors must be identified and applied to bring forth the func-

13Cyril L. Sargent, Eugene L. Bedisle, Educational Administration: Cases and Concepts, (Boston: Houghton Mif-

tions or desired effect, whereas some behaviors may express not only ends or functions, but also the means or methods. The verbal problem was to find action words which described the administrator's contribution to the advancement or maintenance of the institution - the school. Examples may include setting goals, making policy, and determining roles. The emphasis is upon the "-ing". If such behaviors could be found, administration can be greatly simplified and clarified because the confusion of ends and means and the old questions of whether the end justified the means could be eliminated. The hierarchy of ends over means would be eliminated, but a new hierarchy, a hierarchy of behaviors, would be created.

Several studies had been made of the leadership act or behavior. According to Gibb, "the most notable, and to date the most complete, researches directed to the determination of dimensions of leader behavior have been those of Hemphill and his colleagues in the Ohio State Leadership Studies."\textsuperscript{14} Leaders in business, education, and the Armed Forces were investigated. These nine postulated \textit{a priori} dimensions of leader behavior were investigated: initiation, membership, representation, integration, organization, domination, communication, recognition, and production. From these, four concepts emerged which were found

\footnote{Gibb, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 891.}
to be significant. They were listed here with the percentages of the total variance for which each accounts: consideration (49.6%), initiating structure (33.6%), production emphasis (9.8%), and sensitivity - social awareness (7.0%). These same dimensions were significant for school superintendents but to a different degree. The dimension called consideration was more important than the dimension called initiating structure for school superintendents.

In addition to the identification of particular behaviors, another significant point was discovered. Leadership was differently evaluated from above and below.

In an organization, those who hold superior positions to that of the leader or head under consideration expect of him that he will insist upon strict discipline, follow closely standard operating procedures, and emphasize production. On the other hand, the followers expect and value his mingling with them, his use of consultation procedures, his showing consideration for them and their needs, and his being socially sensitive.

Many have drawn the conclusion that the conflicting results of leadership behavior research proved that leadership is entirely situational. On the other hand, some such as Halpin have viewed this approach critically as


16Gibb, op. cit., p. 916.
indicated here.

Early research was marked by a search for traits of leadership that would discriminate between leaders and non-leaders. The situational emphasis which has characterized research during the past decade arose as a protest against the earlier trait approach, but in some respects this present emphasis may have been carried to excess. To say that leader behavior is determined exclusively by situational factors is to deny freedom of choice and determination to the leader. This violates common sense and experience. Even now, within research circles a gradual but growing counter-reaction is taking shape -- a drawing away from the extreme situational position, with increasing recognition that the truth probably lies in an area of middle ground.17

School-Community Development Study Research Regarding Leadership Behavior

The School-Community Development Study is the Ohio center of one of the eight Cooperative Programs in Educational Administration centers supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. All of these centers have engaged in studies of educational administration and have enlisted the efforts of scholars from several fields including education, sociology, economics, psychology, political science, journalism and other fields. Research at the various centers have utilized several different designs and have resulted in significant findings of many different types. Recurring emphases in these studies in-

cluded the professionalization of administration and the assumption that schools must be tied closely to the community in which the schools are found.

Nine of the hypothesized categories of administrative behaviors investigated for this study emerged from investigations and deliberations by the staff of the School-Community Development Study at Ohio State University field centers.

The categories of behaviors were:

1. Appraising effectiveness
2. Communicating
3. Coordinating administrative functions and structure
4. Determining roles
5. Involving people
6. Making and maintaining policy
7. Setting goals
8. Using educational resources of the community
9. Working with community leadership

These labels were constructed from analyses of anecdotal descriptions of administrative behavior. The original descriptions of behaviors in field situations were made by advanced students of educational administration.

18John A. Ramseyer, et. al., Factors Affecting Educational Administration, (Columbus, Ohio: School-Community Development Study, Ohio State University), pp. 18-55.
who observed various kinds of administrators over a period of two and one-half years. These categories represented considerable research in the field of educational administration and constituted the \textit{a priori} categories of behavior of this dissertation.

These nine categories of behavior were assumed to be stimulated by various elements in the administrative situation, namely personal factors and situational factors. The factors constituted the raw materials of the behaviors and should be understood by persons investigating the behaviors. The personal factors included:

1. Beliefs about the purpose of education
2. Beliefs about the function of administration
3. Beliefs and attitudes about authority
4. Beliefs and attitudes about cooperative action
5. Attitudes toward change
6. Beliefs and attitudes about the tentativeness of answers and solutions to problems
7. Intellectual ability
8. Self awareness
9. Professional knowledge
10. Professional skills
11. Physiological condition
12. Situational diagnosis
13. The problem solving approach
14. The sequence or cycle of administrative events
   a) Planning
   b) Deciding
   c) Managing
   d) Appraising

15. The drive or need to succeed

16. Adherence to principle or commitment to individual

17. The relative urgency of immediate pressures and long range goals

18. Perception of self

19. Perception of others

20. Perceptions of conditioning factors

21. Emotional resilience and versatility\(^{19}\)

The situational factors included:

1. Educational values held by people in the community

2. Nature of leadership in the community

3. Provisions made for the use of civic, human, and material resources

4. The status of school board membership

5. The quality of family life

6. Transitional nature of the community

7. Physical and material resources of the community

\(^{19}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 57-82.\)
8. The composition and character of the population
9. The dynamic character of community organizations and associations
10. Spiritual and religious institutions in the community
11. Complexity of business, industrial, and labor development
12. The nature of community service organizations
13. Power conflicts in the community

The situational factors listed above, constituting the milieu in which the administrator operates, will be seen in the anecdotal descriptions and explanations of behavior. The important behaviors identified in this dissertation will be used in subsequent studies to test the effect of both the personal and situational factors listed earlier.

\[20^{*}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ pp. 82-95.}\]
CHAPTER III

METHODS EMPLOYED IN COLLECTION OF DATA

This chapter contains a discussion of the methods and techniques used to collect data and a description of how this methodology was formulated.

Formulation of General Methodology

The general design of this study was cooperatively developed in a series of group meetings including the writer, the other three doctoral students engaged in the similar studies mentioned in Chapter I, the project coordinator of the four studies, who was also on the general advisory committees of all four of the graduate students, and occasionally other staff members of the School-Community Development Study. Minutes of these meetings, which appear in Appendix A, indicate that several approaches and designs were considered by the several persons involved. In addition to meeting formally, the doctoral students conducting the four comparison studies frequently dined together for a period of six months, and thus informally extended the opportunity for the exchange of information and criticism. This cooperative approach prevailed during the period of the formulation of the methodology, and during the period of the collection of data.

Since the problem was to identify effective and ineffective administration behaviors, it was decided that it
was advisable to actually observe the behaviors of effective and ineffective administrators. The technique of observation had been successful in the study of teachers and children. In these studies, educators were cautioned to observe the following rules in a chapter called "Learning to Describe Behavior" in a book written for teachers to use in observing students:¹

1. Try to avoid recording reactions of the observer. Record valid descriptions and analyses of the children in question giving what each person did or said and a description of the situation.

2. Avoid thinking of personality as characterized by a single prominent trait. The real basis of behavior is the interaction between children's needs and the pressures of concrete situations.

3. Avoid offering an immediate explanation of behavior without marshaling a body of facts.

It was decided that there would be at least four, preferably more, observations of each administrator including an initial explanatory conference, two one-half day observations including both a morning and an afternoon, a full day conference, and a teacher's or administrator's meeting. This comprised a total of more than fifty visits altogether in a three-month period. Also, written materials issued by each principal were to be examined.

To obtain objective evaluations of the administra-

tors it seemed logical to use a panel of qualified educators not prejudiced by the pleasant or unpleasant face to face contacts involved in the observations. That is, if an administrator should have intentionally or unintentionally deflated the ego of the observer, the observer might have tended to label the administrator as ineffective whereas other qualified persons with a long range evaluation of the administrator's behavior would have rated the person as effective. Similarly, the observer might have been likely to have rated those administrators effective who pleased him very much in his visits even though other qualified persons would have rated the person ineffective. Thus the so-called jury of qualified educators was composed of the principal's superiors, such as his superintendent or central staff members in direct contact frequently with the principal, officials in the State Department of Education who had had direct contact with the principals through inspections of high schools, professors of secondary education who knew the principals, and fellow principals who were elected as officers in principals' discussion groups and who knew the principals.

Since a contrast of effective and ineffective behaviors was sought, it was assumed that such contrasts would be manifested more clearly by principals at the extreme limits on a scale of effectiveness. Thus, principals were to be placed in quartiles according to their
effectiveness and only the principals at the extreme ends of the scale were to be used. Principals mostly in either the second or third quartiles, those next to the mean on either side, were to be excluded in the belief that the behavior of these principals who clustered near the mean would be so similar that differences could not be discriminated. Also, as was verified by the actual ratings, it was found that ratings for most principals would fall in more than one quartile. If principals were chosen in all four quartiles or in all divisions of the continuum regardless of the number of divisions, whether it be into quintiles, deciles, or whatever, these principals could not be characterized as effective or ineffective because they would represent degrees between effectiveness and ineffectiveness. Figure 1 illustrates the point that the behavior of principals B and C do not overlap even though the ratings were not unanimous. Principals who received a few ratings in the second quartile in addition to many in the first, could still be used without any overlapping with principals in the fourth quartile having a few ratings in the third quartile.

Due to the intensive type of study of the administrative behavior of the principals chosen, it was reluctantly concluded that time would permit only a few to be studied. From the forty-three high school principals which could adequately be compared, rated, and studied,
Figure 1 - Examples of a Principal Could Be Rated as

(A) Both Effective and Ineffective or
(B) Clearly on One Side or the Other Even
Though the Ratings Were not All in One Quartile.

ten were to be chosen, five from the first quartile and
five from the fourth quartile.

If the cooperation of the necessary persons was to
be secured, it was decided that many precautions would be
taken to see that the ratings of the jurors and the behav­
ioral descriptions were kept confidential. It was expected
that some persons would feel uncomfortable if these data
were disclosed so jurors were assured that their names and
their ratings would not be revealed. Code numbers were
used instead of names in order that ratings would be re­
turned in such a manner that any one rater could not be
distinguished from the other qualified raters. The report
of the study would omit names and data which would identify the persons involved.

This particular pattern of methodology seemed to not only fit the hypotheses and the unique difficulties involved but also it met the specific conditions necessary for reporting of usable behavior descriptions. According to Flanagan who was widely quoted in regard to behavioral descriptions, five specific conditions were necessary as follows:\(^2\)

1. The actual behavior must be observed. This was done.

2. The observer must have knowledge of the aims and goals of the individual in relation to the activity observed. The observer had recently been a high school principal in the same state as the high school principals observed and had studied similar literature at similar schools.

3. The specific judgment must be clearly defined. The judgment was defined for the jurors who made the judgment.

4. The juror must be qualified to make judgments of successful and unsuccessful behavior in the activity observed. The jurors making the judgment were qualified

educators in a position to make such judgments.

5. The conditions of reporting must insure a reasonable degree of accuracy. The observer was in a position to see and hear the behavior in question and to record it.

Selection of the Jury and Instructions to the Jurors

As was anticipated, the jury was selected from the administrative superiors of the potential sample, officials of the State Department of Education, professors of secondary education, and fellow principals with offices in the principal's organization.

Since it was unlikely that all jurors knew all of the potential sample of principals to adequately rate them, a plan was devised whereby the jurors would rate only the principals on the list which the jurors knew well. Consequently, it was decided that only those principals rated by at least five of the jurors would be included in the sample. The sample instruction and rating sheets, altered to preserve anonymity, appearing in Appendix B and C indicate that the jurors were not to rate anyone until they had studied the list and marked the ones they knew well enough to rate.

The jurors were also required to place an approximately equal number of jurors in each quartile. This precaution was necessary because it was believed that some raters would tend to place a disproportionate number of
principals in some of the quartiles. The earlier companion study had revealed that jurors or raters tended to place less than one-fourth of the total in the lower quartile.3

Jurors were sent the following items:

1. A letter intended to lend prestige to the project from the acting director of the School Community Development Study explaining the importance and general nature of the study.

2. A letter from the writer explaining the study as specifically as deemed necessary.

3. A blank ballot containing the names of the potential sample. This sheet could be divided in such a way that the marked portion could be separated from the names of the persons rated and returned to another research worker without any person knowing who gave the particular rating. Consequently, as planned, the tally of the ratings for the principals were unknown even to the writer until the observations and categorization had been completed.

4. A detailed but simple instruction sheet referred to the ballot.

3This experience was gained through assisting in the tabulation of jury ratings in the study by Odean L. Hess, "Critical Administration Behaviors of Elementary School Principals." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1955).
5. An addressed and stamped envelope for the return of only the checked and coded portion of the ballot.

These documents are contained in Appendices B, C, D, E, and F.

After the jurors had complied with the request for their ratings they were thanked for their assistance.

Ratings by the Jury

Some ratings were secured for all of the 43 principals listed. All raters did not agree as to where each principal should be placed. However, since only five principals were desired at each end of the continuum it was possible to secure the desired sample. Only principals were chosen for which there was substantial agreement, that is, there were ratings by at least five of the qualified jurors and the ratings were spread no further than a quartile adjoining the respective extreme quartile. Thus the ratings were not overlapping for the chosen sample.

It is interesting to note in passing that one of the principals not chosen received ratings from one end of the continuum to the other, and that for most principals there was substantial disagreement.

The Sample

In order to provide the jurors, who were top administrative staff, with principals with which they could
compare any given principal, it was necessary to choose dense population areas having several principals. This was possible without choosing the whole sample from large cities because some superintendents were familiar with the work of some high school principals not actually in the city school system, but in the same general area. However, if the superintendent did not know the principal in the adjoining district well enough, he did not rate him.

Principals of all schools were automatically excluded who did not devote more than one-half of their time to administration. Therefore, all of the schools with extremely small enrollments were automatically excluded. There were no other limits placed upon enrollment but actually no high school had an enrollment of more than 2200 pupils.

The sample was determined confidentially for the writers through the assistance of the authors of the three companion studies as planned without the observer-writer knowing at which end of the continuum the principals had been placed.

Permission to Observe

After thorough explanations of the nature of the study, the central administrative staff gave the writer permission to observe the principals in the respective systems. Then it became necessary to secure the permission of the principals involved. The writer made a personal visit
to the offices of each of the chosen principals, explained the purpose of the study, explained the number and kinds of observations to be used, and assured them that data would not be published which could reflect negatively upon any particular person's conduct. Permission was granted by every one of the chosen principals for the observer to make the observations. The observer became acquainted with the administrator and proceeded to form a relationship considered mutually conducive to the attainment of their goals.

**Observations of Administrators by Observer**

The observations proceeded as planned with almost no interrupting factors. However, when principals engaged in an entire half day or full day in some activity not typical of his usual administrative behavior, such as attending a state convention, a note of that behavior was made and a substitute half or full day was added to the schedule of observations.

The principals were very helpful in allowing the observer to sit in an effective but unobtrusive position as possible in the principal's office. Previously, it had been feared that the presence of the observer would create a very artificial situation. However, after the "get-acquainted" session and the first full one-half day observation the presence of the observer did not seem to interrupt the principal's routines. When the series of observations were being closed practically all of the subjects
said that they were surprised at how easy the relationship became after the first contacts. Perhaps this is a tribute to the poise of the principals. Another possible explanation might be that principals were quite accustomed to seeing other persons in the principal's office.

Principals had been assured that if a very confidential conference was imminent the observer would cheerfully withdraw from the scene after the slightest cue. This happened no more than once in any of the ten schools even though many tearful and heated episodes occurred including the corporal punishment of pupils and the dismissal of teachers from the staff. In cases when embarrassment was anticipated the observer busied himself, at least on the surface, with the literature at hand in the office or literature brought to the office for such occasions.

It was sometimes difficult for the writer to remain in the role of the observer. Since he was known to have been a high school principal in the same state, he was occasionally asked to discuss certain problems tempting him to step out of the role of the observer. Such occasions did provide behavioral descriptions but since these occasions were not uniform they were not actually used in the statistical comparisons unless significant administrative behaviors with other persons were involved. However, these occasions facilitated a relaxed relationship between
the observer and the principal.

The presence of the observer did not seem to bother the principal, the teachers, the students, or the parents, or other community members. However, the observer, without substantial supporting evidence, believed that the observations altered to some extent the relationship of the adult secretary and the assistant principal with a few of the principals. The observer believed that these persons seemed to be jealous of the interloping observer since they seemed to station themselves within earshot of the principal's office without any other apparent reason. The principal had been instructed by the observer in each case to inform his secretary, assistants, and others if desired, that the presence of the observer merely meant that some research was being done with the principal and that it would not interfere with the work of the principal or others.

Perhaps the slight uneasiness of the secretary or of the assistant principal was due to the fact that in some schools these persons were expected to enjoy almost exclusive entrance to the principal's inner office and the observer altered this routine. Also, their work was very dependent upon the whims and conversations of the principal so they naturally were interested or concerned.
Recording of Observations

The behaviors of the administrators were recorded by the observer on three by five index cards in as unobtrusive manner as possible. This recording seemed to disturb no one, perhaps, because educators were often seen writing things down, especially when seen with a professional magazine. All conversations and other behavior were recorded. Efforts were made to determine what problem the behavior was in relation to, if it were not readily apparent, and who the persons were who were involved.

The date, time, and sequence of the observation were recorded with the behavioral description. Pertinent descriptions of the situation were also included.

The rough notes were checked for completeness and accuracy and then dictated on recorders for clerical workers to type. The typed anecdotal descriptions were then checked for accuracy, edited, and divided as described in the following chapter. Whereas this chapter merely included a discussion of the methods of collecting the new data, the following chapter treats the process of categorizing the data preceding the analysis.
CHAPTER IV

THE CATEGORIZATION OF THE BEHAVIORAL DESCRIPTIONS

In this chapter the origin of the categories of behavior, the definitions of the categories, the problem of the units of behavior, the methods of tabulating, and the reliability checks will be explained.

The Origin of the Categories

The first two chapters of this study contained references to field studies made over a period of two and one-half years by the School-Community Development Study. From these field studies investigators believed that they had identified these nine categories of behaviors which described administrative behavior and determined whether the administrator was effective or ineffective:

1. Appraising effectiveness
2. Communicating
3. Coordinating administrative functions and structure
4. Determining roles
5. Meeting people
6. Making and maintaining policy
7. Setting goals
8. Using educational resources of the community
9. Working with community leadership to promote educational improvement.
Definition and Explanation of the Original Nine Categories of Behavior

The definitions of the categories of behavior were listed here along with hypothetical general illustrations which were actually used by the writer when he categorized the behavior and by the co-researchers when they performed a check for reliability. Specific examples of actual behavior were also added in this chapter to illustrate what was classified in each category. These definitions and illustrations were followed by a discussion of each of the categories of behaviors.

1. **Appraising effectiveness** was evaluating or analyzing the worth or status of an educational activity in terms of its effects or its relationship to its objectives, determining the effectiveness of persons in the roles which they were expected to perform, or verifying the continued existence of property or arrangements.

   A secondary school principal was appraising effectiveness when he:

   a. Formulated judgments concerning aspects of the school program or the performance of roles by participants in school affairs.

   b. Made judgmental statements concerning aspects of the school program or the performance of roles. This did not include what he did in the light of appraisal such as giving verbal appraisal in a person's presence which changed the person's role and thus was categorized as "defining role."

   c. Assayed or appraised the reasons for changes
which occurred in the school program or the development of the personnel.

d. Sought the judgments of others concerning change and growth.

e. Engaged in testing procedures.

f. Analyzed test data.

g. Made inspections of the school plant, facilities, and the general functioning of the school program.

h. Took inventories of school properties and materials.

i. Checked on the progress of work underway or the status of work without re-defining the role of persons.

j. Noted or recognized change or growth.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "appraising effectiveness" included the following:

The principal checked the wording of the public address announcement concerning the prohibition of parking.

The principal explained to the visitor that the honor system used in the school's snack bar worked beautifully and that less than one dollar was lost each year with such an arrangement.

The principal told the visitor that he usually treated the parents like older children. He (the principal) said that they (the parents) know no more about school than the principal knows about medicine or law and that we let our profession down by not using the insights our special training affords us.

The principal discussed with the teacher the merits of the unit on religion in American Problems classes.
Thus, "appraising effectiveness" was seen to be a category including several types of evaluating behavior in relation to the administrator's own behavior, the behavior of others, and aspects of the school program. Also, the process was often viewed as a cooperative venture.

2. Communicating was the deliberate interchanging or transferring of thoughts, opinions, or information concerning the educational program through speech, writing, or signals. The concept included behavior connected with the mechanical aspects of communication, as well as the function itself.

A secondary school principal was communicating when he:

a. Wrote or drafted messages, memoranda, bulletins, brochures, etc.

b. Provided for the mechanical media of communication: duplicated materials; dispatched messengers; delivered communications personally; used the telephone, mail, or intercommunication system; gave speeches; filed communications, etc.

c. Channeled communications passing through his office: relayed messages, distributed mail, distributed directives, etc.

d. Exchanged information through discussion, conversation, answering questions, sharing materials, etc.

e. Sought information by study, questioning, or more formal means, such as blanks, forms, etc.

f. Gave information through bulletins, announcements, memoranda, circulars, messages, etc.

g. Received information and instructions.
h. Reviewed plans or procedures for other persons.

i. Verified information by seeking authenticity, checking on reception, editing, etc.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "communicating" included the following:

In response to the telephone call, the principal asked the caller if the dog bite was serious.

The principal conferred briefly in the general office about a clerical matter.

When a student entered the office and asked where certain papers were, the principal explained that Mr. X took them.

The principal tried to phone the P.T.A. president of a company, but since the president could not be reached, the principal left his telephone number for the president to call back.

Obviously, all behavior capable of being observed was some kind of communication whether intentional or otherwise, or the observer could not have perceived it. Communication so broadly defined was meaningless as a category of behavior. However, a total of communicative behaviors thus defined was secured by merely summing up all of the behaviors. This again was an empty concept as a kind of behavior because such a total would fluctuate as the number of hypothecated other behaviors fluctuated. Therefore, the more restricted concept defined previously was used for this category itself. Other categories were developed for other ideas. If behaviors other than communication were present, the behavior was called by the
other label instead of communication.

Even thus defined it was easy to mistake the "communicating" behavior for other behaviors. It was tempting to read other behaviors into the anecdotal descriptions. For instance, in the description of behavior including: "... the principal left his number for the president to call back," one might have mistakenly categorized the description on the basis of what the principal and the president would have talked about. One might have labeled it "working with community leadership." However, such a categorization would have to assume something beyond the given data. The only actual behavior was that the principal called and left a message for the president to call back. Only an exchange of information occurred. If more behavior occurred later categorizable as something else, it was duly recorded only after it actually happened.

It was interesting to note that persons readily categorized a behavior as "communicating" when a material means of communicating was used such as a telephone or piece of paper. If the same words were said to the same people in the same way but without employing paper or telephone, due to a face-to-face relationship, persons were likely to call the behavior something other than communication. The material means was a powerful cue for the identification of this category called "communicating."
Sub-divisions of communicating behaviors were constructed and appear later in this chapter.

3. Coordinating administrative functions and structure was combining in harmonious action or relationship persons, activities, and materials in order that the instructional program could operate at a maximum level of efficiency. It included the performance of administrative functions on the part of the administrator and others. It seemed operative at several levels, from almost automatic facilitation to the abstraction of coordinating the entire educational program.

A secondary school principal was coordinating administrative functions and structure when he:

a. Carried through, supported, or reinforced administrative actions begun by someone else.

b. Settled competitive demands for time or facilities: scheduled, kept a calendar of events, constructed and used an agenda, made and kept appointments, etc.

c. Requisitioned and allocated supplies and materials.

d. Planned events and activities.

e. Carried through plans by assembling the appropriate factors of people, time, and facilities.

f. Made reports as needed by the central office.

g. Moved from the office to another location in order to attend to school business but did not primarily define the roles of persons.

h. Arranged for the presence of persons at appointed places and times.
Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "coordinating administrative functions and structure" included the following:

In the phone conversation concerning the other matter, already described, the principal (A) informed the principal (B) of the neighboring school of the victory luncheon planned for his (principal A's) school celebrating the passage of the 20 million dollar bond issue. He gave dates and plans.

When presented a paper by the janitor, the principal signed it and said, "The snack bar won't be open next Saturday night, and probably not next Tuesday either because the baseball game is away.

The principal asked a deliveryman by phone to deliver things for a program at a particular time at a particular door.

The principal said to the boy who was moving cars, "Since I am going back to the office I will give the keys to the assistant principal."

One of the central ideas here was that the principal operated with more than one thing in mind and combined the one element with the other in a satisfactory way. The complicating factor in the categorizing of this kind of data was the abstract nature of this concept. It seemed to be present only when two or more other behaviors were present. However, traditional means of coordination such as schedules, agendas, bells, etc., were helpful as cues for identification. Also, the coordination was often unmistakably revealed when the principal instructed someone to do something. In this event the behavior was also called "determining roles" which is discussed below.
4. **Determining roles** was deciding, designating, assigning, describing, resolving, modifying, or controlling the relationships which persons have to tasks or jobs.

A secondary school principal was **determining roles** when he:

a. Defined, explained, or interpreted a person's role to him; gave instructions, advice, orders.

b. Suggested to, outlined to, or told others what to do as an extension or modification of their roles.

c. Explained or interpreted a person's role to another person.

d. Made verbal corrections of behavior.

e. Settled conflicts as to duties and responsibilities.

f. Supervised another person's performance of role or his behavior.

g. Controlled the behavior of others through compliments, expressions of approval, warnings, manipulating social pressure, threats, manhandling, and other disciplinary action.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "determining roles" included:

When the principal was asked by a student if others could go to the track meet besides the track team, the principal said, "See the track coach."

In response to a question about whether the teacher could be out of class while she was helping a group of students the principal said: "I'll take the criticism from the faculty."

The principal told the activities teacher that he had a serious problem, he would have to ask her to
teach four periods next year.

When a teacher told the principal about her hus-
band's plan to do graduate work in another city
but that this plan was not yet definite, the prin-
cipal suggested that the teacher sign her con-
tract anyway and then resign if necessary.

The behavior seemed to comprise what many students
of administration, including Halpin, call structuring.¹
In fact, it contained so many different kinds of structur-
ing that it was later sub-divided, that is, "delegating
functions" was designated as a separate behavior.

5. Involving people was causing, seeking, or invit-
ing those persons in the school-community, who had a poten-
tial for strengthening the educational program, to parti-
cipate in, or become associated with, the school and
school-community affairs. The concept of involvement de-
noted participation rather than mere interest on the part
of individuals who were the objects of this kind of behav-
ior. This concept also included efforts to discourage the
participation of those persons whose motives were question-
able or whose ability to participate was doubtful.

A secondary school principal was involving people
when he:

a. Was a member of, or sought membership in, other
community organization.

¹ Andrew W. Halpin, Leadership Behavior of Aircraft
Commander and Educational Administrators, (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1952,) in toto.
b. Solicited support (financial or moral) for the school from large groups of people.

c. Formed or fostered organizations and committees whose task was to deliberate and advise on problems faced by the school.

d. Made speeches or appeared on programs in support of the school or in connection with school-community relations.

e. Encouraged and invited school personnel and community members to participate in school-sponsored activities.

f. Collaborated with community leaders and agencies in jointly sponsored school-community activities.

g. Engaged community members or patrons to perform unskilled and unpaid functions in the school enterprise: cafeteria workers, clinic aides, room mothers, chaperones, etc.

h. Recruited members for the teaching profession.

i. Conferred deliberately with persons on school matters.

j. Invited and encouraged community and school personnel to participate in making suggestions, plans, and decisions, and in evaluating and revising the school program.

k. Made plans to involve people in school affairs.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "involving people" included the following:

The principal called the president of a grade parents' organization and invited him to dine with the president of a college who was to be the main speaker at the parents' group meeting that evening.

In the executive meeting the principal tested the suggestions given by the assistant principal with other members of the faculty.
The principal conferred with a teacher concerning the budget for the following year.

In respect to flowers for the principals' luncheon, the principal said to the staff committee making the arrangements, "Who should I contact?"

Due to the emphasis placed upon cooperation and democratic procedure this behavior was expected to be found among educational administrators. The rationale for this behavior might be similar to that of a slogan contest - get as many persons interested as possible and then these persons will think the project is their's and they will support the project. This reasoning seemed to be perfectly legitimate in school administration since the schools in a general sense do already belong to all.

6. Making and maintaining policy was the setting-forth of principles or the establishment of a course of action or procedure to provide guidance to members of the school organization, or to other persons who enter into a participatory relationship with the school, for their behavior in subsequent situations. Policies may be applicable to the use and disposition of school properties and materials as well.

This concept embraced supporting, and abiding by, policies emanating from higher echelons of authority. It included enforcing, or modifying, existing policies at the administrator's own level. It included explaining and interpreting existing policies to people when their inten-
tions or behavior challenged those policies or pointed up a need for new ones. It included leading the faculty in making policy.

A secondary principal was making policy when he:

a. Set or established precedent by his behavior in a situation.

b. Set-forth or verbalized principles which were to guide the actions of himself, the school staff, pupils, or community members having a participatory relationship with the school.

c. Permitted use of school facilities by community members and other educators.

d. Approved the proposed plans of staff members involving interclass or school-community relationships.

e. Affirmed and followed policies, procedures, and instructions from the central office.

f. Interpreted or explained existing policies to staff and community members.

g. Set, or reminded personnel of, deadlines in recurring situations; periodic reports, etc.

h. Sought clarification of, or suggested changes in, established operational procedures.

i. Made decisions in crisis situations which involved a challenge to existing policies.

j. Proposed new ways or changes in meeting the requirements of a situation.

k. Agreed to cooperate with ventures proposed by other community elements.

l. Enforced or emphasized existing modes of operation and policy.

m. Accepted gifts and contributions, on behalf of the school, from community sources.
Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "making and maintain-
ing policy" included:

When a teacher asked about the absence procedure on the day of the baseball tournament, the principal explained that absences before 2:00 would be illegal but after 2:00 would be legal.

The principal conferred with the assistant maintenance chief from the central office concerning the buffing of the gym floor. The principal pointed out that regardless of how fancy the maintenance man made the floor, the school was going to use it that night for a dance.

In the planning session of the executive meeting (described in other anecdotes) the principal said: "These two hours have been about enough for today, don't you think?"

After the principal discussed with the assistant principal, who was coordinator of research, the questionnaire the principal had received, which would require 40 minutes' time of two-thirds of the staff, the principal said that the decision to cooperate would probably be decided on the basis of whether the study would contribute to the goals of the school.

The making or maintaining of policy dealt with the structure or the more stable part of the institution instead of the fleeting aspects. It enabled persons to predict how things were to be determined.

7. Setting goals was fixing, formulating, or help-
ing to formulate objectives, aims, purposes, or points toward which effort or movement could be directed.

A secondary school principal was setting goals when he:
a. Set deadlines, by which time, a specified state of progress or accomplishment was to be achieved.

b. Described conditions which he, as the administrator, wished to bring about: changed social climate, changed physical setting, changed attitudes of school or community personnel, etc.

c. Identified or described changed behavior toward which effort could be directed: more parental participation in school affairs, no fighting on the playground, improved teaching, etc.

d. Set up standards of achievement: scholastic, attendance, athletic, musical, etc.

e. Indicated professional status to which he aspired for his associates: membership in organizations, election to office, certification, acquiring degrees, etc.

f. Set-forth statements of the desired end-products of the school's operation.

g. Modified or extended existing goal-statements.

h. Suggested solutions to problems in such a way that the suggestion represented a goal to be attained.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "setting goals" included the following:

To the two teachers he was conferring with regarding commencement exercises, the principal suggested that some student sing the benediction in order that more music and senior talent be added to the program.

In the conversation (described in another anecdote) the principal said that he wished we could all retain our sense of humor.

In the conference of the executive committee concerning the planning conference, the principal asked the teacher reporting a certain suggestion
if she had any alternatives the group could consider.

A student was conferring with the principal concerning the program for the following week which involved the placing of living evergreens on the stage in tubs in order that the evergreens could later be used to landscape the new addition to the building. The principal merely said to the student, "Where will you borrow the tarps?" Since nothing had previously been mentioned about tarps the observer considered this question the principal's subtle way of suggesting that something would have to be done to protect the floor.

This category of behavior, "setting goals", sometimes seemed to be quite similar to the previous category, "making and maintaining policy", as shown in the last anecdotal description. This last illustration was labeled setting goals instead of making or maintaining policy because there was more emphasis upon an aspiration than there was upon a requirement; however, elements of both were present. Often the goal was so evident and reasonable that no requirement was necessary to prompt persons to work toward the goal.

8. Using educational resources of the community was utilizing persons, organizations, groups, facilities, objects, materials, or wealth in the school-community having an educational potential so as to provide more effective learning experiences for children. The concept included strengthening both the instructional and service programs through utilizing resources. Persons within the school organization used in a capacity other than their
official assignment were also considered resources in this unofficial capacity. Thus a teacher could share a hobby with another classroom group which was studying related material. The same teacher sharing her hobby with her own class would not ordinarily involve administrative attention.

A secondary school principal was using the educational resources of the community when he:

a. Purchased or secured supplies and equipment for educational purposes within the community which were unavailable through regular channels.

b. Secured the loan of articles and materials for teaching purposes.

c. Arranged for school personnel to visit places and conduct interviews in the community.

d. Arranged for community members to share their special skills, experiences, hobbies, etc., with school personnel.

e. Provided for special professional skills not available within the school, as needed: medical, dental, psychiatric, educational specialists, etc.

f. Made available to the school his personal educational resources: pictures, films, objects, hobbies, etc.

g. Recommended resources to teachers.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "using educational resources of the community" included the following:

The principal sent three teachers to a school in a nearby city to find out about the remedial reading program there for the best students of the senior class.
The principal made arrangements with the Ford Foundation for an experiment whereby high school students took freshman college work.

The principal arranged for an exchange student from France, currently in the community, to meet with the high school French class.

After the principal had arranged to get a list of the students majoring in electrical engineering to the business requesting it, the principal said, "I like to help on things like that so that I can get industry to give us the equipment that we need, help us on career day, give our students jobs, and give us opportunities for our Cooperative program."

The rationale for this category of behavior undoubtedly developed from the modern emphasis upon use of varied life-like educative experiences to supplement the traditional textbook and lecture type instructional presentation. Other categories of behavior, including the following one, concerned relationships with the community. However, "using educational resources of the community" was limited to relationships specifically concerned with students' instructional opportunities.

9. Working with community leadership to promote educational improvement was identifying and utilizing for educational ends any sources of power, influence, status, prestige, authority, and control present in the community.

A secondary school principal was "working with community leadership" when he:

a. Identified, or sought to identify, existing power-groups and persons.
b. Participated in activities with community leaders.

c. Exerted leadership in, or gave support to, the formulation of new power structure.

d. Solicited financial or moral support for specific school purposes such as in the endorsement of his plan for modifying school enrollment, the purchase of new equipment, and contributions to a school fund.

e. Sought specific services for the school-community from government agencies, civic groups, merchants' organization and similar organizations. This service included playground, facilities, additional police and fire protection, classroom equipment, student employment opportunities, and other educational advantages.

f. Lobbied for educational legislation.

g. Manipulated influence and power such as by extending courtesies or privileges to community leaders.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal description of observed behavior categorized as "working with community leadership" to promote educational improvement included the following:

Upon request, the principal gave the industrial executive a list of graduates in college majoring in electrical engineering. The industrial executive wanted these boys in order to give them jobs for the summer and to have the opportunity of attracting them to the company after graduation from college.

After attending the power and light company's amateur production of Brigadoon, the principal called the company and told them how he enjoyed it.

The principal called an executive of a large downtown industry and arranged for the industry to finance a banquet at the best hotel for the execu-
tive committee of a state educational organization of which the principal was a member.

In the telephone conversation with X, concerning the PTA member Y objecting to the giving of award certificates to graduating seniors the principal said, "I'll ask Mr. Z. (a very prominent person in the community) to talk to Y. Y might not know how important it is to have these."

Working with community leadership was considered important because a favorable relationship with community leaders was presumed to be essential to acquire access to the resources of the community useful to accomplish modern educational aims. Many governmental and private youth serving agencies were independent of the board of education so much cooperation was required for even the minimum school program.

This has concluded the definition, explanation and illustration of the original nine categories of behavior.

Persons-Behaviors-Were-In-Relation-To

Other studies showed that even though leadership resided in individuals it was by virtue of their interaction with other persons. Leadership must therefore be studied as a relationship between persons.

Each anecdotal description included the naming of the categories of persons the behaviors were in relation.

---

These categories of persons provided useful referents for recording anecdotal descriptions, provided another way of categorizing the behavior itself, a way of analyzing the data, and aids for the interpretation of the data.

Readily identifiable and stable categories of persons were designed and defined as follows:

1. Pupils enrolled in the given school.

2. Student office aids drawn from the student body assisting with clerical work in the office. (The shift in terminology from pupils to students was intentional to lessen confusion between this category and the previous one.)

3. Teachers on the staff of the given school attendance unit.

4. Assistant principals of the given school assistant to the principal described.

5. Non-certified personnel including paid secretaries, custodians, and cafeteria workers.

6. The superintendents, board of education, or board of education personnel, higher in authority than the principal described.

7. Parents of the pupils enrolled in the school.

8. Adult members of the community other than parents or staff members.

9. Educators other than ones in this given school district.

The categories of persons listed above appear hereafter in the abbreviated form as follows: pupils, student office aids, teachers, assistant principal, non-certified personnel, superintendent-board of education, parents, other community members, and other educators.
Units of Behavior

Some method was necessary to measure the behavior observed. Since rating systems seemed to be inadequate, due to the great possibility of subjectivity, it was decided that the frequency of occurrence would be used. A frequency count required a system of standard units which units when counted and totaled approximated the totality of behavior in the respective categories. Therefore, as many different bases of units were considered as possible.

The classification of units involved two types of problems, one involving a division of behavior in such a way that appropriate parts of the total description could be separated into the various categories previously described and one involving the division of behavior belonging in any given category into constant parts making frequencies reasonably comparable. Figure 2 illustrated the two types of problems.

In order to find a satisfactory definition of a unit of behavior several bases were investigated.

1. Each sentence of verbal behavior of the principal constituted a unit of behavior.

This basis was rejected because colloquialisms presented difficulties of ascertaining where one sentence began and another finished. Most of the behavior which was oral verbal behavior was composed of incomplete sentences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Units of Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraising effectiveness</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Functions</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining roles, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Categories</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Categories</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aIdeal unit of behavior because it represented one category and occurred once in that category of behavior

^bUnit less than ideal because it extended into more than one category of behavior

^cUnit less than ideal because it was less than one full unit and if counted would thus contribute to an erroneous total

^dUnit less than ideal because it was more than one full unit and total of units too large would be erroneous

Figure 2 - Problems Involved in the Construction of Units of Behavior
more than one of which was necessary for intelligible categorization or interpretation of any kind.

However, the observer's concern about the completeness of the principal's sentences, especially in regard to objects and indirect objects, alerted the observer to the fruitful search for whom-the-behavior-was-in-relation-to. Proceeding with grammatical analysis, attempts were made to find variations in the verbs used to describe what the principal did. Such variations were expected to constitute units. Units of force and kinds of doing were investigated but this search was not fruitful enough to provide an adequate basis of units. In order to discriminate between kinds of "doing" some object such as a telephone seemed to be necessary. Such objects were nouns as such or implied it as in the verb "telephoning".

2. Each sentence of the anecdotal descriptions by the observer constituted a unit of behavior.

This basis was rejected because the type and number of sentences depended more upon the literary character of the observer than upon the behavioral characteristics of the principal.

3. The interval between times the principal changed the intent or goal of his behavior defined a unit of behavior.

This basis was rejected because no method was available to an observer, within the design of this study, to accurately and reliably determine the intention of the
4. The predominant behavior which occurred in a given defined amount of time (such as in a 60 second period) constituted a unit of behavior.

This basis was rejected because any given amount of time often contained more than one significant behavior and the vast majority of given amounts of time, such as minutes, contained no significant complete behavior. The significant behaviors were usually grouped together.

5. The predominant behavior in the interval between pauses in the behavior of the administrator defined a unit of behavior.

This basis was rejected because the vast majority of these situations or intervals contained more than one significant behavior. In fact, the behaviors tended to be clustered together.

6. The interval between shifts in the direction of the principal's behavior from one person to another defined the unit of behavior.

This concept of whom-the-behavior-was-in-relation-to greatly affected the progress of this study, especially by providing referents for the behavior and encouraging the search for referents other than people but this basis was not the sole basis for the construction of units of behavior. The concept was rejected as a sole basis for the construction of units because even though it distinguished between persons whom the principal dealt with. However, such a system did not insure that any given unit
could be classified in any one category of behavior, because a principal could have more than one consecutive behavior with one person before he shifted to another person. Thus this system would not distinguish between the behaviors.

7. The responses of the recipients of the administrator's behavior constituted units of behavior. Since leader behavior was significant mostly to the extent that it affected in some way the persons led, significant units of effect or significant units of response of others were desired. However, this basis was rejected because the response of hundreds of persons affected, in classrooms and in the community and contacted by remote means, such as by telephone or by way of teachers, was out of the sight of the observer. Also, different observers could have assumed different effects of the behavior. Also, an a priori assumption was that the direct behavior of the administrators would be observed directly instead of indirectly through its effect upon others.

8. The inherent uniqueness of each category of behavior determined the system of units for that given category.

In such a system the units for a behavior such as "communication" would be different and perhaps smaller than the units for a behavior such as "making policy". The behavior "making policy" could contain several communicative behaviors. There seemed to be considerable merit in a
system in which the units were adapted to each peculiar behavior but such a system was not initially possible with the type of research design used in this study. In this study, units of behavior were prepared before the data were categorized in order to present these data to co-researchers for reliability checks. If the types of units of behavior varied with the behavior and these categories were prepared in advance of the categorization of the data, the co-researchers in performing the reliability checks could have ascertained too soon the category in which the researcher placed the behavior. Thus, this reliability check would not have been possible.

9. Each and every significant aspect of behavior constituted a unit of behavior.

Since emphasis was placed here upon "significant" the term must be clarified further. Each relatively indivisible aspect of behavior, such as "praised a student", constituted a behavior and when clustered together with other small aspects, such as "scrutinized pupil's record card" constituted a third unit of behavior such as "the principal conferred with a pupil" which was significant on another basis. This latter concept which included a more overall view could almost be viewed as a situation because it consisted of more than one behavior. The same anecdotal description containing more than one aspect of behavior was categorized in more than one way. This eighth
basis for units of behavior was the basis primarily used in this study to as great an extent as possible.

In order to make the smaller aspects meaningful when standing alone other related aspects were included in the sentence as dependent clauses or parentheticals. When such an aspect was listed more than once in the data to clarify meanings of latter aspects, the duplicate appearances were marked in such a way that the duplicate appearance itself would not be erroneously counted more than once. Here is an example of how cognizance was taken of another aspect already categorized but was not to be considered as data for categorization in this description. "In the reported conference between the principal and the pupil concerning truancy, the principal merely assigned the pupil to detention." The dependent clause at the beginning of the sentence indicated that the conference had been considered once. The conference had to be mentioned here to make the action of the principal intelligible. This repeating of essential data without danger of double tabulation made it possible to consider simultaneous behaviors.

Reliability Checks

All of the data were categorized by the observer-researcher-writer on the basis of the categories of behavior and units of behavior previously described. Since it was feared that the observer-researcher-writer might categorize the same behavior differently than other persons,
provisions were made for reliability checks by the co-researchers on the same data. Therefore, ten per cent of the cards containing the behaviors were withdrawn from the others to provide data upon which the reliability checks were to be performed. All of the cards had been numbered consecutively and the ones withdrawn were picked at random by means of using a table of random numbers.\(^3\) The randomization of the choice of the ten per cent was for the purpose of securing as representative a sample as soon as possible.

Each of the three co-researchers independently selected the descriptions without knowing how anyone else had categorized the same data. Then the results were compared. When it was found that any one rater placed a sample description in the same category as another rater, this consistency was called an agreement and when any rater placed a sample description in a different category than any other rater this inconsistency was called a disagreement. Then total agreements and percentages of agreement were computed for each possible pair of researchers, the average was computed for the percentage of agreement between the observer and three co-researchers, and an average percent was computed for all of the possible combinations.

The average percentage of agreement among the four who categorized the data were as follows:

- Between co-researcher A and writer-researcher 75.2
- Between co-researcher B and writer-researcher 80.4
- Between co-researcher C and writer-researcher 70.3

Average of co-researcher's agreements with writer-researcher 75.3

- Between co-researcher A and B 64.3
- Between co-researcher A and C 55.6
- Between co-researcher B and C 67.1

Average of all six possible combinations 68.8

It can be seen that these percentages of agreement varied from 59.6 to 80.4 but at all times constituted a majority agreement.

**Method of Handling Data**

Each unit of described behavior divided as explained in the previous section was typed on cards of the type shown in Figure 3. A code had been devised for each piece of information about the principals, such as the name of the principal, when the behavior was observed, who the behavior was in relation to, and ultimately the category into which the administrative behavior was placed. These coded data were then placed on the cards by punching out, with a special hand punch, the area of cardboard between the numbered holes and the extreme edge of the cards.

This system made it possible to readily locate the
cards of any type coded. One merely inserted the needle shown in outline in Figure 3 in the numbered hole corresponding to the category desired and lifted up. The cards which were not lifted up, and thus dropped out, were the cards desired. The friction between the sides of the several cards sometimes prevented all of the cards of a particular type desired from readily falling out so visual inspections were necessary to insure accuracy.

There have been discussed in this chapter the original nine categories of behavior and how the anecdotal descriptions were placed in these categories. The results of the categorization will be considered in the following chapters.
Figure 3 - Type of Card Upon Which Each Unit of Behavior Was Recorded and the Type of Needle Used to Select Any Category of Cards.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The categories and units of behavior which were described in the previous chapter were tested firstly, for their adequacy to describe all administrative behavior and secondly, to discriminate differences in effectiveness.

Data Relevant to the First Hypothesis

The first hypothesis was that the administrative behavior of high school principals could be described by the original nine categories of behavior. The usefulness of the categories is almost entirely dependent upon the second hypothesis, the question of whether differences in these dimensions are related to effectiveness, but first the problem of inclusiveness is considered.

After some difficulty, which will be explained later, the researcher was able to place all of the anecdotal descriptions into the original nine categories except for a certain large quantity of data which needed at least one other category for classification. Thus the finding for the first hypothesis was negative. The original nine categories of behavior did not describe all administrative behavior. However, when the tenth category of behavior was established, called "fostering human relations" by a co-researcher, and later changed to "showing consideration" by
the writer to indicate that it was the verb form of the original dimension, identified by Halpin called consideration,\(^1\) all of the administrative behavior could be categorized. By this time in the development of the study, the four co-researchers had all discovered in their own and each other's data the presence of behaviors which seemed to be quite different from the rationale of the original nine categories and which seemed to be readily classifiable as fostering human relations or showing consideration. Thus, since all saw the presence of this element and the inadequacy of the original nine, it was decided that this tenth category would be tested in the reliability check applied by the co-researchers to ten per cent of the data.

Since it was found that the percentages of agreement varied from 55.6 to 80.4 but at all times constituted a majority agreement, it can be said that it was possible to classify all of the data within the ten categories and reasonably reliably so indicating that the set of ten categories could describe administrative behavior. No further claims about the exhaustiveness of this set of ten are made except that all of the data could be placed in these categories.

It should also be noted that none of the ten categor-

\(^1\)Andrew W. Halpin, Leadership Behavior of Aircraft Commanders and Educational Administrators, (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1952), in toto.
ies were completely superfluous. Table I indicates that each of the ten categories contained some of the administrative behavior. However, when one considers that the frequencies listed in Table I are the totals for ten administrators one can see that the last four behaviors occurred very infrequently compared to the other six.

Data Relevant to the Second Hypothesis

The second hypothesis of this study was that effective and ineffective administrators would differ in respect to these categories or dimensions of behavior.

This later hypothesis has been tested by comparing the average frequency of behavior for the effective with the average frequency of behavior for the ineffective principals.

The use of percentages of the frequency of one principal's behavior of any one type of all frequencies was considered as a measure to replace the straight frequencies. However, the percentage method was rejected because such percentages would vary with changes in total frequencies and the total frequency of behaviors increased as new hypotheses were added. Also, in comparing one kind of a principal's behavior with another kind of his behavior, equal appearing percentages, such as 10 per cent, could actually represent things which were quite different; i.e., one frequency could have been fifty while the other was only five.
The rather consistently high frequencies of behaviors of the effective principals indicated that the dimensions represented by the categories of behavior tended to be positively correlated with effectiveness.

The tabulation of frequencies, grouped according to whether the principals were rated as effective or ineffect-
tive, the means of each respective group, and results of
the Chi Square tests of significance are presented in
Table II.\(^2\) Under each category of behavior there are sub-
categories of kinds of persons the behavior was in relation
to as defined in the previous chapter. The sum of the fre-
quencies appearing after all nine of these sub-categories
is not necessarily equal to the total frequency of behavior
listed after each category of behavior because any given
behavior may be in relation to more than one category of
persons. Also, a few categories of behavior, such as "seek-
ing recorded data", were not necessarily in relation to any
category of persons.

Principal H-1 lacked an assistant principal and
principal H-3 lacked student office aids. Therefore, means
were calculated by leaving these principals out for these
respective categories of persons.

Non-certified personnel contacts consisted mostly of
contacts with the secretary. There were few contacts with
janitors, cafeteria workers, or bus drivers.

It can be seen that even though there were differ-
ences in the average frequencies of each behavior for the
effective and ineffective groups of administrators only

\(^2\)Chi square = \(\frac{\text{fr_0 - fr_E}}{\text{fr_E}}\), Allen L. Edwards,
Statistical Analysis For Students in Psychology and Educa-
### TABLE II

**FREQUENCY, ANALYSIS OF FREQUENCY, AND CHI SQUARE TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF TEN BEHAVIORS OF EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>Frequency of Behaviors of all 10 Administrators</th>
<th>Effective Administrators</th>
<th>Ineffective Administrators</th>
<th>Level of Significance of Chi Square Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H-3* H-4 H-5 H-6 H-8 Average</td>
<td>H-1 H-2 H-7 H-9 H-10 Average</td>
<td>.05 .02 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. APRAISING EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>262**</td>
<td>23 42 47 21 19 30.4</td>
<td>11 43 21 13 22 22.0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils***</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4 17 11 4 5 8.2</td>
<td>4 15 4 2 10 7.0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0.3</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9 8 14 3 6 8.0</td>
<td>2 7 3 1 1 4.0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5 4 3 0 0 2.4</td>
<td>- 1 0 1 1 0.5</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0 1 2 5 2 2.0</td>
<td>2 1 5 1 2 2.2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 0 2 2 2 1.2</td>
<td>3 3 2 0 1 1.8</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 2 0 1 1 0.8</td>
<td>0 6 1 0 0 1.4</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. abrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 1 2 2 2 1.5</td>
<td>0 7 2 0 0 1.8</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 1 1.0</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 1 3.0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- * Denotes that average frequency for the given effective administrators' behavior was significantly greater than that of the ineffective group according to the Chi square statistical test.
- 0 Denotes that the difference of the average frequencies of the two groups was not significant.
- - No data was available since this category of persons did not exist in this school.
- ** Code name for principals studied.
- *** Frequency in this category of behavior irrespective of categories of persons behavior was in relation to.
- ** Breakdown under each behavior denoting categories of persons behaviors were in relation to.
### TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>Frequency of Behaviors of all 10 Administrators</th>
<th>Effective Administrators</th>
<th>Ineffective Administrators</th>
<th>Level of Significance of Chi Square Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>R-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other con. mb.rs.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. COORDINATING ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>All 10</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. COORDINATING ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other con. abrs.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DETERMINING ROLES</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other con. abrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. INVOLVING PEOPLE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors and Persons</td>
<td>All 10 Admins</td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>H-5</td>
<td>H-6</td>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>H-8</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>H-5</td>
<td>H-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. INVOLVING PEOPLE</strong> (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. str.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. MAKING AND MAINTAINING POLICY</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. str.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. SETTING GOALS</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>All 10 Administr</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8 Average</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10 Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. SETTING GOALS (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. mbres.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. USING EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. mbres.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors and Persons</td>
<td>All 10 Admins.</td>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>H-5</td>
<td>H-8</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>H-9</td>
<td>H-10</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WORKING WITH COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Ed. of Educ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. membs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
/ Denotes that average frequency for the given effective administrators' behavior was significantly greater than that of the ineffective group according to the Chi square statistical test.
0 Denotes that the difference of the average frequencies of the two groups was not significant.
- No data was available since this category of persons did not exist in this school.

* Code name for principals studied.
** Frequency in this category of behavior irrespective of categories of persons behavior was in relation to.
*** Breakdown under each behavior denoting categories of persons behaviors were in relation to.
differences for communicating were significant at the 5% level. Also, communicating was significant when considered only in regard to teachers.

Other analyses of the data presented in Table I and Table II follow after other constructs necessary for the further analysis are explained.

The Emergence of New Categories

The investigator thought he saw other vast differences between the administrators which the ten categories did not reveal. It was stated earlier that it was possible to place all of the anecdotal descriptions of behavior into the ten categories but that this task was difficult. The writer believed that even though the data could all be compressed into the ten categories the data could not only be more conveniently placed into additional categories but also that additional categories or dimensions could be constructed which discriminated between effective and ineffective administrators. It repudiated the first hypothesis, which was already repudiated by the discovery of the category called showing consideration, because it denied the inclusiveness of the original list of nine categories. It increased the list of behaviors investigated to twenty-three. There was no reason why hypothesis number two, concerning the critical nature of certain behaviors in determining effectiveness, could not be applied to all of these
new categories in the same fashion it was applied to the original nine and subsequent one already described.

Thus as categories emerged definitions and illustrations were carefully constructed and data originally classified into a certain category were classified again if it fitted the new categories. The new categories with definitions, illustrations, and explanations already defined are presented below. Many of the additional categories are sub-divisions of the original ones, e.g., having information distributed is a sub-division of communication. It was not possible to put all of the additional ones on the same level because the original ones were not on the same level.

Definition and Explanation of the Additional Fourteen Categories of Behavior

The categories discussed previously were those which were contained in the original hypotheses and were largely constructed before this study began. Additional categories are similarly presented here and discussed in a parallel fashion.

A researcher who conducted the comparison study on elementary school problems identified another behavior when he analyzed his anecdotal descriptions. He called
this behavior "fostering human relations." This behavior was also described as essential by the Ohio State leadership studies under the label of "consideration." The label "showing consideration" was devised to include the two ideas and it was added to the original list of categories of behavior. It is explained here as were the original nine.

**Showing consideration** (or fostering human relations) was recognizing the personal integrity, dignity, and worth of individuals in the school-community through social interaction by some act of kindness.

A secondary school principal was showing consideration when he:

a. Observed common social amenities by greeting, welcoming, apologizing, begging pardon, thanking, and showing these courtesies.

b. Behaved in a supporting fashion toward other people or raised their status by congratulating, encouraging, giving assurance, sympathizing, permitting complaints, etc. This was not to be confused with the principal's control of the role of persons in his administrative span of control through complimenting and supporting.

c. Engaged in personal conversation with school personnel in the manner of chatting, joking, teasing, kidding, etc.

d. Arranged the physical setting and facilities to facilitate inter-personal and group identific-

---


4Halpin, _loc. cit._
tion, awareness, and exchange of thought.

e. Extended personal or institutional hospitality, beyond common social amenities.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as showing consideration included the following:

After lunch the principal went to the teachers' lounge and smoked and joked with the teachers.

The principal took a phone call which was evidently about some printing being done for the school. The principal said, "You sound differently today, maybe you talk too much." Then he jokingly discussed the printing job.

When a teacher said to the principal that he (the principal) should speak to the student body about how well the students rejoice in the success of others, the principal said, "Yes, they do, don't they? I'm glad you noticed that."

The principal arranged for two student hostesses to greet the principals who were to visit the school the day of the city principals' meeting. The principal instructed the two hostesses, one a striking blonde and the other an attractive brunette, whom he said he had chosen because of their attractiveness, to "be nice to these principals." He also arranged for the girls to take the wraps of the principals and to pin flowers on them.

Acts of consideration resulted in acts of consideration by others and then more acts of consideration by the principal. Behaviors of this type were so intertwined that they were difficult to separate. Also, the consideration often contained an order or an indication of what was expected of a person in the future. One of the effective principals was outstanding in this respect. For in-
stance, after a student office aid straightened up the office, the principal said: "Oh, Sue, that looks so much better." Also, "You know your sister is almost as pretty as you are. Will you file this?"

Each of the preceding ten categories, that is, each of the original nine and the one just discussed, was somewhat discrete from each of the other nine categories. After categorizing on the basis of the ten, new categories began to emerge. Therefore, each of the thirteen new categories which are to follow is not discrete from the ten discussed already or discrete from any of the remaining new categories. In the collection and analysis of his own data, the writer believed that he saw evidence of these thirteen behaviors in addition to the other ten:

1. Clarifying problems
2. Planning
3. Delegating functions
4. Speaking disparagingly
5. Contacting face-to-face
6. Initiating communication or contacts
7. Engaging in communication or contact initiated by another person
8. Talking
9. Telephoning
10. Writing
11. Disseminating information widely
12. Reading
13. Seeking or studying recorded data

This last group of hypothetical behaviors were attempts to make the original nine behaviors listed earlier, and the other one, showing consideration, more specific or pointed and more complete. They are defined and illustrated here in the same fashion as the other ten.

1. Clarifying Problems. This was a behavior which demonstrated creative thought. It was not merely communicating ideas already at hand. Clarifying problems meant making more penetrating, more comprehensive, more flexible or a much more insightful statement than the repetition of ideas already prevailing.

A secondary school principal was "clarifying problems" when he:

a. Identified a problem or cause of a problem which cause then became the real problem

b. Stated a hypothesis.

c. Restated other statements of a goal, policy, role, etc., when the behavior in question did not set the goal, policy, role, etc., but explained, clarified, or gave new insight into it.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "clarifying problems," included the following:

In response to a discussion with the executive committee about why the language-art committee did not
have time to meet, the principal said that it was probably due to the fact that no member of the language-art committee was on the scheduling committee.

By computing time necessary for the boy's rides, the principal demonstrated to the boy requesting an excuse from school to see a television show that the boy could not possibly get to the television station in time for the program.

The principal justified the retardation of the oversized and obese student by saying to the parents: "Maybe the girl should have a bigger chance and more time to do her work."

The principal explained to the 95 pound student teacher that her difficulty developed because she tried to imitate the 200 pound male critic teacher. The principal said that she was different from the critic teacher and that there was no reason to try to imitate him.

This hypothesis was derived from the conviction that the effective administrator, due to his ability or unique position, occasionally provided special insights for his staff. It was assumed that the administrator was intellectually creative and could be observed at trying to change the perceptions and conceptions of the staff. Creative thinking was thought of as a process of destroying one Gestalt in favor of a better one.

Again, each important advance in form, in structured truth or beauty, is the result of a new closure of a fresh set of axioms; a better set resulting from the greater knowledge and understanding built with the aid of those dying.5

2. **Planning** was anticipating, projecting, preparing, pre-arranging, or making ready for something in the future. It involved behavior now in relation to what the administrator stated or unmistakably implied would or could happen in the future. Foresight, "on-goingness," or "means to a stated end" was involved. It involved plans, roles, goals, relationships, agendas, outlines, rosters, arrangements, reservations, programs, etc., for the future. It overlapped with other categories of behavior labeled coordinating functions, setting goals, and determining roles.

This behavior or aspect of other behaviors was readily identifiable from anecdotal descriptions because a future time was referred to such as "tomorrow," "when do we do that," etc. The verb was often in the future tense using auxiliary verbs such as "will," "should be," etc., or phrases like "in order to,"

A secondary principal was "planning" when he:

a. Promised to perform certain functions at a future time.

b. Asked others to do something in the future.

c. Performed behavior which had no present significance except as it unmistakably facilitated a behavior or moved toward a goal in the future.

d. Gave his secretary advance warning of work to be done.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "planning" included
The following:

The principal told the activities teacher that he had a serious problem. He said he would have to ask her to teach four periods the following year.

The principal told the secretary to put the suggestion for the recognition of art students the next year, in the notes for the recognition assembly.

The principal suggested to a journalism student that sorority news not be put in the senior edition of the school paper, since the state bill banning fraternities and sororities had already passed one house of the State Legislature.

In a conference concerning a student program about to be given, a student asked the principal how they were to know who to thank for things contributed to the program. The principal said, "Maybe you can keep a list of donors and then write letters after the list is completed."

This category was devised to include behavior indicating futurity of thought and was much more inclusive than the label ordinarily connotes.

3. Delegating functions was asking some other person or committee to perform some function which the administrator could do. The principal actively initiated this shift presumably to free himself for more important functions such as thinking and planning.

This behavior was a part of determining roles but did not include behaviors merely involving decision making marked by "yes" or "no" answer and not shifting the performance of a duty to anyone else. For example, the behavior was not classified as "delegating functions" when a secretary asked the administrator if it was all
right if she performed a particular function and the administrator said "yes" or "no" or "all right." Perhaps such behavior, not instigated by the administrator, merely revealed the prudence and willingness of the secretary and thus the administrator was just "going along." However, if the principal asked the secretary to perform a function which he could have performed himself, the behavior was classified as delegating authority.

A secondary school principal was delegating functions when he:

a. Had action performed by having someone else do it.

b. Asked a student or secretary to find a person or to carry a message to a person such as a teacher, janitor, or pupil.

c. Asked a student to locate another record.

d. Referred a problem or a person to another person who was presumably in a position to perform the function.

e. Asked persons to make decisions themselves.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized "delegating function" included the following:

The principal told the two coaches that, since the plumbing system in another school had broken down and caused the school to be dismissed, if the coaches saw any of their students from the other school at their school the coaches were to kick them out.

The principal's daily bulletin contained a list of persons designated as members of the Arbor Day Committee.
After taking the phone call from the parent, the principal asked a student aid to have a particular student call her father at a certain number.

The written announcements to teachers included a notice for homeroom teachers to read to the students the portion of the bulletin concerning recognition day.

This category was a reconstruction of the aspect of the category labeled "defining roles." It dealt specifically with the shifting of functions to someone else, presumably for the reason of freeing oneself for more important functions. No distinction was intended here between delegating responsibility and delegating authority. Both were included in this category.

4. Speaking disparagingly was scolding, insulting, or making uncomplimentary remarks to a person in such a manner that the person scolded could hear the remarks. When these remarks were made outside of the hearing of the person involved, these remarks were not classified here.

A secondary school principal was speaking disparagingly when he:

a. Said "You should know better," etc.

b. Lost his temper in the presence of others.

c. Spoke in a disapproving manner or tone of voice.

d. Deflated the ego or lowered the status of a person.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal description of observed behavior categorized as "speaking disparagingly" included the following:
When a student from a university stopped in the office and asked the secretary if it would be all right for him to observe a particular class, the principal shouted gruffly from his office to the outer office, "No more! This is the fifth one up there in the last two periods. Call Mr. X at the university at once and put a stop to this business."

In the conference with the pupil, the principal demanded that the pupil say "Yes, sir" when the pupil spoke to him.

In the reported conference with the pupil who had been absent from school, the principal said, "Don't you know that truancy violates the law? I'll have to turn you over to the board of education downtown."

When the teacher said no that he had not brought the material on commencement ticket distribution with him, to the conference, the principal said bitterly and disapprovingly, "Well! You should have."

This was the only behavior hypothesized to be negatively associated with effectiveness. It was roughly the converse of the category labeled "showing consideration."

In a sense its rationale was based upon a concept of Bales, that is, the behavior was the type which produced a disintegrative effect upon others.6

5. Contacting face to face was an inclusive term which included as many kinds of behavior as involved the presence of the administrator in the immediate presence of someone else. When the administrator was so remote that

ordinary unamplified conversation from the other could not be heard, the administrator was not having a face to face contact. Oral direct communication was usually involved but not necessarily so since intimates sometimes communicated with gestures or other contacts without visible communication.

A secondary school principal was contacting face-to-face when he:

a. Appeared in the presence of another person.

b. Another person appeared in the presence of the principal.

c. The principal communicated with another person without the use of audio-amplification.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as contacting face-to-face included the following:

The principal listened to an explanation of a student aid having difficulty with some clerical work. The principal offered no advice but merely listened sympathetically and smiled. The student aid seemed to be satisfied and left.

The preceding anecdotal description was a good but rare example of a face-to-face contact involving no verbal communication.

When the assistant principal told the principal that a younger brother of a certain student had the mumps, the principal replied "Gee, I hope we don't get them here!"

The principal answered a question for a teacher who had entered the office and consulted him about a report she had in her hand.
The principal told the assistant principal that he would give her an article by Pressey, concerning the gifted students, that he wanted her to read.

Face-to-faceness certainly was at least an aspect of behavior but there is some question as to whether it was necessarily a behavior in and of itself. The principal had willfully done something if he actively initiated a contact or communication, but there was some question as to whether he had performed a behavior before he reacted to a contact initiated by someone else. Consequently, two new concepts emerged: (a) initiating communication or contact, and (b) engaging in communication or contact initiated by another, in order to analyze the two different kinds of behavior.

Since the category called communicating was so broad and seemed to contain so many different concepts and kinds of behavior, several additional or sub-categories were developed. To assist the reader in perceiving the relationship between these related categories, Figure 4 is presented.

6. Initiating communication or contact was beginning or starting a connection, association, or meeting with another person or persons. Conversely, when the communicator or contact was begun by someone else the person was not initiating the communication or contact.

A secondary school principal was "initiating communication or contact" when he:
Figure 4 - Conceptual Relationships of Behaviors Categorized as Communicating and Sub-Categories of Communicating.
a. Opened a conversation with a person.
b. Maneuvered himself into a position where conversation was likely to ensue.
c. Telephoned persons.
d. Broadcasted orally.
e. Issued written conversation.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "initiating communication or contacts" included the following:

In the cafeteria the principal asked the teachers seated at a table who would preside over a certain committee meeting that evening.

The principal asked the teachers to collect anecdotes of critical incidents pertinent to the experimental program already described.

The principal greeted a student who was passing through the hall.

To the teacher who was sitting in the cafeteria across the table from him, the principal said, "Could I see one of those individual schedule sheets of the seniors for the trip?"

As was stated earlier this category was a sub-division of the more inclusive term "contacting face to face." It could be argued from a philosophical and psychological viewpoint that nothing was new under the sun, and that anything which one does is triggered by something else, etc. However, this category includes those behaviors which the writer observed to originate with the principal. The next category includes those behaviors he observed to originate with the persons other than the principal.
7. Engaging in communication or contact indicated by another was participating in oral or written intercourse initiated by someone else. Conversely, when the principal initiated the contact or communication it was not classified here.

A secondary school principal was "engaging in communication or contacts initiated by others" when:

a. Another person opened a conversation with him.

b. Another person maneuvered into a position with the principal when communication was likely to ensue.

c. A telephone call was taken by the principal.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behaviors categorized as "engaging in communication or contact initiated by others" included the following:

In a conversation initiated by the cafeteria worker about the details of proposed legislation concerning compulsory retirement, the principal referred the worker to the local representative of the state employees association.

The principal answered the teacher's questions about how to fill out a report.

In response to the question by the secretary, the principal said, "Yes, I know Mr. X will be absent tomorrow."

The principal talked to the visiting educator from California. They discussed the happenings at the recent A S C D national convention and other miscellaneous shared experiences.

One rationale for this behavior included an assumption that the number of contacts initiated by others pro-
vided an index to the approachability of the principal. If one assumed that the effective principals should be approachable then one would expect them to have a comparatively higher frequency of contacts initiated by others. However, if you assumed that effective principals delegated functions to the extent that many of the persons likely to want to initiate communication with him would be handled by someone else, then you might expect the effective principals to have less of these contacts than others.

8. Talking was putting into spoken words, uttering, speaking, or conversing. The speech was either trivial or weighty. It included all kinds of oral discourse including telephoning by the principal or telephoning initiated by someone other than the principal. Only written discourse was excluded.

A secondary school principal was "talking" when he:

a. Uttered intelligible sounds.
b. Reacted with words or sounds to the speech of other persons.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behavior categorized as "talking" included the following:

The principal said in the committee meeting, "We are merely getting ideas now, don't hesitate to give suggestions!"

The principal chatted with a teacher concerning the advisability of using another teacher on a certain project.
The principal conferred with the secretary concerning parent chaperones for several impending school functions.

The principal related to the teachers at the lunch table that the student council project involved the checking on the noise in the school building with a sound volume device and comparing the noise there with the noise in other school buildings.

The category labeled communicating was so inclusive and so complex that attempts were made to sub-divide it into the kinds of communication on the basis of whether it was oral (talking) or written and broadcasting or receiving.

9. **Telephoning** was directly using the ordinary two-way mechanical device called the telephone and involved oral discourse initiated by the principal or initiated by someone telephoning the principal. The subject matter was irrelevant since both weighty and trivial matters were included.

A secondary school principal was "telephoning" when he:

a. Answered the telephone himself.

b. Took a telephone call referred by his secretary or any other person.

c. Spoke over the telephone after dialing a number himself.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behaviors categorized as "telephoning" included the following:

The principal telephoned a family which had just
moved to town and would soon return to their native country but had asked permission to visit the school. The principal invited them to visit the school whenever they wished.

By telephone the principal asked permission to give an announcement at staff meeting where the other person would be chairman.

In the conversation with the lady who called by telephone the principal asked the caller if she could teach swimming the following summer.

In the telephone conversation with the placement director of a university in the same city, the principal said that he would like to put in a good word for a certain student teacher who had done such a good job in his school. He said that he wanted to help her get a good job somewhere.

The category labeled "telephoning" was possible to construct because it contained an identifiable stable referent, the telephone. It was the result of attempts to sub-divide the more inclusive and complex category called "communicating" and to further divide a sub-division of "communicating" called "talking."

10. writing was communicating ideas by means of characters or other visible signs on paper, cardboard, blackboard or other materials.

A secondary school principal was writing when he:

a. Used the typewriter.
b. Used a pencil.
c. Used chalk.
d. Used pen and ink.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions
of observed behavior categorized as "writing" included the following:

In preparation for a staff meeting the principal wrote background information on the school enrollment problem. The information was then duplicated and distributed to the staff prior to the meeting.

The principal made an outline for an article which he was writing for the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. This article described the school's provision for general education.

The principal wrote information of an undetermined origin on a sheet of paper and dropped it into one of the teacher's mailboxes.

The principal dictated a letter which was directed to an official of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in Washington, D. C., pointing out that since Ohio's collection of material was not up-to-date, would Washington please send a list of their latest materials.

The category labeled was constructed because it contained an identifiable stable referent, writing tools. It was the result of attempts to sub-divide the more inclusive and complex category called "communicating." It was a sub-division of the broadcasting portion of "communicating."

11. Disseminating information widely distributed involved the placing of written documents in a prominent place such as on a bulletin board or in a spot in a classroom, halls, or office where other persons might see it, the writing and/or distribution of letters, bulletins, or pamphlets to teachers, students, pupils, parents or school
employees; and broadcasting information in a large group
by means of a public address system or in an assembly of
persons.

A secondary school principal was "disseminating
information widely" when he:

a. Personally tacked, stapled, taped, glued or
attached in any other fashion, written communi-
cations on a bulletin board or wall where others
could see them; personally distributed litera-
ture directly to persons, by mail, or by means
of the office mailboxes; or personally broad-
casted information.

b. Asked others to display written communication
in a prominent place; asked others to distribute
literature; or asked others to broadcast cer-
tain information.

c. Gave permission to others to display written
communications in a prominent place; gave per-
mission to others to distribute literature; or
gave permission to others to broadcast informa-
tion.

d. Facilitated the display of communications in a
prominent place; facilitated the distribution
of literature; or facilitated the broadcasting
of information.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions
of observed behavior categorized as "disseminating infor-
mation widely" included the following:

The principal issued a weekly teachers' bulletin
which was distributed via the teachers' mailboxes.

The teachers' bulletin contained a request for
suggestions for the administrative bulletin for
the central office.

The principal went to the public address system
and announced that parking in a certain area
would be prohibited if students continued to eat
there.
The principal told a student office aid to tell the teacher in charge of announcements to announce that afternoon that there would be no baseball practice that evening due to baccalaureate practice.

The category "disseminating information widely" resulted from efforts to sub-divide the behaviors labeled "communicating." It was possible to construct this category of behavior because the means of dissemination provided reliable cues for the identification of it.

12. Reading was the action or practice of observing any written or printed data. It always involved visual contact with documents and may or may not have necessarily involved handling of these documents.

A secondary school principal was "reading" when he:

a. Observed written data.

b. Scrutinized written data.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behaviors categorized as "reading" included the following:

The principal read the weekly guide from the central office.

The principal looked at the principal's office record card of a boy the principal and teacher were discussing to find out what grade the boy was in.

The principal checked through the statements of the company submitting information for a proposed new sound system for the school.

In the conference with the boy concerning absence, the principal checked the schedule card record to see when the schedule was changed, in other words,
to see if the boy was really absent from a teacher's particular class or had been transferred by a schedule change and thus was legitimately absent.

This behavior resulted from attempts to subdivide the communicating behaviors into smaller meaningful categories. This behavior was identifiable because of the necessary presence of written documents.

13. Seeing or studying recorded data was the exertion of effort in finding or in perusing compilations of data or facts. Studious habits such as checking and/or rechecking more than one document in the preparation of a speech or writing also were cues to this behavior.

A secondary school principal was "seeking or studying recorded data" when he:

a. Sought any written document.

b. Sought data in any writing.

c. Spent more than the usual amount of time in the reading of a document.

d. Moved from an advanced spot in a reading to a spot nearer the front of the document.

e. Checked more than one written document in the preparation of a speech or original writing.

Specific examples of actual anecdotal descriptions of observed behaviors categorized as "seeking or studying recorded data" included the following:

In making a service report, the principal consulted several other schedules and reports.

The principal reread the material he was using in a speech.
The principal inspected a large sheet of paper which contained the tallies of students enrolled in various classes for the next year.

The principal said that he often came to the office on Sunday to study his mail in order to get a head start on the week's work.

This category was constructed to separate the actively reading or rereading behaviors from the large category called reading which included both active and passive behaviors. This "seeking or studying recorded data" was to "reading" what the "initiating communication" behavior was to "communication." It was hypothesized that taking the initiative was positively related to effectiveness.

Analysis of New Categories of Behavior

The same analyses were made of these new categories as the previous ones. The data are presented in Table III in the same format as data concerning the other ten appeared in Table II.

Table III indicated that each of the following five additional behaviors were significant as a total unsub-divided behavior, that is, the effective principals did these things to such a greater extent than the ineffective ones that the differences are significant as indicated in the table:

1. Showing consideration
2. Planning
3. Delegating functions
4. Contacting face-to-face
5. Initiating communication
TABLE III
FREQUENCY, ANALYSIS OF FREQUENCY, AND CHI SQUARE TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF ADDITIONAL THIRTEEN BEHAVIORS OF EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>Frequency of Behaviors of all 10 Administrators</th>
<th>Effective Administrators</th>
<th>Ineffective Administrators</th>
<th>Level of Significance of Chi Square Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-3   H-4   H-5   H-6   H-8   Average</td>
<td>E-1   E-2   E-7   E-9   E-10 Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. mbrs.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

- Denotes that average frequency for the given effective administrators' behavior was significantly greater than that of the ineffective group according to the Chi square statistical test.
- Denotes that the difference of the average frequencies of the two groups was not significant.
- No data was available since this category of persons did not exist in this school

*** Code name for principals studied.
** Frequency in this category of behavior irrespective of categories of persons behavior was in relation to.
*** Breakdown under each behavior denoting categories of persons behaviors were in relation to.
### TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>All 10 Admins.</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10 Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. CLASIFYING PROBLEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. mbrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>3. PLANNING</strong>       |               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |               |     |     |     |
| Pupils                | 829            | 136 | 165 | 121 | 113 | 95  | 125.8| 24  | 13            | 54  | 62  | 35  | 23.5| 0   | 0   | 0   |
| Student aids          | 227            | 22  | 64  | 32  | 26  | 16  | 46.0 | 15  | 5            | 17  | 20  | 7   | 8.2 | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| Teachers              | 55             | -   | 25  | 1   | 9   | 3   | 9.5  | 0   | 1            | 11  | 6   | 0   | 3.4 | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| Assistant principal   | 241            | 58  | 49  | 41  | 29  | 25  | 40.0 | 6   | 3            | 8   | 14  | 8   | 8.2 | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| Non-cert. persons     | 65             | 19  | 12  | 11  | 2   | 8   | 10.4 | -   | 0            | 10  | 3   | 0   | 3.3 | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| Supt. or Bd. of Educ. | 96             | 22  | 13  | 6   | 23  | 12  | 15.2 | 1   | 6            | 4   | 7   | 5   | 4.0 | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| Parents               | 22             | 2   | 0   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1.6  | 1   | 0            | 4   | 3   | 3   | 2.8 | 0   | 0   | 0   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>All 1G Admins.</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. PLANING (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cox. mbres.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DELEGATING FUNCTIONS</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup't. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cox. abrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SPEAKING DISPARAGINGLY</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>All 10 Admins.</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. SPEAKING DISPARAGINGLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comm. mbrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CONTACTING FACE-TO-FACE</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>206.8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comm. mbrs.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and persons</th>
<th>All 10 Admins.</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. INITIATING COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cert. abs.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ENGAGING IN COMMUNICATION INITIATED BY OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors and Persons</td>
<td>All 10 Admis.</td>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>H-5</td>
<td>H-6</td>
<td>H-8</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>H-9</td>
<td>H-10</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ENGAGING IN COMMUNICATION INITIATED BY OTHERS (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. abrs.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TALKING</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. abrs.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TELEPHONING</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors and Persons</td>
<td>All 10 Admins.</td>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>H-5</td>
<td>H-6</td>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>H-8</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>H-9</td>
<td>H-10</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TELEPHONING (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cox. abrs.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. WRITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cox. abrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. DISSEMINATING INFORMATION WEEKLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>All 10 Admins</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. DISSEMINATING INFORMATION WIDELY (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. afrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. READING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. afrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Persons</th>
<th>All 10 Admins.</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. SEEKING OR STUDYING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEKED DATA</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Ed. of Educ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. abrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- / Denotes that average frequency for the given effective administrator's behavior was significantly greater than that of the ineffective group according to the Chi square statistical test.
- 0 Denotes that the difference of the average frequencies of the two groups was not significant.
- - No data was available since this category of persons did not exist in this school.
- * Code name for principals studied.
- ** Frequency in this category of behavior irrespective of categories of persons behavior was in relation to.
- *** Breakdown under each behavior denoting categories of persons behaviors were in relation to.
Also, these six behaviors were significant when considered only in relation to the following respective categories:

1. Planning with pupils
2. Planning with teachers
3. Contacting face-to-face the teachers
4. Contacting face-to-face the non-certified personnel
5. Initiating communication with teachers
6. Initiating communication with the assistant principals

Also, talking, which was not significant generally, was effective when considered only in relation to teachers and when considered only in relation to assistant principals.

It can be seen that many of the additional behaviors were more numerous than the original ones. Also, since some are similar to the original ones, many of the subsequent analyses will be identical. The original hypothesis, hypothesis number one, concerning the inclusiveness of the original nine categories, being found negative and indicating the existence of other categories makes it possible for the entire list of categories, whether in the original nine or otherwise, to be considered similarly.

Comparisons and Analyses of All Twenty-Three Categories of Behaviors and Categories of Persons

Table IV provides a sum total of all behaviors of all administrators. Table V is derived from data in both Tables II, III, and IV, and concerns the categories most
frequent and least frequent of all twenty-three so that comparisons can be made. The second most frequent behavioral analysis, for instance, in Table V, suggests that initiating communication is more important than mere communication or effective administrators and ineffective ones would not differ in this way. Also, the least frequent behavior for effective administrators, speaking disparagingly, suggests that this behavior is one to be avoided even though it was not significant in the Chi square test. It can be seen that effective and ineffective administrators differ in the analysis of persons most frequently contacted, i.e., effective ones have their greatest number of contacts with teachers and ineffective ones have their greatest number of contacts with pupils.

The behaviors, standing alone, without the sub-categories of persons, are presented in Table VI. The frequencies appearing in Tables II and III are presented here in the form of ranks which were necessary for the calculation of the degree of correlation of the behaviors by the Rho method.\(^7\) These calculations are presented in Table VII.

Table VII indicates the rank order correlations which merely indicate the relationship of occurrence of any two behaviors. If two behaviors have a coefficient very

\[ \rho_h = \frac{1 - 6 \frac{D^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}}{N(N^2 - 1)}, \]  

Allen L. Edwards, loc. cit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Persons Contacted</th>
<th>Frequency of all Behaviors of all 10 Administrators</th>
<th>Effective Administrators</th>
<th>Ineffective Administrators</th>
<th>Level of Significance of Chi Square Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-3  H-4  H-5  H-6  H-8  Average</td>
<td>H-1  H-2  H-7  H-9  H-10 Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL CATEGORIES OF PERSONS</td>
<td>9920  1081  1265  1088  1232  1172.6</td>
<td>401  441  834  1016  540  666.4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>2652  73   530   242   369   304.8</td>
<td>230  123  268  365  122  225.6</td>
<td>/ / /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aids</td>
<td>551   -    159   69    76    83.5</td>
<td>12   13   84   101  7   43.4</td>
<td>/ / /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2729  525  430  395  337  403.4</td>
<td>65   126  143  218  159  142.2</td>
<td>/ / /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>1679  141  113  114   24   91.4</td>
<td>-    8    101  62   24  48.8</td>
<td>/ / /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cert. persons</td>
<td>1027  158   86   115  155  160  134.8</td>
<td>30   59   101  96   67  70.6</td>
<td>/ / /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Educ.</td>
<td>347   12    6    40    65    37.0</td>
<td>9    42   31   42   38  32.4</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>490   23   52   29    99    58.0</td>
<td>18   12   60   90   20  40.0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other com. mems.</td>
<td>343   5    94    70   79    56.6</td>
<td>8    24   25   8   10  15.0</td>
<td>/ / /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educators</td>
<td>356   88   52   38    44    33  51.0</td>
<td>41   3    26   23   8   20.2</td>
<td>/ / /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- Denotes that average frequency for the given effective administrator's behavior was significantly greater than that of the ineffective group according to the Chi square statistical test.
- Denotes that the difference of the average frequencies of the two groups was not significant.
- No data was available since this category of persons did not exist in this school.
- Code number of high school principal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CATEGORY OF BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>For All 10 Administrators</th>
<th>For Effective Administrators</th>
<th>For Ineffective Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most Frequent</td>
<td>Contacting face-to-face</td>
<td>Contacting face-to-face</td>
<td>Contacting face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Most Frequent</td>
<td>Initiating Communication</td>
<td>Initiating Communication</td>
<td>Initiating Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Most Frequent</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least Frequent</td>
<td>Working with Com. Leadership</td>
<td>Speaking Disparagingly</td>
<td>Working with Com. Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Least Frequent</td>
<td>Using educational resources</td>
<td>Working with Com. Leadership</td>
<td>Involving People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Least Frequent</td>
<td>Speaking Disparagingly to</td>
<td>Using Educational Resources</td>
<td>Using Educational Resources and Setting Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CATEGORY OF PERSONS CONTACTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most Frequently</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Most Frequently</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Most Frequently</td>
<td>Ass't Principal</td>
<td>Non-cert. Persons</td>
<td>Non-cert. Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least Frequently</td>
<td>Other com. mburs.</td>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Education</td>
<td>Other com. mburs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Least Frequently</td>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Education</td>
<td>Other Educators</td>
<td>Other Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Least Frequently</td>
<td>Other Educators</td>
<td>Other com. mburs.</td>
<td>Supt. or Bd. of Ed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI
RANKS OF THE FREQUENCY OF CATEGORIES OF BEHAVIOR FOR THE TEN PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appraising effectiveness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarifying problems</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinating functions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Determining roles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Showing consideration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Involving people</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Making policy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Setting goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$$\text{TABLE VI (continued)}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Using educational resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Working with community leadership</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Delegating functions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Speaking disparagingly</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Contacting face-to-face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Initiating communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Engaging in com. initiated by others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Talking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>H-5</td>
<td>H-6</td>
<td>H-8</td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>H-9</td>
<td>H-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Telephoning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Disseminating information widely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Seeking or studying recorded data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appraising effectiveness</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarifying problems</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicating</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinating functions</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Determining roles</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Showing consideration</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Involving people</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Making policy</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Setting goals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers refer to respective numbered categories listed at left margin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Using educational resources</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Working with com. leadership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Planning</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Delegating functions</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Speaking disparagingly</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Contacting face-to-face</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Initiating communication</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Engaging in com. initiated by others</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Talking</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Telephoning</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Writing</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Disseminating information widely</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Reading</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Seeking or studying recorded data</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appraising effectiveness</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarifying problems</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicating</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinating functions</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Determining roles</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Showing consideration</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Involving people</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Making policy</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Setting goals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Using educational resources</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Working with community leadership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Planning</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Delegating functions</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Speaking disparagingly</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Contacting face-to-face</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Initiating communication</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Engaging in com. initiated by others</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Talking</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Telephoning</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Writing</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Disseminating information widely</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Reading</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Seeking or studying recorded data</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
close to 1.00 then where one behavior is found the other one is likely to be found. If a behavior is correlated with many others to a high degree it suggests that it is dependent upon many other behaviors. Thus it is not surprising that the behavior with the largest number of correlations with other behaviors over .60 was Number 15, "contacting face-to-face", which had 14 such correlations. The two behaviors with the next two largest number of correlations over .60 were Number 12, "planning" and Number 16, "initiating communication", each of which was correlated with 12 others over .60. The behaviors correlated with the least number of other behaviors were Number 14, "speaking disparagingly" and Number 21, "disseminating information widely", which were correlated with no other behaviors. The third least behavior was Number 1, "appraising effectiveness" which was correlated with only one other behavior over .60.

Table VIII also indicates that the behaviors with the highest correlations were as follows:

First, .94, Number 22, "reading", and Number 23, "seeking or studying recorded data".
Second, .89, Number 12, "planning", and Number 15, "contacting face-to-face."
Third, .88, Number 5, "determining roles" and Number 22, "reading".

It can be seen that "reading" and "seeking or studying recorded data" are almost synonymous and our other experience verifies this so this result is not surprising.
The other high relationships are not readily explainable. However, it may be that planning is impossible without face-to-face contacts. Also, it may be true that in order for a principal to find time to read he would have to determine the roles of a lot of other persons.

Table VII similarly indicates that the three behaviors with the lowest correlations were tied and were the following combinations of behaviors:

- .01, Number 3, "communicating", and Number 14, "speaking disparagingly".
- .01, Number 8, "making policy", and Number 17, "engaging in communication initiated by others."
- .01, Number 11, "working with community leadership", and Number 14, "speaking disparagingly".

The low correlation between the first two may be because speaking disparagingly inhibits further communication and work with community leadership.

Table VIII reveals the seven behaviors in descending order according to the number of other significant behaviors correlated to at least the .60 point. Accurate factor analysis by the Thurstone centroid method was not permitted by the nature of this data since the design of the study called for the deliberate exclusion of the normal curve of distribution of the population.

However, an inspection of the Rho correlations in Table VII reveals that all of the seven critical behaviors were correlated to a considerable degree. Nevertheless, the behavior, "showing consideration" was not correlated
### TABLE VIII

**MATRIX OF CORRELATIONS OF CRITICAL BEHAVIORS**

|  | Behaviors |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Contacting face-to-face (6) | - | .82 | .93 | .72 | .72 | .73 | 1577 |
| 2. Initiating communication (6) | .82 | - | .78 | .69 | .52 | .52 | 1057 |
| 3. Planning (5) | .84 | .78 | - | .64 | .76 | .52 | 829 |
| 4. Communicating (5) | .78 | .69 | .64 | - | .62 | .83 | 1072 |
| 5. Delegating functions (3) | .84 | .64 | .76 | .62 | - | .70 | 267 |
| 6. Talking (4) | .72 | .60 | .52 | .83 | .70 | - | 946 |
| 7. Showing consideration (3) | .73 | .81 | .82 | .58 | .58 | .48 | 394 |

---

**Notes:**

- Correlations derived by rho rank order method. Behaviors found critical by Chi Square test in discriminating effective administrators from ineffective administrators as shown in Table V-1.
- Numbers 1-7 refer to respective behaviors in list at left.
- Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of other critical behaviors any given behavior is correlated with to the extent of at least .60.
with three of the seven other critical behaviors to a point more than .60. The three behavior, "showing consideration" was not correlated with three of the seven other critical behaviors to a point more than .60. The three behaviors "showing consideration" was not correlated with are "communicating", "delegating functions", and "talking" even though these latter three were correlated to a rather high degree. This was a slight indication that "showing consideration" was more independent than the others and thus constituted a different kind of dimension.

The category labeled "contacting face-to-face" was highly correlated with all of the other six critical behaviors and is thus a very dependent variable, being an aspect of the others.

The frequency of contacts principals had with various categories of persons listed in Tables I, II and III are presented in Table IX in the form of ranks, and were necessary to calculate, by the Rho method, the degree of correlation of the contacts with the various categories of persons. These coefficients are presented in Table X.

Table X indicates that the categories of persons with the largest number of correlations with other categories of persons over .60 were Number 3, teachers; Number 5, non-certified personnel; and Number 7, parents; all three categories of which were correlated with at least three other categories at the .60 level. This is not surprising
since contacts with teachers or parents usually involve the secretary as a means to getting in touch with them. Also, conferences with parents often involve the teachers. The category of persons correlated with the least number of other categories and thus the most independent variable, was Number 6, superintendent-board of education, which was correlated with only one other category, other educators, to the degree of .61. Thus administrators with many contacts with the central office do not have many with educators outside of the district. Five categories were tied for the next places representing the categories with the next least correlations over .60 and were as follows:

Number 1. Pupils
Number 2. Student office aids
Number 4. Teachers
Number 6. Assistant principal
Number 9. Other educators

Table X shows that the combinations of categories of persons with the highest correlations were as follows:

First, .82, Number 3, teachers and Number 4, assistant principal
Second, .72, Number 1, pupils and Number 7, parents
Third, .68, Number 4, assistant principal and Number 5, non-certified personnel.

It is not surprising that principals who have many contacts with assistant principals also had many contacts with teachers since these principals, the effective ones, had relationships with pupils delegated to assistants and teachers. Also, these principals had delegated so much to secretaries that there were many necessary contacts with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Persons Contacted</th>
<th>H-3</th>
<th>H-4</th>
<th>H-5</th>
<th>H-6</th>
<th>H-8</th>
<th>H-1</th>
<th>H-2</th>
<th>H-7</th>
<th>H-9</th>
<th>H-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pupils</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student office aids</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-certified personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Superintendent-board of education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other community members</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other educators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories of Persons Contacted</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pupils (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student office aids (2)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers (4)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant principal (3)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-certified personnel (4)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supt.-board of education (1)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parents (4)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other community members (2)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Othereducators (3)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total (5)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Correlation calculated by Rho Rank Order method.

*b Numbers refer to respective numbered categories of persons contacted listed at left margin.

*c Numbers refer to quantity of other categories of persons this category is associated with at .60 or above.
secretaries. The high relationship between contacts with pupils and parents may be due to the fact that contacts with parents were usually concerning serious behavioral problems of students and thus was often correlated with conferences with these problem students.

The combinations of categories of persons with the lowest correlations were as follows:

First, .02, Number 2, student office aids and Number 6, superintendent-board of education.
Second, .03, Number 1, pupils and Number 2, student office aids.
Third, .04, Number 2, student office aids and Number 3, teachers.

It is not known why the relationships are low but on the other hand, it can be seen that there is no reason known why these correlations should be high.

Accessory Findings

Presented here are the results of investigations of several accessory or secondary hunches not originally hypothecated and quite different than the original nine and additional fourteen behaviors systematically investigated. These hunches were neither readily subject to reliability checks nor to adequate statistical analysis. They were included because they have some bearing upon this study and related studies.

1. Initial cheerfulness about being observed did not discriminate effective administrators from ineffective ones. The most reluctant and the
most willing were in the "effective" group.

2. The observer was able to determine at what end of the continuum eight of the ten principals were after the first brief contact.

3. The observer at first believed that the "swiftness of reaction" and "directness of interaction" of the principals provided cues which enabled the observer to correctly guess whether the principals were effective or ineffective. This hunch was correct for only eight of the ten principals. Four of the five effective principals were "swift in reacting" and "direct in interaction" but the other one was not. Four of the five ineffective principals were slow in reacting and indirect in interaction but the other one was not. The exceptions here were not the same exceptions mentioned in either of the preceding two paragraphs. Perhaps the near unanimity here indicates that the exceptions were due to mistakes made by the jury, that is the evaluations by the observer were more valid than that of the jurors in their selection of the group.

4. Effective principals tended to be "fussy" or very meticulous about the appearance of the office or school building. For instance, of the effective
ones, two straightened the papers in the office several times, four attended to paper on the floor as they toured the halls, and one religiously washed the mirror in the boys' restroom whenever he visited it. The observer believes the ineffective principals did this to a lesser extent.

5. With one major exception in each group of principals, "effective" principals had more systematic procedures for handling persons wanting to see or talk with the principal. Adults and pupils could see or talk by telephone to the effective principal only after checking with one of the secretaries except when the principal happened to be inside his office. However, one of the most effective principals deliberately arranged his office in such a way that he would make direct initial contact with visitors to his office. This one also had a general office several yards away where routine affairs were handled. Even when secretaries were present, some of the ineffective principals initially answered the telephone or initially spoke to the visitors at the counter.

6. Overall congeniality or friendliness was not a discriminating factor between the two groups. As previously indicated, the effective principals
showed more acts of consideration but some of the ineffective principals were extremely friendly and wanted to spend much time in chatting.

7. Four of the effective principals but only one of the ineffective ones seemed to have some kind of unusually artistic fabric prominently displayed on the wall or as a window drape. Both ineffective and effective principals had paintings displayed.

8. Both groups complained about the past and present but only the ineffective ones complained about the future. Ineffective principals frequently expressed beliefs that youth were getting worse and that they did not know what this world was coming to. The effective ones seemed not only to be conspicuously lacking in complaints about the future but also seemed to make optimistic statements like "we are going to do better next year", "students know so much more today", and "students like to take responsibility nowadays - I was even embarrassed when some visitors the other evening saw our students with old gunny sacks picking up trash from our lawn". The optimistic ones seemed to anticipate the future. This difficult to measure aspect gave rise to the category called
planning or acting in relation to the future.

9. Age was unrelated to effectiveness or optimism.

Uncategorized Non-Administrative Behavior

Even though this study was primarily devoted to the study of behaviors of the administrators which were administrative in nature, some attention was given to other kinds of behavior of the administrator rather than to exclude data too early which might later be found to be significant. Some of the frequent comments of administrators with no one but the observer, which the writer did not think classifiable as administrative behavior were: complaints about the principals' aches and pains, stories about their life's experiences, and critical comments about the state department of education and universities. Non-verbal actions included apparent daydreaming, nail chewing, and looking for things they could not find, etc.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

In previous chapters the hypotheses have been stated, the problem discussed in the light of related studies, the methods of investigation described, and the more reliable or objective findings stated. However, interpretations by the person most familiar with the data may be of some value for others less familiar with it. Yet it is imperative that a distinction be drawn between any demonstrable facts and the investigator's interpretations or these unverifiable interpretations may be mistaken for demonstrated truth. This chapter contains interpretations which the investigator believed were implied by the findings. However, other persons might arrive at different conclusions from the same findings.

First a brief summary of principal findings will be given as an overview of the study and then specific findings will be reiterated and interpreted.

Review of Principal Findings

1. The original nine categories of behavior, as follows, did not describe all administrative behavior of the selected high school principals:

   Setting goals
   Making policy
   Determining roles
Communicating
Using educational resources of the community
Working with community leadership
Involving people
Coordinating administrative functions and structure
Appraising effectiveness

2. When the category, "showing consideration" was added to the original nine categories, which were just listed, the total of ten categories could reliably include all of the administrative behaviors.

3. The original, the revised, and the additional categories or dimensions of behavior which were significantly greater in frequency for effective administrators than for ineffective ones were:

   Communicating
   Initiating communication
   Showing consideration
   Planning
   Delegating functions
   Contacting face-to-face

4. The behavior called "talking" was not significantly different for effective administrators from ineffective ones when considered generally but was significantly greater in frequency when narrowed to include only talking with teachers.
5. The following behaviors which were already mentioned as being significantly greater in frequency for effective administrators than ineffective ones were also significantly greater in frequency when considered only in relation to the following sub-categories of persons-whom-the-behavior-was-in-relation-to:

Communicating with teachers
Initiating communication with teachers
Initiating communication with assistant principals
Planning with teachers
Planning with pupils
Contacting face-to-face the teachers

6. The categories of behavior which were significantly greater in frequency for effective administrators than ineffective administrators were highly correlated.

7. The following categories of behavior did not differ significantly for effective and ineffective administrators when considered generally or when limited in scope to include only certain categories of persons-the-behavior-was-in-relation-to:

Appraising effectiveness
Clarifying problems
Coordinating administrative functions
Determining roles
Involving people
Making and maintaining policy
Setting goals
Using educational resources
Working with community leadership
Speaking disparagingly
Engaging in communication initiated by others
Telephoning
Writing
Disseminating information widely
Reading
Seeking or studying recorded data

Jury Ratings

An interpretation of the conclusions of this study would be incomplete without some explanation and interpretation of the outcome of the jury ratings. The jury of superiors, peers, and associates, who rated the administrators, was described in previous chapters. The ratings of the general overall effectiveness of high school principals by this jury varied tremendously. For instance, one principal was placed in all of the four quartiles by various raters. In fact, most principals were placed in more than one of the four quartiles and only a few were placed in the same quartile by the different judges. Due to the fact that only five principals were needed at each of the extreme ends, it was possible to obtain a sample clearly on one or the other sides of the median.

The difficulty in obtaining unanimity among the
jurors may indicate that certain jurors were more familiar with some aspects of the principals' behaviors than others and/or that different judges use different criteria for general effectiveness. This study, however, is relatively unaffected by either of these possibilities since only those principals were chosen who were clearly on one side of the median or the other.

Categories of Behaviors and Persons

An attempt is made here to discuss the categories of behavior and persons concerning why the categories were critical or were not critical in discriminating between effective and ineffective administration. These categories have already been defined in Chapter IV and statistically analyzed in Chapter V.

Behaviors Not Critical - The categories which were not critical will be discussed first because out of these non-critical categories emerged categories which were critical and thus these non-critical behaviors genetically preceded the others. The writer believed that the behaviors which were not significant fell into one or more of the following categories:

1. Some of the behaviors were insignificant because they were so essential that both kinds of administrators performed them. For instance, coordinating behaviors, such as making schedules, were so obviously important for a principal to do or have done that all principals saw that
it was done.

2. Some of the insignificant behaviors actually were irrelevant to administration because administrators did not exhibit these behaviors. The behavior actually did not exist.

3. Some of the insignificant behaviors would have been significant if a longer period of observation permitted the recording of a larger frequency of behaviors. That is, differences between the groups would widen if the period of time for observing each group were increased equally. The average frequencies for "contacting face-to-face" for effective and ineffective groups were 208.8 and 106.6 respectively and were thus plenty large enough to allow differences to be manifested, whereas the average frequencies for "working with community leadership" for effective and ineffective groups were only 2.2 and 0.4 respectively and thus were not large enough to manifest significant difference. A few additional behaviors could alter this later relationship one way or the other.

4. Some of the behaviors, such as appraising effectiveness, were not demonstrated overtly and thus could not be observed. Objective indices are lacking for such behaviors.

5. A few of the insignificant behaviors would have been significant if the units of behavior had been designed
differently and specifically for each category of behavior. This would have permitted more precise and accurate measurement of some types of behavior.

An attempt will be made to explain why certain behaviors were not critical.

"Appraising effectiveness" was a category which seemed applicable to many situations but which actually was observed infrequently. This may have been because it did not necessarily characterize administrators but was performed by other staff members. For leaders, the wrong course vigorously pursued may be better than the right one followed in a vacillating manner. That is, considerable appraising by the administrator may suggest vacillation to persons on the staff. "This is like the military maxim, 'when in doubt attack'. At least it gets information." The writer believes that much appraising or evaluating is necessary but that it is not important for administrators unless it is performed in relation to the future. It is involved in planning but does not exist as a separate behavior for the administrator. For instance, the effective administrator is not very likely to spend much time studying test results or evaluation sheets but when assigning a student or a teacher to a class may hurriedly glance at

---

such results and in the light of his many contacts with these persons act.

"Clarifying problems" occurred so infrequently in the period of observation that no statistical analysis was fine enough to detect differences which might have been significant. The writer still believes that the behavior was essential in ascertaining where other effort was to be applied. However, this behavior tends to be an intellectual one which some writers believe is incompatible with the administrative processes since an intellectual is reputed to see so many sides he cannot make up his mind.

"Coordinating administrative functions" occurred frequently enough to manifest significant difference if such a significant difference actually existed. Perhaps it was found in both groups because it was a traditional important function of administrators that even the ineffective ones recognized and exercised it.

"Determining roles" was a behavior frequently found in both groups and was a traditional role perhaps recognized by both groups. When this category was reduced in scope to cover only delegating, delegating was found to be critical as described in a later category. Also, explained later, is another index of delegation, who the effective principal contacted the most, the teacher.

"Involving people" was a behavior observed so infre-
quently that the Chi square test did not reveal a significant difference but the means of the two groups, 6.6 and 1.6, would be significantly different if they increased in the same proportion. The involvement of people has become very popular in government, industry, and commerce, as well as in school administration. For instance, the slogan contests and other forms of lay participation seduces the interest of persons to the point that persons involved identify themselves with the project and support it. Nevertheless the involvement of all kinds of persons in the administration of public schools is legitimate since the public schools actually belong to all. Perhaps the widthness of the involvement is as significant as the frequency and should be a factor in studying this behavior.

"Making and maintaining policy" might have been significant had a much longer period of observation permitted a larger frequency with the same proportion but such a period would have to be quite long. Perhaps both effective ineffective administrators inescapably make and maintain policy.

"Setting goals" was a behavior observed infrequently but would be very critical if the frequencies increased in the same proportion. In fact, it was almost significantly different in the present study.

"Using educational resources" was a category which
occurred so infrequently that no generalizations could safely be made about it. If resources were defined more broadly the frequency would increase but such a broad category would include behaviors in regard to conventional educational materials such as textbooks, etc., which certainly are employed by both effective and ineffective administrators. Therefore, the behavior still would not be critical. Perhaps the use of educational materials is a function of the teachers instead of the principal.

"Working with community leadership" was also a category which occurred very infrequently and thus permitted only presumptuous generalizations. However, the inclusion of the following factors could have increased the scope of this category and thus increased the likelihood that it would have been critical:

1. Participations of the principal in projects arranged by the community leadership with the superintendent's central office. Since laymen who are really effective leaders will be wise enough to work with the central office, principals are effectively working with community leadership when they work with the central office.

2. Working with community leadership be weighted according to the importance of the leaders. The principal who has the most effective relationship with community leadership may be the one who has contact with the fewest leaders, but is only the person or persons at the very top of the power structure.

3. Contacts with community leaders at church and at other community affairs outside of school.

4. Routine business contacts resulting from purchases
of school materials.

"Speaking disparagingly" was to include behaviors assumed to be negatively correlated with effectiveness but the infrequency of its occurrence caused it to be judged not significant. The writer now believes that even if a much longer period of observation were used the difference would still be largely insignificant.

"Engaging in communication initiated by others" occurred in sufficient quantity that it seems that if differences existed they would have been manifested. It was almost critical at the 5 per cent level. It had been hypothesized that this behavior might have been an index to the approachability of the principal.

"Telephoning" may have been more significant than indicated here if a longer period of observation had been employed to include greater frequencies. However, the inevitable routine telephone calls may have obscured the calls which were significant, the ones initiated by the principal. The problem led to the development of a new category called "initiating communication" which will be discussed later. A category of initiation of telephone calls alone, however, would probably include many calls by ineffective principals to the central office about how to fill out forms and about what to do with problem students.

"Writing" was not found to be critical according to
the Chi square test, but the means of the two groups would be significantly different if they increased in the same proportion.

"Disseminating information widely" occurred so infrequently in the period of observation that conclusions could not safely be drawn but information at hand does not indicate that this behavior is critical.

"Reading" also occurred too infrequently to manifest differences. This behavior was extremely difficult to investigate because principals may have engaged in much professional reading at home. Also, it was difficult for an observer to tell whether the focus of the principal's eyes on written material indicated active reading or idle daydreaming.

"Seeking or studying recorded data" was a sub-division of reading constructed to include only the active reading and thus separate it from the idle daydreaming, but the division naturally decreased the frequency which was already too small for study. The division did result in a greater difference in means which suggests that it might be critical if frequencies were increased.

In connection with the behaviors listed previously which were found to not be critical it should be noted that the behaviors were also not critical when considered in regard to the sub-categories of persons with whom the behaviors were involved.
Critical Behaviors. Certain categories of behavior were not only critical generally but also critical when considered only in relation to certain categories of persons. Both aspects will be considered as each general behavior is discussed. It should be noted that certain behaviors might have been significant in relation to certain other categories of persons if increased frequencies would have increased in the same proportion. Also, some general categories of behavior are genetically related to each other.

"Communicating" was significant from several different viewpoints. First of all, as a general category of behavior the difference in means was critical. Secondly, it was critical when considered only in respect to teachers. Thirdly, if it was assumed that all behaviors were communication the difference of frequency of the two groups was critical generally and when considered only in relation to pupils; student aids; teachers; assistant principals; non-certified personnel; community members not including pupils, staff, board of education, or parents; and educators other than those in the school system. Fourthly, certain subdivisions of communication, that is, "initiating communication" was significant as a separate category. This subdivision of communication "initiating communication" was also significant when considered only in relation to certain categories of persons: the teachers and the assistant prin-
cipals. The category, talking, was formed by sub-dividing communicating. It was not significant by itself but was significant when considered only in relation to teachers and the assistant principal.

It is not surprising that in modern society communicating is important. In view of this importance, principals must develop skills in communication.

The tradition-directed person (formerly prevalent) takes his signals from others, but they come in a cultural monotone; he needs no complex receiving equipment to pick them up. The other-directed (modern) person must be able to receive signals from far and near; the sources are many, the changes rapid. The control equipment, instead of being like a gyroscope, is like a radar.2

Thus principals must develop radar-like methods to gather information.

Since behaviors, strictly of the structuring type, such as setting goals, making policy, and determining roles, were conspicuously absent from the list of critical behaviors, even though other respectable studies of leadership indicated the importance of structure, it was natural to look for critical behaviors which might include submerged structure not readily apparent. It was later believed that communicating was a category which included structuring in this concealed sort of way. Perhaps the

administrator used communication to avoid the naked or blatant use of authority. The ideas disseminated gave indications to persons, within his span of control, what should be done, thereby eliminating the necessity for him to frequently formally order persons to do things. Perhaps this explains why effective administrators communicate more than ineffective ones but do not seem to determine roles, make or maintain policy or set goals significantly more than ineffective ones.

Others have considered communication as structuring or using authority. Authority has been defined in part as the character of a communication in a formal organization. Thus the communication system forms a system of objective authority. The essential aspects of such a communication system have been described as follows:

a. Channels of communication should be definitely known.

b. Objective authority requires a definite formal channel of communication to every member of our organization.

c. The line of communication must be as direct or short as possible.

d. A complete line of communication should usually be used.

e. The competence of persons serving as communication centers, officers, supervisory heads, etc., must be adequate.

f. The lines of communication should not be interrupted during the time when the organization is to function.
g. Every communication should be authenticated.³

If communication represents authority or structure, then perhaps the sub-division of communication, initiating communication, is similar to initiating structure, which has been found to be significant in Halpin's extensive study.⁴

Communication is obviously important in the sense that it is a vehicle for the conveyance of considerate acts and other aspects of the category, "showing consideration" which is a critical behavior. Effective communication amplifies his acts of consideration. Similarly, however, disparaging remarks may be so amplified. Therefore, it was thought at first that communication itself was not sufficient for effective administration because disparaging remarks could also be amplified. However, since "speaking disparagingly" was found not to be a critical behavior communication cannot be bad in the rational and findings of this study.

"Showing consideration" was a category which was very critical as an undivided behavior. It is not surprising that this behavior is generally very significant because it is a major value of most American religions, an important


⁴Andrew W. Halpin and B. J. Winer, loc. cit.
aspect of our general culture, and consequently a purpose of our schools. Also, if other aspects such as delegating functions, initiating, and structuring are important, showing consideration is important as a means to their accomplishment. For instance, an administrator cannot delegate until he has a high sociometric score.\(^5\) He must be accepted by the persons he delegates functions to before he can delegate. Often the two were closely tied together in one situation or even the same breath. For instance, an effective principal was heard to say to his student office aid "Gee, you look pretty today, will you file this?" Also, this effective principal facilitated the initiation of an idea with this comment, "I'll bet you boys would know when to get a tarp." (No mention had even been made of a tarpaulin before he mentioned it in this compliment.)

Lay literature sometimes contains references to how an effective administrator combines good human relations with getting the job done, as for example: "He knows how to drive people and still make them like him."\(^6\)

Showing consideration by effective principals sometimes became a chain reaction. Such an act by the administrator resulted in a reciprocal act by another which re-

---

\(^5\)R. M. Stogdill, *loc. cit.*

sulted in another such act by the administrator. The ineffective principals not only failed to initiate acts of consideration but often responded negatively to acts of consideration initiated by other persons and thus broke the chain of reaction.

At first it was suspected that "showing consideration" could be explained in terms of attractions and antipathies, that is, it was assumed at first to be merely a matter of attitude without definite attendant behaviors. The observer informally attempted to note the attractiveness or antipathy of the principals. Much to the surprise of the investigator, some of the principals that seemed to be hostile in attitude, manner, and demeanor, were principals with many acts or behaviors categorized as "showing consideration" and were principals rated as effective. Conversely, some of the principals who seemed to have a very friendly attitude were judged ineffective and had a significantly lesser number of behaviors categorized as "fostering human relations." The conclusion is that showing consideration consists of definite acts. Mere pleasantness is not sufficient. The status of persons must be raised by the administrator.

These acts of consideration include the general and specific illustrations listed under the definition "showing consideration" in Chapter IV. These acts of considera-
tion sometimes contradict other principles of administration. For instance, when a principal does something for someone he would not ordinarily do he is in a sense showing consideration. On the other hand, this may be time consuming and interfere with the principle of delegating functions, which will be discussed later. Here is where many ineffective principals seemed to have considerable difficulty, they sometimes fill out time consuming reports which might be considered an act of consideration for the secretary or teachers, but consume time which could be spent more wisely.

"Showing consideration" sometimes, in another sense, conflicts with a function of a scholar, researcher, or writer, in that their function sometimes is to be disloyal to the group by performing acts and saying unheard of things which are unpopular. If something is new it will be different from the prevalent. The principal has to be forward looking but only slightly ahead of the group or he will not be showing consideration. He must be generally loyal to present values.

"Planning" was a category which was critical not only as a general category, but also when considered only in relation to pupils and when considered only in relation to teachers. It should be noted that planning was defined very broadly. The only common factor seemed to be indica-
tions of forethought and acting now in relation to something in the future. In Aristotelian logic one can change only the present and not the past or the future. Actually, while working in the present one can change the past by reinterpreting it or putting it in a different perspective. Also, while working in the present, even though predictions may not be accurate, one definitely changes the future by altering the way the future will be from the way it would have been without the present planning. The best way to cope with the future seems to be to prepare for it.

In a sense, planning is the addition of the third dimension to the gestalt. It involves seeing the future and perhaps the past. Some of the elements of the process include not only calendars and agendas, but notes or memoranda to one's self and others placed in strategic places to provide continuity and coherence.

"Delegating functions" was critical as a general category. As indicated in the interpretation of "determining roles", one of the behaviors which was not critical, "delegating functions", was a category constructed from those deputizing behaviors originally classified as "determining roles". Other frames of reference, the categories of persons the behaviors were in relation to, provided another indication of the delegation of functions. For instance, the effective administrators had more total behaviors, irregardless of categories, with teachers than they had with
pupils. Conversely, the ineffective administrators had more total behaviors, irregardless of categories, with pupils than they had with teachers. This could not be accounted for by size of schools (small ones of which might necessitate fewer behaviors with teachers) or by any other factor considered. Perhaps this indicates that effective principals have delegated most functions involving students to teachers and behave in relation to teachers. The teachers were more sufficient in number to cope with the many pupils. Teachers were the persons most often causing a category of behavior to be significant. This conclusion was in agreement with findings in other studies. One of the conclusions of Sternlof’s study was that:

School administrators demonstrate more observable behavior relative to the administration and organization of instruction and pupil services than any other aspect of administrative responsibility.7

These interpretations concerning the importance of dealing with teachers may appear self evident but it must be remembered that one-half of the principals, the ineffective group, had more behaviors in relation to pupils than in relation to teachers. Also, there are many sentimental cliches about the relatively greater importance of princi-

pals having direct contacts with pupils. It is interesting to note that several of the effective principals voiced this cliche but apparently behaved differently.

Since total behaviors or contacts were statistically significant irrespective of the categories of behavior an attempt was made to find out what kind of contacts were the most significant. Therefore, the next category was constructed.

"Contacting face-to-face" was a very critical behavior not only generally but when considered only in relation to teachers, too, thus substantiating conclusions concerning the importance of relationships with teachers. It was critical, but to a lesser degree when considered only in relation to non-certified personnel. The contacts with non-certified personnel were almost all with the secretary. It was not surprising that all principals had many face to face contacts with their secretaries because of the usual proximity of their desks and the fact that the secretary was hired to work in close relationship with the principal. However, the finding is that there is a critical difference between effective and ineffective principals in this respect. Perhaps this is another index to the principals' structuring of contacts, that is, the effective ones save time by channeling contacts through their secretaries who handle some of the details and the ineffective ones do not.
An analysis of contacts with secretaries revealed that the majority involved matters more nearly classified as relating to teachers than in regard to pupils.

"Talking" was a category which was not critical generally but was critical when considered only in relation to teachers and the assistant principal. This is another indication of the importance of contacts with teachers. The fact that the whole category was not critical and "talking to teachers" was significant illustrated the importance of analyzing each behavior on the basis of whom-it-was-in-relation-to.

Perhaps as significant as the fact that several behaviors when sub-divided were found significant, when considered only in relation to teachers, is the fact that behaviors when sub-divided were never significant when considered only in relation to the superintendent-board of education. Since the superintendents, assistant superintendents, and other high ranking central office personnel originally determined which principals were effective, it was suspected that principals rated thus were ones who "played the top-side" and had more contacts of some type or another with these central office officials. However, this was not the case. In fact, the two groups differed the least in relationships of this kind.
Total Frequencies

The totaling of all behaviors, irregardless of categories of behavior or the categories of persons, resulted in gross sums which were of dubious significance but it was interesting to note that when the total of everything was divided on the basis of whether the principals were effective or ineffective the effective group had a significantly greater total. Possibly two explanations can be made.

1. The categories investigated were stated positively and with the expectation that all but "speaking disparagingly" would be associated with effectiveness. The more frequent behaviors such as communicating were critical which outweighed several ineffective ones.

2. Effective principals did more of everything.

Effectiveness was associated with motion, or energy. Perhaps this indicates that one index of a good potential administrator is the energy he exhibits. Naturally other indices must be considered, too, as implied by the other critical behaviors such as communicating and showing consideration.

Importance of Maintaining the Organization

Although the frequency of so-called structuring behaviors, such as determining policies and determining roles, were not significantly different for effective principals than for ineffective ones, it was revealed repeat-
edly that effective principals had more behaviors or just mere contacts with teachers than with pupils whereas ineffective ones had more contacts with pupils. This suggested the importance of maintaining an organization whereby the principal dealt mainly with staff members who in turn dealt with students. It can be readily understood that the answering of petty questions, etc., can be done more effectively by the sum total of teachers in their respective classrooms, homerooms, or other assignments than by any one person such as the principal. However, in order for teachers to do this effectively they must have the information. Thus the importance of communicating, initiating communication, talking, planning, etc., with teachers can readily be seen. Communication seems to support structure. Also, structure supports communication by providing a systematic means of dissemination. In this setting structure and communication support each other to the extent that the two concepts are inseparable.

In relation to organizational structure it was noted that the frequency of contacts with the superintendent's office did not differ significantly between the effective and ineffective principals. However, there were indications that persons tended to judge the superintendent and entire school system by their conception of the principal and particular high school. For instance, when parents or teach-
ers were thwarted by local regulations of particular
schools these persons made comments such as this: "I don't
see why our city can't allow us to do this," etc. Thus the
principal is an important representative of the superintend-
ent. Judgments about the superintendent are often based
upon conceptions of the principal.

Office Arrangement and Procedure

It is difficult to study administrative effectiveness
without paying some attention to office arrangement and pro-
cedure, even though these matters are not ordinarily
thought of as administrative behavior. It is rather obvious
that behavior is affected by such arrangements and also,
since the administrator can change it, the arrangement is
the result of behavior or lack of behavior of the principal.
Office procedure may not be important per se but the lack
of proper procedure can interfere with other things which
are more important. This point can be shown by two extreme
examples:

Here is what the writer considered an office with
poor arrangement and procedure actually observed in a
secondary school containing an ineffective principal:

1. The telephone was out of the reach of anyone
sitting at the principal's desk even though the
aged principal had the habit of personally
answering many telephone calls before his secre-
tary did. If one answered the telephone for the
other, shouting was necessary to shift the call
to the other.
2. A working schedule of irregular activities and enrollment sheets currently being worked on frequently by the principal were filed on a high top shelf of a cabinet.

3. No records of pupils were in the principal's office, nor was there a system for necessary records to be taken to the principal, which caused the principal to go to the outer office each time he desired a pupil's record.

4. There was no ornamentation or color in the principal's office except for the monotone neutral wall paint.

5. Pupils reporting to the office often reported directly to the principal causing him to have to go to the secretary's office to hunt the pupil's card.

Here is what the writer considered an office with excellent arrangement and procedure actually observed in a secondary school containing an effective principal in the same city as the one described above:

1. The secretary greeted all visitors, both pupil and adult, and asked them their names and reason for wanting to see the principal. If the principal was busy the secretary tried to steer the person to someone else, such as the assistant principal, attendance officer or teacher concerned. If a person had to wait, magazines such as parent and teacher organization magazines or the school paper were given the visitors.

2. The secretary used the list she compiled of visitors to locate the pupil's record for the principal before the conference, to call the visitors in the proper sequence, and to announce them correctly when she opened the door to the principal's private office and introduced the visitor and problem to the principal.

3. When the secretary announced a visitor, she gave the principal a record card if a student was involved, and checked the box marked "out" on the principal's desk.
4. The secretarial staff opened all mail for the principal.

5. The principal's telephone was located on his desk, was answered initially by a secretary on an extension, and then calls for the principal were announced by a soft non-irritating buzzer.

6. The clock, calendar of events, and schedules were within sight or easy reach of the principal.

7. The office contained an attractive leatherette divan and other simple but cheerful furnishings.

Possible Psychological Origin of Categories

The writer believes that except for the uncategorized behavior just mentioned which is commonplace and which the observers are accustomed to seeing others do, the observers tended to see the behaviors which they were looking for. He believes that in such unstructured situations persons unavoidably project their rationale into the situation. Thus the category called fostering human relations or showing consideration may not have been in the original nine categories established by the workers in the School-Community Development Study because at that time the Halpin study,\(^8\) enunciating the consideration dimension, was unknown to them. However, the writer and all the three co-researchers who observed administrators independently and unanimously saw this distinct category perhaps because they had been immersed in the rationale supporting this category.

\(^8\)Halpin, loc. cit.
If this conclusion is true one is led to wonder about the genesis of the original nine behaviors. Perhaps each was to some extent the result of a researcher’s reading about a particular theme in school administration. Thus, the communication dimension may have emerged after reading about some recent communications research or Riesman’s, The Lonely Crowd. Working with community leadership may have emerged after hearing about the work of Floyd Hunter concerning the Community Power Structure.

The writer believes that there is no limit to the number of categories of behavior which may be enunciated and thus it is inaccurate to say that all administrative behavior can be described within a given framework. The significant question concerning any category or set of categories or dimensions is whether the category discriminates between effective and ineffective administrators.

New List of Categories Considered Necessary to Describe Administrative Behavior

After studying the a priori list of nine categories of behavior, revising some of them, and creating new ones, it was concluded that it was very difficult to make one list which would be sufficient to describe all administrative

9Riesman, loc. cit.

behavior without making categories so broad that they did not constitute dimensions of behavior which discriminates significantly between effective and ineffective administrators. One alternative is to have a list of broad categories such as the original nine plus "showing consideration" and another alternative is to have a list of discriminating categories more limited in scope. Both alternatives cannot be pursued at the same time because some behaviors such as "coordinating functions" are used by both kinds of principals.

A compromise may be made by choosing the most frequent behaviors and the most discriminate behaviors but an accurate title for such a list is difficult to find, because the more prevalent are not necessarily discriminate. However, the writer believes that the following new list will be "useful" in considering administrative behavior. The sub-heads to communicating are especially useful.

1. Communicating
   a. Initiating communication
   b. Communicating face-to-face
   c. Communicating with teachers

2. Showing consideration

3. Planning

4. Setting goals

5. Making and maintaining policy
6. Delegating functions
7. Coordinating functions
8. Working with community leadership

It is assumed that these categories and sub-heads are to be defined as they originally were in the previous chapter. Any other definitions would prevent claims to be made about their usefulness.
CHAPTER VII

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE, TRAINING, AND RESEARCH

The findings and interpretations contained in earlier chapters seem to indicate that there should be changes in:

1. the practice of administration in school systems,
2. the identification and training of potential and actual administrators, and
3. research regarding school administration, especially regarding administrative behaviors.

Perhaps changes should first be attempted in practice to re-establish this rationale in reality and thus discover if these vast related research efforts have practical utility.

Implications and Recommendations for Practice

1. Since effective and ineffective principals differ greatly in their behavioral pattern, principals in service should investigate thoroughly the meaning of the administrative behavioral approach.

2. Principals in service should view their own conduct in terms of administrative behavior and realize that knowledges, skills, and attitudes concerning their problems are insufficient without the appropriate behaviors or action pattern.

3. Principals in service should thoroughly investigate the nature of at least these behaviors found to be discriminant: showing consideration, planning, communication,
initiating communication, delegating functions, and having face-to-face contacts, and incorporate these actions into their daily administrative practice. Likewise, the acutely significant aspects of the general communication dimension: face-to-faceness, initiation, and contacts with teachers, should be thoroughly understood and incorporated into their patterns of action.

Also, since communication is so important but time consuming, principals may institute some systems of communication which disseminate information widely, help plan or anticipate the future, and delegate the execution of the communication. Examples of such systems of communication may be as follows:

a. Public address announcements be complete in details and then be filed in order that unclear items can be verified.

b. Irregularities about groups or individual students be noted on the daily absence list.

c. The calendar of school events be placed on hall bulletin boards every day or week to reduce bothersome questions by students and teachers.

d. The official school event calendar for the year be placed in such a position in the office that it can be consulted by persons planning without disturbing the principal or other staff members.

e. The principal's office manager keep a duplicate of the principal's appointments to minimize the disturbance of the principal when appointments are being planned.

f. Weekly staff bulletins warn of impending complications which may complicate matters in the process of being planned by others.
g. Planned teachers' meetings, conferences, and other face-to-face contacts to clarify problems, not readily solvable in indirect communications, be established.

These channels of communication may provide answers to questions and provide solutions to questions before problems arise.

The tremendous amount of office work, the time consuming inter-personal contacts, and interdepartmental coordination behaviors in the central and principal's offices can be reduced by the delegation of certain functions and the needed delegation of authority. Since many procedures must be somewhat uniform in order that they meet the principle of equality and thus be fair to all, these uniform procedures should be reasonably easy to delegate since they would be applied approximately the same way to all cases and only the exceptional cases would be referred to a higher authority. When these procedures are written down, then all staff members, including secretaries and student helpers, can acquire the ability to fulfill these functions and thus free the principal to improve the procedures, deal with exceptional cases, and attend to other more important matters. Naturally these procedures would depend upon the number of assistant principals, the quality of clerical workers, and many other school factors. Also, the rule of reason would probably dictate that the procedures be cooperatively developed with the aid of those who are to follow
them and with persons in a position to know what can be 
effectively delegated.

A simple example of a sound procedure which can 
save the principal a lot of extra time is to have clerical 
workers, whether student or adult, automatically hand the 
schedule card and cumulative record to the principal when­
ever any student is announced to the principal. Many other 
examples of such procedures are contained in Appendix G.

It must be remembered that functions and authority 
can be wisely delegated only after certain conditions are 
met such as the following:

a. Subordinates are placed at key points who have 
sufficient capacity and training.

b. Records and reports are provided which indicate 
whether or not the assigned tasks are performed.¹

4. Superintendents and boards of education are 
ultimately responsible for the effectiveness of principals; 
they should investigate the rationale of the behavioral 
approach, investigate the nature of the behaviors which 
were important for effectiveness, evaluate the behavior of 
the principals on the basis of these behaviors, and assist 
in improving the behavior of the principals within their 
system. Perhaps this can best be implemented in a large

¹Harlan L. Hagman and Harland L. Swartz, Administration in Profile for School Executives, (New York: Harper 
system by having a skilled administrator specifically
designated to assist in the improvement of the behavior of
administrators.

Boards of education are now willing to expend large
sums to employ curriculum and child service specialists,
but these efforts are wasted in schools where ineffective
principals fail to focus these services in the place where
they are intended. Boards of education must realize that
society's massive addition of functions to the highly de-
partmentalized and perhaps outmoded high school organiza-
tion has created unprecedented problems of coordination
alone which must be solved before positive instructional
leadership can be exerted.

A simple but result producing beginning would be to
show administrators how to institute the most functional
office procedure discussed earlier and thus save hours of
the principals' time in order that they may think, plan,
and apply their efforts to the more significant problems.
Another beginning would be to show him how to raise the
status of teachers and disseminate information in order
that other persons may make decisions without bothering the
principal.

5. Boards of education should employ adequate cler-
ical help and assistants for the principal in order that
he may devote his efforts to leadership behaviors and func-
Implications and Recommendations for Training

Institutions training administrators face not only the training problem, but also the problem of selecting potential candidates for training. First the recommendations for selection will be discussed.

Criteria for Selection of Candidates. Certain desirable qualities of potential administrators will be discussed here.

1. The energetic and active educators should be sought since effective administrators have a greater frequency of many behaviors. Resources of energy may not be readily evident at first. In fact, some persons who seem to have great energy resources may be merely nervously expending energy in inconsequential channels such as in biting their fingernails and in idle gossip. The energetic person potentially effective may not appear very active but is cogitating methodically and is involved in many responsible projects.

2. Since principals must continually show consideration, persons should be sought who either have a good personal adjustment or who at least have no psychological problem incapable of solution before assuming administrative functions. Ego involved persons or those interested only in raising their own status would probably soon tire
of raising the status of others.

3. Since effective principals must deal largely with teachers, persons should be selected who will maintain the necessary organizational structure and thus be willing to do the best for children by working with them largely indirectly through teachers.

4. Since communicating is a critical behavior, a candidate should have the basic physical, mental, and academic background for extensive oral and written communication. That is, he must potentially be able to speak and write fluently. Training can be of assistance if he has no speech nor mental disorder.

5. Candidates should be optimistic in attitude and expressive of this attitude because it seems to be necessary for the position and no training seems to be available for the development of this essential quality.

Criteria For Selection of Training Experiences.

1. Training institutions should remedy the candidate's psychological problems which are capable of being alleviated and develop insight into the ego needs of people.

It has been shown that effective administrators not only have tremendous burdens but must continually be showing consideration to the whole gamut of persons he comes in contact with. Thus his own ego needs must already be satisfied in ways satisfactory to these associates or he
will not feel able to show consideration to these others.

The help of psychiatrists seems imperative in analyzing and solving this problem. However, skilled professors can use role playing and other forms of group therapy to develop insights into other persons' feelings and into one's own.

2. Training institutions should make sure that candidates are aware of the best manners and the roles and expectations of hosts since principals are often expected to assume the role of host in staff conferences, parental conferences, student conferences, etc. Such manners, while unimportant per se, can facilitate the necessary communication and reduction of tension. Some principals seem to be unaware of this need.

3. Since planning was a critical behavior, a vision of the possibilities of what the school can do for the children must be inculcated in candidates in order that sights be raised from the mere process of making a living and be focused on planning for the future. Trainees should be familiar with what the very best schools are doing and what is best for their own schools.

4. In order that candidates can plan they should be instructed in some of the basic principles of planning such as: making sure that short term goals do not conflict with and hinder the attainment of long range goals, definitizing
flexibility in plans, consulting persons affected by decisions, making calendars, etc.

5. Since effective principals work through teachers, thereby maintaining an organizational structure, training institutions while stressing democratic participation and concepts, should develop insight into the nature and purpose of each organizational structure in school. They should also develop skill in designing functional organizational structure. Some principals, who find certain aspects of structure undesirable, seem to try to abolish all forms of it instead of improving it, and thus they have chaos.

6. Since so many demands are made upon the time of the principal, training institutions should enlist the aid of operations research and office procedure specialists to devise optimum procedures for high school offices. Training institutions should then help principals to develop time saving office practices in order that the potential principals have an opportunity to attend to the major problems. Office training specialists from the schools of business and office equipment companies in an hour or two could develop consciousness of procedures which could save the principal literally thousands of hours of work later.

7. Colleges and universities should not only develop the candidate's communication skills but also the
willingness to use these skills. The quality, though imperfect, is usually adequate but the skills are not set in motion in many cases.

Implications and Recommendations for Related Research

1. The findings of this study should be compared with the three companion studies in order that findings be verified, disputed, and resolved and to determine similarities and differences in behavior at the various administrative levels.

2. Administrators who are trained in the behaviors suggested should be investigated to determine if such behaviors (and thus "effectiveness") can be taught.

3. There should be an instrument devised for similar investigations with appropriate units of behavior devised for each behavior. This should be prepared previous to the observations for the following reasons:

   a. To insure that all pertinent dimensions to a behavior are recorded when they are observed.
   b. To insure that behaviors of the same kind are recorded in the same way.
   c. To simplify the initial recording of these complex data.
   d. To simplify the handling of these complex data. Units for categories such as "involving people" should be multiplied by the total number of the persons involved to provide for the proper
weighting of occasions which are more important than others. This factor, the number of persons participating, would also make other categories of behavior more researchable and more meaningful. Such categories may be: clarifying problems, making policy, setting goals, and speaking disparagingly.

4. If situational factors determined the type of behavior, which the observer believes is doubtful at this level of specificity, a larger sample should be studied in order to apply partial correlation methods which partial out situational variables. Naturally such an undertaking would necessitate a sizable research staff to study a sufficient sample in a sufficient number of situations.

5. The period of observation should be increased for the collection of data concerning how the principal performs various behaviors with the community. This is necessary to increase the total amount of potential data which is relatively small compared to the large quantities of behavior in relation to staff or pupils in the same amount of time.

6. If the period of observation is increased it would be more profitable to spread it over a larger number of days than to observe full days. The behaviors occurring in a given day can be recorded well enough in less than a day's time. This conclusion is based on the following
facts. The observer made an average of fifteen cards of rough notes for each A.M. observation and fifteen cards for each P.M. observation. However, when the writer observed the same principal throughout the A.M. and P.M. of the same day approximately fifteen cards of notes were made for the A.M., as before, but only six cards of notes were gleaned from the P.M. period of equal length. The observer believes that he recorded aspects of behavior in the morning of the full day, connected with aspects of behavior extending throughout the day, which he would have also recorded in the P.M. if he were observing only in the P.M.

7. Better indices should be developed for the futurity aspect of behavior now crudely labeled "planning." Elements of anticipating, projecting, designing, optimism, or zest for living are also involved. A synonym is needed for the term "planning" to include the things listed in the definition in Chapter IV which ordinarily are not included under this term. Optimism and zest for living are attitudes but the behaviors which indicate, or are components of, these attitudes should be identified. This aspect is significant enough to merit considerable effort.

8. More objective concepts are needed to accurately describe the appropriateness of an administrative behavior. The term "quality" of behavior is meaningless if not defined in terms meaning the same thing to different people.
Scientific concepts must be communicable and not be dependent upon value or religious concepts, such as "better" or "higher quality". Some persons, anxious to convict ineffective administrators of sin, state that ineffective administrators do certain things, such as communicating, badly or poorly without using identifiable and consistent referents.

a. Whom-the-behavior-is-in-relation-to, such as teachers or pupils, etc., is one example of a basis of referents but other bases are also needed. Perhaps a system for the classification of problems can be found. The classification of subject matter of administration: financing, pupil personnel, instructional personnel, etc., varies from one textbook to another. An analysis of behavior on the basis of the technical problems involved may uncover critical behaviors.

b. Another basis for referents may be time. Identifiable objective referents such as persons and problems establish specific points on an abstract-like dimension, such as time. For instance, when persons, such as teachers, encounter problems, such as instructional problems, a particular time becomes objectively
identifiable and useful for research. The appropriateness of a behavior may be dependent upon the time in the school year or phase in the administrative process it is performed.

(c) Another objective referent may be space - more specifically where in the school building or where in the community a behavior occurs. Undoubtedly, some behaviors are more appropriate in the principal's private office than on the auditorium stage or in the hall or at a convention. Such referents are desirable because they are objective bases for dimensions which may be significant. Such referents should be put in one sequence and all oriented from one point of view, since he is the operator of the behavior and can change it. On the other hand, space may be insignificant and meaningful only as it relates to whom the persons are who the principal interacts with.

d. Another referent for behaviors like "communicating", which lacks a direct object, may be the "means" employed. These means should be as objective a term as a telephone and not an unilluminating term such as "pleasantly".

e. The processes themselves represented by verbs
must be found and classified. These processes would be different than the referents suggested so far with concrete things or things like time or space which are ascertainable by things. Processes take place between things such as "principal calms teacher", etc. The writer did not find writers, on the administrative process, such as Sears, very helpful in classifying processes because the ten writers disagreed as to what phases were essential and also each phase of the process contained large elements of the other phases.² The phases were confusing and not objectively defined.

The classification of processes by Bales is much easier to comprehend because all behavior is reduced to one continuum, the effect upon the ego of the other persons.³ However, the effect on all of the recipients of the person's behavior cannot be as readily ascertained as in the case of the face-to-face groups of Bales. This process dimension


seemed insufficient standing alone but would be much more significant if combined with other referents especially if combined with categories of persons, types of problems, and the time - that is at the beginning, during, or end of the problem. Thus, the process could be definitized as follows: raising the status of teachers in regard to parent conferences at the beginning of the school year.

9. The behavior or process, unlike the referents discussed previously, should be couched in terms of what the administrator tries to do - that is, things that the administrator can control. The concepts could be objective to the observers and or recipients of the behavior but unrelated to what the principal is trying to do and thus unrelated to what is causing the behavior. If a principal is effective in an overall sense, then it is not important whether individual behaviors seem right or wrong. Thus, if a student of administration tries to do what the effective administrator tries to do he might more nearly approximate what the effective administrator is trying to do than what the observer or recipient of the behavior think they see him doing.

An effective hunter hits the running rabbit not by aiming at the rabbit but by aiming at a spot in front of the rabbit. Since the hunter hits the rabbit, observers
might assume that he is aiming directly at the rabbit. Similarly the administrators may be aiming at something other than what the observer sees him hitting. Phenotypical behavior may be easier to be observed but if the observed behavior is to be duplicated by another, the genotypical elements must be identified. The genesis of the behavior may be different than the result.

The behavior should be operationally defined from the point of view of the person trying to perform the behavior so that if he strives for this, the other will result, even though the immediate goal does not seem to observers to coincide with the resulting effectiveness.

10. A study should be designed in which effective administrators go about their work thinking aloud, saying to the observer everything they are thinking, telling why they perform each conscious act, stating assumptions they are operating on, and stating goals they are striving for. It is imperative that the observer have an accurate knowledge of the goals of the administrator in relation to the activity observed.

It is believed that the goals stated by the administrators would be different than the goals assumed by the observer to be operative. It is believed that several effective administrators would be willing to reveal these matters which now are almost secrets. Such administrators
may not have sufficient insight to explain everything they do but, if what they strive to do which results in general effectiveness becomes known, something will be added to the field of educational administration.
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APPENDIX A: School-Community Development Study
Cooperative Program in Educational Administration

Progress Report
on the
"Critical Areas" Validation Studies
February 18, 1955

Meeting: February 16, 1955 - 2:00-4:00 P.M. - Room 212, Arps Hall

Participants: Dr. Burr, Dr. Campbell, Mr. Clark, Dr. Eikenberry,
Mr. Hartzler, Mr. Hess, Dr. Jonassen, and Mr. Rosenberger.

Purposes:

1. To hear, and discuss, the research proposals of Mr. Clark
   and Mr. Hartzler.

2. To determine, unofficially, the suitability of the proposals
   for dissertation purposes.

Discussion:

1. Dr. Eikenberry suggested the possibility of including certain
   superintendents on the jury. Dr. Burr concurred in the idea.
   There are eight cities of over 100,000 population whose super-
   intendents might be asked to serve as jurors, since it is
   likely that these superintendents will not be included in the
   research sample.

2. Dr. Burr expressed a preference for the term "administrative
   associates" instead of "administrative subordinates" in identi-
   fying persons with whom the superintendent works. (See
   paragraph D, 4, page 2, Mr. Hartzler's proposal.)

3. Dr. Jonassen cautioned against being too categorical in the
   statement of "the nine" areas; considering previous studies,
   these may be some categories; there may be others.

4. Dr. Jonassen suggested further study of techniques in dealing
   with "small group samples." (See Beals, in the "American
   Sociological Review"; and Mr. Quade, of the Sociology
   Department.)

5. Dr. Jonassen suggested having several men judge behavior
   (when classifying and ranking), and then determine a
   coefficient of reliability of judgment. Similar situations
   or conditions, or "stock" situations, might be selected for
   observation. Frequency of the act may show something. The
   possible reduction of variables should be considered, and
   perhaps planned.
6. Dr. Burr suggested the use of an additional observer at a different time; or, perhaps co-observation at the same time, provided that the situation is not disturbed excessively by the presence of more than one observer.

7. Dr. Burr pointed out the necessity of defining the nine areas operationally.

8. Dr. Eikenberry expressed a concern over the problem of co-operative categorizing of behavior if only one observer sees the behavior. How will the researcher be objective and reliable in classifying data? Dr. Campbell suggested the possibility of limited co-observation, which might provide a basis for more accurate classification of behavior.

9. Dr. Campbell suggested the possibility of a "trial run" as a means of developing a guide for observation. It was pointed out, however, that it is not the purpose of the study to develop an instrument.

10. Dr. Campbell stated that if an "area" does not show up in the observations of a particular administrator, it may be because: (a) the administrator does not recognize the area of behavior; (b) the area may not be critical; or (c) the timing of the observation prevented seeing such behavior, which might be seen at another time.

Agreement Reached:

It was generally agreed that the proposals were worthy of continuation, development, and implementation; and that it is possible that the research might be used for dissertation purposes. Such a statement has been put in writing and is on file in the Office of the Department of Education. Official approval, however, cannot be granted at the present time.

It was generally agreed that further development of the design of the research is necessary, and that suggestions made at this meeting should be incorporated in the design where practicable.

Next Meeting:

The research team (Mr. Clark, Mr. Hartzler, Mr. Hess, and Mr. Rosenberger) will meet with Dr. Campbell and possibly Dr. Burr, on Monday, February 21, 1955, 8:00-10:00 A.M., Room 204, Arps Hall.

John Hartzler
Meeting: February 21, 1955, 8:00-10:00 A.M., Room 204, Arps Hall

Participants: Dr. Campbell, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hartzler, Mr. Hess, Mr. Rosenberger

Purpose:
1. To discuss the suggestions resulting from the joint meeting (February 16) of the Committees of Mr. Clark and Mr. Hartzler; and to incorporate these suggestions into the design where feasible.

Discussion:
1. Mr. Hess presented the form of his ballot for sample selection, and the names of his jurors.
2. Mr. Hartzler added the names of two large-city superintendents to his jury as a means of obtaining some peer judgments.
3. The matter of co-observation was discussed. It seemed as though such observation could not be undertaken before the third visit, and then only with a part of the subjects. It is possible that limited co-observation may give some indication of reliability of observation, recording, and classification of behavior observed.
4. The development of an observation guide was briefly discussed. While it was agreed that such a guide will be necessary, it was pointed out that it should not be structured to the extent that it precludes other observation. Behavioral acts are to be recorded on 5" x 8" cards, with interpretations to be included separately, probably on the reverse side of the card.
5. It was generally agreed that the observation guide will help to define the "critical areas" operationally.
6. Mr. Hess assumed the responsibility to secure a copy of the SternlofF dissertation from the University of Wisconsin, and to arrange a conference of the "team" with Dr. Halpin (on the use of the LBDQ).
7. Mr. Clark discussed the selection of his sample and of his jury. The sample will probably come from Dayton, Franklin County (except Columbus), Canton, and, if necessary, Akron.
8. Mr. Rosenberger has decided to participate in the study, his approach being through local district executive heads with full-time administrative responsibilities and with no full-time principal. His sample will possibly be drawn from Clark, Champaign, Licking, and Montgomery Counties.

Next Meeting:

Thursday, March 3, 1955, 8:00-10:00 A.M., Room 210, Arps Hall.

John Hartzler
March 3, 1955

The School-Community Development Study is validating a group of field studies in educational administration. Before the work can proceed, the judgments of a panel of experts is necessary. We will be very grateful if you will assist us by acting as a juror.

Enclosed is a more complete description of the task prepared by Mr. Dean O. Clark, a research assistant on our staff.

We realize that such a request places a demand upon your time, but we also recognize that our research efforts must make use of the best resources available. We hope you will give us the benefit of your knowledge and experience in developing the study now underway.

Very truly yours,

Lewis E. Harris
Associate Director
In order to finish a project concerning educational administration, the composite judgment of a jury of experts is needed. This letter is a request that you serve as a member of that jury.

The jurors are asked to describe those high school principals with whose administrative performance they are familiar. The pertinent directions and forms are enclosed.

We are aware of certain handicaps which are involved at this stage of the research. We are also aware of the reluctance with which some jurors will face this request. However, all we are asking for is a statement of the best judgment of each juror.

The focus of attention in this research is upon administrative behavior and not upon the individual administrator per se. No names of jurors, subjects, or school systems will be reported. Rest assured that detailed procedures have been developed to protect the anonymity of the jurors as well as the integrity and reputation of the principals on the list.

You will note that a coding system is being used to protect the individuals involved and to prevent the researcher from knowing how any particular juror described the principal.

In order that the field work may begin on schedule, we will need the jurors' descriptions not later than Wednesday, March 9. We will be very grateful to you if you can forward your judgments to us by that date. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dean O. Clark
Research Assistant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
<th>COLUMN C</th>
<th>COLUMN D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Sub-columns of Quartiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Schooltown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

DIRECTIONS

1. Column A contains the names and locations of certain Ohio high school principals.

2. In Column B, place a check mark after the names of all high school principals who can be described by you as a juror. (It is suggested that Column B be completed before placing check marks in Column C.)

3. Column C contains categories by which the principals may be described. The quality being described is "over-all administrative effectiveness." Place a check mark in the sub-column (of Column C) which best describes each principal checked in Column B.

   NOTE: The design of this research requires that, as nearly as possible, the same number of check marks appear in each of the four sub-columns. Thus, the total number of check marks in each sub-column (of Column C) should approximately equal one-fourth (\( \frac{1}{4} \)) of the total number of check marks placed in Column B.

4. The descriptions:

   Sub-column C-1: "This high school principal is one of the least effective administrators checked in Column B."

   Sub-column C-2: "This high school principal is in the lower half, but is not one of the least effective of those checked in Column B."

   Sub-column C-3: "This high school principal is in the upper half, but is not one of the most effective of those checked in Column B."

   Sub-column C-4: "This high school principal is one of the most effective administrators checked in Column B."

5. Column D contains code numbers which are a part of the method used by a co-researcher for protecting individuals involved in the research. This column will not be used by the juror.

6. Please tear the pages along the triple line, destroy the list of names and locations, and return the portion with Columns B, C, and D by means of the enclosed stamped, self-addressed, envelope to the School-Community Development Study.
APPENDIX F

Stamped and Self-Addressed Envelope Coded to Be Opened Only By Co-Researchers Who Did Not Make the Observation

BUSINESS REPLY ENVELOPE
First Class Permit No. 184, Sec. 349, P.L. & R., COLUMBUS, OHIO

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLUMBUS 10, OHIO

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STUDY
APPENDIX G

Procedures for Office Staff

1. Courteously greet all visitors both pupil and adult. Find out their business and if the principal is busy try to steer the person to someone else such as to the appropriate teacher.

2. If a person wants to see the principal, announce the person to the principal.

3. When the visitor is a student in difficulty with a teacher hand the schedule card and cumulative record to the principal as the student is announced.

4. Keep the box marked "file" empty.

5. Sort mail as soon as it arrives. Open the mail merely marked Gahanna High School and place in teachers mail box if there is a teacher in charge of the material in the correspondence. If no one else is in charge of the activity give the material to the principal. Open all mail to the principal except mail marked personal and place in box marked "IN".

6. Answer all telephone calls. The answer should be "Lincoln High School". If the principal is out of his personal office be sure to answer calls directed there.

7. If someone wishes to make an appointment check the principal's appointment book to avoid conflicts. Also avoid appointment with persons other than teachers at the beginning of the a.m. or p.m. sessions. Assume that the appointment can be kept but take the phone number of the person in order that the person can be called in case the appointment cannot be kept and leave a note of details of the appointment for the principal.

8. When first aid is needed see the nurse or the physical education teacher immediately.

9. When teachers, students, or others report irregularities be sure to get information such as what, who, when, and where.

10. When there is a question about heat or sanitation directly notify the janitor.
11. When any object is reported lost, get a description in order that an announcement and a search can be made.

12. When any object is found attach a note to it telling by whom, where, and when it was found and prepare announcement about it.

13. Announcements for the public address system should be placed in the tray provided on the control unit and ones already given should be filed in the combination tray-file.

14. When transfer students arrive:
   (1) Make sure that the student lives in the district by checking the map or list of bus routes.
   (2) Fill out the card regarding the Federal employment of parents.
   (3) Have them fill out the face of the schedule card.
   (4) Have them write their names on the "tear-apart" room assignment cards.
   (5) On a separate sheet of paper have them write down all courses which the transfer student was taking at his previous school.
   (6) Then after each subject so listed write the periods when the same courses are offered in this school as shown on our schedule.
   (7) Schedule the subjects given only one period first.
   (8) When there is a choice between more than one period, schedule the student in the smallest group.
   (9) If conflicts cannot be worked out see the principal.
   (10) Fill out the top six lines on the new cumulative record folder.
   (11) Assign student to home room of appropriate grade group presently having smallest enrollment.
   (12) Mark H.R. on section of tear-apart registration card and place in the mailbox of homeroom teacher to which assigned in order that the teacher will place new students on roster and check attendance.
   (13) Check all forms again and present material and
student to the principal. If the principal is not available, introduce the student to the teacher of the appropriate class and place the schedule card on the principal's desk.

15. Before the teachers bulletin is duplicated, proof read it and then ask the principal to check it. After it is duplicated:
(1) File one copy in the bulletin file.
(2) Give the principal one copy.
(3) Place a copy in each mailbox including those of the teachers, superintendent, the janitor, cooks and nurse.
(4) Place a copy of the calendar of events on each bulletin board.

16. Keep the office as uncluttered as possible by keeping everything in its place. Belongings of office girls and found articles can be placed on the shelf provided. Keep the furniture arranged neatly in general office, principal's office, and conference room. Keep office ash trays empty.

17. Each morning fill desk pens with ink and sharpen pencils for the desks.

18. When a student wishes to withdraw from school for any reason other than moving out of the district, arrange for the student to see the principal. When the student is moving out of the district with his family, have the student clear the locker, books, bills, etc., with each teacher taking down his new residence address and name of school he is likely to attend; note the student's withdrawal on the next absence list; and move his cumulative record to the inactive file. The registration card is also taken from file and placed at the rear of the registration file according to the date of the six weeks period.

19. Each morning the names of students who are absent from home room are sent to the office. The names are put on a list and distributed to home room teachers. When a teacher has a student absent from class she checks the list. When a student's name does not appear on the list, she checks with the office. When a student cannot be located at all in the building, the teachers notify the office.
20. Parents are requested to call on the day of the absence, but notes are acceptable after the absence occurs. Before a student is admitted to class after being absent, he has to check through the office.

21. When a student is tardy he is sent to office for pass by the teacher. When a student is tardy three times from home room or classes, a letter is sent to his parents. When a student is tardy four times he is suspended from school and cannot be re-instated until a parent re-instates him.

22. Special procedures during football and basketball season:

(1) Each Monday an eligibility list, prepared by the faculty manager is sent to the school played that week.

(2) Game tickets are placed in the home room teachers' mail boxes.

(3) The envelopes containing the unsold tickets and money is collected Friday morning.

(4) On the day of home games, checks are made out to officials and police.

23. Loan seating charts of the absent teacher to the substitute teacher. Do not accept the pay request until these seating charts are returned.

24. When a textbook or item is to be ordered which is not already in supply, hand the person making the request a request form.

25. Before the school treasurer or principal is asked to sign any voucher for the issuance of a check, make sure that the faculty sponsor has signed the voucher.
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