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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DESCRIPTION OF EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

1. Background of the Problem

Changing Concepts in the Preparation of Educational Administrators

Developed because of the press of increased enrollments and expanding cities, the profession of educational administration became the swift creation of necessity. Little philosophical thought preceded its comparatively recent establishment. It grew because there was a job to be done. And because American education swept and developed at such a rapid pace, there was little time to view its administration as a very complex and comprehensive social process. Rather, it became a race to prepare administrators to perform, with some degree of competence, the various functions prescribed by law and required for the purpose of efficient school operation.

Educational administration, thus, became an accretion of skills involving law, finance, school board relationships, staff, curriculum, construction and maintenance, transportation, public relations, business management, and many other things as well. To become an efficient administrator, then, it was necessary to master as many of these skills as quickly and as adeptly as possible.

To facilitate this process of function-mastery, universities which concerned themselves with the responsibility of training adminis-
trators followed the guidelines of job analysis, and designed courses for the purpose of developing competencies in these various skill areas, as they emerged. Most advanced degree programs for educational administrators, thus, were blocked out to cover these major skill areas as comprehensively as possible.

It is not to be inferred, however, that the foregoing is, in any sense, toned to depreciate the work of the function analysts in the universities. On the contrary, their contribution to the field of educational administration has been noteworthy. To perform as a school administrator, it is vital to command a measure of control over the somewhat mechanical phases which relate to law, finance, and building. These are the realia of the profession which cannot be ignored by the person who chooses to work in this area.

As the functions attendant to the field of educational administration continued to multiply at a rapid pace, however, necessitating a much more comprehensive breadth and depth understanding, serious questioning began to arise in the minds of those who saw the approach of a line of limitation. In an era of school expansion, and a further development of the multiple school district, the administrator, and more specifically, the school superintendent, could not be expected personally to fulfill all of the responsibilities, which previously he had been able to discharge. The first concern, therefore, was with this limitation which not only was impending, but in many instances impinging upon the successful functioning of administrators.

More importantly, however, in the opinion of the investigator, was the raising of the issue concerning whether or not administration was the accumulation or sum total of all of its related skills. This
issue had at least two ramifications. First, and most obviously, the work of the Gestaltists in the discipline of psychology had demonstrated that the whole is more than a sum of its parts, and that no comprehensive understanding of the functioning of the whole could result merely from a depth study of its parts. If this applied to the human organism, it was assumed that it also could pertain to the human organism in his behavioral relationships. Specifically, for our purposes, would not this reasoning apply to the field of educational administration? Secondly, there developed a growing concern over the question of educational administration as a total social process, which in no way could be separated from personal interrelationships. Since, because of the growing magnitude of his job, the administrator no longer could be expected personally to fulfill all of the attendant functions previously ascribed to the profession, it became increasingly important for him to know the administrative processes which, if followed, would enable him to perform in a manageable and constructive fashion.

We find, hence, a growing concern on the part of universities to meet the challenge of these developments in the area of educational administration and to translate the related thought into programs of preparation.

The Work of The Committee on Educational Administration at The Ohio State University

At The Ohio State University, the Department of Education established a Committee on Educational Administration for the purpose of examining and appraising its existent program for the preparation of educational administrators. The committee was also charged with the responsibility of recommending procedures for the reorganisation of the
program, if it seemed warranted to do so. The first major statement of this committee was presented on March 1, 1953, and was entitled, "Competencies Needed By School Administrators." The eleven major competency areas are listed as follows:

1. Possession in reasonable degree of appropriate personal attributes and a disposition to improve them.

2. Understandings, attitudes, and skills resulting from an adequate general education.

3. An understanding of the role of the school in the social order.

4. A disposition and an ability to cooperate with other people in planning, executing, and evaluating courses of action.

5. An understanding of the instructional program and skills in curriculum development.

6. Understanding and skills in the technical aspects of school administration.

7. An understanding of and skills in the administrative process.

8. An ability and a disposition to apply sound problem solving procedures to school concerns.

9. An inclination to act in terms of conscious value judgments.

10. An inclination and an ability to understand one's own motivations for action and how they affect his way of working with other people.

11. A disposition and an ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community, and the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others.1

These eleven competency areas did not emerge as the result of statistical factor analysis. Rather, they stemmed, a priori, as a refine-

1Committee on Educational Administration, "Competencies Needed By School Administrators" (Department of Education, The Ohio State University, March 1, 1953), pp. 3-l. (Mimeographed.)

The committee membership and a list of the field advisers is contained in this document. The eleven competency areas, as quoted, are headings only. A more complete description of each is contained in the committee statement.
ment of the thinking of the committee and the judgment of field advisers, chosen from the ranks of Ohio school administrators.

Significant to the question of the attitude of the committee in reference to the subsequent recommendations made for the revision of Ohio State's program for the preparation of educational administrators are the three convictions which are stated in the document:

1. Our concern is not so much with single competencies as with the pattern of competencies.

2. It is unreasonable and possibly even undesirable to expect a student to achieve the maximum of each competency. Probably too much expertness in one competency area, particularly without relationship to the total pattern of competencies, may actually be a handicap.

3. An examination of the material will reveal that single competencies are not enumerated, but each statement tends to be a competency area.2

As evidence that the Department of Education was willing to deal experimentally with the recommendations of the Committee on Educational Administration, two concomitant events are discussed at this time.

Also appearing on March 1, 1953, was the statement of The Committee on Educational Administration, "Internship In Educational Administration." The purpose of the internship program was "to provide the prospective administrator with opportunities to observe successful practice, give him some actual experience in performing administrative functions, and permit the intern himself and others to appraise how well those functions were performed."3

With the sanction of the Department of Education, the proposals

2 Ibid., p. 5.

3 Committee on Educational Administration, "Internship in Educational Administration" (Department of Education, The Ohio State University, March 1, 1953), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)
of this document were implemented into an action program in cooperation with the School-Community Development Study, the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration Center, which was located at The Ohio State University.

Beginning at this period, then, two kinds of internships became available to candidates in the area of educational administration:

1. The beginning internship, available to those people who have completed the bachelor's degree, who have had at least one year of successful teaching experience, and who have been approved by the Department of Education. The time requirements were at least fifteen hours per week for one quarter at the place of assignment.

2. The advanced internship was available only to those people who have completed the master's degree, who have had at least three years of successful teaching, administration, or other school work, and who have been approved by the Department of Education. The time requirements were full time assignment for no less than one quarter and preferably a full school year. The intern was to receive, from the participating school system, no less than subsistence salary and necessary travel expense to and from the University.4

The second event which occurred at this time was the initial offering of Interdepartmental Seminar 899b. Prima facie evidence that this course was of an experimental design is revealed when it is stated that the ratio was four staff members to seven advanced graduate students, all of whom were employed currently in positions of educational administration. The four participating staff members were Dr. Cristen Jonassen from the Department of Sociology, Dr. Meno Lovenstein from the Department of Economics, Dr. Roald F. Campbell from the Department of Education, and Dr. John A. Ramseyer, Director of the School-Community Development Study.

The purposes of the seminar were listed as follows:

4 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
1. The seminar should deal with selected problems submitted by the participants, and by interdisciplinary approaches help to clarify the issues involved in the problems and to explore possible lines of action.

2. The seminar should provide an opportunity to appraise how successfully education and the other disciplines, in this case economics and sociology, can work together in the processes of problem clarification and exploration.

3. Each person attending the seminar should derive more value in acquiring a fuller understanding of the process of problem solving, which involves community and school resources, than he would if the seminar undertook to "solve" his problem for him.

4. The seminar experience should enable each to see more effectively the philosophical concepts which underlie chosen courses of action.

For a broader delineation of the seminar, its method of operation, and particularly the student evaluations of the experience, the full report can be obtained from the School-Community Development Study.

The next formal step undertaken by the Committee on Educational Administration occurred on June 1, 1954, when it issued "A Suggested Program In Educational Administration," the document which, in a major sense, represented a culminating phase of its three-year study. Since much of it was recommended for immediate implementation, it is important to consider it in broader detail.

Assumptions Underlying the Program

The program suggested in this report is based on the following underlying assumptions:

1. That certain selection procedures should be established and applied to students desiring to enter educational administration.

2. That to secure an adequate number of capable candidates from

---

5 Fred Staub, "Report of Interdepartmental Seminar 899b" (School-Community Development Study, The Ohio State University, July 20, 1953), pp. 1-2. (Mimeographed.)
which to select, a program of recruitment should be estab-
lished.

3. That job demands of elementary principals, secondary princi-
pals, superintendents, and other similar leaders in education, 
while different in some respects, have many elements in common.

4. That adequate preparation for educational administration re-
quires at least two years of graduate study, not necessarily 
in one block of time; emphasis on administration, per se, 
should be in the second year.

5. That for the time being, in order to meet the wide diversity 
of administrative positions, programs in administration must 
be available at the master's level, the two year level, and 
the doctoral level.

6. That the program in educational administration should include 
more general education and more work in the related disci-
plines.

7. That the program should include more work in such professional 
educational areas as the school in the social order, human 
growth and development, the curriculum, and evaluation.

8. That appropriate field resources (e.g., resource people, field 
data, field trips) be used as part of the work in every course 
in administration, and that every program in administration 
include one or more appropriate field experiences (e.g., sur-
vey experience, internship).

9. That problem solving should characterize much of the program 
in administration.

10. That the two-year sequence in administration include a large 
block of time where the administrative process may be examined 
in its totality.

11. That students have the opportunity, after a rather intensive 
experience with administration as a total process, to elect 
specialised courses in administration as needed.

12. That the program should have some structure within which there 
is considerable flexibility to meet individual needs of stu-
dents.

13. That appraisal of student progress, including student self-
appraisal, is an integral part of the program.

14. That the development of the program in educational adminis-
tration is a cooperative project involving the Department, the 
College, the University, and practicing administrators in the 
field.
15. That changes in the program in educational administration on this campus should be gradual but continuous in nature.

16. That each segment of the program be seen as flexible in nature subject to further planning by the committee, and by the staff member or members responsible for that segment.

The specific recommendations which the committee made to the Department of Education represented their initial translation of these underlying assumptions into a proposed program:

1. That a selection program be established to secure candidates in educational administration. Details of the program should include the following:
   a. Use of the competency statement as criteria for selection.
   b. Review of campus and field records of candidates.
   c. Candidates should be elected for the master's program and for the two-year sequence.
   d. Members of the Department of Education and administrators in the field should be invited to recommend candidates.
   e. Details of the program should be handled by the Committee on Educational Administration with the help of the School-Community Development Study.
   f. Permission to do graduate work with emphasis on Educational Administration is to be granted by the Committee on Graduate Work with the recommendation of the Committee on Educational Administration.

2. That candidates demonstrating competence at the master's level, in the two-year sequence, or in the doctoral program, be endorsed for certification. This competence should be based on field and campus records.

3. That one summer section and one academic year section of 727 (Introduction to School Administration) be given as an exploratory program for prospective elementary principals, secondary principals, executive heads, superintendents, and other administrators.

4. That the ten-hour basic program in administration for the second
year of graduate work be tried experimentally during the 1954-55 academic year and during the summer of 1955. This might be done under the 800M number.

5. That a problems course or seminar for elementary principals at the post master's level be developed and tried experimentally during the summer of 1955.

6. That a course in the administration of special services be developed. For prospective elementary principals, secondary principals, and superintendents this course should replace such courses as administration of guidance and administration of health education.

7. That an appropriate committee or committees of the Department of Education begin study of the following problems:
   a. The professional sequence at the master's level.
   b. A research practicum at the post master's level.
   c. Possible need for a course in the administration of the curriculum.
   d. Possibility of combining elementary and secondary supervision courses.

8. That new aspects of the program be tested whenever possible with the help of the School-Community Development Study.

Although the recommendations of the Committee on Educational Administration were made for implementation at the earliest possible date, and as such were acted upon favorably by the Department of Education, which put them on the suggested timetable, it was the sanctioning of Recommendation 4, the initial experiment with the ten-hour basic program in administration for the second year of graduate work, which provides the backdrop for this study.

2. The Problem

Need for the Study

When Dr. Roald F. Campbell, Professor of Educational Adminis-
tration, undertook the responsibility of designing, with the assistance of The Committee on Educational Administration, and teaching the ten-hour block during the Winter and Spring Quarters of 1955, a necessity for evaluating the experience was recognised. Since the experimentally-designed ten-hour course, which was entitled Education 800M, or "Cases and Concepts In Educational Administration," represented a departure from previous patterns followed at The Ohio State University in preparing educational administrators, and since it was envisioned as playing a key role in the projected two-year program, an appraisal of it in its first presentation seemed particularly important.

A Broad Outline of Education 800M

Although a specific delineation of the structure and procedures of "Cases and Concepts In Educational Administration" is given in Chapter III, a broad outline is necessary at this point to facilitate an understanding of the hypotheses and organisational framework of the study.

In the first place, the course was to follow seminar procedures and not be designed as a traditionally-conceived class, which primarily would employ a lecture plan. It was to meet four class hours a week, and at the outset this took the form of two hours each Wednesday evening and two hours each Saturday morning. During the Spring Quarter this was changed, by group action, to one four-hour session on alternate Wednesdays and Saturdays.

Problem analysis and solving in actual school-community situations was to constitute the major project, and seminar time primarily was to be spent in facilitating these processes by group discussion. As the need arose, resource people from specialised fields in education and
from other disciplines were to be asked to present information and to lead discussions.

The Group Involved in the Study

Consistent with the recommendations of the Committee on Educational Administration, a specific method of recruitment was employed in securing the class membership for 800M. As a result of this process, fifteen men enrolled in the course. They had met the criteria of the committee, inasmuch as they were all working on a post-master's level, with at least a major or minor in educational administration, had had at least three years of teaching or administrative experience, and had applied for admission on either their own initiative or had been recommended by someone in education as a person with a promising administrative potential. In addition, they had all signified a willingness to enroll in the course for its full sequence, which extended through the Winter and Spring Quarters of 1955.

Although a more complete description of the background of these students is given in Chapter IV, it seems adequate to state here that these were students of experience, who seemed, on an a priori basis, very likely to respond in mature manner to the challenge of the flexible structure of the seminar. Eight of the fifteen men held, during the period of the seminar, full-time positions in public schools, and of these eight, seven were employed as administrators. The remaining seven were full-time graduate students, who were fulfilling residence requirements toward doctorates at The Ohio State University. The mean years of experience in educational positions for the entire group was 10.3, and fourteen of the fifteen either currently were holding, or had
held in the past, an administrative position in the public schools.

Since references will be made throughout this study to both group and individual development, anonymity will be preserved by referring to these men numerically as student number 1 through student number 15.

Organisational Framework of the Study

**Hypotheses.**—The hypotheses involved in this study are directly related to the purposes of "Cases and Concepts in Educational Administration." These had evolved from the work of the Committee on Educational Administration, and were stated specifically by the instructor in his "Tentative Plans for Education 800M."

The overall purpose was that the course should make a substantial contribution to the theory and practice of educational administration. Stated in specifics, the major purposes of the experience included the following:

1. **Assessment of the background and potentiality of each student for a career in educational administration.**
   a) Personal
   b) Academic
   c) Experience

2. **Problem solving in an actual school-community situation.**

3. **Improvement of skills in administrative behavior.**

4. **Extension of understandings and know-how of school operation.**

5. **Further development and clarification of basic concepts and values in educational administration.**

It was the assumption of the Committee on Educational Administration and the instructor that significant gains could be registered by the students in each of these five areas in a single course experi-
ence of Education 800H's experimental design. It was difficult to speculate, on a prior basis, to what degree this could be effected. To provide more precise information relative to this problem, it became the major intent of the investigator to assess the amount of achievement made in each of the five areas by the fifteen students who registered for the seminar. Having this data, it would then be possible to make more warranted assumptions about the amount and kinds of gains which reasonably could be expected from a problem-centered seminar in which an attempt was made to deal globally with educational administration.

Methods and procedures involved in the study.--Since this investigation, at the outset, was not conceived to be a tightly controlled study, the methods and procedures to be used were thus affected. It was decided that an analysis of the recorded class proceedings would provide the basic core of information for the study. As a consequence, the investigator attended the seminar meetings, and at the first session was introduced to the group as one who would be a non-participating observer. In this role, the investigator made a very concerted effort to record the proceedings of each session. To structure in some measure of reliability, one member of the class was designated as the recorder. Each week a report was prepared by him and this, then, was compared with the one made by the investigator. In this fashion, the respective judgments of the recorder and the investigator could be checked with reference to what constituted the major points of concentration of each session.

These recorded class proceedings, in addition, served another purpose. Since problem solving in an actual school-community situation
was the major procedural thread of the seminar, an analysis of the material in terms of its relatedness to this process was followed. Permission was obtained from Dr. Robert F. Bales, of the Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard University, to use an adaptation of the technique which he developed for the analysis of problem solving processes of small groups.

Dr. Bales developed twelve categories which described the types of action people take in a problem solving situation in which the verbal approach is used. These are:

1. **Shows solidarity**, raises other status, gives help, reward:
2. **Shows tension release**, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction:
3. **Agrees**, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies:
4. **Gives suggestion**, direction, implying autonomy for others:
5. **Gives opinion**, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish:
6. **Gives orientation**, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms:
7. **Asks for orientation**, information, repetition, confirmation:
8. **Asks for opinion**, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling:
9. **Asks for suggestion**, direction, possible ways of action:
10. **Disagrees**, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help:
11. **Shows tension**, asks for help, withdraws out of field:
12. **Shows antagonism**, deflates others status, defends or asserts self:

In keeping a comprehensive account of class proceedings, it was then possible for the investigator to make judgments in reference to the contributions which each class member and the instructor made.

---

These were plotted on the Bales charts, and a process analysis then became possible. These results were the source of many of the conclusions made in later chapters. In following this procedure, the investigator analyzed and categorized 3312 responses, which represented the individual contributions made by the students and instructor during the twenty-nine seminar sessions.

To serve as a check on the reliability of the investigator's judgment, the following method was employed. During the ninth session, Marius Garofalo, a doctoral candidate in the area of educational administration, who was not enrolled in 800M, recorded his judgments during a thirty-minute block of seminar time. A reliability coefficient of .714 was obtained when these categorizations were compared. During the twenty-first and twenty-sixth sessions, in addition to Mr. Garofalo, Robert Lucas, also a doctoral candidate in educational administration not enrolled in the seminar, analyzed responses for periods of thirty minutes. Reliability coefficients of .85 and .88 were derived as the result of this process.

A second major source of data was derived from the test-retest results of the following instruments:

1. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, which was adapted by Dr. Andrew Halpin for use with educational administrators from the original instrument devised by J. K. Hemphill and A. E. Coons of the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University.

2. The F Scale, which was constructed by T. W. Adorno and others.

3. The Ideas About Myself Inventory, which was adopted from the National Training Laboratory Form JJ50.

4. The Professional Problem Sheet which was devised for specific use with this group.

5. The Summary of Field Experience Inventory, which was devel-
oped by the instructor.

6. The Test of Professional Understandings in Education, which was developed by Dr. Lowry Harding and Dr. William Fleisher.

These instruments were administered to the students at the beginning of the seminar in January, 1955, and again at the conclusion in June, 1955.

Limitations of the study.--Several limitations of the study became at once apparent. In the first place, no great dependence can be placed on the statistically-derived results because of the small number of cases in the sample. This was recognized at the outset, and there seemed to be no practical method to circumvent this difficulty. As a consequence, the results at best can provide only the basis for tentative conclusions and recommendations.

Secondly, because of the time limitations under which the investigator was working, due to full-time employment as a high school principal during the period of the study, and because of some of the other inherent difficulties of structuring such a group, no control group was established. Resultantly, it was not possible to compare the developments of the fifteen seminar students with the ones registered by those in a controlled setting. Because this, too, was recognized at the outset, it became apparent that the measured differences could be ascribed, with less assurance, directly to learning experiences in the seminar.

In the third place, it was realized that many of the appraisals were to stem primarily from the subjective judgment of the investigator. As has been mentioned previously, some checks were established to test the reliability of judgment. It is realized fully, however, that these were not as rigid as desirably could have been employed if it had been possible to design a tighter research structure for this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An examination of the literature which deals with the description of experimental programs for the preparation of educational administrators indicates that the evaluative period of these programs is in its very early stages. Most of the programs have been of such recent origin that a definitive type of evaluation has not been done widespread. Therefore, it is only possible in this chapter to point up the vast impetus in the direction of experimentally-designed programs and to indicate some of the areas of research currently being tested by these programs.

It can be asserted with a large measure of confidence, it is believed, that the establishment of the Kellogg Foundation area CPEA centers in 1950, with a grant of $3.5 million, provided a rallying cry, and what is equally important, the financial means to probe analytically into the possibilities for analysis of and experimentation with the preparation programs for educational administrators. It, therefore, has been assumed that an analysis of the materials from the files of these regional centers would give a reasonably comprehensive view of the amount and kinds of research presently being done with this problem. This chapter is by no means an attempt to deal exhaustively with all of the existent material. That, rather, which is reported has been chosen
only to give an overview.

In a bulletin, "Creative Educational Leadership for a Changing Region," the CPEA Program Center at George Peabody College for Teachers, or SSCPEA, pinpoints a situation in the area served by that center which is perhaps somewhat typical for the entire United States. In May of 1951, a work conference was held and attended by sixty persons in the southern states who, primarily, were representatives of graduate institutions. Among the significant questions explored at that meeting was the one which dealt with the kinds of preparation then available for preparing educational administrators. The evidence was quite revealing.

The forty-six institutional graduate programs in educational administration in the region were essentially academic in nature. The programs were largely subject-centered; they included much non-functional content and were not usually focused upon the problems of leadership. Courses were taught, chiefly by the lecture method, by approximately 182 professors in the forty-six graduate institutions. The courses were not, for the most part, well organized for the ends sought; rather, they seemed random, unrelated, and unsupported by a clear-cut point of view. Programs were not effectively mobilising their own institutional resources nor those of other agencies.

In relation to the social importance for which the programs were presumably preparing individuals, the selection and recruitment of the promising administrators for the preparation seemed to be incidental and unimportant. The principal concern in selection and recruitment appeared to be the ability on the part of prospective leaders to meet degree requirements with almost complete disregard for leadership competencies.

The use of field experiences, field conditions, field studies, and various agency resources in a laboratory approach to the development of needed competencies was the exception rather than the rule. Research was, for the most part, of the status variety. It often dealt with the interests of individual staff members in the institutions, and was aimed primarily at thesis and dissertation requirements. Research rarely involved group action on community problems. These emphases ruled out investigations concerning the improvement of preparation programs of which research was a part. In short, the evidence showed that preparation programs had grown by a process of uncritical and fortuitous accretion.1

1The Program Center, "Creative Educational Leadership for a Changing Region" (CPEA Center, George Peabody College for Teachers), pp. 22-23.
Accordingly, with the agreement of the area graduate institutions, the CPEA staff at George Peabody College for Teachers, developed the Six-Step Study Plan to guide the participants in an analysis and improvement of their existing programs:

1. Identifying and characterising the competencies needed by educational administrators.

2. Determining and describing preparation programs for the development of desirable competencies.

3. Analysing and describing present preparation programs for educational administrators.

4. Comparing the existing programs with the kinds of programs needed.

5. Setting forth specific plans for securing needed changes.

6. Putting the specific plans for improvement into operation.2

It is reported that twenty-three of the forty-six graduate institutions in the area served by the SSCPEA agreed initially to undertake systematically and cooperatively a program of research designed to improve their programs. Some of research projects and their aims are abstracted as follows:

1. The University of Florida is studying the relationships of leadership qualities of the school administrator to the human relationships, pupil achievement, and program development in local situations.

2. The University of Georgia is approaching the improvement of educational administration by means of a long-range study of method, content, and organisation of preparation programs.

3. The University of North Carolina is studying the development of community lay and professional leadership in education and the stimulation and study of the interaction between them.

4. The University of Tennessee is investigating the characteristics of effective educational administration.

2Ibid., pp. 24-25.
5. The University of Kentucky is experimenting with the preparation of school administrators through inter-disciplinary action.

The Fourth Annual Report of the SSCPEA which was issued in January, 1955, summarized the progress reports of these major projects and indicates that research findings are being reflected in preparation programs at those institutions. As the result of this concerted program of cooperative research, the report states, "it is significant to notice that virtually every state in the Southern region has projected a very definite plan for revising preparation programs in the near future."

The project of greatest magnitude reported by the SSCPEA was issued as a progress report on November 22, 1954, and entitled "Improving Preparations Programs in Educational Administration." In this document, one can find what is perhaps the outstanding contribution of the SSCPEA. During a two-year period, area work commissions had undertaken the job of isolating competency areas of educational administration. This was done by following the critical incidents technique, which required allegiance to the following criteria:

1. That the job must be defined in terms of the important behavior requirements necessary to satisfactory performance;

2. That one assume ability cannot exist independent of observable behavior;

3. That observations of worker behavior, or the results of such behavior, constitute the only sources of valid evaluative data.

---


4 The Program Center, "Improving Preparation Programs in Educational Administration" (CPEA Center, George Peabody College for Teachers, November 22, 1954), p. 3.
By applying this technique, the following Critical Tasks Areas of Educational Administration were isolated:

1. Instruction and Curriculum Development
2. Pupil Personnel
3. Community-School Leadership
4. Staff Personnel
5. School Plant
6. School Transportation
7. Organization and Structure
8. School Finance and Business Management

In each of the eight areas, many specific critical tasks were isolated, and for each of these tasks the method of performing them is recorded, and the operational beliefs, skills, and knowledges are given.

Recognized by those who worked together in developing the Critical Areas document, and apparent from even a brief examination of it, is the necessity for the development of a philosophy of educational administration in a democracy to serve as the undergirding structure for one's operation in these areas. It would seem that this is one of the "critical tasks" which lies ahead as further research is conducted toward the continued improvement of preparation programs for educational administrators.

Since the function of this investigation is not to present an exhaustive account of all of the developments, nation-wide, which are leading to revisions of preparation programs, the remainder of this chapter will deal only briefly with those developments which are occurring elsewhere. The activities of the SSCPEA have been dealt with more comprehensively to serve as a somewhat detailed account of what is be-
lieved to be representative of the effort made in other CPEA areas of the nation.

To provide that overview, a further pamphlet of the SSCPEA, "Current Developments in the Pre-Service and In-Service Preparation of Educational Administrators," serves as an excellent source.

**Middle Atlantic CPEA**

Sixteen colleges and universities are involved in cooperative research for the improvement of their preparation programs in educational administration. Its work teams are dealing with the following problems:

1. The concept and functions of educational administration.
2. The problems of recruitment and selection of able and talented persons for training and service in the administration of American public education.
3. The basic professional preparation needed by administrators.
4. The continued professional development of school superintendents and other administrators.
5. The organization and financing of improved programs for basic professional preparation of school administrators.

**Midwest CPEA**

This center began with four basic purposes:

1. To improve the selection and basic preparation of educational administrators.
2. To create better opportunities for administrators to grow in understanding of the place of education and the functions of administration, and in developing abilities to work with people.
3. To increase the availability and effectiveness of consultative services.

---

5 The Program Center, "Current Developments in Pre-Service and In-Service Preparation of Educational Administrators" (CPEA Center, George Peabody College for Teachers, November 30, 1953).
4. To encourage cooperative study of critical issues and problems as a basis for action programs.

The following six critical needs in educational administration in the Midwest were isolated:

1. Adequate district organization
2. Sound finance policies
3. Effective board functioning
4. Improved consultative services
5. Leadership for instruction
6. Informed, responsible citizens

With the orientation of its basic purposes, the Midwest Center, after three years of operation, viewed its major contributions as a participant in the development of the following encouraging signs of progress:

1. Progress has been made in translating research into practice.
2. Gains are being made in increasing the effectiveness of school board operation.
3. Many state departments are evaluating and improving their consultative services to local school systems.
4. Newspapers are joining school administrators in attempting to improve educational interpretation.
5. Citizens' participation in educational planning is being studied and improved.
6. Many school systems are evaluating conditions relating to the effectiveness of instruction.
7. Progress is being made in identifying the factors which encourage or impede adequate district organization.
8. There has been improvement of conferences, workshops, and other opportunities for the continuing growth of administrators.
9. Programs for the preparation of administrators are being strengthened.
10. New concepts and techniques are being applied to the study of administration.6

New England CPEA

The major undertaking of this center has been the improvement of preparation programs for educational administrators at the pre-service and on-the-job levels.

One of its most significant achievements of the universities in this area was the establishment of Ed. D. program at Harvard University for the preparation of educational administrators through the case method, which employs a clinical type of instruction. These cases are designed to involve the student in a rigorous analysis of administrative situations requiring decisions. Related interdisciplinary readings are chosen to widen the student's scope of the area of administration.

Further to give the student experience, he becomes a participant in actual field studies. The culmination of the experience comes when the student is involved in an administrative problem of major scope and is rigorously examined as an "administrator" in the problem setting through role-playing techniques.

The primary attention of the NECPEA has been paid to the long-term action-research study of community behavior and organisation.

A significant study in this area has been one which involves an analysis of decision-making with respect to a variety of public and community issues in a city, over several years. The second is geared to a study of how school superintendents and board members perceive each other's roles. This also includes a study of the factors involved.

in the career patterns and mobility of superintendents.

The Ohio CPEA

This center is somewhat unique in that its program is limited to the investigation of the duties and responsibilities of educational administrators within the State of Ohio. It has been concerned, primarily, with school and community interaction. This emphasis is reflected in the name of the center, The School-Community Development Study.

In assessing its progress to date, the center feels that its work has contributed to the following achievements:

1. Identification of factors affecting the quality of administration.
2. Organisation of the Ohio Conference of Professors of Educational Administration.
3. Acceleration of efforts to improve preparation programs in school administration.
4. Involvement of related disciplines in research and in improvement programs.
5. Involvement of many citizens and educators in the survey of local school needs.

For its final year of operation, The School-Community Development Study has mapped out the following plans:

1. Maintaining field contacts with community centers, professional associations, and universities.
2. Involving more persons from related disciplines in the study of administrative problems.
3. Publishing completed research and reporting activities and progress to the profession.
4. Developing other ways of communicating research findings to the profession.
5. Building a framework for long-range research in educational
administration.7

Since the present investigation is directly related to the Ohio CPEA, in a strong sense, no further elaboration of this program presently will be made.

Pacific Northwest CPEA

This center has undertaken research to contribute to increased understandings of three aspects of the administrative process: the administrator as a person; the situation in which he operates; and preparation for the job, both pre-service and in-service.

As the result of the research done under the auspices of the Northwest CPEA, it is reported that the following changes have been effected by the institutions of the area served by the center in their programs for the preparation of educational administrators:

1. An increased interest in what the social sciences have to offer in the way of knowledge and insight into the problems of human behavior and a recognition that these insights and knowledges must become familiar to school administrators.

2. Experience with the interdisciplinary approach in the presentation of problems believed to have relationship to the basic problem of working with people. This interdisciplinary approach has already taken the form of seminars involving more than one social science area and has included the case-study approach to the problems of administration.

3. Recognition that the master's degree no longer meets the needs of school administrators. Plans are underway in several of the training institutions for extending the program of preparation into a second year of graduate study.

4. The need for planning the preparation program on a flexible basis to fit the background of training and experience of the students and keeping in mind their own goals.

5. The inclusion of field experience in the preparation program. This field experience would include not only the study of actual

7"CPEA In Ohio," The School Executive, LXXIV (June, 1955), 4-5.
problems in a school situation but also the involvement in a research project having relevance to problems in educational administration.8

Pacific Southwest CPEA

The research conducted directly or stimulated by this center falls into three major classifications:

1. One group of studies has been aimed at clarifying the criterion problem in administrator selection and evaluation. They have sought to find the range of identifiable and relatively homogeneous concepts of administrator effectiveness.

2. A second group of studies was conducted to identify and analyze the research needs in educational administration. One of these sought the research priorities as perceived by large city superintendents in all states of the country. Another gathered the research priorities of professors of school administration and compared the results with those implied in a distribution of doctoral dissertations.

3. A third group has been concerned with the identification of techniques for administrator selection, evaluation, and success-prediction. One study has been made of the reliability of several standardized tests used in administrator selection. Another was directed toward the construction of techniques for identifying and evaluating written and oral expression, community activities and leadership, supervisors' appraisals of effective teachers, philosophical orientation, situational behavior, and professional growth. A final study is being made to examine the ability of the standardized tests, and the data-gathering procedures referred to, to make usable discriminations of degrees of administrative success at the level of the principalship.9

Southwestern CPEA

The major purposes of this center were to improve the preparation programs for future school administrators and to try out and evaluate ways and means for providing effective in-service education opportuni-

---

8 Donald E. Tope, "Northwest CPEA-Aims and Results," The School Executive, LXXIV (February, 1955), 74-76.

ties for school administrators.

More than twenty colleges and universities have cooperated in the study of this first question. Major conclusions of their conferences have pointed up the necessity of developing individuals in the light of their capabilities, that general competency areas of administration need to be developed, that the administrator’s job is one of "action" and "decision-making," that cooperative research is necessary into these questions, and that communication lines need to be strengthened if an administrator is to function effectively.

One of the basic experiments in this area has been conducted at the University of Texas. Offered initially during the 1952 Summer Session, an eleven-week, all-day "Foundations in Educational Administration" program was offered on a master’s level. It is reported that interdisciplinary approaches were used to present related thinking in the various areas of administration. Twenty-eight major topics in school administration and eighteen related topics were covered by reading, by group discussions, by the preparation of committee reports, by lectures, by films, by dramatizations, and by field experiences. The student evaluations of these programs reflected the superior reactions felt by them at the conclusion of the experience.

Sixteen active associated centers, representing a total of forty-one school systems, cooperated with the SWCPEA toward the development of a more comprehensive program of in-service education.\(^{10}\)

\(^{10}\)The Program Center, "Current Developments in Pre-Service and In-Service Preparation of Educational Administrators" (CPEA Center, George Peabody College for Teachers, November 30, 1953), pp. 14-12.

With the exception of that material ascribed to The School Executive, the description of the major research areas and projects of the CPEA Centers has been abstracted from this source.
Additional Experimental Programs

In addition to the experimental programs at Harvard University and the University of Texas, which were discussed earlier in this chapter, two more are presented here briefly further to illustrate the growing trend to seek new and effective methods for the preparation of educational administrators.

At Syracuse University, in the Fall of 1951, a seminar, "Human Relations for School Administrators," was begun as the result of the joint cooperation of the School of Education and the Central New York School Study Council. This seminar, composed of fifteen practicing school administrators, was under the joint direction of Dr. Robert Fisk, a professor of school administration, and Dr. Arthur Combs, a professor of psychology. At first the weekly four-hour seminar was equally divided between lectures and discussions concerning technical problems of administration and human relations. After the twelfth week, the seminar was conducted entirely as a free group discussion open to the consideration of any topic whatever. This process was continued during the remaining four sessions.

Four major research studies were made of the seminar experience. Those studied, and the major findings, are listed:

1. Behavior Changes During the Group Experience
   a. Changes in behavior as measured by an index of participation were brought about.
   b. Positive changes occurred in group participation and interaction throughout the period of the group sessions.
   c. The individuals of the group behaved in an increasingly warm and democratic manner toward each other throughout the sessions.
d. A group-centered climate seemed to contribute more to a rapid and sustained positive gain than a content-centered or lecture approach. The content-centered sessions did not show significant gain in member interaction until the orientation was shifted to a client-centered one.

e. Evaluation of the attitude and behavior changes of the group members as observed by the staff were consistent with changes demonstrated by the more objective scoring method of the Participation Index. This seemed to indicate that changes may be demonstrated in both systematic and less formal, personal evaluation.

2. Pre-Post Changes in Attitudes and Motivations

a. Changes in attitude and motivation were brought about by the social action method described in the study.

b. Positive changes occurred in the individual's attitudes toward self, other adults, and children.

c. Changes in a democratic direction took place in the individual's desires, involving less need to be in command or to gain respect, but more concern about understanding, respecting and aiding others.

3. Changes in the Definition and Solution of Administrative Problems

a. The way the seminar participants defined their administrative problems reflected a significant change in the direction of a more accepting attitude toward other persons.

b. These men showed an increasing concern with problems immediately within the school and/or closer to themselves (e.g., their own personal rapport with the school personnel, improving the adequacy and effectiveness of teachers, and assisting non-teaching personnel), and a relative decrease in their concern with "lay" opinion and extra-territorial conditions (e.g., community sentiment, functioning of lay committees, and children's home environments).

c. Two problems persisted as "most critical" in their eyes: (a) designing a curriculum correlated with real human needs, and (b) behaving effectively within the limits of their personal energies, aptitudes, and time.

4. Changes in Attitudes and Behavior as Seen by the Administrator's Employees and Co-workers.

a. Administrators who participated in the seminar showed greater concern for their relationships with school personnel and a deeper understanding of the dynamics of human interaction than administrators who had not participated in the seminar.
b. Greater changes were reported to the interviewer by staff members and pupils in changed attitudes held by the administrators toward others.11

At Teachers College, Columbia University, a series of experimental programs was initiated in 1951 to explore ways and means of providing better human relations training for its students in educational administration. These programs were financed equally by the Kellogg Foundation through CPEA, the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, and the Guidance Department of Teachers College.

The first T-Group (training group) which met during 1951-52 was composed of six doctoral students and two faculty members, Kenneth Herrold and Stephen Corey, who drew on their experiences at the National Training Laboratory in Group Development at Bethel, Maine, to lead the Seminar in an identification of common objectives and concerns.

As a result of their work, an expanded program was developed in 1952-53. Eight students, recommended by the faculty, composed a T-Group, whose primary purpose was to improve the human relations skills of the group members. Training methods included practice, through rotation, of the roles of leader, recorder, and observer; analysis through role playing of a wide variety of interpersonal situations; practice of new skills; gathering of data in regard to the success of such practice; evaluation; and general discussion.

Each T-Group member undertook the responsibility of leading a D-Group (personal and professional development group). The primary function of the D-Group was to give the new students coming into the

graduate department of educational administration an opportunity to clarify and identify personal and group needs in relation to orientation to a college program, and to their own professional development.

As a result, in large measure, of the experimentation with these approaches, basic changes have occurred at Teachers College in reference to its introductory course in educational administration. In 1951 this course met for two hours on a week day. Departmental faculty members gave lectures on their specialties. No attempt was made to assess student perceptions. Marks were based primarily on an objective test which covered the content of required readings.

The present course is now held on Saturdays, to meet the needs of the great majority of students who work full time or part time. Class meetings take four hours, with a general session which is followed by D-Group meetings. These are followed by area seminars. The general session content is organized around major administrative problem areas. Several faculty members form a panel, and with their guidance these problem areas are discussed by all in attendance. Post-meeting reaction sheets and a student Steering Committee are used. Students have helped to draw up the evaluation methods which are used in the course.12

Signs of Further Experimentation

The 1950 Report of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Providing and Improving Administrative Leadership for America's Schools, shows the concern of its members for the improvement of preparation programs. Its recommendations are:

1. Colleges, schools, and departments of education should be free to develop programs and teaching methods adapted to the requirements of professional leaders in education.

2. An institution preparing school administrators should be large enough and have sufficient resources at its command to provide adequate services and facilities to operate efficiently and effectively.

3. Institutions responsible for the training of administrators should exhibit democratic relationships in operational procedures.

4. Preparation for leadership in education is a function to be carried on at the graduate level.

5. Graduate departments of educational administration should seek more adequate financial support.

6. Adequate concern must be given to the preparation and in-service improvement of the teachers of school administration.

7. A wide variety of teaching materials should be provided and made easily available for instructional purposes.

8. Experimentation with teaching procedures and evaluation of instructional techniques should be continuously encouraged.

9. The resources of other colleges and departments of the university and appropriate extramural resources should be used.

10. Specialized professional skills and techniques should be taught by actual demonstration and practice in a field situation or in a situation simulating that which would prevail in the field.

11. Provision should be made for administrative experiences on an apprenticeship basis.

12. The training institution should provide for school administrators in the area served by the institution opportunities to consider current practical problems.

13. Service bureaus for the study and evaluation of school systems and administrative problems should be a part of the institution's service to the field.

14. Research and experimentation are important means of developing improved programs and procedures for the schools.

15. Professional placement and follow-up services are essential to
Concluding Statement

It became apparent to the investigator that a crucial area in the field of research concerned with educational administration is that of pulling together and diffusing the results of the research. Although platitudinous on the surface, it nevertheless is necessary to keep in mind that we must be aware of research findings, and have a rationale for their evaluation, in order to effectively put them into practice.

Realizing that this problem was growing to one of major magnitude, even as it affected the CPEA projects, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation allocated $50,000 to set up and finance the work of an information committee to diffuse the results of CPEA projects and studies. In June, 1955, Dr. Hollis A. Moore, Jr., was appointed executive secretary of this committee. Represented will be the American Association of School Administrators, Council of Chief State School Officers, County and Rural Area Superintendents, National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, and National School Boards Association. In addition, there will be a representative from each of the area CPEA centers at Teachers College (Columbia University), Harvard University, George Peabody College for Teachers, Ohio State University, University of Chicago, University of Oregon, Stanford University, and the University of Texas.

An optimistic hope thus can be expressed that as this job of

pulling together and disseminating is done, graduate programs in the area of educational administration can be assisted in the processes of self-evaluation and of charting future research which more purposefully is directed toward a common goal.
A clearer comprehension of the material presented in subsequent chapters will follow, it is believed, if an account is given at this time of the session-by-session proceedings of the seminar.

Despite the anticipated flexible structuring of the course, there were, none-the-less, procedures designed by the instructor and others to provide guide lines for the experience. These procedures, quoted from the course outline, are as follows:

1. Assessment of personal, academic, and professional background of students (self, peer, and faculty assessment).

2. Assignment of each student to a school or community situation for observation, participation, and problem source.

3. Identification and delineation of problems found in the situations (may also include a group project).*

4. Examination of relevant research literature in the field, including case material.

5. Group planning of and participation in class activities (includes group interaction).

6. Presentation in oral and written form of an account of the problem, its identification, and attempts at solution (may also include contribution to a group project)*


8. Critical reactions to readings.

*The group project was abandoned because of time limitations.
Session I - January 5, 1955

Introductory remarks were made by the instructor. Each member of the seminar introduced himself and then gave a brief description of his experience background. The Ten-Hour Sequence, or Education 800M, was then presented in broad outline as one of the initial experiments of the Committee on Educational Administration. The departmental report, "Program Planning in Educational Administration," was explained as indicative of the overall program planning recommended by the Committee.

Tentative plans for the seminar were presented and the discussion followed the course outline prepared by the instructor. A bibliography of suggested readings was distributed and the critical reaction responsibility of each student was indicated.

The investigator was introduced, and his functions as an appraiser were outlined.

Five minutes were then taken to request each student to list the five most crucial problems which he was encountering, or had experienced, as an administrator.

Thirty minutes were spent in each student's filling out the Summary of Field Experiences Inventory which had been developed by the instructor. At the conclusion of this time, students were then asked to exchange questionnaires, read through the responses, and indicate apparent strengths and weaknesses, by areas. These were to serve as the first guidelines for critical readings by each student.

The session ended after each student had been asked to indicate a school-community problem affiliation in which he, tentatively, was
interested. These were to be studied by the instructor and specific assignments would be developed through student-instructor conferences by the next session.

**Session II - January 8, 1955**

The assignment for January 12 was given:

1. Write a brief diary account of a personal administrative situation of recent origin and indicate an interpretive analysis of its meaningfulness.

2. Hand in the first critical appraisal of a reading from the bibliography.

3. Make the initial contact on the field assignment.

A discussion of the field assignment was then conducted, and one general criterion was developed. The assignment was to be in a location outside each student's own professional setting. Each student was to have a role in the field assignment which was to be threefold:

1. Observation of the people who work in the problem, their interpersonal relationships, the physical facilities with which they operate, the types of approaches they use. In this connection, there should be analysis of purposes and processes.

2. Participation in some respects should be considerable for the student.

3. Administrative responsibility for the student should probably be very limited.

From three to five hours each week were to be spent in the field assignment. It was stressed by the instructor that the research project should be an action-oriented one. The solutions to the problems were not to be library-centered and developed ones.

As the concluding part of this seminar, Dr. Lowry Harding spoke briefly of the Test of Professional Understandings in Education which he developed in collaboration with Dr. William Flesher. Each student then took the test.
Session III - January 12, 1955

Dr. William Flesher, co-author of the Test of Professional Understandings in Education, met with the seminar and explained how the instrument had been designed and gave information about its rationale. It covers the areas of administration, child development, curriculum, evaluation, guidance, instructional material, methodology, professional relationships, public relations, and supervision.

Several critical reactions to readings were then presented for illustrative purposes to determine a future format to be followed. It was decided that a critique of basic ideas was the most important job to be done. These were to be handed in once a month.

Diary entries were to be given to the instructor once a month, written with the following kinds of emphases:

1. A brief description of the event.
2. Is this the role of the particular administrator? What else?
3. Is this the only way the job can be organised?

The students during the next half hour took the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, which had been adapted for use with educational administrators by Dr. Andrew Halpin of the Personnel Research Board of The Ohio State University.¹ It was decided to ask Dr. Halpin to a future seminar to discuss his findings in leadership behavior.

One of the students then presented an administrative problem concerning public relations which he had recently encountered in his community. After the statement of the problem, the students suggested

¹Dr. Halpin is now associated with the School of Education of Montana State University.
methods of solving the problem. The presenting student then related how he had solved the problem, and an analysis of his approach was made.

The remainder of the seminar period was spent in deciding which major points the group wished to stress in discussing "Purposes and Structure of Education in the United States."

Session IV - January 19, 1955

The students handed back two test results, Adorno's F Scale and the Ideas About Myself Inventory. These had been taken by them outside of class.

The instructor then called for plans relative to subsequent seminar sessions. It was decided to ask Dr. Halpin to discuss the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire rationales and to request Dr. Max Goodson to relate information relative to the Group Dynamics Program, especially stressing its significance for the field of educational administration.

Each student gave a progress report on the status of his field affiliation problem. The instructor indicated that this type of presentation was important at the present stage of the seminar development, but that it could be done only very infrequently henceforth because of time pressures. Individual analyses of problems should take up the bulk of time in future seminar sessions.

A further discussion of the course outline then was held. It was decided to structure a meeting soon on the problem of "Private Education in the United States." The instructor agreed to arrange for resource people to meet with the group.
A student distributed copies of a problem which had developed in reference to parent-teacher organizations in his own community. An analysis of this problem by the entire group then followed during the balance of the seminar period.

One of the students indicated that he would present the initial statement of his field affiliation problem during the next session.

Session V - January 22, 1955

Another critical incident problem from a student's local administrative area was related and discussed by the group.

The initial statement of a field affiliation problem was presented by one of the students. The blackboard was used to indicate graphically the area in question, and the students pinpointed questions which bore on the development of the problem. Since this was a problem highly controversial in nature, it was decided that more information was needed before it could be decided whether or not it was desirable to go ahead with its investigation.

Dr. Max Goodson, Assistant Dean of the College of Education at the Ohio State University, then lead a discussion of Group Dynamics. In doing so, he presented an overview of the work of the National Training Laboratory at Bethel, Maine. He indicated that many administrators need training in the concepts and operational phases of shared leadership. For further understanding of the area of Group Dynamics, Dr. Goodson suggested three sources:

1. D. Cartwright and A. Zander, Group Dynamics-Research and Theory;
3. Herbert A. Thelen, Dynamics of Groups at Work.2 He agreed to work with five members of the class to develop and present a role-playing episode which will illustrate primarily how hidden motivations operate in Group Dynamics.

Session VI - January 26, 1955

Another student presented the preliminary statement of his field affiliation problem. Extensive questions by the seminar group indicated that a narrowing and specific development of the problem further needed to be made.

Dr. Andrew Halpin then presented some research findings which related to the definition of the factors involved in a leadership role. He explained how, by factor analysis, two dimensions were isolated in the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Initiating Structure in interaction and Consideration. He indicated that research seems to point out that leadership operates maximally when the leader rates high on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

He related that one of the needed research areas is to study what the limits of situational variance are in reference to leadership. He recommended the following resources:

Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive;


George Homans, The Human Group;


2Sources referred to, but not quoted from, in this study are listed separately in the bibliography.
Session VII - January 29, 1955

A panel consisting of Father Applegate, Superintendent of Schools, Columbus Diocese, R. M. Garrison, Director of Elementary and Secondary Education of the State of Ohio Department of Education, and Dr. Robert Sutton, of the Department of Education, The Ohio State University, discussed "The Role of Private Education." Dr. Sutton presented the problem, historically, abroad and in the United States, and indicated the different ways in which the problem has been met.

Father Applegate indicated the purposes of parochial education and outlined its structure. Mr. Garrison related the problems of the State Department of Education in reference to private education.

An extensive period of questioning then followed, during which the students sought further information and interpretations.

At the conclusion of the seminar, the instructor summarized his major reactions to the discussion as follows:

1. There is no one solution to the problems posed by private education. Each one seems to require its own solution in its own problem environment.

2. The "child benefit theory" appears to be the basic concept to define now. The limits of this theory seem important to find.

3. The "equivalency of education" provision in the state standards needs to have more teeth in it if state departments are to have a method of regulatory control in their operations which relate to private education.

4. It is important in any relations between private and public education for good lines of communication to exist. Problems seem to occur most readily when this is not the case.

Session VIII - February 2, 1955

Scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire were returned to the students, and a discussion was conducted by the instructor
on the desirability of maintaining a good operational balance between the dimensions of Initiating Structure and Consideration. He indicated that this was one very critical area, in his judgment, in the effective development of administrators.

An analysis of the previous session was made by the seminar group. It was decided that it might be well in the future to develop some structure in reference to the issues to be covered when other panelists come to subsequent seminars. There was strong enthusiasm expressed for the worthwhileness of the experience.

One of the students distributed copies of "What Faces Ohio's Public Schools," a brief digest of the report of the Ohio School Survey Committee. It was decided to spend some time during a subsequent session discussing recommendations of the Survey Committee.

The major share of this session was spent, then, in hearing the preliminary problem statements of two members of the seminar. These statements were outlined in duplicated form and distributed to the group. An analysis of these problems by the seminar group drew further suggested lines of approach for the two men to follow.

Session IX - February 5, 1955

Two additional students presented their preliminary problem statements for analysis. These underwent the same probing procedure developed by the seminar during previous sessions.

Further to provide background for the analysis of educational administration and particularly of the problem solving function of administrators, the instructor discussed the rationales of a dissertation, recently finished by Phillip Smith at The Ohio State University, entitled
"The Role of Philosophy in the Preparation of Administrators." The major dimensions which were expanded were Philosophic-Mindedness, Penetration, and Flexibility. The instructor then asked members of the seminar to provide concrete illustrations of how these dimensions operated in administrative behavior.

Session X - February 9, 1955

The first two hours of this session were devoted to a discussion of points of greatest concern in the report of the Ohio School Survey Committee. Discussed during this period were the instructional program, the classroom unit, recruitment of teaching personnel, the testing program, discrimination issues, the capital outlay recommendations, and the state school board.

In response to a request from the group, the instructor led a discussion of "Controls as a Factor in Public School Administration." The major headings of the discussion were:

1. Legal Control
   a. State Responsibility
   b. Home Rule at the District Level
   c. Federal Influence

2. Extra Legal Control
   a. The Power Structure

During the remainder of the session, two additional students presented the preliminary statements of their research problems. Recommended lines of procedure were drawn by seminar discussion for the further investigation of these problems.

Session XI - February 16, 1955
Dr. Max Goodson met for his second session with the group during the first hour. Having as his purpose an introduction of the topic "Processes Involved in the Study of Group Phenomena," he presented a role-playing situation, with the assistance of five members of the group.

After the role playing, his discussion was concerned with three aspects:

1. Inner-relations for Group Maintenance
2. The Goal of the Group
3. The Movement of the Group Toward the Goal

Showing how the phenomenon of the "hidden agenda" operates in group process, the following storm signals were isolated:

1. Conflict in goals.
2. Security alignment of members with invisible groups.
3. Motivation of a group member to improve his status at the expense of another member.
4. Sub-alignments by friendship patterns within a group.

So much group enthusiasm resulted from this experience that it was decided to structure and present another role playing situation at a future session.

The balance of the seminar period was spent in hearing the preliminary statement of another of the students and working with him to provide further lines of investigation for the continued analysis of his problem.

Session XII - February 19, 1955

The opening part of this session was devoted to a student-led discussion concerned with "Problems Involved in the Selection of School Board Members." The central ideas isolated during the discussion were:
1. Criteria of school board membership.
3. The roles of the superintendent, incumbent board, and community during a campaign.
4. The legal framework of school board membership.

After this analysis, another student presented his preliminary problem statement. During the ensuing analysis suggestions for next steps were developed by the group.

The remainder of the period was spent in taking a preliminary view of "A Concept of Educational Administration," an initial statement prepared by Roald F. Campbell and John A. Ramseyer. The concept was presented diagrammatically in the form of concentric circles, and contained the following areas:

1. Purpose of administration—to set goals and provide conditions necessary to their achievement.
2. Operational areas—program development, pupil personnel, staff personnel, physical facilities, finance and business management, and public relations.
3. Situational factors—physical conditions, cultural setting, institutional organisations, face-to-face groups, and the administrator himself.
4. Organisational patterns—legal provisions, scope of program, administrative structure, informal or social structure, citizen relationships.
5. Administrative processes—planning, organizing, executing, coordinating, and appraising.\(^3\)

A decision was made to devote a major block of time to the analysis of this concept statement during the next seminar session.

\(^3\) Roald F. Campbell and John A. Ramseyer, "A Concept of Educational Administration" (The School-Community Development Study, Ohio State University, 1955), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)
Session XIII - February 23, 1955

In discussing "A Concept of Educational Administration," which was the first item on the agenda, the following points were stressed:

1. An administrator, to work effectively, must assess his own abilities to cope with situational factors.

2. Administrators, by definition, are action people and have the responsibility to see that goal-setting is accomplished.

3. Administrators must learn to establish realistic goals in their own situations.

4. Administrative process cannot be looked at independently as tasks.

The remainder of the session was spent in examining the preliminary problem statement of another student. Group decisions were made concerning recommendations for next steps in the analysis and solution of the problem.

Session XIV - February 26, 1955

A discussion of "The Role of the Federal Government in Education" centered around Hollis P. Allen's Federal Government and Education. Central ideas which developed during the analysis were:

1. A much greater degree of coordination must develop if the government's role in education is to achieve maximum purpose.

2. We must learn, more adequately, to tap resources on a federal level for education.

After this, a decision was made to meet only once a week during the Spring Quarter for four hours on alternate Wednesdays and Saturdays.

In response to a previous request, a block of time was devoted to a discussion of "Business-Industry-Education Day." Major points of emphasis were:

1. An alert superintendent can, by scheduling and further struc-
turing, apprise patrons in the community of pressing educational needs.

2. Concern was expressed over the tendency in some areas to deal only with top and second level management instead of with a cross-sectioning of the industry.

The instructor then led a discussion of "The Purposes of Administration." As a backdrop, central ideas from the following sources were presented:

Chester I. Barnard's *Organisation and Management*

W. H. Newman's *Administrative Action*

Gordon MacKenzie's and Stephen Corey's *Instructional Leadership*

Willard B. Spalding's *The Superintendency of Public Schools: An Anxious Profession*

Summary ideas from the class discussion were:

1. Administration is an implementing activity, a way by which things get done. It encompasses action, with thought, planning, and involvement entering into the process.

2. An administrator gets his primary satisfaction, basically, in helping others achieve.

Session XV - March 1, 1955

The instructor called the attention of the group to two articles in the current literature, "Our Itinerant Schoolmasters," in the February, 1955, issue of the *Administrator's Notebook*, and "Socially Perceptive Administration," by Francis G. Cornell, in the March, 1955, issue of *Phi Delta Kappan*.

A student then presented the preliminary statement of his field problem, and during the analysis he was provided with ideas for its further exploration and direction.

At this point a new project was introduced. The instructor distributed mimeographed copies of a problem case which dealt with the
issue of differentials in the salary of men and women teachers. He asked each student to read the case and to be prepared to participate in the class discussion which would be centered around the following three issues:

1. What situational factors are involved in this case?
2. How, if at all, might the board or superintendent have performed more adequately?
3. Given this situation, what should the board and superintendent do now?

There was excellent participation in response to this problem. Without structuring the situation to obtain maximum participation, it nevertheless resulted from the challenge of the specific problem to be solved.

Session XVI - March 5, 1955

Dr. Robert Bullock, a sociologist on the staff of the School-Community Development Study, led a discussion of the methods by which community development analysis can be accomplished as a technique. He explained that the first step in the construction of an analysis technique is to develop a rationale. Once this has been worked out, it is then necessary to posit hypotheses and to devise instruments which can be used to test those hypotheses.

For purposes of his research, he indicated that the traditional concept of an administrator as an autonomous agent was being discarded. Instead, he was contending that once a superintendent signs a contract, he becomes, in part, affected by the community patterns and pressures. Because of this, it is highly important for a superintendent to learn what the criteria elements are in the community which employs him. One of the crucial findings for the superintendent in any community is the
power structure. He indicated that the best research into this ques-
tion seems to be that conducted by those who work in Group Dynamics.

Session XVII - March 9, 1955

The assignment was made for each student to prepare and hand in, one week hence, a 300-500 word statement on "Educational Administra-
tion: This I Believe." These were not to be conventional library projects, but rather were to represent the product of each student's serious thinking on the subject.

Since the group had neared the end of the first round in reference to presenting preliminary statements of their field problems, volunteers were sought to present progress analyses to show the advanced stage of development of their projects.

It was then decided that Dr. Bullock had done an excellent job of focusing attention on the area of "The Administrator in His Community Setting," and that to expand an understanding of the entire question it would be well to investigate "The Superintendent as a Man, With a Personal Motivational Pattern." Dr. Andrew Halpin was to be asked for a return trip to the seminar to lead this discussion.

The written examination for the quarter was taken at this time. It consisted of an analysis by each student of a case problem which dealt with a critical personnel situation in a medium-sized school dis-

1. How might the board, the superintendent, or the principal have performed more adequately?

2. As the situation now stands, what should be done to improve the future actions of the board, the superintendent, or the principal?

3. What additional data, if any, would you have liked in the case?
During the next hour, the remaining two students presented the preliminary statements of their field problems. As was the procedure in previous instances, class analysis provided lead lines for the next steps to be followed.

As the result of a decision made at a previous session, a role-playing situation was presented by that part of the group which had agreed to undertake the responsibility. An analysis of the group dynamics involved then ensued, and the tape recording, which had been made of the session, was played back as certain sections were being discussed.

Session XVIII - March 16, 1955

Dr. John Herrick of the Bureau of Educational Research of The Ohio State University met with the seminar group to discuss "Financing the Schools of Ohio." As a referent point for the analysis, he distributed to each student Form I: Statement of Apportionment of State Funds Based on Teacher Plan. This, then, became the work sheet for the group, as the discussion dealt primarily with the new foundation program proposed for the State of Ohio. Central ideas of the discussion were:

1. The plan was designed to reduce class size, inasmuch as a district must employ teachers to get state allotments. The foundation program substantially will absorb the salary of the extra teachers.

2. The plan encourages the hiring of better qualified teachers.

3. The plan contains a hint of an inducement for specialized personnel to be employed.

4. The plan will terminate, probably on the cut-off date of July, 1959, tuition payments by the state.

5. The plan's distance-weight features will help to eliminate the small unit.
Session XIX - March 30, 1955

Dr. Andrew Halpin met with the group during the first part of the session to focus attention on "The Administrator As a Person in American Society, Characterized by Social Mobility and Anxiety Forces." The fundamental questions dealt with were:

1. Why does a man aspire to a leadership role?

2. How does an administrator go into a community with his own sense of values, there encounter other senses of values, and learn to make judicious compromises without losing his integrity?

3. How does an administrator act in ways that are human, considerate, and thoughtful of others, because they are humans, with intrinsic worth, and not because he wishes to manipulate them?

4. How can we get competent people to aspire to positions of educational leadership, so that the purposes of the institution can be advanced?

At the next point in the seminar, the assignment of the analytical diary entry was abandoned because time limitations made it difficult for the students to comply with it. Substituted for this was the request to hand in two "critical incidents" analyses by the end of the course, in which each student was to draw on his own experience for the material.

Results of the Analysis of Field Experience Inventory were returned to the students by the investigator and charts distributed on which individual scores could be plotted and compared with class means. The suggestion was made to build up weak areas through reading, through experiences with their field problems, or through their job experience.

Since the next session would deal, primarily, with the second analysis of the field experience problem, the following criteria were developed:
1. There should be little content given of the specific problem and procedures involved in it since this was dealt with comprehensively the first time.

2. Process analyses, findings, and recommendations should make up the bulk of the report.

3. Related research can be brought in, if it contributes directly to the problem analysis.

The remainder of this session was devoted to the analysis of a field problem presented by a student who previously had analysed one with the group but who since had chosen another because of its wider range of applicability.

Session IX - April 9, 1955

As many of the students had attended the regional American Association of School Administrators meeting in Cleveland during the time since the last seminar session, a short period was devoted to appraising its effectiveness. It was decided to spend part of the next session in discussing Beardsley Ruml's speech, "Long Term Goals in Public School Finance."

The instructor then presented some research findings relating to "The Superintendent and the Board of Education." These data pointed to the conclusion that one could not predict how a board member would react on the basis of his socio-economic status. Other significant points of the discussion were:

1. The chief criterion for school board membership should be a genuine concern for education.

2. School boards have both legislative and judicial roles.

3. School boards seem to function most effectively where there is a unit type of administrative organisation.

4. School boards ordinarily operate better without standing committees.
5. The superintendent carefully should help the board prepare the agenda.

6. School boards need full information concerning issues for most effective operation.

7. Board study sessions are often very desirable to provide background understandings necessary for major decisions later on.

8. School boards should discuss issues relating to the instructional program more frequently.

9. Duplicated copies of the minutes should be sent to board members in advance of meetings.

10. A school board should have a written statement of its policies.

The remainder of the session was spent in discussing the second, and final, oral reports of two students in reference to their field experience problems.

Session XXI - April 13, 1955

The development of future agenda items was discussed, and it was decided to invite Dr. Paul Klohr, Director of the Ohio State University Laboratory School, to discuss "The Administrator's Role in Curriculum Change."

There followed a discussion of Beardsly Ruml's address at the April, 1955, Cleveland AASA meeting. One of the major lessons derived from the analysis was that this speech exemplified a very important trait for the effective administrator, the ability to wipe away, when necessary, the little things to take a long-range look at the big issues.

Two students then presented the second reports of their field experience problems. These were concerned primarily with an analysis of process and an explanation of recommendations.

The instructor led, during the remainder of the session, a dis-
cussion of "Administrative Organisation," and centered it around his article, "Emerging Partnership for Better Instruction," from Educational Trend, Vol. 254. The primary ideas developed were:

1. There should be some structure which is clearly understood by all.
2. Lines of communication should be kept simple, understandable, and short from teacher to superintendent.
3. There should be an administrative council composed of principals and directors to assist the superintendent.
4. A council on instruction, composed of several teachers and some administrators, will facilitate effective communication and assist in the development of policy.
5. The area for group decision should always be clarified.
6. There should be a growing area of building autonomy to promote a leadership role for principals.
7. Resource people from the Central Office need to be available to the classroom teacher.

Session XIII - April 23, 1955

During the first two-hour session, two more students presented the second reports of their field experience problems. Their analyses of process and recommendations were discussed and evaluated by the group.

In the second period, Dr. John Herrick returned to the seminar to discuss "School Plant Planning." He stressed that buildings should be thought of primarily in terms of the entire school program which is to be housed in them. Some criteria for good educational planning are:

1. That it be related to a survey, so that the right plan for the right building can emerge.
2. That it be conducive to good architectural work.
3. That it be continuous until the drawings are approved and the contracts let.
4. That it involve those who are going to use the building.
Some of the most important functions of the superintendent during this period are:

1. To coordinate plans and to see that communication lines are kept open.
2. To orient the board of education concerning the necessity of extensive educational planning.
3. To see that there is reasonableness and balance in the planning.
4. To organize the new staff and to get them started in the new building.

Session XXIII - April 27, 1955

The report of a field experience problem which was given by a student in comprehensive form to include both background information as well as process analysis and recommendations was discussed with the group.

A mimeographed copy of an administrative problem was distributed by the instructor for reading and oral analysis. It was concerned with making administrative provisions to secure the more effective services of a special teacher. Guiding questions were:

1. What is the major problem involved?
2. What additional data would be desirable?
3. What are the possible solutions and supporting points for those solutions?
4. How does the principal get started toward a solution?

After this project was completed, a student presented a current problem from his own experience and asked the group to assist him with its analysis.

The final part of the session was spent in hearing the report of one of the students who had been requested by the group to attend a lecture by Dr. Berelson of the Ford Foundation of New York City on "The
State of Communications Research.

Session XXIV - May 7, 1955

Dr. Paul Klohr, Director of The Ohio State University Laboratory School, discussed the "Role of the Administrator in Curriculum Development." He centered his presentation around four major headings:

1. The nature of curriculum change.
2. Barriers to curriculum change.
3. Personal resources that are indispensable for an administrator in curriculum development.
4. The basic ingredients of curriculum change—a study of children and a study of society.

The roles of the superintendent, the principal, the supervisor, the teachers, the pupils, and the community in curriculum development were clarified during the discussion period which followed Dr. Klohr's overview of the problem.

In response to the request to recommend some resource material, Dr. Klohr listed the following:

Alice Miel, Changing the Curriculum - A Social Process
George Sharp, Curriculum Development as Re-Education of the Teacher
Hollis L. Caswell, Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems
Kimball Wiles, Supervision For Better Schools
Harold Spears, The Teacher In Curriculum Development
Edward A. Krugg, Curriculum Planning
Harold Albery, Reorganizing the High-School Curriculum
Gordon MacKenzie and Stephen Corey, Instructional Leadership

One of the students called attention to the pamphlets which can be obtained from the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools
and indicated the method by which they can be secured.

Two students then distributed progress reports for the second analysis of their field experience problems. The processes involved and the recommendations given were then discussed by the group.


Session XXV - May 11, 1955

During the first hour of this session, the investigator gave an overview of the research problems contained in the dissertation. This presentation came as the result of a previously-expressed interest of the group. At the request of the group at this time, the investigator agreed to suggest a means by which each student could rate each other student in reference to contributions to the development of the class.

Following this period, another student then discussed his process analysis and recommendations concerning his field experience problem. Reactions to these were made during the appraisal time which followed his presentation.

After the interval for eating, which divided the four-hour session of the Spring Quarter, Dr. Max Goodson returned for a discussion of "Staff Functioning in the School." He first of all identified the roles, or units of behavior, which people are apt to play in inter-group functioning. Role requirements are determined by the tasks of the group, the needs of the group to maintain itself, and by the personality needs of the people who compose the group.

To assist the seminar students in becoming sensitized to the
recognition of roles as they operate in group process, Dr. Goodson then divided the students into two role-playing groups and structured the situations as follows:

1. Group I was to discuss whether a school administrator is best prepared by experience or by academic training.

2. Group II was to list as many activities as possible that a school administrator should be familiar with in a community.

After the role-playing episodes, the various roles were then identified and discussed.

**Session XXVI - May 21, 1955**

Dr. Harvey Walker, Professor of Political Science at The Ohio State University, discussed "The Administrative Process." Starting with the definition that administrators are those who supervise men, money, and materials toward stated objectives, he based his analysis on what he regards to be the major areas of administration:

1. Determining the objectives of the organization
2. Building an organization
3. Operating an organization

The analysis of this information as it specifically relates to educational administration then developed after Dr. Walker made his background presentation. For further understandings of the administrative process, he recommended the following resources:

1. American Management Association, *The Development of Executive Talent*
2. Charles E. Redfield, *Communication in Management*
4. Harleigh Trecker, *Group Process in Administration*

At the conclusion of this discussion, a student presented the
analysis of process and recommendations in reference to his field experience problem. During this part of the session, Marius Garofalo, Robert Lucas, and the investigator recorded judgments of the process on the Bales Analysis Chart. This material was used to determine a coefficient of reliability.

The last project of this session was concerned with the analysis of a field experience problem by a second student.

Session XXVII - May 25, 1955

A student who previously had volunteered for the job presented the major ideas developed in Truman Pierce's Community Leadership and Educational Planning. This material then served as the basis for group discussion of "The Role of the Educational Administrator in Working With the Community on School-Related Projects."

Following this discussion, the instructor presented an abstract of Chapter II, "Critical Behavior in Educational Administration," from the pre-publication copy of the School-Community Development Study's Factors Affecting Educational Administration. Nine critical behavior areas were isolated:

1. Setting Goals
2. Making Policy
3. Determining Roles
4. Communicating
5. Using Influence and Power in the Community
6. Using the Educational Resources of the Community
7. Involving People
8. Coordinating Administrative Functions
9. Appraising Effectiveness
After an analysis of this material, four students, two of whom were from the seminar group, who have been closely associated with the School-Community Development Study, presented the data concerning administrative behavior which they have accumulated in preparation for their dissertations. Each has pinpointed his investigation to one specific administrative position. These are the superintendent, the executive head, the high school principal, and the elementary principal. The data were collected by behavioral observations techniques. These men expressed considerable enthusiasm about this research device and appraised it to be superior to the questionnaire method for gathering these types of data.

The Summary of Field Experiences Inventory, the Professional Problem Sheet, and the Ideas About Myself Inventory were distributed to each student. Each was to fill in the requested information and return the results to the investigator by the time of the next session.

Session XXVIII - June 4, 1955

The first hour of this session was devoted to a written appraisal of the seminar, Education 800M, and to individual student evaluations of each other student with reference to his contributions to the seminar experience. For this latter evaluation, the Bales instrument was used.

Following this, the group participated in an oral evaluation of the seminar experience. The central points developed during this process are as follows:

1. Students had an excellent opportunity to test values and beliefs, as they emerged from group analysis, against the ones which they had developed as a result of their own experience.

2. The experience gained from working with a specific problem in the field was extremely valuable. It was recommended that this remain as an integral feature of the seminar.
3. Preference was expressed for a continuation of the practice of having both full-time graduate students and practicing administrators compose the seminar membership.

4. A feeling of security on-the-job developed, as several sensed that many of their operational practices were substantiated by research findings and by the carefully thought out practices of others.

5. Each practicing administrator indicated that he had developed a keener sensitivity, as a result of the seminar experience, about the various relationships entailed in his work.

6. The readings of the seminar were of particular value, because they developed out of the specific needs of individual members. In this way, the required critical evaluation could be related directly to problems which currently were being analyzed.

During the remainder of this session, the instructor presented the thinking of the Committee on Educational Administration, as it is mapping further specific plans for the revision and continued development of the program for preparing educational administrators at the Ohio State University. The following related suggestions were made by the students:

1. In seminar courses, such as 800M, try to provide experiences whereby a group can undertake the responsibility for assisting with the solution of major problems. This responsibility desirably should be not only to the University but to another agency, such as a board of education.

2. There should be increased opportunities to deal with the theoretical phases of problem, so that administrators can develop a keener sensitivity to the philosophical issues that are involved in problem analysis and solution.

3. A condensed bibliography should be developed which contains some basic references in various areas of administration that have proved especially useful to students. This bibliography could then be made available to practicing administrators.

4. There should be increased opportunities for students to gain an understanding of their personal effect in interaction experiences with others.

5. There is a pronounced need felt for more individual counseling at the doctoral level.

6. It would be desirable to develop a method for continuous evalu-
ation of doctoral candidates, even beyond the point of their degree, so that they could be assisted to work at a maximal level.

Session XXIX - June 8, 1955

At the last seminar session of Education 800M, each student turned in his final list of critical readings. In addition, he handed in the written analysis of his field experience problem, which was the major writing project of the course, and his final statement on "Educational Administration--This I Believe."

Each student then took the retest on the following instruments:

1. Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
2. F Scale
3. Test of Professional Understandings in Education

Summary Statement

The material presented in this chapter can, by no means, provide a complete description of all that took place in the seminar. Rather, that which was selected only indicates the major content areas and principal procedures of Education 800M. A fuller analysis of content areas and the processes of the seminar is given in the subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER IV

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT BACKGROUND AND POTENTIALITY

At first viewing it might appear that the assessment of the background and potentiality of each student for a career in educational administration had been placed anachronistically among the specific goals or purposes of the course. Taken in the conventional sense, such an appraisal would have had validity. It has been a growing concern among those who are responsible for the preparing of educational administrators that a very perceptive look needs to be taken at the recruitment, selection, and guidance of candidates for preparation programs. This concern, of course, has both its quantitative and qualitative implications. The scope of their concern was reflected, somewhat, in Chapter II, where some indication was given of the amount of research which is being conducted by the CPEA centers in reference to the question. In Chapter I reference was made to the stress placed by the Committee on Educational Administration at The Ohio State University on recruitment and selection.

It was stated in Chapter I that the fifteen students who enrolled in Education 800M, came through a selective screening process, the details of which previously had been outlined. The purpose of this chapter is to carry the process of assessment on from that point, as it developed during the period of the seminar. Finally, mention will be made of the applicability of the methods, as reflected in the research
findings, to the broader questions of recruitment, selection, preparation, and guidance of students who aspire to a career in the field of educational administration.

Analysis of the Summary of Field Experience Inventory Data

Since one of the major purposes of the seminar was to consider, insofar as possible, the totality of the administrative process as it is operative in the educational field, it became desirable to assess, at the beginning of the course, the degree to which each student had had experience in its component areas. To provide material for this assessment, the Summary of Field Experience Inventory, which had been developed by the instructor, was administered. Although this did not purport to be a standardized instrument, it represented, none the less, an attempt to pull together as many of the areas of educational administration as possible. The skeletal outline of the instrument is listed below:1

Operational Areas

1. Goal Setting
2. Curriculum Development
3. Pupil Personnel
4. Staff Personnel
5. Physical Facilities
6. Finance and Business Management
7. Public Relations

Administrative Processes

1. Planning
2. Organizing
3. Directing
4. Coordinating
5. Controlling

1The complete instrument is listed in the Appendix.
Situational Factors

1. Physical Conditions
2. Cultural Setting
3. Institutional Organization
4. Face-to-Face Groups

Under each classification, from three to seven specific activities were listed. At the first seminar session each student was asked to rate himself, using a scale of 0 - 1 - 3 - 5, twice, according to extent and intensity of experience, in terms of each specific activity. The evaluation was done on the basis of actual and/or campus-initiated experience. A re-evaluation, using the same instrument, was made after the twenty-seventh session.

When the inventory was taken initially, the students exchanged instruments, made a critical appraisal of the results, and indicated areas of strength and weakness. These were returned, and the instructor suggested that the students should undertake to buttress weak areas through reading, and through their administrative activities and/or ensuing field experience problems. Further to sharpen the picture for each student, a graph was prepared on which class means had been plotted. It was suggested that each use this to plot in his own curve. This information was used, also, during individual counseling sessions with the instructor.

The results of this inventory, on a test-retest basis, are presented, by means, in Table 1. Since the categories contained different amounts of specific items, the total possible score is given in the first column of the table. As the total possible score did vary, from category to category, it is believed that a tabular presentation of the material is more meaningful than a graphical one would be.

When the scores derived from this inventory were analyzed sta-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total Possible Score</th>
<th>Extent₁</th>
<th>Extent₂</th>
<th>Intensity₁</th>
<th>Intensity₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Goal Setting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Development</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pupil Personnel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff Personnel</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physical Facilities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Finance and Business Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Relations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organising</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Directing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinating</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Controlling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical Conditions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural Setting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional Organization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Face-to-Face Groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The means presented here, and in subsequent tables, have been rounded off at one place beyond the decimal point. For statistical purposes, they were dealt with three places beyond the decimal point.*
tistically, the t-test was run to determine if the calculated mean difference could have resulted from chance factors. With a mean score of 10.333 on the first test and one of 88.067 on the retest, the resultant t-score of 3.649 was obtained. This indicated that the difference in the means was significant beyond the .01 level. Thus, that this increase could have resulted by chance can, to all intents and purposes, be ruled out of the picture.

For further evidence, an examination of Table 1 indicates that there was an upward shift of the means in each of the thirty-two instances. By binominal expansion this would have happened as the result of chance only once in over three billion times.

On a test-retest basis, when the same instrument is used, there is always the possibility that participants rely on the memory factor to upgrade the results. It is highly unlikely, however, that this factor would operate with such consistency over an interval of five months.

There seems to be a strong likelihood, therefore, that class and class-related experiences bore directly on the changes which occurred. Since administration is viewed as process, involving both human and material resources, and since there was a definite attempt to deal with administration globally during the seminar experience, it is concluded that this process was a successful way of doing it, at least when viewed quantitatively. Qualitative evidence must, of course, be ascertained from other sources. That phase of the problem will be dealt with more comprehensively in Chapters V through VIII.

An Analysis of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Data

The LBDQ, which was adapted for use with educational administra-
tors by Dr. Andrew Halpin, while at the Personnel Research Board of The Ohio State University, from an instrument devised by Hemphill and Coons to measure the behavior of aircraft commanders, was administered to the seminar participants on January 12, 1955, and again on June 8, 1955.

Stated briefly, the rationale of this instrument is that the most effective administrator is one who rates high on the two dimensions measured, Initiating Structure in Group Interaction and Consideration. He understands that he has an administrative responsibility to coordinate the enterprise toward its objectives, but that this can be done best if he realizes that the human resources with whom he works are of much more importance than the material ones. This not only must be recognized, but it must also be manifested in the ways he works with human resources of the enterprise. If this is done deviously, by the administrator who manipulates human resources by techniques, his method of operation is rarely as successful as the one who works with people because of a sincere belief in their intrinsic worth.

A further discussion of the rationale will be more meaningful, it is believed, if it is related to the specific data of the study. In Table 2 the test-retest results of the LBDQ are presented.

The t-score technique was applied to these data to determine whether or not the difference between the means was significant. For the dimension of initiating structure, a t-score of 1.97 was obtained. This indicates that the possibility that this difference resulted from chance factors was between .05-.10. Although this does not clearly rule out the factor of chance, inasmuch as the statistical cutting point has been set at .05, there is nevertheless a strong likelihood that chance was not operative in the change which occurred.
TABLE 2

CLASS RAW SCORES, BY CATEGORIES, DETERMINED FROM TEST-RETEST RESULTS ON
THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE,
JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Possible Structure Score</th>
<th>Initiating Structure Score₁</th>
<th>Initiating Structure Score₂</th>
<th>Possible Consideration Score</th>
<th>Consideration Score₁</th>
<th>Consideration Score₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean          |   38.3                        | 41.4                         |       |   51.3                        | 52.3                |
Abstracting from the seminar proceedings of Session VIII, the following related discussion of structure is presented:

Instructor: Remember, Dr. Halpin said because good leaders, we think, have high structure and high consideration, we don't know the training implication. Can you raise structure if you know you need structure?

We are becoming a more highly motivated group in educational administration in reference to democratic values, but because of this we should be aware of the danger of thinking that the best way to achieve those values is through all consideration and no structure.

It became one of the intents of the seminar, thus, not only to assist the students to increase in initiating structure and consideration, but what was perhaps of even greater importance, to effect a better balance between the two. An inspection of the means will indicate that this goal was achieved. There was a difference of 13.0 between the means when the instrument was administered at the beginning of the course and a difference of 10.9 on the retest at the end of the course.

A t-score of .331 was derived when the test was applied to the dimension of consideration. This falls far short of significance, inasmuch as the likelihood that chance factors could have been operative in the mean difference rises to .7-.8. With probability as high as between 70 and 80 per cent, it is very unlikely that the difference which occurred between the consideration means resulted because of factors traceable to the course.

The implications of the foregoing cannot, as yet, be stated with a reliable degree of certainty. Conjecturally, however, this much can be said. There seems to be a growing amount of evidence that the most successful administrators are those who not only rate high in both initiating structure and consideration but who also keep these dimensions
within reasonable balance. As further research is done with this instrument, normative information can be accumulated and distributed to those who are concerned with using it in conjunction with selection, preparing, and counseling administrators. It is understood that this normative information is being collected.

Another limitation on the ability of the investigator to draw more widespread conclusions from the data results directly from the fact that this study could not be carried on under more controlled conditions. The LBDQ is a flexible instrument inasmuch as it can be taken in many ways, some of the most significant of which are listed as follows:

1. The board of education can score the administrator as they think he should operate.
2. The board of education can score the administrator as they perceive he is operating.
3. The administrator can score himself as he perceives he is operating.
4. The administrator can score himself as he believes he should operate.
5. The teachers can score the administrator as they perceive he is operating.
6. The teachers can score the administrator as they believe he should operate.

Thus, if the instrument were administered six times in this fashion, it would follow that the greater the degree of congruence which existed, the more effectively the administrator would operate.

As the study ran, however, the fifteen students took the instrument only on the basis of what is called the LBDQ-Ideal. That is, they scored it as they believed an administrator should act. Consequently, on the strength of the data, it can only be said that the seminar, it
would seem, helped to effect a better balance between initiating structure and consideration and to have contributed to a development of initiating structure, insofar as the students' perception of the administrator's role is concerned.

An Analysis of the F-Scale Data

The F-Scale was developed by Adorno and his colleagues to measure the degree to which a person exhibits fascist tendencies. This particular scale is composed of twenty-eight items, and the person who takes the test reacts to each one on the following basis:

1. slight support, agreement
2. moderate support, agreement
3. strong support, agreement

-1 slight opposition, disagreement
-2 moderate opposition, disagreement
-3 strong opposition, disagreement

In accordance with the rationale behind the instrument, a high positive score would indicate a person who is rigid, to a pronounced degree, and strongly prone to exhibit fascist behavior. A high negative score, then, indicates much more flexibility and a greater propensity to exhibit democratic behavior.

Table 3 shows the scores made by the students of the seminar on a test-retest basis.

When the t-score was derived for these data it proved to be 1.09, with a probability of between .2 - .3 that the difference in the means could have resulted from chance factors. Although this fails to achieve the statistically significant figure of .05, it can nevertheless be noted that there was a move in the second class mean further toward the more democratic pole of the scale.

It is interesting to note that whereas there was a marginally
TABLE 3
CLASS RAW SCORES, DETERMINED FROM TEST-RETEST RESULTS ON THE F-SCALE, JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Highest Test Limit</th>
<th>Lowest Test Limit</th>
<th>Test Result₁</th>
<th>Test Result₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 ...</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>-824</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean... ... ... ... -32.4 -35.5

significant shift in the means of the initiating structure scores on the LBDQ instrument, which taken by itself might be construed to mean a trend toward more rigidity, it was not reflected in a decrease of the mean score on the F-Scale, as might, on an a priori basis, have been expected. Because of this factor, and because of the slight increase in the mean consideration score, it is felt, even more strongly, that the seminar had a tendency to effect the more desirable balance between initiating structure and consideration.

It can further be hypothesized that the F-Scale appears to have definite promise as one of the instruments to be used in a program of selection for potential educational administrators. In the absence of
more conclusive statistical data, it seems tenable to believe that a candidate with a high positive score might encounter real difficulty in developing those qualities which would make for successful operation as an educational administrator in a democracy.

As far as the students of Education 800K were concerned, it is believed that the flexibly-structured nature of the seminar, with its attempt to view administration in a global sense, and with its give-and-take approach to problem analysis and solution, could only be possible, in a productive way, because they were not rigid in their temperament.

Analysis of the Ideas About Myself Inventory Data

The Ideas About Myself Inventory was developed by the National Training Laboratory at Bethel, Maine, to provide participants in the study of Group Dynamics a measure of self-assessment in respect to their personal feelings about group work. It gives an indication of personality structure in reference to leadership-followership tendencies. Since successful group operation necessitates the possession of both types of characteristics on the part of the participants, a score of close to zero is regarded as most desirable.

The instrument is composed of forty-five items, which focus attention on the person taking the inventory in terms of his perception of himself in a role of working with other people. It is scored on the following basis:

-2 Statement describes me very accurately
-1 Statement is quite descriptive of me
0 Statement is both true and untrue as a description of me
-1 Statement is generally not a true description of me
-2 Statement is decidedly false as a description of me

Although it would be highly unlikely that a person would make
scores of ±90 or -90, which are the two extreme limits, this would be possible. In either case, however, such a person would represent a rather peculiar personality configuration. This is true because of the tendency of the items to have a balancing effect. A person, thus, who would mark a certain item with a +2 would have a tendency to mark another with a -2, in order to maintain some semblance of consistency as far as personality structure is concerned.

Table 4 shows the test-retest scores of the 800M students.

TABLE 4
CLASS RAW SCORES, DETERMINED FROM TEST-RETEST RESULTS
ON THE IDEAS ABOUT MYSELF INVENTORY,
JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Test Result₁</th>
<th>Test Result₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A t-score of .12 was derived in testing the significance of the difference between the means, indicating a probability of .6 - .7 that this change could have resulted from chance factors. With probability
this high, then, it is not warranted to tie in the change with the seminar experience.

It can be speculated, however, that with a mean on the first test of -5.5 so close to what is regarded as the optimum score, 0.0, the balance of leadership-followership functions of the students in the seminar experience would be expected to effect only a very slight degree of change. It is interesting to note that the change which did take place was in the direction of 0.0.

Since one of the original purposes in administering these instruments was to provide a diagnostic picture of the students, and the seminar group, the usefulness of the instrument cannot be determined solely on the basis of whether or not it measured a statistically-significant change. If this instrument is used in subsequent parts of the preparation program, it seems plausible that its results can be considered particularly in reference to individual scores. If a student has a relatively low score in the negative range, individual guidance and an assignment of him to a field experience where a more pronounced leadership than followership role is required, this should help to effect a better balance of these dimensions. The roles could be reversed, of course, for the student who has a high positive ranking.

Analysis of the Test of Professional Understandings in Education Data

As indicated previously, the Test of Professional Understandings in Education was developed by Dr. Lowry Harding and Dr. William Flesher of The Ohio State University. Primarily, the instrument has been used to date in assisting school systems with the selection of cadet principals for their in-service promotional programs. Since it has not been
used extensively enough, as yet, for the development of normative infor-
mation, it can only be discussed here in reference to its use with the
seminar group. The test-retest results are listed in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

CLASS RAW SCORES, DETERMINED FROM TEST-RETEST RESULTS
ON THE TEST OF PROFESSIONAL UNDERSTANDINGS
IN EDUCATION, JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Test Result&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Test Result&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The derived t-score of .41 indicates that a probability of be-
tween .6 - .7 exists that the difference in the means resulted from
chance factors. Even if a significant change had occurred, it probably
would have required looking beyond the experience of the seminar to
find an explanation for it. This is felt because it is believed that
the instrument, by the items it contains, bears more directly on the
principal and the supervisor than it does on the superintendent. Since
the concerns of the seminar dealt more with the superintendency than
with the principalship, it was not to be expected that significant changes would take place. An examination of the areas assessed in this test will bear out this point, it is believed. They are:

1. Administration
2. Child Development
3. Curriculum
4. Evaluation
5. Guidance
6. Methodology
7. Instructional Material
8. Professional Relationships
9. Public Relations
10. Supervision

Its usefulness will grow as continued research is conducted with this instrument. At present it is thought that it would have more value as a measure of development in a seminar experience that is designed to deal with supervision or the principalship. When normative information about the instrument is developed to a further point, it is believed that it will also have increased diagnostic value for those whose primary interest is the superintendency. That superintendents should have good comprehensive understandings in these areas seems obvious. Taken diagnostically, then, the instrument can provide important information for the counseling of students of the area of educational administration.
CHAPTER V

EXPERIENCE IN PROBLEM SOLVING

Problem Solving in an Actual School-Community Situation

In a very real sense, the predominant activity of the administrator of an educational enterprise is problem solving. This process is continuous, and is related, either directly or indirectly, to the objectives of the enterprise. Usually, the wider the range of the objectives, the more complex is the process of administration. Although it can be stated that the major purpose of an educational administrator is to facilitate the learning process of the students, to do this effectively and purposefully he is engaged in a multiplicity of activities.

Different philosophies of the administrative process point to different methods of operation to effectuate the purposes of education. Some contend that since the responsibility is vested by law on the superintendent of schools for all that transpires there, he then is the one who should have the enlightened ability to make the decisions, at least the major ones which affect policy. That this method of operation has been, and is still, widespread is well known. In its worst sense, a despotic type of control exists in relatively small systems and a hierarchical bureaucracy in large ones. In its best sense, an enlightened leader keeps the enterprise moving toward the goals which
he believes to be important, but his goals are apt to become restricted as the result of personal time and energy limitations.

Posed against this type of educational leadership is the concept which recognizes that although the administrator has fixed overall responsibilities which have been determined by law, he can none the less operate more purposefully if there is shared leadership. This is different from delegated leadership, which is the segmenting of administration, fixing responsibility for various areas of operation, but still keeping the decision-making in very specific places. When this is done, a line type of organization usually is employed. The shared leadership concept, however, contains the belief that decisions are often best-made and best-executed when those whom the decisions affect have some voice in their making.

In the worst sense, shared leadership can assume that almost every conceivable decision or policy must be made by the group it affects, and thus the enterprise becomes bogged down under the burdensome weight of its own cumbersome process. In the best sense, groups in the enterprise can work together, with the prudent and coordinating efforts of its administrators, and make the decisions which are most judicious for them to make. It operates within the structure of law and its own objectives, recognising and working with those who have fixed responsibilities for decision making, delegating responsibilities to some others, and participating according to purpose, in other activities which require decision making.

It is within this matrix of administrative theory that the seminar operated. With problem solving believed to be the major function of the administrator, it was logical to structure the primary activity
of Education 800M accordingly.

Although a specific account was not given in Chapter III of the field experience problems which were discussed, because of an interest in dealing with them here, more purposefully and economically, a review of the seminar sessions indicates that each of the fifteen students had the opportunity to analyze his problem on two different occasions with the entire group. In addition, an examination of the specific topics dealt with, as described in Chapter III, indicates that each in a very real sense related to a problem solving area of educational administration.

Although oral analysis of the field experience problem was, by far, the major concern, time-wise, of the seminar, there were in addition, other types of experiences provided which were designed to strengthen individual competence in the activities of problem analysis and solution. These were:

1. The presentation of situational problems by the instructor for either oral or written analysis.

2. The assignment to make a comprehensive written report of the background, development, process analysis, and solution or recommendations-for-solution of the field experience problem.

3. The presentation of a major topic in educational administration by one of the students, by the instructor, or by an authority on the topic from the outside, for oral analysis.

4. The assignment to hand in, periodically, a critical analysis of readings, or of incidents from the student's own administrative experience.

As was indicated in Chapter III, the selection of a field experience problem was one of the first concerns of the seminar. In the first session, some criteria were developed. The problem was to come from outside the geographical sphere of each practicing administrator's normal area of operation. This was done to standardize, in a sense,
the experience for the students, inasmuch as seven of the fifteen stu-
dents were not at the time practicing administrators, but rather were
full-time graduate students. More important, however, was the goal to
have each student gain the experience of working with a group in which
he, at the outset by virtue of his position, would not have a status
role. Secondly, the problem was to be one of sufficient duration as to
permit a period of at least four months' work with it. In the third
place, it was to be the type of problem with which an administrator
would normally become involved. Most importantly, in the final analy­sis, the problem was to involve a group of people, rather than a
single individual, so that the student could become both a participant
in, and an analyst of, group decision making.

In not all instances could these criteria be rigidly followed.
In the case of some practicing administrators in the seminar group, the
time pressures of their dual responsibilities precluded their going out
of their communities to participate in a field experience problem. In
all such cases, however, problems were selected which were beyond the
normal confines of their day-by-day operations.

The fifteen field experience problems which were selected are
listed as follows:

1. Assisting a school system to look at the possibility of estab­lishing a type of salary schedule which would incorporate some
   form of merit ratings.

2. Participating as a member of a service club to develop a recre­ational program for boys 9-14, who, by virtue of circumstances,
   needed a father-son relationship.

3. Helping to develop and expedite plans for the building of a
   branch Y. M. C. A.

4. Analysing the process of lobbying as it operates in the Ohio
   Legislature.
5. Studying the operation of a mental health center to develop broader understandings of how its facilities could be used by the community and by the schools.

6. Acting as a consultant to a school system which was considering a revision of its organizational plan to include a Director of Instruction.

7. Working with a city manager and other civic and school officials to develop a program of bicycle registration and safety control.

8. Helping a school system to consider the advisability of continuing its home instruction program for atypical children or of developing a program of special education.

9. Considering with a school the role that it should play in the development of a recreational program.

10. Working with a high school and a university department to appraise how well one phase of the curriculum was meeting the needs of college-bound students.

11. Developing a proposal of State Organization for Vocational Education.

12. Assisting a city school system to develop a plan for immunizing its first and second grade pupils against poliomyelitis.

13. Helping a school system to develop a program for the continuous professional development of its staff.

14. Planning with a citizens' committee for the development of a village recreational program.

15. Studying the problem of school transportation in an Ohio county.

The degree of participation by the seminar students in the field experience problem was not narrowly circumscribed. This varied from student to student because of the nature of the problem and because of the varying amounts of time which each could spend in its analysis and solution. On the average, however, between three and five hours per week outside the seminar were spent by each in activities specifically related to the field experience problem.

Evaluation of a student's competence in handling his assignment
was limited primarily to the evidence which he presented during the seminar session. As was stated previously, each presented progress analyses on two different occasions. During the first quarter, he gave the background elements of the problem, and participated, guided by the discussion of the group, in the clarification of the problem and a planning of next steps in the development of a solution. During the second quarter, then, the final oral report was given, and this involved an analysis of the group process elements which were operating in the problem and recommendations for its solution. A critique of the effectiveness of these evaluations will be given in the latter half of this chapter. For the balance of this section, an evaluation will be made only of the written analyses of problems which were prepared by the seminar students.

In making an appraisal of the written analyses, it is recognized that subjective opinion is being expressed. Substantiation, in part, is obtained when reference is made to the evaluations which the instructor applied to this work.

The final written reports of the field experience problem, it is believed, represent substantially less than could be expected, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Although it is difficult to measure and compare, the oral analyses which were given by the students were considerably more comprehensive.

Although there were three or four exceptions, where the calibre of the written reports was very commendable, in general this was not the case. Several reasons seem to exist for this. Each of the students in the seminar was particularly busy. Seven were full-time administrators, and the others were full-time graduate students carrying full programs.
Since graduate courses traditionally carry the assignment of a term paper at the end of the quarter, quality of the work often suffers because of the ensuing log-jam. Administrators, in late May and early June, are beleaguered with commencement exercises and concomitant closing-of-school activities.

An additional, and perhaps much more deep-seated, reason exists, however. There seems to be an expectation, somewhat unwarranted by the facts, that a graduate student is proficient in the skills of written expression. As a consequence, he often receives very little guidance in this throughout his program. There are numerous occasions for writing during this period, but not much direction is provided. Since clarity of written expression is a much-needed skill, the value judgment suggests that the interdisciplinary possibilities of meeting this problem be explored. The departments of English and Journalism could be of great assistance, it is thought, in coping with this situation.

When the shorter, more pointed assignments were appraised, the quality of written expression improved. The mid-term examination, for example, which consisted of reacting to a specific case-study type of problem, brought forth a much more lucid example of tightly-written, well-analyzed reports than did the more comprehensive assignment.

One further point is developed in reference to the experience in problem solving in an actual school-community situation. Evaluatively, the only frame of reference in which the experience could be gauged was that provided by the participating student.

In the initial experiment with Education 800M, the lines of demarcation had to be drawn some place. By marking them off at this
point, however, there was no provision made for evaluation of the student's effectiveness in the problem solving experience by anyone who likewise was a participant or observer in the process. It was recognized by the seminar students, as they indicated by the recommendations which they made during the twenty-eighth session, reported in Chapter III, that they felt the need of some measure of their own personal effectiveness in their interacting processes with others. This suggests, possibly, that some provision be made for this, as this major block of work in their graduate program is further developed.

Problem Analysis and Solving as Reflected in the Seminar Experience

Since an analysis of process was one of the vital concerns of this study, one of the problems which had to be met was that of making an appraisal in terms of some constant structure. Although it was recognized at the outset that this appraisal, because of the loose research design, would largely be a subjective one, it was believed that the introduction of this constant structure would to a degree lessen, if not obviate, this problem. Permission was obtained from Dr. Robert F. Bales of the Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard University to use a modification of the technique which he developed for interaction process analysis of small groups. This was designed primarily for the appraisal of groups involved in the process of problem analysis. A description of the Bales categories, and the methods employed by the investigator to check the reliability of his judgment, were given, it will be recalled, in Chapter I.

As much of the material discussed in this section of the chapter relates directly to the composite summary sheet, for illustrative pur-
poses it is listed now as Table 6.

It is not to be construed that the Bales scoring method was used to record the responses. His is a much more precise type of measurement and primarily is concerned with an analysis of process. Since the seminar sessions were not tape-recorded, an on-the-spot analysis which would have been plotted directly on the chart would have meant a sacrifice of content. Hoping also to include an analysis of content as part of the study, it was not feasible for the investigator to record in this fashion. Instead, a concerted effort was made to record the seminar proceedings as completely and as accurately as possible. In this way, what was said, by whom, and in what sequence, became the part of each session's record. Cue words, reactions, and symbols were listed in the notes when the investigator wished to recall the emotional tone of the discussion, and other especially important points of reference. This material was then transferred later, session by session, to the Bales charts. The content of each statement, often buttressed by the clues in the notes, provided the line of direction in plotting the material on the charts.

As indicated by Bales, the categories fall into three major classifications:

1. Social-Emotional Area: Positive (1 through 3)
2. Task Area: Neutral (4 through 9)
3. Social-Emotional Area: Negative (10 through 12)

Since it was the interest of the investigator to discriminate as perceptively as possible in these areas, as was indicated previously in

---

### TABLE 6

PARTICIPATIVE RESPONSES AS RECORDED ON THE BALES INTERACTION PROCESS ANALYSIS CHART, BY EDUCATION 800M STUDENTS, JANUARY 5, 1955 THROUGH JUNE 4, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bales Categories</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestions, direction, implying autonomy for others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Campbell

Totals

Percentage of totals
Chapter I, two men from outside the seminar recorded with him on three occasions. When the coefficients of agreement were determined, they ran consecutively, .74, .85, and .88. With these as indices, it was felt that the recordings were being made with reasonable accuracy.

An analysis of Table 6 raises, it is assumed, the natural question relative to the utility of information which is quantified in this fashion. Each in his own group experience, it is believed, at some time or another has felt that the most significant contributions were not made, necessarily, by the person who participated vocally the greatest number of times. To the contrary, each possibly has felt upon occasion, that such a person even, in his opinion, was a deterrent to group progress.

With this as a serious concern in the mind of the investigator, a question was addressed to Dr. Bales, in reference to the possibility of using the instrument for an appraisal, by each student, of the effectiveness of each other student. This, it was thought, would provide some qualitative data which could be used as a cross-reference. His reply added a substantial degree of credence to this hypothesis.

We have had some experience asking subjects to rate each other on the same twelve categories and find, in general, a close relation between their ratings and the results we get, although there are small differences probably due to the fact that participants evaluate (or distort) somewhat differently than observers.2

This process described by Dr. Bales is different, substantially, from that which was used in this study. It is assumed that he referred to a situation where after trained observers had rated a problem situation, the participants then listened to a tape recording and rated

---

2Letter from Dr. Robert F. Bales to the investigator, July 18, 1955.
themselves, and the results were in close agreement.

The evidence, however, was encouraging enough to lead to the correlation of student evaluations, in terms of contribution to the seminar experience, with the numbers of times each participated during the course of the seminar in each of the twelve categories. This was done to provide some quantitative evidence which would assist in answering the question of what relationship exists between the amount and quality of participation.

This relationship was determined by the following process. Each student, during Seminar Session XXVIII, rated each other student in terms of the twelve Bales categories, and in so doing used a six-point scale from 5, most effective, through 0, least effective. The rating was done on the basis of each student's perception of the effectiveness of each other student as a participant in the entire seminar experience. For each student, therefore, there were fourteen ratings for each of the twelve categories. The mean rating was then determined for each student for each category and plotted on the Bales chart. Class means were also calculated for each of the twelve categories. This information is listed in Table 7.

A rank ordering of the means was made for each student. Likewise a rank ordering was made according to the total number of times he participated during the entire seminar experience, in each of the twelve categories. A rank order correlation was then determined for each student. These correlations ranged from .82 to .07, with a median of .56. All correlations were positive.

Whereas this median correlation of .56 is far short of an ideal one-to-one relationship, it does, however, rank very favorably in terms
### TABLE 7
EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS, BY MEANS, DETERMINED FROM
STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF FELLOW SEMINAR
MEMBERS ON JUNE 1, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bales Categories</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestions, direction, implying autonomy for others</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, deflects other's status, defends or asserts self</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the correlations typically reported for the relationship between performance on academic-aptitude tests and grades earned in college. These usually range from .40 to .60.³

On the strength of this relationship, then, it appears warranted to discuss the data recorded in Table 6 qualitatively as well as quantitatively. It is realized that as this is done, certain limitations are in effect. A larger sampling would have added validity to the data; the qualitative rating was done by the students without additional cross-correlational data, and the judgments which were required for the numerical tabulations were made by a single observer—the investigator. The conclusions which are made, then, should be interpreted with these limitations in mind.

A host of observations could be made about the data presented in Table 6, and about the dozens of tables from which its data were drawn. No attempt, however, will be made to exhaust its possibilities. Only those conclusions which seem most directly related to this study will be made. These observations are directly related to an analysis of process, inasmuch as an analysis of content will be made in subsequent chapters.

One of the charges often leveled by critics of the group process is that it is so concerned with the maintenance of good human relations that it neglects its responsibility of moving toward its objectives. Using Bales' breakdown of the twelve categories into the three major areas, it is discovered by referring to Table 6 that the seminar time was spent in the following ways:

1. Social-Emotional Area: Positive (1-3) 13.8 per cent

2. Task Area: Neutral (4-9) 83.6 per cent
3. Social-Emotional Area: Negative (10-12) 2.6 per cent

With 83.6 per cent of the 3312 separate class contributions falling in the task-area, it is believed that the seminar remained oriented quite well to its job-centered purpose. Inasmuch as the Bales areas contain, in addition, a separation which is based upon predominant emotional content, it can be pointed out, plausibly, that responses in the social-emotional area, both positive and negative, also can directly be related to the task area. In classifying the responses, it seemed as if this was primarily the case. It was, for example, regarded as especially significant by the investigator that an excellent esprit de corps was maintained throughout the seminar experience by spontaneous excursions into the positive social-emotional area. That this far overbalanced the negative area—13.8 per cent to 2.6 per cent—was particularly important.

An analysis of Table 6 indicates that the responses were divided between the instructor and the students—37.7 per cent and 62.3 per cent. The range in participative responses on the part of the students was from 277 to 28, with a mean of 137.5. These data indicate that the seminar was conducive to widespread participation on the part of the students and yet was not achieved by a pronounced loss in the area of instructor's participation.

It should be pointed out that the 28 responses, which represent one pole of the participation range, were given by the student who served as the seminar recorder. Since, because of his recording responsibilities, this student was not able to participate in the seminar more freely, this evidence seems to suggest that this responsibility be
passed around from member to member in subsequent sections of the seminar. If, however, the recorder is designated as an analyst of both process and content in the future, there may be frequent intervals during which he is asked to give an oral report.

Since one of the major purposes of the seminar experience was to increase skill in the area of problem analysis, another measure of the degree of fulfillment of this objective was taken by the rank order correlation method. The participative responses of the instructor were arranged in rank order, based on frequency. The same was done for those of the students. The rank order correlation between these two sets of data was .89. There was, then, a very close degree of agreement between the participative patterns of the instructor and the students. This indicates that the relationship between the two was not information-giving and information-receiving primarily, as is the case in more traditionally-designed course procedure. This correlation of .89 is regarded as a significant point of evidence that the problem-analysis purpose of the seminar was fulfilled to a major degree.

Although not stated directly in the purposes of the seminar, it was felt that the ability to state a problem succinctly, in written fashion, is an important skill. To provide a technique for measuring this, the students were asked to state, at the beginning of the seminar, the five problems which were considered to be the most pressing ones which faced them as an administrator, or as a former administrator. This request was repeated at the end of the experience, as well. A judgment was then made by the investigator, who used a scale which ranged from 5 - 0, regarding the quality of the problem, as it was stated. The results are given in Table 8.
TABLE 8

CLASS RAW SCORES, DETERMINED FROM TEST-RETEST RESULTS
ON THE PROBLEM SHEET, JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Test Result&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Test Result&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Means          | 15.2                    | 16.9                    |

A t-score of .671 was derived in testing the significance of the difference between the means, which indicates that a probability of between .5 - .6 exists that the shift in the means occurred as a result of chance. Although it is recognized that in this statement the investigator is again relying upon subjective judgment, it is interpreted that these results, which did not achieve statistical significance, lend further evidence to the opinion that more guidance is needed for the graduate student in the area of his written expression.

In summary, then, it can be stated that as the material has been interpreted by the investigator, the major purpose of providing opportunities for the development of additional skills in problem solving
ability was realized to a significant degree, as far as the oral ramifications are concerned. This, in the judgment of the investigator, was less true of the written material.
CHAPTER VI

IMPROVEMENT OF SKILLS IN ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR

Administrative behavior, as the term is used in this chapter, refers to the way in which a formally-designated administrator acts as he performs functions associated with his position. Despite the apparent simplicity of this definition, its complexity is realized when one recognizes that the evaluation of behavior often is made by many people who use their own value systems as the basis of the appraisal. The educational administrator, for example, almost constantly is in an interacting relationship with the board of education, the administrative staff, the teaching staff, the non-certificated staff, pupils, and individuals or groups from the community. Each of these has expectations concerning how the administrator should act. These expectations are compounded of their own need structure, the status relationship which they have with the administrator, and of the perception they have of the function of education in the school-community. In addition, the administrator himself has perceptions of how he best should act to perform his responsibilities. For the sake of simplicity, this has been described in terms of groups in the school community. The picture takes on increased subtlety when it is realized that individuals within these groups also are making appraisals of the quality of administrative behavior, and affecting, often in rather complex fashion, the group opinion.
When a qualitative judgment is made, therefore, about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the administrator, it is necessary to realize that his behavior is evaluated as a basis of that judgment. Also, because an educational administrator works with so many different groups, it is apparent that his behavior might be regarded as effective by some, and ineffective by others. Obviously, too, there are some conditions under which it would be impossible for administrative behavior to be judged as effective. If the board of education and the teaching staff, for example, have different expectations about the way in which an administrator should perform his functions, it would be virtually impossible for the administrator to act in ways which would be judged as effective by both groups.

In the face of these complexities, then, it is not surprising that an increasing amount of research activity is being directed to the analysis of administrative behavior. This may be a product of the realization that more than a technical knowledge of school operation is needed for successful educational administration. Particularly does this seem to be the case when the leadership function of educational administrators is stressed. The leadership function may well mean different things to different administrators. To present a contrasting situation, one might construe this to mean that the objectives of the enterprise should determine the course of the decisions he makes and behavior he exhibits, while another might seek his direction from the wishes and needs of the people who work in the enterprise.

As administrative behavior was dealt with during the seminars, each of these extreme positions would have to be rejected as undesirable. Administrative behavior which is conditioned solely by the ob-
jective of the school often is too inflexible and too impersonal for widespread acceptance in our democratic society. Administrative behavior which is conditioned by the wishes and needs of those who work in the schools often is too contradictory and too lacking in central purposes. It was advocated, rather, that the most preferred administrative behavior is that which manifests skill in the technical aspects of public school administration, with a relating of them to the objectives of education, and a sincere interest in promoting wholesome human relationships.

During the period of the seminar's operation, the School-Community Development Study at The Ohio State University was continuing its research and analysis of the critical areas of administrative behavior, and the situational factors which seem to affect the quality of that behavior. Its research teams worked directly in representative school-community settings to collect their data. Although Education 800M was not formally included as part of the research design, it did play, however, a tangential role. The seminar instructor, for example, was currently serving as project coordinator in an affiliated study, "Critical Areas of Administrative Behavior Among Superintendents, Executive Heads, Secondary-School Principals, and Elementary-School Principals." Two of the seminar students were research assistants in this project and engaged in the process of collecting data for their dissertations.

The report of the School-Community Development Study on this topic did not appear until September, 1955, three months after the conclusion of the seminar.\(^1\) Despite this fact, because of the indicated

---

1 John A. Ramseyer, Lewis E. Harris, Millard Z. Pond, and Howard
closeness of the seminar to the research project, it is regarded as warranted to use its findings as a guide in analyzing the degree to which the seminar contributed to the improvement of skills in administrative behavior.

From its field-study data, nine critical areas of administrative behavior in educational administration were identified. These areas are:

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

As these nine areas of administrative behavior were isolated, it became increasingly evident that the quality of that behavior was affected by two types of factors, the interpersonal and the environmental.

In determining the degree to which there was an improvement of skills in administrative behavior on the part of the fifteen students, the most valid data would have come from observations of them as participants in their field experience problems and/or as administrators on the job. In the study, this was not possible. Likewise, it also was not possible to obtain evaluations of their administrative behavior from those with whom they worked in these situations. In addition, no instruments were developed and administered which related directly to these nine areas of administrative behavior, and the interpersonal and

---

Wakefield, *Factors Affecting Educational Administration* (The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio: University Press, 1955).

2 It will be noted that these represent a revision of the areas which were presented to the seminar during Session XXVII.
environmental factors which affect the quality of that behavior. With these limitations, then, the search for evidence of change which occurred during the seminar period follows a necessarily oblique course.

Despite this, there are several sources of data which relate to the question of the administrative behavior of the fifteen participating students, and changes or lack of changes during the seminar period which are considered as significant.

**Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire**

As indicated in Chapter IV, a marginally-significant shift in the mean of the dimension, Initiating Structure, occurred during the seminar period. This is interpreted to mean that seminar participants had an increased awareness of their responsibility as administrators to clarify the relationships between themselves and those with whom they work, to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done.

Although no statistically-significant shift occurred in the mean scores of the dimension, Consideration, the test and retest means of 51.3 and 52.3 are quite high, and are interpreted to mean that the participants realized the importance of manifesting behavior which is indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationships between themselves and those with whom they work.

It also is regarded as significant that a more desirable balance was effected during the seminar experience between these two dimensions, as is indicated in Table 2, page 72. The students, thus, at the conclusion of the seminar experience had a perception of administrative behavior which more closely approximated that which was described as preferred.
F-Scale

The mean scores of -32.4 and -35.5 on this instrument revealed a strong tendency on the part of the students to believe in the flexibility of democratic action and to reject the rigidity of authoritarian action. In respect to the implications which this has for administrative behavior, it is regarded as important that there was no significant swing from this position during the period of the seminar.

Ideas About Myself Inventory

Mean scores of -5.5 and -4.8 on this instrument show that the students had close to an optimum balance of leadership-followership tendencies. Again, it is regarded as significant that no appreciable shift occurred in these scores during the seminar period. For the type of administrative behavior which has been posited as ideal, a balance of these tendencies is thought to be very important.

Field Experience Problems

An examination of the fifteen field experience problems, which were presented in Chapter V, indicates that the participants, by the nature of the problems, gained experience in working with community agencies in a majority of cases. In the seminar discussions of these problems, it often was indicated that many of the interpersonal and environmental factors which affect administrative behavior were encountered. As an illustration, several statements are quoted which were made by the students in the course of the analysis of their problems.

1. Plans involving large numbers of people cannot be made in isolation. Even when they are made cooperatively, provisions must be worked out for adaptation to changing situations or later developments.

2. In working with other groups, some compromises and concessions
may have to be made to achieve the desired goal. The nature and extent of the concessions are determined with a view to the net effect on the parties and goals involved.

3. Persons of different backgrounds and fields of endeavor see and emphasize different problems. Persons outside the school sometimes do not see school problems. School people sometimes do not see problems of persons outside the school.

4. There are certain kinds of undertakings which, if they are to be successful, require that the administrator have faith in the ability of other persons, that he accept good ideas from others, and that he not try to carry the whole load.

5. The contributions brought to the working out of our problem by various community members proved to be an asset. Varied points of view and kinds of thinking are to be desired.

Seminar Process Material

Each of the nine critical areas of administrative behavior relates directly to problem solving. Since this activity occupied by far the major block of time during the seminar experience, the gains in problem solving ability, reported in Chapter V, seem particularly relevant to the question of improved skills in administrative behavior. Especially related is the fact that 62.3 per cent of the total responses analyzed by the investigator were those contributed by the student, indicating a high level of participation on their part. Also, these responses revealed a strong tendency to follow the same analytical pattern, as far as problem analysis is concerned, as that employed by the instructor. A rank order correlation of .89 shows this relationship. Thus, the problem analysis as carried on during the seminar did not follow the information-giving and information-receiving pattern on the part of the instructor and the students.

The evaluation which perhaps most closely represented a measure of behavior, as observed and evaluated by someone other than the participant himself, was the one made by the students at the conclusion of the
seminar experience. Each student evaluated each of the other fourteen students as regards his contribution to the seminar experience, in terms of the twelve Bales categories. These data are listed in Table 8, pages 95 and 96, and indicate, from an examination of the means, that behavior was evaluated as having been exhibited primarily in the Social-Emotional area (1 through 3) and in the Task area (4 through 9).

Summary of Field Experiences Inventory

The section of this instrument which relates most directly to the nine critical areas of administrative behavior, and the interpersonal and environmental factors which affect it, is "Administrative Processes." To point out the relationship more completely, a short description is presented of the areas included in this section.

Administrative Processes

Planning:

1. An administrator, working in this area, is concerned with the determination of purposes, or development of objectives, of the enterprise he serves. These may be both internal and external. If they are fixed by law, his job becomes one of interpreting them to the board, to the staff, and to the community. Objectives of the enterprise must be compatible with legal provisions which are in effect, and planning must be done within the resultant framework. In those areas which are not fixed by law, educational leadership must be equal to the task of recommending the best possible policy to further the developing objectives.

2. Planning also involves the use of relevant information
which will lead to the most promising formulation of policy possible under prevailing conditions.

3. Having established purposes or objectives, and considered relevant information, the administrator then must develop the means and procedures by which the goals can be achieved.

4. Time limits and priorities must be established in reference to these processes or to a target date for a fulfillment of the objectives.

Organizing:

1. An administrator has the responsibility to assist in establishing the structure of the enterprise he serves. In the area of education, as in other fields, part of the task lies in designing the structure, consistent with existing legal provisions, which most adequately will facilitate the realization of the objectives.

2. Division of labor also is involved in organizing. An alert administrator does this carefully, and in such a way as to free himself for the integrative job necessary for efficient and productive operation.

3. Assessing the personnel already in the enterprise, or needed in addition, he also must make the assignment of jobs to be done.

4. To enable the personnel to carry out their responsibility, he delegates and/or clarifies the sanctions which are attached to each job.

5. Successful organizing entails the development of under-
stood and accepted agreements about working relationships.

Directing:

1. Having a large measure of responsibility in the development of policy, the administrator must successfully authorize the action which is necessary to translate the policy into an action program.

2. If inaction or chronic abuse of delegated responsibility occurs, the administrator must carefully appraise the consequences of his possible lines of action, and apply the necessary sanctions, if such seems to be the advisable course.

Coordinating:

1. In assessing the course of an objective of the enterprise toward its achievement, the administrator must see clearly who and what are involved in the process.

2. He must make a diagnosis of the relationships of these components in reference to the time and space limitations which have been established for the objective.

3. Having done these things, he then has the responsibility of authorizing the appropriate action necessary for the movement of the enterprise toward its focused objectives.

Controlling:

1. Once a program of action is initiated, the administrator needs carefully to follow its progress.

2. As this is occurring, and/or at various interim points
In the process, he needs to make a careful appraisal of the results being obtained.

3. At any point in this process, whether there be new information which alters the nature of the objectives or a breaking down of process because of ascertained signs of weakness, the administrator needs to assist in the establishment of lines of redirection as they become necessary.

Table 9 shows the scores which were made by the fifteen students on the section, "Administrative Processes," of the inventory.

### TABLE 9

**CLASS RAW SCORES ON THE "ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES" SECTION OF THE SUMMARY OF FIELD EXPERIENCES INVENTORY, JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Extent₁</th>
<th>Extent₂</th>
<th>Intensity₁</th>
<th>Intensity₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Means          | 44.8    | 56.6    | 63.2       | 68.3       |
means on the extent of participation, a t-score of 2.27 was derived. This indicates a probability of between .02 - .05 that such a change could have resulted from chance. Since this does have statistical significance, it can be asserted that there is a strong likelihood that the students, as the result of seminar or seminar-induced experiences, had a substantial increase in the degree to which they participated in the administrative processes of planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling.

A t-score of 1.9 was obtained when the significance of the difference between the means of the intensity scores was analyzed. This indicates a probability of between .05 - .1 that such a change could have resulted from chance factors. Although this lies on the margin of statistical significance, it can be mentioned that not only was there a substantial increase in experience with administrative processes, but that also these experiences were, it is strongly probable, of a more intensive nature than they had been at the outset of the seminar experience, and that these increases, it is very likely, resulted from seminar or seminar-induced projects.

Although the section of the instrument, "Situational Factors," relates less directly to the nine critical areas of administrative behavior, part of it pertains to the environmental factors which affect that behavior. An examination of that section of the instrument, as it is listed in the Appendix, will indicate those parts which bear the closest relationship.

Table 10 shows the scores made by the students on the section, "Situational Factors." When the t-test of significance was applied to the extent of experience scores, a score of 3.02 was obtained. This
TABLE 10
CLASS RAW SCORES ON THE "SITUATIONAL FACTORS"
SECTION OF THE SUMMARY OF FIELD EXPERIENCE
INVENTORY, JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Extent₁</th>
<th>Extent₂</th>
<th>Intensity₁</th>
<th>Intensity₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means..... 33.1 50.0 42.0 57.3

proved to be a particularly significant score, inasmuch as the probability that such a change could have resulted from chance factors was beyond .01.

Also significant was the t-score of 2.88 which resulted when the scores reflecting the intensity of experience in "Situational Factors" were processed. That the change could have resulted from chance factors was at a probability level of .01 - .02.

Concluding Statement

Although several sources of data have been used to indicate the growth which appeared to occur during the seminar period in reference to an improvement, on the part of the fifteen participating students,
of skills in administrative behavior, it must be pointed out that many of these instruments were checked by the students themselves, and that when this occurred there were no cross-reference attempts made to determine validity. As has been indicated previously, it would have been desirable to supplement this information with data secured from observations of behavior in the field experience problem environment and with appraisals made by various people with whom these students worked. This, it was recognized at the outset, was a necessary limitation of the study's research design.

Despite these limitations, however, and despite the frequent low correlations which exist between how a person sees himself as acting and how others perceive his behavior, it is felt that the strongly consistent pattern of the data which have been presented leads to a tenable hypothesis that the students of the seminar displayed good human relations in their interactions with others, and that they were sufficiently goal-centered to have effected appreciable gains toward the balance which was advocated as the preferred type of administrative behavior, during the course of the seminar experience.
CHAPTER VII
EXTENSIONS OF UNDERSTANDINGS AND KNOW-HOW
OF SCHOOL OPERATION

No other phase of educational administration has been explored so thoroughly as that of school operation. Because, as was indicated in Chapter I, the profession has undergone such rapid growth and has had to meet the exigencies which ride in the wake of swift progress, it is logical that such an emphasis should be the accompaniment. Because, as the profession has begun to come of age, increased attention has been given in research, in the literature, and in preparation programs to such concerns as a philosophy of administration, administrative behavior, and basic concepts and values in educational administration, this, in no sense, has been done to play down the importance of the technical skills which are required for day-by-day school operation. The wholesome trend, however, has been to relate these skills to a philosophical orientation of administration, toward the goal of seeing ends and means in education as an inseparable entity.

The method which primarily was used in Education 800 to assess individual development in the operational phases of administration was the self-rating one. Since not all of the students, during the seminar's period of operation, were engaged in administrative positions, and since not all of the field assignments were directly related to an operational phase of education, it was not possible to set up a cross-
reference check on how, in behavioral terms, increased skills and understandings of school operation were being acquired by the students.

In devising the Summary of Field Experience Inventory, the instructor included, by major categories, what seemed to him to be predominant operational areas of educational administration. They included the following:

Goal Setting:

1. Characteristics of the community should be assessed by the administrator, as a step in goal setting, so that realistic and needed objectives can be established.

2. Pupil needs should be studied and formulated so that objectives can be developed which are consistent with developmental patterns of wholesome child growth.

3. The administrator should work with the staff in the development of school goals, better to insure their fulfillment and more adequately to use the combined professional skill for the establishment of the objectives.

4. The thinking of the citizens should be elicited by the administrator to secure objectives which will be understood and accepted by the school community.

5. To establish school goals which are sensitive to the needs of the school population, the administrator should work with the pupils in the process of determining the objectives.

Curriculum Development:

1. The administrator should assist in the process of and/or provide the climate for the establishment of course objectives which are stated in behavioral and measurable terms.
2. The administrator should assist in the development of a plan for instruction which is consistent with the resources and needs of the school community.

3. The administrator should help to consider the instructional methods and procedures which are flexible enough to meet the needs of individual pupils and yet structured sufficiently to permit communicability, implementation, and evaluation.

4. The administrator should use resources of the school, and his own personal skills, to help select the best feasible instructional materials which can be purchased, and to encourage the development of instructional resources from the community.

5. The administrator should employ a combination of complementary techniques to appraise the results of the instructional programs in terms of the curricular objectives.

Pupil Personnel:

1. Better to meet the needs of all pupils of the school population, the administrator should determine their numbers and characteristics.

2. On the basis of this information, the administrator needs to develop an organizational plan for the pupils.

3. To comply with legal responsibilities and to establish a basis for efficient operation, the administrator should devise a pupil accounting system.

4. Once this system is established, sufficient personnel should be given the major responsibility to work with it. Each staff member, who, in some way works with it, needs to be
oriented to his responsibility, so that administration of the system becomes simplified and yet efficient.

5. A determination of the special services needed by pupils should be made by the administrator, and such services developed as rapidly as possible. Such needs should receive a priority listing, so that programs can be developed as soon as resources and personnel become available.

Staff Personnel:

1. A determination of staff needs by the administrator and the development of a positive program which recognizes those needs, will enhance the chances for optimum effort on the part of the staff toward meeting the objectives of the school.

2. Since the staff plays a key role in the operation of a school system, an administrator needs to give major attention to the recruitment and selection of candidates for positions.

3. It is the responsibility of the administrator to recommend for appointment the best possible candidates to the board of education.

4. After the selection of new staff members, it becomes the responsibility of the administrator to develop an optimum assignment plan for them. This can be done with greater efficiency if a job description has been developed in advance, and if staff personnel files are kept comprehensively enough to indicate the information which is likely to make possible the most promising placement plan.
5. When new staff members are selected, an administrator who has a plan of induction can usually expect more productive results from the often inexperienced personnel. Thus, by effecting the security which results from more adequate knowledge, he also can expect less of a staff turnover rate.

6. In addition to an induction plan, the administrator facilitates more productive operation if he has a mutually acceptable plan of supervision. In this way, the skills of teacher and supervisor can be pooled to develop methods of instruction which more adequately lead to a realization of the objectives of the school.

7. Finally, the development of a plan of staff appraisal by the administrator provides the opportunity for in-service development and more efficient assignment of personnel. This operates with greater benefits when the appraisal criteria clearly are understood by both teacher and administrator, and when the assessment is developed by both.

Physical Facilities:

1. The administrator best can administer the physical facilities of the school district when he evaluates them in terms of their implication for the instructional program. In the consideration of new construction or renovation, it especially is important to determine, as a first step, the instructional program which is to be housed.

2. A running inventory of population and equipment enables the administrator to plan more efficiently for needed sites, buildings, and materials. This, in a rapidly expanding area,
is a particularly crucial operation.

3. An appraisal of present sites, buildings, and equipment makes it possible for the administrator to plan more effectively for the allotment of yearly resources. Annual expenditures, made on the basis of a priority list which can be established as the result of this process, can represent efficient spending.

4. Inasmuch as most administrators must work within the confines of a legislatively-established bonding limit, the determination he makes of available funds for school plants becomes very important. In rapidly-expanding areas, it is important for him to know if a qualification for federal assistance exists. Good working relationships with real estate developers, and others in the community, often enable him to avoid major outlays for building sites.

5. The formulation of school plant needs often requires the closest type of coordinated planning on the part of the administrator. Since the development of the school plant represents one of the largest single investments on the part of a community, it is particularly important that community, staff, technicians, and pupils cooperate closely in the formation of a plan for an expansion program.

6. The management of the plant development program represents a major area of responsibility for the administrator. To avoid spending all of his personal time in this function, to the exclusion or serious curtailment of other important responsibilities, it is important for the administrator to
secure needed technical assistance, and to delegate certain specific jobs to those who most proficiently can perform them. This often means working with the school's legal counsel, with the consultative services of a state department of education or of a university, with bonding companies, with architects and contractors. It sometimes is wise for an administrator, during the period of construction, to recommend the employment of a person who is skilled in the supervision of construction.

Finance and Business Management:

1. The administrator needs to project his thinking a year or more hence, with the aid of the staff, to determine needed expenditures for the financing of a school program.

2. A knowledge of the taxable resources of the community, and of the financial needs and plans of other tax-supported agencies of the community, enables the administrator to determine, more precisely, funds which are available for the school program.

3. Having the projected needs of the school program and an indication of available funds which can be secured, it then is possible for the administrator to develop the school budget. If this budget can have, as its focal point, the instructional program of the school, its acceptance by the staff and by the community is assured more readily.

4. Once a budget has been accepted, the administrator has the responsibility to see that it is managed efficiently. The more successfully this can be done, the more certain it is
that subsequent budgets will be supported.

5. Since the administrator has a legal and moral responsibility to account for all income, expenditures, and property of the school district, it is important to develop accounting and inventory procedures which are performed efficiently.

Public Relations:

1. A community is more apt to give active support to its schools if its desires and aspirations in some measure are reflected in the educational objectives. The administrator, then, in his public relations activities, should learn to work as effectively as possible with citizens who are representative of the community, so that school programs, functional in terms of community needs, can be developed.

2. An administrator should be able to determine the many channels which can be used to disseminate information about the program of the school. With a regular flow of news about the many facets of the school's program, the criticism can be avoided which often is directed against the system which goes to the public with extensive releases only when it wishes financial support.

3. If the school is to reflect the desires and aspirations of the citizens, it then becomes very important for the administrator to assist in the development of consensus on the role of the school in the community. As he participates in this process, it is important for the administrator to remember that there are many publics in any community, and that the school, to serve best the community at large, must
offer a program which meets the needs of its different pub-
lies.

4. Since the administrator, both in his function as a private
citizen and in his status role with the public schools, is
interested in the total life of the community, he has some
measure of responsibility to assist in the development of
consensus concerning the role of other community agencies.
His is often not a direct role in this process. Indeed, he
often can function to best advantage when he encourages
others to assume leadership positions in this process.

Education 800.11 students evaluated the extent and intensity of
their experience in these operational areas in January and June of
1955. The results of this appraisal are listed in Table 11.

To determine the statistical significance of these scores, t-
scores were obtained in the areas of extent and intensity of experience.
As regards extent, a t-score of 2.88 was derived. This indicates a
probability of only .01 - .02 that the difference in the mean scores
could have resulted from chance factors. Thus it can be hypothesized
that seminar, or seminar-related experiences, helped to account for
this statistically-significant shift in the means.

Although it is obvious that only limited use can be made of this
line of reasoning, it is believed that action, to a certain degree, re-
results from new or increased understandings.

A review of the class procedures recorded in Chapter III indi-
cates that blocks of time were devoted to each of the seven major areas
of school operation. No attempt, however, was made by the instructor
to balance off that time equally between these seven.
TABLE 11
CLASS RAW SCORES ON THE "OPERATIONAL AREAS" SECTION
OF THE SUMMARY OF FIELD EXPERIENCE INVENTORY,
JANUARY AND JUNE, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Extent₁</th>
<th>Extent₂</th>
<th>Intensity₁</th>
<th>Intensity₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>136.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As would be expected, the most noticeable gains were registered
by those seven students who, during the course of the seminar, also
were practicing administrators.¹ Gains, however, were not made ex­
clusively by this group, because some of the other eight indicated
progress, primarily because their field experience affiliation was
with a school system.

Although there is, then, some supportive evidence to lead to
the conclusion that gains were made in understandings and know-how of
school operation, it is felt that these were not as considerable, as

¹Those who held administrative positions during the seminar period were students 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 15.
measured by the instruments used in the study, as the ones made by the students in other areas, such as problem analysis and solution and administrative behavior.

Evidence for this point of view comes from two sources. In the first place, when a t-score was derived for intensity of experience in the operational areas it was .88. This indicated that there was a probability of between .3 and .4 that the change in the mean scores could have resulted from chance factors. This falls, then, considerably below the statistically-significant figure of .05. On the basis of this information it can be stated that although a significant degree of change did occur in the amount of participation of the students in the seven operational areas of educational administration, the experience was not of a sufficient depth to be reflected in intensity scores. This, of course, does not say that the experience gained was of such a superficial nature as to be of limited value. All it does indicate is that during the seminar period, there was not a sufficient concentration of experiences in the operational areas to permit the students to reflect this in their evaluation of the intensity of their experiences.

A second line of support for the conclusion is found in the scores made by the students on the Test of Professional Understandings in Education, which was reported in Chapter IV. Since this instrument represented a potential to measure, more than any of the others used, with the exception of the "Operational Areas" section of the inventory described in this chapter, gains in understandings and know-how of school operation, its results are cited again. As was reported previously, there was a probability of between .6 and .7 that the difference
in the mean scores could have resulted from chance factors. That the difference in mean scores resulted from seminar, or seminar-related, experiences was not claimed, therefore, because of the lack of statistical significance of the difference. Despite the fact that this instrument was not designed primarily for superintendents, but rather for principals, it is felt that its results lend additional weight to the conclusion that the seminar experience did not contribute to substantial gains in technical understandings of school operation.

This, it should be pointed out, is the judgment of the investigator, based on an appraisal of the data which were analyzed statistically. It is likely, and indeed, in the investigator's opinion, quite probable, that the understandings developed during the course of the seminar which were not directly measured by any of the instruments used in the study. Several factors are presented to reinforce this opinion, and the reader is free to judge their face validity.

1. An examination of Chapter III indicates that considerable seminar time was spent in analyzing various phases of school operation. Specialists in the areas of school finance, school construction, and curriculum, met with the seminar group on several occasions. Students brought problems from their current agendas which dealt with several of the operational areas, and these were analyzed by the participants. The instructor introduced case study problems for both oral and written analysis which dealt with staff personnel and the question of differentials in a salary schedule.

2. A consideration of the field experience problems which were presented in Chapter V indicates that eight of them were
concerned, in varying degrees of emphasis, with an operational area. At least one hour of seminar time was spent in the analysis of each of these problems.

3. Reference to the concepts and values which were dealt with during the seminar period and are presented in Chapter VIII, illustrates that many of these relate directly to the operational areas of educational administration.

A brief consideration of the types of questions asked and concept statements made by students during the analysis of a problem which related to an operational area, will lend, perhaps, some evidence that growth in understandings did occur during the seminar period.

Questions:

1. In curriculum revision, is it the function of the administrator to start the process, provide for the conditions of its continuation, and then to turn the job over to others?

2. What should one do, as chief administrative officer of the school district, if some of the administrative staff lack sufficient skills to exert leadership on a building level in the process of curriculum revision?

3. Is it valid for an administrator to make a judgment about the effectiveness of a teacher from the way she participates in small work committees?

Concepts:

1. Often curriculum development will be tackled more energetically and purposefully if there is released time and/or released personnel.

2. Broad central policies are needed in a school system in reference to curriculum development, but those policies must permit enough building autonomy for the following of individual needs.

3. We need to develop better follow-up techniques in our relations with pupils. They are frustrated and aggravated by talk which is not followed by some kind of action.

---

2 These are problems 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15.
Ideally, of course, it would be pertinent to have behavioral evidence on this question, which was obtained from the staffs of the seven administrators in the seminar group and from the persons with whom each of the fifteen worked in his field experience problem in reference to their perceptions of the growth in understandings and know-how of school operation which occurred during the seminar period. Since this was beyond the scope of the present study, the material which has been presented must serve as the basis of judgment concerning the extent to which this growth took place. Such evidence indicates that the seminar experience effected, with moderate success, an extension of understandings and know-how of school operation on the part of the seminar students.
CHAPTER VIII

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AND CLARIFICATION OF

BASIC CONCEPTS AND VALUES IN

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Although the instructor wished to deal with educational administration as comprehensively as possible during the course of the seminars, there was no structural pattern developed, on an a priori basis, which, if followed, would determine that this goal would be achieved. The manner in which the seminars were conducted did not lend itself to such a rigid design, inasmuch as the major share of time was spent in the analysis of each individual field experience problem. Thus, many of the concepts and values in educational administration which are listed in this chapter were developed in process, as they related to, or were illustrated by, the particular problem which was under discussion at the time. When Education 800M was in its early planning stages, the hope was expressed that this development of concepts and values in process would happen recurrently during the seminar experience, inasmuch as it was felt that this would be conducive to effective learning. A tabulation of the origin of the concepts and values indicated, however, that in addition to the ones developed in process by the instructor and the students, there were some which were presented formally, either by the instructor or by a guest, in some cases from a
discipline other than education, who had been invited to discuss some aspect of an educational problem.

In presenting the concepts and values which were developed during the course of the seminars, it is necessary to clarify the meaning of each term as it is used in this chapter. Particularly is this needed when one reflects about the different meanings which often are attached to them. Sargent and Belisle point out:

The term "concepts" is used differently in different fields of knowledge. Its use in philosophy, in psychology, and in other fields of study varies not only with the fields but also somewhat according to whether it is used as an operational term in a specific research project or as an attempted means of relating notions in different fields.¹

The term "concept," as it is used in this chapter, follows the more conventional meaning of a thought or an opinion. "Value" is something which is regarded as useful. Since no attempt is made to differentiate between the two, it can be assumed, with justification, that the two tend to run together in meaning. Actually, an examination of them indicates that this is the case. Each statement is really a thought or opinion which has proved to be useful on the basis of experience. No further claim is made than this. Since these statements were made by the instructor, the students, and by various seminar guests, it is obvious that they would not, of necessity, hang together in one consistent philosophical framework. Some of the statements are very broad in their implications, while others are quite specific. Each reader, then, is left free to accept or reject them on the basis of his own philosophy of administration.

Realizing that their inclusion would necessitate a rather ex­
tended chapter, the investigator believed that it was important to pre­
sent them, despite this problem, for two reasons. In the first place, 
these statements represent some of the crystallized thinking about edu­
cation, and educational administration, to which each participant was 
exposed during the course of the seminars. Certain measured changes in 
attitudes and/or behavior might be traced to their origins a little 
more clearly if these were presented in their entirety. Secondly, 
these statements can be taken to supplement the material presented in 
Chapter III as class proceedings. They show, therefore, how content 
material was included in the seminars.

All of the concepts and values which are listed were chosen on 
the basis of the investigator's judgment. They were taken directly 
from the recorded proceedings of seminar sessions, in almost the exact 
form that they emerged. The major headings, "Operational Areas," "Ad­
ministrative Processes," and "Situational Factors," which were dis­
cussed comprehensively in Chapters VI and VII, have been used to serve 
as the frames of reference for the listing of the concepts and values. 
"Administrative Leadership" and "School Board Relationships" were se­
lected as the two additional major headings.

Operational Areas:

Goal Setting:

1. One of our big jobs as administrators is to teach 
   people to establish realistic goals for the specific 
   situation.

2. No goals can be achieved by appointed leaders unless 
   those with whom they work associate them with a way
to achieve their goals.

3. Although an administrator works with many groups in goal setting, it is well for him to realize that the job is his, in the final analysis. He is the one who is held responsible.

4. As an administrator works with groups to set the goals of the enterprise, it is well for him to be able to recognize that the ostensible objectives can be blocked because of the hidden agenda. Knowing sub groups, individuals, and their goals and conflicts helps the administrator to resolve them and to strive toward the larger purposes.

Curriculum Development:

1. The curriculum is what happens to pupils on school time.

2. Administration is not a function separate from the learning which takes place within a system.

3. The administrator primarily has a coordinating role in curriculum development.

4. We need to shake ourselves clear of the notion that testing is evaluation. It is but one phase of it. We need to evaluate reflective thinking as well as the Three R's.

5. Often curriculum development will be tackled more energetically and purposefully if there is released time and/or released personnel.

6. In curriculum planning motivation of participants is
important. There must be opportunities for skills to be learned and concepts to be developed.

7. Many different "publics" urge curriculum change. Administrative skill is needed to ascertain them, to relate suggestions to sound educational practice, and to establish priorities.

8. Broad central policies are needed in a school system in reference to curriculum development, but those policies must permit enough building autonomy for the following of individual needs.

9. The unit for curriculum development is the individual school.

10. Curriculum development must start with ideas, spring from needs, and involve both a study of children and a study of society.

11. It is usually unwise to start curriculum development at the highest level. More often it should start with a specific problem from the day-by-day operation of the school.

12. Teaching materials have improved so vastly in the last twenty years that administrators must not be lulled into thinking that they alone can do the entire curricular job.

13. Curriculum supervisors should be resource people who demonstrate effectively that they can help teachers, and not perform merely a regulatory function.

14. Administrators need to find out more about the learn-
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ing resources which exist in a community.

15. Boards of education need to be more aware of curricu-
lum development. Although they rarely play a
participant's role in the process, they should, none
the less, sanction it. Often, an administrator's
principal task in curriculum development lies in
keeping the board informed. He can delegate many of
the other responsibilities in reference to the process.

Pupil Personnel:

1. There is a need for us to learn to be more profes-
sional in our work with this phase of education. A
school system needs to formulate and follow a code of
ethics which serves as a guide to how pupils' prob-
lems should be discussed in a professional manner.

2. We need to develop better follow-up techniques in our
relations with pupils. They are frustrated and aggra-
vated by talk which is not followed by some kind of
action.

3. Promotion policies further need to be developed which
permit decisions to be made about the individual child
in reference to his own developmental growth and needs.

4. An administrator needs to know the extent to which the
state provides subsidies for atypical children, and to
realize that this aid represents minimum figures be-
yond which the local district can go in establishing
an educational program for them.

5. A simplified structure of organization, and yet one
which provides thoroughness is necessary if enrollment projections are to be made with reasonable accuracy. P. T. A. members, Home Room Mothers, and other community groups often can provide much assistance with such a problem.

Staff Personnel:

1. We need to learn to meet at a professional level. Too often we merely gather and exchange prejudices.
2. It is extremely important for the administrator to clarify the area for group decision. Do not, as an administrator, ask for a decision unless you want one. If you want advice, only ask for advice. Define the limits for group participation.
3. An administrator, as he works with his staff, must develop role sensitivity, or he can make some erroneous appraisals of people and their potentialities.
4. The roles people play as staff members often are functions of their personality and of the structure of the enterprise.
5. The needs people possess have to be satisfied primarily through the behavior of other people.
6. Supervisors often fail to see that their chief role is to help others.
7. Some in-service programs are losing their effectiveness because more emphasis is being placed on their required aspect than on serving as a means to stimulate creative teaching.
8. It is frequently excellent practice for several representatives of a staff to go as a team to a university in order to solve a specific problem of concern to them in their local school situation.

Physical Facilities:

1. One of the natural points of school-community cooperation in reference to physical facilities is in the planning and sharing of recreational areas.

2. School plant planning should be related to a survey so that the right plan can be developed for the right building.

3. School plant planning should encompass the entire school program and contain a complete list of needs if it is to promote good architectural work.

4. As an administrator, do not make architectural decisions just because you feel you have some competence in this area. The educator should provide the decisions about the educational program.

5. Sound educational planning should precede, and continue throughout, the entire period of construction. An administrator is especially active in this process until after the drawings are completed and the contracts let.

6. Educational planning should promote proper use of the new building. Better planning is done if administrators involve those in the process who are going to use the building.
7. Educational planning should use sound technical procedures, among which are the following:

a. Describe the function of the school in the community.

b. Review the survey report and make allowances for enrollment predictions and annexation possibilities.

c. Calculate the number of teaching stations needed in each subject.

d. Determine the qualitative needs of the building, where rooms should be in relation to each other, what special lighting and ventilation needs there will be, and the like.

e. Plan big, because many useful things will not come into the open if an extremely tight budget is stressed right from the beginning. It is difficult to determine whether a good idea will work out economically at the preliminary stage.

f. Reduce all educational specifications to a written document insofar as possible.

8. It is important for an administrator to work with the architect as he designs the building, because it is difficult to put all educational needs into words.

9. An administrator should check specifications before submitting them to the board to see that they meet the educational needs. If necessary, secure the services of an architectural consultant to check the
specifications, architecturally, if you feel that they need additional work.

10. An administrator should realize that the weaker he is in these functions, the more technical assistance he should seek.

11. The administrator's chief role is to see reasonableness and balance in the educational planning. Merely adding together the total wishes of the staff and of the community is not enough. The educational needs should be the major criterion.

12. More consultative services on an advisory, rather than on the regulatory, level are needed.

Finance and Business Management:

1. When dealing with a financial problem, it is sound procedure for the administrator to get documentary evidence, and then to devise the best answer in the light of research information as it relates to local needs and resources.

2. Administrators need to realize that education is competing in a tight labor market. If men staff members are needed in a system, realistic financial methods must be devised to attract them.

3. Administrators should work to get legislators to face up to the capital outlay problem, and to help communities realize the relationship of finances and education.

4. It will permit a more exact study of educational finance, and aid in public relations, if administrators
can develop good, reasonably uniform, accounting procedures.

5. School finance would be easier to plan if we had a more objective method of assessing property values.

6. In planning a salary schedule revision, a basic consideration of what constitutes good teaching should precede the attempt to link merit with salaries.

7. Finances need to be put into terms of the instructional program, recreation, safety, and the like, to enhance the chances for community comprehension and acceptance. Thus, it can be emphasized, more effectively, that if the school is to provide services, it has to have organizational structure and money.

Public Relations:

1. Administrators, who by their actions, indicate that they trust the press, will usually find that a reciprocity will develop.

2. In most school systems it is excellent practice to prepare and circulate descriptive pamphlets which explain the functions of the school to both the staff and patrons of the community.

3. When citizens visit the schools, it is often astute administrative practice to show them what needs to be seen, and thus alert them to problem areas.

4. When the school and community anticipate holding a two-way visitation program, it is desirable for each to participate in the planning so that specific inter-
tests can be pinpointed.

5. We need a great deal more research concerning the question of what constitutes effective communications in education.

6. A good public relations program will get an informed, and not uninformed, reaction from the community.

Administrative Processes:

Planning:

1. Administrative processes should not be regarded as independent tasks. They pervade all of the activities in which an administrator engages.

2. When a problem appears, the administrator needs to realize the limitations of the academic approach. Essential to the solution is a knowledge of the situational factors which are involved.

3. It is the responsibility of the administrator to determine the objectives of the enterprise he serves. Some of these are determined by the legislature, by the board of education, and by public or staff consensus. Educating the staff in the goals of the enterprise is an essential administrative function.

4. When plans are made, it is important for the administrator to understand that the law operates as a guiding factor, but that it is of many different varieties—constitutional, legislative, administrative decisions, and court decisions. It is also desirable for the administrator to recognize that the schools
cannot be administered entirely through legislation. He, through planning, takes direction from the law, but works to expand the horizon of education.

5. Since planning always involves other groups, it is wise for the administrator to explore the principle of the plan with those groups before the plan itself is developed.

6. The principle that those affected by a policy should participate in its formation is not the crucial element. The degree to which they should participate is the important judgment for the administrator to make.

7. In administrative planning, opposition is needed at times to stimulate and expedite the development of constructive procedures.

8. The perceptive administrator often recognizes that a problem occasionally needs to be pushed back to a more basic problem.

9. It is sometimes important for the administrator to realize when it is necessary to dwell less on the analysis of a problem, and instead to recognize what needs to be done and then to see that it gets done with dispatch.

Organizing:

1. When administrators realize that existing legal structure is impeding the development of sound organizational practices, they have the responsibility to work toward the repeal or revision of the road blocks.
The court is one way to affect social change, and administrators should be less reluctant to use it.

2. No two school systems are exactly alike in organizational climate.

3. A school district should be large enough and have sufficient resources to attract, support, and keep an effective administrative staff.

4. The community area, as a basis for school district organization, shows a great deal of promise for expanded development.

5. All organizations have a hierarchical structure, and this is one of the basic realities of life. We need to face this objectivity, however, and regard it as capable of improvement. Revering structure usually leads to stagnation.

6. It is a reasonable expectation for an organization chart to indicate who one's boss is.

7. It is generally wise, in establishing an organizational structure, to keep the line as short as possible between the superintendent and the principal.

8. In delegating responsibility, it usually is advisable for the administrator to appoint and work with subordinates who, by and large, can make the decisions which he would have made had the delegation not occurred.

9. An administrator must learn to delegate as much as possible, so that he has time to think through to de-
decisions and to choose the most expedient moment to announce them.

10. The administrator needs to realize that in addition to the formal organizational structure there also exists the informal one, about which it is extremely important for him to know.

11. It is essential for the administrator to know the organization he serves and to understand how each subdivision and person is contributing to the objectives of the enterprise.

12. When an administrator delegates, the authority he delegates must be equal to the responsibility he expects to receive. If he has confidence in subordinates, he should be willing to tell them what he expects, and then leave the means primarily up to them.

13. If an administrator has a question about the ability of a staff member, a sound practice is to delegate, rather rigidly, to him something which it is believed he can do. Preferably, this should be a short-term job which can be evaluated soon. Future delegations, then, can be based on the outcome.

14. As a general administrative principle, it is better to trust a staff a little farther than it is believed should be done.

15. Support must be built for decisions through the group process. It is important for each member of an enterprise to understand the working responsibilities and
relationships of each other member.

16. In one situation, an administrator may be responsible almost entirely for establishing the goals of an enterprise. In another, it might be more desirable to so organize the staff and the community that objectives primarily result from their interaction. It is the administrator's function, however, to see that the objectives are developed.

Directing:

1. When an administrator delegates authority to a subordinate, it is then essential to hold him responsible for exercising that authority.

Coordinating:

1. Since World War II, it no longer is assumed that people inherently have the skills and understandings necessary for working together effectively. There has been an upsurge of interest in the interpersonal relationships which are involved in coordinating the activities of an enterprise.

2. An administrator must think and act in terms of the entire enterprise. As he does so, it is vital for him to realize that others on the staff are usually thinking primarily in terms of part of the enterprise. The administrator must not allow the details to obscure his vision of the major objectives.

Controlling:

1. Where a school was, what situational factors were
operative when the objectives were established, and what limitations have appeared, are important considerations for an administrator to weigh in his evaluation process.

2. An administrator should evaluate quality of product in terms of the objectives of the enterprise. As part of the evaluation process, he should make notations in his personnel file. Commendations should be given to those who have done well. Administrators too often miss out in the earned recognition area. As a principle, it is better to overpraise than to underpraise.

3. An administrator needs to develop the appraising habit so that he can do it informally as well as formally. His appraising should be conducted, primarily, in a non-threatening way.

Situational Factors:

Physical Conditions:

1. When an administrator plans new bus routes, it is helpful if he constructs a hazard map based on information which he receives from the drivers.

2. In assessing the physical facilities which bear on the development of an educational program, it is important for the administrator not to overlook the consultative services which are available from universities, state departments of education, and from many other sources.
Cultural Setting:

1. An administrator goes into the community which employs him with his own set of values, and he encounters there other sets of values. As he operates, he learns to make judicious compromises, but he needs to do this in such a way as to preserve both his own and the community's integrity.

2. It is important for the administrator to discover, as much as possible before signing a contract, what the criterion elements are in the community which employs him, inasmuch as he does not operate as an autonomous agent, entirely, but rather is affected by community patterns and pressures.

3. When controversial issues are handled in the schools, it is necessary for the administrator to know his environment. It often is prudent for him to send up trial balloons concerning them with the community's power structure.

4. When new sections are integrated into older communities, there often is a pronounced attempt on the part of the latter to dominate. When the young, emerging leadership of the former is blighted, a lot is lost in the process.

5. Many older communities, now in the process of rapid growth, need a re-evaluation of their values and a definite plan for integration established, if conflicts between old and new forces are to be avoided.
6. A rule of thumb for an administrator to use in determining community values is that in loosely organized, fairly small communities, the spirit of the law is important. In highly complex urban ones, the letter of the law is the primary consideration.

7. Balance, the degree of crisis involved, and what you need to know about a group or a leader and his activities, are criteria which an administrator can use in making a judgment about what meetings outside those of the school he should attend, and how frequently he should go.

Institutional Organization:

1. When problems arise which involve different institutional organizations in a community, an administrator needs to assess the relationship of those problems to the schools before he plunges into a consideration of them as an official representative of the school.

2. As public school administrators work in communities where cooperation is very important between public and parochial education, it is well for him to remember that in parochial education the total education of the child is bound up intimately with his religion.

3. In working through problems involving institutional organization, good communication is essential. The administrator should not make unwarranted assumptions, but rather work directly with diverse elements so that common problems and interests can be discovered.
as points of reference. In any community, where an administrator needs to get things done, and the co-operative effort of many groups is necessary, he can find people far apart on a conceptual level and close together on a practical one. The administrator, then, should use the practical to tie groups together, such as common agreements about what is good for the wholesome development of children.

4. In plans which affect the total community, there has been too much evidence of each group's going its own way. Each day it becomes more apparent that greater coordination is needed if the total welfare is to be served.

Face-to-Face Groups:

1. When problems arise which involve many different groups, it is usually better for the administrator to deal with the people concerned on a face-to-face basis. Differences often can be ironed out in process which would not be altered individually.

2. Many research studies are indicating that the power structure in a community derives its power primarily on the basis of personal competence, rather than on the basis of economic position.

School-Board Relationships:

1. In a large public school system, about 50 per cent of the superintendent's time is spent with the board of education.
2. A superintendent needs to use his board as a counsel. In meetings, his recommendations are modified and approved in terms of the board's knowledge and perception of the needs of the community.

3. Some boards need to be educated to the fact that they have "implied authority." Much school law establishes minimums beyond which the local district can go, consistent with its resources and beliefs regarding desirable practices.

4. One of a superintendent's important functions is to educate the board, when this needs to be done, about the importance of its representing many publics.

5. A community often establishes a pattern of the particular types of people to run for the board of education. A superintendent should help to set the climate for this in a community.

6. An increasing amount of research indicates that boards do not follow their own socio-economic class lines in decision making.

7. It is not the responsibility of the superintendent to select the man for the board of education. Rather, he should help to effect the conditions where the community sees the man.

8. The single most important criterion for board membership is the concern a person feels for education.

9. Little of lasting significance finds its way into a school system without the involvement of the board
of education.

10. The major functions of the board are legislative and judicial, not administrative.

11. A superintendent needs to bring research assistance to the board, so that it can discharge, in a more enlightened manner, its responsibility as the adopter of policy.

12. The most effective relationships usually are found where there is a unit type of administrative organization, and the board recognizes the superintendent as the major administrative officer.

13. Boards ordinarily operate better without standing committees, inasmuch as these often tend to usurp administrative functions, to demand too much of a superintendent's time, and to present recommendations which are not reviewed too carefully by the entire board.

14. A superintendent should help, carefully, the board to prepare its meeting agenda.

15. Supplying the board with appropriate objective information is one of the easiest ways for a superintendent to build up board confidence in his administration.

16. Board study sessions, at which no official action is taken, are often necessary.

17. More concern needs to be given by a board to the instructional program, and less to the financial problems, of the school district it serves.
18. If minutes are kept with carefully-noted side headings, and sent to the board in advance of the meeting, they can be reviewed much more productively.

19. Boards need to develop, much more widely, a written statement of their policies.

20. The major function of a citizens' committee is to supply information to the board of education.

21. A board needs to deal primarily with broad policy issues. Too much time often is spent with things which more profitably could be handled by administrative decisions.

22. Some of the most challenging teaching a superintendent is called upon to perform is that which he does with his board of education.

23. A board of education only has the right to expect that a superintendent's batting average is reasonably high. Their tolerance may vary with different things, inasmuch as some of the superintendent's responsibilities are more crucial than others. In this area, the element of reasonableness has to apply.

Administrative Leadership:

1. Administration is an implementing activity, a way by which things get done. It entails action, thought, planning, and the involvement of others.

2. A public school administrator should get his satisfaction, primarily, in helping others to achieve.

3. Administrators are too prone, in general to get into
the limelight. It should be remembered that working behind the scenes is often leadership at a very high level. Their total job is educative, and they need to learn, more effectively, how to help other people to carry the ball.

4. An administrator in public education should be motivated by the principle of community unity.

5. Administrative leadership often involves the suggesting of approaches and the exploring of possibilities.

6. Some agencies estimate that their administrators spend at least 50 per cent of their time in group work. It therefore becomes essential for the administrator to study groups and their interacting forces.

7. Administrators must be prepared to take the consequences of their actions. To know group processes in advance often enables the administrator to choose better courses of action.

8. Some administrators become very anxious when their authority roles are lost in the group. Many of them need to be oriented to the concept of shared leadership and to its relationships to group cohesiveness.

9. When an administrator interacts in a group, there are four forces involved: one from within, the reflection of his own need structure; that one exhibited by the level of the group with which he is working; the one demonstrated by an organizational staff, whose
behavior is influenced by the specific enterprise responsibilities which they hold; and the force which is exerted by the dynamics of the community.

10. As he carries out his responsibilities, an administrator has three types of selves—the rationalized self, or his own perception of what he thinks he is like, the potential real self, or that which he is capable of becoming, and his empirical self, or the perception of those with whom he works of what he is really like.

11. The effective administrator is one who can initiate action in such a way that he does not have to do it over and over again. To achieve this effectiveness, the administrator carefully should appraise that which he proposes to initiate before he actually puts it into operation.

12. As an administrator works with groups, he must make a judgment whether the status leadership, which he already has on the basis of his position, or emerging leadership, which often is no more efficient, but which usually creates better morale, is more important for the job which needs to be done.

13. There are many jobs which have to be performed in education, but the administrator must remember that people need to be treated decently as those jobs are being accomplished. This is frequently a neglected area.
14. The effective administrator is the one who maintains a good balance between Initiating Structure, which establishes specific lines of direction for the enterprise, and Consideration, which takes account of the human relations that are involved in the operation of the enterprise.

15. When working in a community with a power structure which is rather inflexible in reference to its views concerning the needs of the school, an administrator often gets broken on the rocks trying to beat it. He frequently is much more successful if he works indirectly to establish a new power structure, by encouraging leadership in others.

16. An administrator often works in the preventive area. Frequently his most creative job is done here.

17. Administrators should realize that it is more important to help people do things than it is to talk about the things too much.

18. Administrators need to remember that their status leadership is always situational leadership.

19. An administrator carries his personality with him wherever he goes. It is just as important for him to know his weak points as it is to recognize his strong ones.

20. One of a superintendent's jobs is to "plant" ideas in board members, patrons in the community, and in staff members. These, then, often come back later as
21. Administrators should assess their own behavior in terms of its relationship to the educational objectives of the school system.

22. An administrator is more successful in helping a community to alter its expectations than he is in attempting to dictate or otherwise force change.

23. One important function of the administrator is to keep the group moving toward its goals.

24. A shortcoming of administrators is that they often get many projects started, secure good publicity for them, and then let them go down like a stack of cards because no one else has caught the vision.

25. A superintendent needs to encourage the development of more building autonomy, and help to build up the leadership role of the principal. He should aim primarily for broad uniformity between the buildings.

26. A function of administrative leadership in group activity is to help people raise their sights and see needs. The articulation of the unexpressed interests of a group is often leadership operating at a high level.

27. An administrator must maintain a judicious balance between being available to the staff and preserving enough time for reflective thinking and getting things done.

28. It is no real credit if an administrator can walk out
and have the enterprise continue in toto. If such happens, there is a serious question about the extent of his contribution.

29. If an administrator attempts to solve each problem which confronts him without consciously or subconsciously relating it to a theoretical framework, he soon can get lost in the maze without a sense of direction.

30. An administrator should do things for people because of a sincere respect for them and their aspirations, and not because he is trying to manipulate them. If manipulation is involved, the administrator's program is shallow and will fall through.

Table 12 indicates the origin of the concepts and values of educational administration which were presented during the course of the seminar period. As the table shows, there were 158 of them, and they were stated in this chapter under 18 specific headings, each one repres-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter of Concept and Value</th>
<th>Number Presented in Process</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Number Presented Formally</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Total Percentage Presented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary guest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
senting a major phase of administrative responsibility.

Since, as was indicated earlier, the concepts and values of educational administration which were presented during the course of the seminars were not developed in advance, on an a priori basis, as illustrated by the fact that 92 of the 153 were enunciated in process, and since there was no formal attempt made during the seminar period to isolate and categorize them as they developed, no direct measurement was made of the degree to which the participating students were assimilating them. It is not possible, as a result, to illustrate in a direct manner that this assimilation did take place. However, an examination of the entire study reveals that the structure of the seminars did not encompass the plan to come up with reasonably close to one-to-one relationships. At best, it has been possible only to hypothesize that the measured changes which did occur happened as the result of seminar activity.

In the absence, then, of a direct measurement, the best source of evidence is found in two short 300-word statements which the instructor asked each student to prepare. On March 16 and June 8 of 1955, each student presented a paper which was entitled, "Educational Administration: This I Believe." Explicit directions were given by the instructor that these were not to be library exercises, but rather were to be the product of each student's reflective thinking.

It was assumed, therefore, that some measure of evidence should be displayed in these papers, in reference to the degree to which each student had caught something from the concepts and values which were developed during the seminar period and had incorporated them into his own thinking. In reference to this assumption, the first qualitative
evidence is presented on the basis of the instructor's grades. There was a range of grades from A to B-, and for purposes of comparison the following weights have been assigned to them:

\[
\begin{align*}
A & = 5 \\
A- & = 4 \\
B+ & = 3 \\
B & = 2 \\
B- & = 1
\end{align*}
\]

The mean weighted grade for the papers handed in on March 16, 1955, was 3.6, which would place the average grade between B+ and A-. The mean weighted grade for the papers handed in on June 8, 1955, was 4.1, which would place the average grade between A- and A.

On the basis of the instructor's judgment, there is this evidence that the students had a more perceptive grasp of a philosophy of educational administration at the end of the seminar period than they had mid-way through the experience.

To present further evidence on this point, excerpts are quoted from the statements to illustrate what, in the judgment of the investigator, represents a clearer, more comprehensive understanding of educational administration in June than that which existed in March. The students are identified by number, and the material listed under A is that which he wrote on March 16, 1955, and under B, that which he wrote on June 8, 1955.

Student Number 10

A. The purpose of educational administration is democratic leadership in the cooperative achievement of worthwhile goals, or in the solution of common problems. Some so-called problems are in reality environmental situations which defy solution without the aid of time. Autocratic or arbitrary decision-making may sometimes be necessary due to restrictions of setting, time, or expediency. However, democratic procedure will produce more favorable results in a vast majority of situations.
B. The administrative process is most effective when it is demo-
cratic in nature. In order to be democratic in nature, any
process must be based primarily upon the concept of consideration.
At the same time, the multiple tasks and responsibilities consti-
tuting the administrative process must be clearly defined and
delegated. This delegation and definition requires a reasonable
amount of structure in the organization in order to assure smooth
locomotion of the group toward established goals. We therefore
demn it mandatory to accept the theory that elements of both con-
sideration and structure will be necessary ingredients in a work-
able formula for educational administration. However, our present
professional concept tends to place more emphasis upon consider-
atjon than upon structure.

Student Number 11

A. Educational administration is not merely the "running of the
schools"; it is not a simple isolated question of "money manage-
ment"; it is not even such a relatively elementary task as the
hiring and firing of personnel. It is, of course, all of these
things, and many, many more in its actual day-by-day routine.
But in its larger sense it is simultaneously—and perhaps even
more fundamentally and urgently necessary—community partici-
pation, lay leadership, public relations, interpretation of con-
temporary society, perpetuation of the culture, cooperative
interaction with many community agencies, equalization of edu-
cational opportunity, teacher recruitment, in-service education,
curriculum improvement, pupil guidance, citizen building, and
human engineering. I believe that educational administration is
the key-stone of our country's great system of public education—
more and more this is coming to be recognized by the profession
and the lay public.

B. Perhaps at one time the whole administration could have been
summed up in terms of management of time, funds, and materials.
And, indeed, the management function is even yet prominently
present among the major responsibilities of the educational ad-
ministrator. Important as it may be, however, this management of
inanimate "tools of the trade" is by no means the most important
function of the educational administrator.

The other broad function, as I see it, is leadership. This
function is broad in its scope and varied in its requirements. I
would even include it within the personnel management functions
as different from the aforementioned kind of management. In order
to practice leadership in an effective way, there are certain de-
mands or qualifications which one must meet. One must be able
first to think reflectively and evaluatively, to give thoughtful
and intelligent attention to all problem situations. This re-
quires both a keen and alert mind, and a trained one. From this
thinking comes the setting of goals that are educationally sound
as well as practical and realistic; planning an effective program
for the attainment of goals must follow. Such planning will
naturally bring into play the management function, for all the
materials and resources for activating the planning must be lo-
cated and brought to bear upon the problem at hand in the most effective way possible. A constant function of leadership is evaluation—honest, objective, and careful appraisal of progress and the degree to which success has been met in the achievement of any goal. Wisdom and maturity are two valuable qualities that every educational administrator should possess in abundance, plus the ability to grow in wisdom and maturity as time and experience accumulate.

Student Number 13

A. Educational administration is the direction and supervision that is provided by a leader in the field of education. It sets the tone and determines the success of the group or educational system. The administrator directs plans for organizational patterns, makes plans for guiding the action of an organization, and motivates other individuals to contribute to the guiding and structuring of the organization.

B. The writer firmly supports the concept that educational administration is the marshalling of human and material resources and directing them toward a common objective for the development and the maintenance of an effective educational program. To the writer, this definition means organizing and motivating a group for attaining common goals; aiding members within the group in seeing and accepting their roles; guiding the group in setting its goals; establishing rapport within the group; developing understanding and cooperation between various groups of a community; providing leadership in establishing policies within the group, and securing the support of the community.

These three examples were chosen randomly by the investigator and illustrate, in his judgment, the qualitative difference which exists between the statements which were prepared in June and those which were made in March. A close examination of each of the papers then indicated that excerpts could have been selected from most of the others to demonstrate the same point. These statements, it is believed, illustrate an integration of many of the concepts and values into a philosophy of educational administration. Emphasized is the belief that administration is leadership, and not merely management. Particularly significant is the prominence given to the importance of both Initiating Structure and Consideration as necessary dimensions of educational leadership.
As was stated in Chapter VI, the most valid data for an analysis of the degree to which change was effected lay in each of the fifteen field problem and/or administrative environments of the students. For reasons given previously, this source could not be tapped by the study. As Dr. Andrew Halpin pointed out in his discussion of leadership during Session VI, which is reported in Chapter III, one of the frontier research areas is that which will probe into the question of situational variance. As more evidence concerning this is found, more will be known about the relationship between what apparently is learned and how it will become administrative behavior in practice, and how that behavior may hold constant or vary as the administrator moves from situation to situation.

Lacking this type of evidence, however, there still is reinforcement for the belief that the seminar experiences contributed to considerable extensions of understandings about the basic concepts and values in educational administration. In addition to the evidence presented in this chapter, attention is directed again to the pattern of gains reported previously, in Chapter V, in reference to problem solving ability. It is regarded as unlikely that these would have occurred if there had not been accompanying integrated growth in understandings of concepts and values, since successful functioning in a problem solving situation requires a well-grounded base of concepts and values from which to operate.
CHAPTER IX

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

It was the purpose of this study to examine the degree to which Education 800M, or "Cases and Concepts of Educational Administration," proved to be a productive way in which to look globally at the area of educational administration, and contributed to the further development of the fifteen post-master's students who participated in the seminar experience from January 5 to June 8, 1955. The major hypothesis was that the seminar and seminar-induced activities would lead to increased understandings of and further growth in the following five specific areas:

1. Assessment of the background and potentiality of each student for a career in educational administration.

2. Problem solving in an actual school-community situation.

3. Improvement of skills in administrative behavior.

4. Extension of understandings and know-how of school operation.

5. Further development and clarification of basic concepts and values in educational administration.

The research design of this study involved an analysis of the results which were derived from the administration of the following instruments in January and June of 1955: Summary of Field Experience Inventory; Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire; F Scale, Ideas About Myself Inventory; Problem Sheet, and the Test of Professional
Understandings in Education. In addition, content and process analyses were made of participant responses, which were obtained from the written proceedings of each seminar session and plotted, by the investigator, on the Bales Process Analysis charts. Additional data came from written student responses to various seminar assignments. These data, then, were analyzed and interpreted as they applied to each of the five specific areas. The research methodology and specific findings for each of the five specific areas are presented in Chapters IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII.

It is the purpose of this final chapter to present the major findings, the implications drawn from them, and recommendations based on them. Finally, the overall implications of the study are considered. In reference to the first objective, since the findings, implications, and conclusions pertain to specific areas, they are dealt with separately under the five headings.

1. Findings, Implications, and Conclusions
Which Relate to the Five Specific Areas

Assessment of the Background and Potentiality of Each Student for a Career in Educational Administration

Findings:

1. As each student rated his own experience on the Summary of Field Experience Inventory, both in terms of its extent and intensity, there were gains, during the seminar period, which were significant beyond the .01 level.

2. No statistically-significant difference in the means of the scores, obtained on a test-retest basis from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, occurred during the
There was no significant shift in the means of the scores derived from the test-retest results of the F Scale. The fifteen students had, at the outset, strong anti-fascistic beliefs, as interpreted from their mean score of -32.4, and the change which did occur on the retest was even further in the same direction, as demonstrated by their mean score of -35.5.

4. When the test and retest means of the Ideas About Myself Inventory were analyzed, no significant difference was found to exist. An examination of the initial test results illustrates that the students had a desirable balance of leadership and followership characteristics, as indicated by their mean score of -5.5. The mean of -4.3 on the retest shows a further trend in the direction of the optimum score of 0.0.

5. The test and retest means of 37.3 and 37.7, obtained from the Test of Professional Understandings in Education, did not shift significantly during the seminar period.

Implications:

It can be inferred from the research findings that the experiences of the seminar contributed significantly to the development of the fifteen students, by providing them with additional opportunities to register gains in the operational areas, administrative processes,
and situational factors of educational administration which are measured by the Summary of Field Experience Inventory. There is little evidence of change in the personality patterns of the students, but as regards their tendencies to hold democratic beliefs and to exhibit a balance of leadership-followership tendencies, it is interpreted as particularly important that no statistically-significant shifts occurred during the seminar period, inasmuch as their test patterns are regarded as close to optimum for the successful practice of educational administration in our society.

The seminar experiences were not geared, as far as content is concerned, to effect much of an increase in the types of things which are measured by the Test of Professional Understandings in Education. That the students tended to strike a closer balance between Initiating Structure and Consideration, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire dimensions, reflects the emphasis which was made during the seminar period of the desirability of administrative behavior which is sufficiently job-centered to permit skill in the technical processes of administration and in relating them to the objectives of the school, and yet personnel-centered to provide a wholesome, productive, and creative atmosphere in which to work and learn.

Recommendations:

1. When the Summary of Field Experience Inventory is used in subsequent sessions of the seminar, it is suggested that the students be asked to keep an anecdotal record, during the seminar period, of their participation in the various categories it measures, so that it can be determined with greater accuracy whether the changes which occur result
from experience traceable to their positions, happen because of a seeking-out process which has been stimulated by the new comprehensions and skills developed during the seminar period, or stem from a combination of the two.

2. It is recommended that a continued effort be made to compile normative data for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, and that further evidence be gathered in reference to the most promising balance for educational administrators between the dimensions of initiating Structure and Consideration. In future sessions of the seminar, it is suggested that each student take the instrument twice, on a test-retest basis, once with instructions for the LBDQ-Real (how they perceive their own behavior as they function in their administrative positions), and once for the LBDQ-Ideal (how they think their behavior should be). The degree of congruence between these two scores should provide valuable counseling material for the instructor. Further, if the seminar student currently is holding an administrative position, it would provide even more valuable information if a random sampling of LBDQ-Real and LBDQ-Ideal scores could be obtained from his staff. Determining the congruence between the staff's LBDQ-Real and LBDQ-Ideal scores and the ones provided by the student should enable the instructor to plan, with greater effectiveness, the individual work for that student.

3. Discontinuation of the use of the F Scale on a test-retest basis is recommended. Instead, it is suggested that it be
given only at the beginning of the seminar to provide information for the instructor about the student's anti-fascistic beliefs.

4. It is suggested that the Ideas About Myself inventory be discontinued as a test-retest instrument. Its major value, for the purposes of the seminar, lies in its revelation of a student's leadership-followership tendencies. If it is given at the beginning of the seminar, it is recommended that the instructor consider its results in mapping out, with the student, his field experience problem. If the student exhibits a pronounced imbalance between leadership and followership characteristics, definite value would accrue, it is believed, from making the specific type of problem assignment which promises to effect a more suitable balance. A student's development, then, could be determined by comparing his original test score with observational data obtained from his field problem environment.

5. It is recommended that a continued effort be made to compile normative information for the Test of Professional Understandings in Education. It is the judgment of the investigator that this instrument should be administered to students who propose to enter the Two Year Program in Educational Administration. Since this instrument deals with eight areas, all of which are important for the educational administrator, the specific strengths and weaknesses revealed at this period of testing could serve as counseling data for the adviser as he assists the student with his se-
lection of a proposed program.

6. Since both oral and written communication are of major importance for students of educational administration, it is recommended that structured interviews and standard written exercises be devised to provide material for an assessment of a student's proficiency in these modes of expression. If this is done during the period of screening for candidates who wish to study educational administration, additional counseling data can be made available to the selection and advisory committees.

7. It is suggested that counseling periods, of whatever frequency is feasible, be established for seminar students. In particular, it is the judgment of the investigator that there would be value in the instructor's constructing, for each student, a profile which is based on his results in the initial battery of instruments, and then mapping out, with the student, some specific courses of action for remedial work in his deficient areas.

8. It is recommended that the Committee on Educational Administration give consideration to the possibility of developing, with interested school systems in the state, a program for the detection and encouragement of staff members who show an emerging leadership potential. Through the continued development of internship opportunities, graduate assistantships, and other plans for financial compensation, it should be possible to attract these promising students in greater numbers.
Findings:

1. When an analysis was made by the investigator of the 3312 responses recorded during the seminar sessions, 13.8 per cent of them were in the Positive Social-Emotional Area, 83.6 per cent were in the Tasks Area, and 2.6 per cent were in the Negative-Social-Emotional Area. These responses had been plotted by the investigator on the Bales Analysis charts.

2. Of the 3312 responses recorded by the investigator during the seminar sessions, 62.3 per cent of them were made by the students, and 37.7 per cent were made by the instructor.

3. When the patterns of oral participation of the students and the instructor, as they were recorded on the Bales Analysis charts, were compared, a rank order correlation of .89 was obtained. An examination of Table 6 on pages 91 and 92 illustrates that student responses followed the same general pattern as that displayed by the instructor in problem analysis and solution.

4. When each of the fifteen students was asked to rate each other student on the twelve categories of the Bales Analysis charts, the mean ratings for each student were rank correlated with the amount of participation recorded for him by the investigator in each of the twelve areas during the course of the seminars. A correlation of .56 indicates that a positive relationship existed between each student's evaluation of the contribution made by each other student in the
seminar and the amount and variety of recorded responses which the student made during the course of the seminar.

5. It is the subjective opinion of the investigator that the fifteen students demonstrated more noticeable gains in their ability to participate in the oral analysis of problems than they did in the written expression and analysis of problems during the seminar period. No statistically significant increase in the means was obtained when the Problem Sheet results were analyzed. The final written reports which dealt with the development and analysis of the field experience problem also, in general, fell short, qualitatively, of the expectation which had been set for them by the instructor and by the investigator.

Implications:

These findings are interpreted to mean that the flexible structure of the seminar proved to be an effective method of dealing with problem analysis and solution in a purposeful, task-oriented manner. It also was very successful in eliciting a strong measure of student participation. Since one of the major goals of the seminar was to increase individual competencies in the process of problem analysis and solution, the correlation of .89 between student and instructor patterns of response is regarded as significant evidence that this aim was accomplished. Verification was gained, also, from an analysis of the data, that there was a positive relationship between the amount and kind of participation displayed by a member of a group and the evaluation made of his contribution by his fellow members. In the opinion of the investigator, there was evidence that the students were more
proficient with the skills of oral expression than they were with the written ones.

Recommendations:

1. In subsequent sections of the seminar, or others which may be related to it in placing a major emphasis on problem analysis and solution, it is recommended that a study be made of the communications media with which an administrator needs to be proficient if he is to do this job well. In Education 800M, for example, the principal concern was with increasing student skill in oral analysis, and the critics of the process were the instructor and the seminar students. It is felt by the investigator that practicing administrators use several different media in their analysis and solution of problems, and that as they do so they deal with many different publics and individuals, all of whom appraise their effectiveness. A specific recommendation for increasing student skills in communications is to use role-playing situations, in which the student is called upon to use a non-academic vocabulary and approach in dealing with differently structured situations.

2. It is suggested that a method be developed by which the instructor can obtain from those with whom the student works in his field experience problem environment an evaluation of the student's effectiveness, from their point of view. A student with high verbal facility and rather poor perceptions, it is conceivable, could convey to the seminar an impression of a greater degree of success than he actu-
ally experienced.

3. When field experience problems are assigned in the future, it is recommended that pretest results be used, so that the selection can be made, as much as possible, on the basis of the student's ascertained needs. A periodic check can then be made to determine if those needs are being met by the experience, or if it should be supplemented by other experiences, such as directed reading or a selection of collateral courses.

4. Inasmuch as the recorder, who is assigned to this task for each of the seminar sessions, is not able to participate very actively in the process of problem analysis, it is recommended that this be done subsequently in one of two different ways. In the first seminar session, develop criteria which will serve as a guide for the preparation of the record, and then rotate the responsibility from student to student, so that each gets the experience. This would have a double advantage, in that each student would have the experience of doing a structured written report, and each student would be released for an equal opportunity to participate in the analysis of the problems. An optional plan is for an auditor, preferably one who is concentrating in another discipline, to serve as the seminar recorder. Periodically, then, the recorder could present an analysis of the seminar process. No matter which plan is followed, it is suggested that copies of the seminar report be duplicated and distributed to each of the participants. Released from
the necessity of taking notes, each student could participate more freely in the proceedings of the seminar.

5. Since the processes of analysis and solution of each student's field experience problem were facilitated with the aid of what, in the judgment of the investigator, was high level assistance provided by the instructor and seminar students, it is recommended that added experience be structured into subsequent seminars which will enable the students to perform these functions with resources which are typical of those they are likely to find in their own professional environments. This type of experience can be gained, perhaps, by selecting actual problem cases in educational administration and by role-playing them to approximate the conditions under which the administrator ordinarily works.

**Improvement of Skills in Administrative Behavior**

Findings:

1. As measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, administrative behavior of the students showed a change during the seminar period in two respects. There was a marginally-significant shift, at the .05 - .10 level of confidence, in the mean scores of the dimension, Initiating Structure. Although there was no significant change in the mean scores of the dimension, Consideration, the test-retest means of 51.3 and 52.3, showed that they had a tendency to remain at a high level. During the seminar period, the difference between the means of these two
dimensions was reduced from 13.0 to 10.9.

2. Results from the two instruments which measured dimensions of the students' personality structures, the F scale and the Ideas About Myself Inventory, revealed that no significant changes occurred during the seminar period. Throughout the experience, the students remained, except for chance variations, appreciably strong in their democratically-oriented beliefs and balanced in their leadership-followership characteristics.

3. Examination of the fifteen field experience problems and illustrative statements made by the students in reference to the understandings which they gained during their participation in them, indicates that considerable improvement of skills in administrative behavior resulted from increased experience with the interpersonal and environmental factors which affect that behavior.

4. On the basis of the evaluation which each student made of the contributions to the seminar by each of the other fourteen students, an examination of the data listed in Table 8 on pages 95 and 96 reveals that the behavior was evaluated as having been exhibited primarily in the Social-Emotional Positive and Task Areas.

5. As measured by the Summary of Field Experience Inventory, student scores on the "Administrative Processes" section of it indicated an increase in the extent of their experiences which was significant at the .02 - .05 level of confidence. Only a marginally-significant change occurred in the intens-
ity scores. These administrative processes of planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling bear, it is thought, a close relationship to the nine critical areas of administrative behavior which are listed in Chapter VI.

Implications:

Since administrative behavior refers to the way in which an administrator acts as he performs the functions associated with his position, it is evident that this behavior is perceived and evaluated by many different people, including the administrator himself. The findings which come from the seminar experience largely are those in which the students evaluated themselves. In this respect, the findings are primarily one-dimensional. With the limitations of the research design, it was not possible to gather data by observing the students as they worked in their field problem environments and by securing descriptions and evaluations of their administrative behavior from the people with whom they worked in these experiences.

From the findings which are listed, however, the following deductions seem logical. The tendency of the students to effect a better balance between Initiating Structure and Consideration reveals that they moved closer, as the result of seminar and seminar-induced experiences, to the type of administrative behavior which was posited as most desirable. The data which pertained to the personality structure of the students indicated that they had those characteristics which are regarded as important for successful performance as an educational administrator in our culture. It is regarded as significant that there was no significant shift in reference to these personality scores.
The experiences gained and reported by the students in their field problems led significantly, in the judgment of the investigator, to an improvement of skills in administrative behavior. In each problem situation, the student was provided with added opportunities to grow in understanding about the interpersonal and environmental factors which affect administrative behavior. The experience of presenting to the seminar group a depth analysis of his problem, and the people involved in it, led to increased sensitivities and perceptions on the part of the students, it is believed.

Recommendations:

1. As the Committee on Educational Administration gives continued thought to the development of the Two Year Program in Educational Administration, it is recommended that consideration be given to the possibility of presenting a course which would deal somewhat formally with the administrative process in toto. In the judgment of the investigator, the often subtle elements of administrative behavior would be understood more readily by students in the seminar if they could have a fuller prior understanding of the scope of the administrative process. The seminars, presented during the Two Year Program, could reinforce these understandings by presenting and analyzing the critical areas of administrative behavior, and the interpersonal and environmental factors which affect its quality.

2. It is recommended that continued study be given to the problem of isolating the areas of administrative behavior, and relating them to the development of what is regarded to be
a desirable configuration of administrative behavior. Some
common agreements should exist about this, if the seminars
which are planned as integral parts of the Two Year Program
in Educational Administration are to have a unifying and
developmentally clarifying effect.

3. It is suggested that instruments be developed which relate
directly to this configuration of administrative behavior,
and used by the instructors of the seminars to obtain de­
scriptions and evaluations of the student's behavior as he
works in his field experience problem environment. These
evaluations should be made by those with whom he works in
the field, by the students in the seminar, and by the in­
structor. The degree of congruence between these three
evaluations would provide counseling material of consider­
able value, it is believed.

Extension of Understandings and
Know-How of School Operation

Findings:

1. As measured by the Summary of Field Experience Inventory,
there was an increase in the extent of student experience
in the operational areas of goal setting, curriculum devel­
opment, pupil personnel, staff personnel, physical facili­
ties, finance and business management, and public relations,
which was significant at the .01 - .02 level. An examin­
ation of the results indicates that this increase stemmed
primarily, although not exclusively, from the seven students
who held administrative positions current to the seminar
period.
2. No significant increase in the mean scores was obtained when the intensity of experience in the operational areas was measured.

3. There was no significant increase in the mean score when the Test of Professional Understandings in Education was administered on a test-retest basis.

4. An examination of selected types of questions asked and concept statements made by the students during the consideration of a problem which related to the operational areas of educational administration provides some evidence that a growth in understandings of school operation occurred during the seminar period.

Implications:

It is the judgment of the investigator that whereas considerable attention was given, during the seminar sessions, to dealing with material designed to increase understandings and know-how of school operation, as is evidenced from an examination of the content of Chapters III and VIII, there was no clear-cut device used in the study to measure the extent to which these were assimilated. There was, in addition, a greater emphasis placed on the broad understandings associated with the processes of school operation than on the specific tasks that are involved in their more routine aspects. It is believed that this resulted, in part, from the fact that the students had experienced a concentration of specific skill area subjects in their prior graduate programs.

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended that an appraisal be made of each student's grasp of understandings and skills in school operation on
the basis of pre-test information, and that a program of course selection, guided reading experiences, and a mapping out of most needed field experience problems represent some of the methods used to build up the deficient areas.

2. A further suggestion is to request students to bring in, for seminar discussion, specific problem cases from their own professional environment which relate directly to some aspect of school operation. These would have the advantage of being live problems, and their guided selection can serve as a means of supplementing this area of educational administration, if evidence indicates that it is not receiving a needed amount of emphasis.

3. If the instructor continues to use the device of asking seminar students for a written reaction to problem cases, as a term examination, it is suggested that these be differentially selected to include several areas of administrative operation, and given to those students who have revealed, on the basis of pre-test information, a deficiency in those areas. This recommendation presupposes that guided experiences, prior to the examination, have been established for each student as a specified program for the strengthening of his deficiencies.

Further Development and Clarification of Basic Concepts and Values in Educational Administration

Findings:

1. From the recorded class proceedings, the investigator isolated 158 concepts and values of educational administration
and categorized them under eighteen major headings.

2. Of the total of 153, 92, or 53.2 per cent of them, were developed in process, during which the seminar participants were engaged in problem analysis. Of these 92, 71 were developed by the instructor, 17 by the students, and 4 by the interdisciplinary guests.

3. Presented formally during the course of the seminars were 66 concepts and values, which represented 41.8 per cent of the total. Of these 66, 23 were made by the instructor and 43 by the interdisciplinary guests.

4. Of the 158 concepts and values identified, 59.5 per cent of them were presented by the instructor, 29.7 per cent by the interdisciplinary guests, and 10.8 per cent by the students.

5. The papers, "Educational Administration: This I Believe," which the students prepared in March and June of 1955, contained evidence which, in the judgment of the instructor and the investigator, indicated that they had assimilated many of these concepts and values, and had incorporated them into their stated philosophies of educational administration.

Implications:

Using the definition that concepts and values represented practices or beliefs which had proved to be useful on the basis of experience, the findings indicate that the seminar proved to be a successful way of presenting information over a wide range of administrative activity. Significant is the fact that 53.2 per cent of these were developed in the process of problem solution and analysis. Since these were re-
lated directly to a specific situation, it is felt that this was particularly conducive to effective learning. As the ability to state a concept or value is tied rather directly to the ability to generalize, the fact that only 10.3 per cent of them were made by the students is indicative of a need to provide more experience in the development of this particular skill. The seminar, thus, was more successful in proving its ability to handle this kind of material in context than it was in developing the skill to produce it on the part of the student participants.

A further implication is that there was only a limited source of evidence which could be tapped to show the degree to which these concepts and values found their way into the behavioral patterns of the students. This is the type of data which best can be gathered through observational approaches.

Recommendations:

1. Using the recorder's report of the seminar sessions, students can gain meaningful experience, and strengthen their ability to generalize, it is believed, if they are asked to isolate what they regard to be concepts and values of educational administration. These, then, can serve as guides for exploratory thinking on the part of each student as he develops his own philosophy of educational administration.

2. As many of the concepts and values in educational administration undoubtedly have been based on meaningful experience, but have not been verified by research findings, it is suggested that they be categorized to serve as a pool of research ideas.
3. Inasmuch as only 10.3 per cent of the concepts and values were expressed by the students during the seminar, it is recommended that the instructor give increased attention in subsequent sessions to methods whereby these can be elicited more frequently from the students. Drawing from their own experience backgrounds, they could then gain increased competence with the inductive process.

4. When interdisciplinary resources are used in future seminars, it is recommended that the students and instructor structure, on a prior basis, those areas in which they principally are interested. This information can be communicated to the guest at the time an invitation is extended. Included, also, should be an indication of the method of presentation which is regarded to be of most value in terms of the specific objectives. At times, for example, it might be more profitable for the resource person to devote his entire time to a formal presentation, and at others he might serve as a discussion leader.

5. In the written exercises, and particularly in the major report of the field experience problem, which are required of the students, it is recommended that the instructor ask for a pin-pointing of references to specific concepts and values of educational administration which are illustrated, either in the observance or the breach, by particular phases of the problem. By doing this, it is believed that the ability to think analytically will be strengthened through the process of relating problems to a conceptual
2. Overall Implications of the Study

The major function of this study was to provide an appraisal, primarily for the consideration of the Committee on Educational Administration of the Ohio State University, of Education 800H, as it was initially offered. With this specific purpose in mind, a concerted effort was made to consider the objectives which were set for the experience, to report what was done in the attempt to work toward their achievement, and to assess the degree to which these goals were met. Because this study was to provide some information for the evaluative planning which this committee proposes to do in its continued development of the Two Year Program in Educational Administration at the Ohio State University, the material which it presents was geared to an analysis of component parts of the seminar experience. Thus, the findings, implications, and recommendations which are presented in this chapter are very specific, to facilitate the process of evaluating the course with greater precision.

There is, however, a broader context in which the study can be considered. It takes its place among the evaluations which have been made, and currently are being made, of the increasing number of experimental programs for the preparation of educational administrators, which began to appear about 1952. Reference to some of these is made in Chapter III. Although these differ in many procedural respects, they are held together by a common premise—that through the trying of new learning approaches, which feature informal seminar structures to encourage the free exchange of ideas and feelings of personal identification and the emphasis on viewing administration as a broad social process, fuller
understandings will result about how educational administrators can be prepared with increased effectiveness.

When Education 80QM is viewed as a part of this experimental process, the findings which have been presented in this study assume, perhaps, a wider applicability. To those, then, who are concerned with the problem of examining programs for the preparation of educational administrators, the following implications perhaps are relevant:

1. The experience with Education 80QM revealed that its objectives were, perhaps, too comprehensive for the period of time allotted to it. An examination of the findings indicates that there was less evidence of student development in understandings and know-how of school operation and in the ability of students to formulate concepts and values in educational administration than there was in the other three areas. These differences are interpreted as having resulted, in large measure, from the lines of limitation which had to be drawn during the course of the seminar.

2. The structure of the seminar which provided the opportunity for each student to participate in a field experience problem and to bring a progress analysis to the group on two separate occasions proved to be an excellent device for building up the extent of oral participation and for strengthening skills in problem analysis and solution on the part of the students.

3. Since it was not possible for the investigator to secure data from direct observation of the student in his field problem environment, or from appraisals of the student's performance
in this environment, which were made by those with whom he worked, it is concluded that more than one investigator should participate in the analysis which is made of such a course experience. A carefully coordinated research project, then, which involved more than one research person, could provide a more comprehensive analysis than this study was able to produce.

4. Perhaps one of the most significant conclusions reached as the result of this experience was that this flexibly-structured seminar was able to deal broadly with the area of educational administration, and yet provide experiences with the very specific problems of this field. An examination of Chapters III and VIII will indicate the extent to which this happened.

3. Suggestions for Further Research

Several problems were recognized during the course of this study which seem to merit further research. These are:

1. There is a need for more evidence which pertains to the relationship which exists between the development which a student of educational administration exhibits in his graduate program and the application he makes of it in his current or subsequent administrative experience. This type of study involves, it is believed, more than an analysis of appraisals of his administrative operation by the people with whom he works. It also requires an analysis of the expectations that these people have of him as an administrator, an assessment of how perceptive he is of these expectations, and an ap-
praisal of his administrative behavior, in response to these situational factors. This behavior, then, can be examined against the assessment of his behavior as a graduate student of educational administration.

2. In reference to the dimensions of administrative behavior which are measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Initiating Structure, and Consideration, it is suggested that further research is needed about the relationship of personality patterns of administrators, as measured by some standardized tests of personality, and the scores they make in these two dimensions. If this information further is compared with some measure of effectiveness, such as that obtained from those with whom the administrator works, it is believed that much more would be understood about the importance or lack of importance of personality as a criterion element of administrative success.

3. It is believed that a seminar experience of this nature, perhaps of a single quarter's duration, profitably could be developed for candidates at the master's level, near the end of their program. This is predicated on the assumption that most administrators will continue to terminate their graduate study at this level, and that it would be a valuable experience to look at the area of educational administration broadly, in a seminar setting. With this short a period, the field problem experience is not regarded as vital. Instead, the analysis of their current administrative problems or of case study problems might be more beneficial. It is
suggested that a study be conducted to determine the need for such an experience, and the problems which would be involved in incorporating it into the master's program in educational administration.

There was only limited evidence on the extent to which a personal philosophy of educational administration was developed by the students during the seminar experience. It is thought that profitable research could be conducted about the extent to which practicing administrators make behavioral choices on the basis of a reasonably consistent philosophy. These data could be gathered, perhaps, by observation of administrative behavior and by interviews which would probe into the reasons which lay behind the choice of that behavior. The findings would have value for the instructors of subsequent seminars, inasmuch as experiences could be selected which would contribute to the development, on the part of the student, of a related system of values about educational administration, and consequently better insure that behavioral choices, in his subsequent administrative experience, would be made on the basis of conscious value judgments.
APPENDIX

Summary of Field Experience Inventory
Summary of Field Experience Inventory

_________________________________________  ______________________________________
Name                                          Date

1. In the spaces below, please list, in sequence and with dates indicated, the positions in the field of education which you have held.
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

2. On the pages which follow, you are asked to appraise, by the use of symbols 0-1-3-5, the experiences which you have had in the operational areas, processes, and situational factors, which represent component parts of the administrative process.

   In the Extent Column, use 0 to indicate no experience, 1 to indicate limited experience in the particular area under consideration, 3 to represent what you regard as an average amount, and 5 to signify a great deal of experience.

   In the Intensity Column, use 0 to indicate no experience, 1 to indicate that your role has been that of an observer, 3 to represent the fact that your role has been that of a participant, and 5 to signify that you have had some major responsibility in the activity under consideration.
### SUMMARY OF FIELD EXPERIENCE INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Areas</th>
<th>Actual and/or Campus-Initiated Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Goal Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Assessing community characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Study and formulation of pupil needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working with staff on school goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Working with citizens on school goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Working with pupils on school goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Determination of course objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Development of a plan for instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Consideration of instructional methods and procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Selection and development of instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Appraisal of the instructional program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pupil Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Determination of numbers and characteristics of pupils to be served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Development of an organizational plan for pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Development of a pupil accounting system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administration of the pupil accounting system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Determination of special services needed by pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Determination of staff needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recruitment and selection of candidates for positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF FIELD EXPERIENCE INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Areas</th>
<th>Actual and/or Campus Initiated Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1. Staff Personnel Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recommendation of candidates to board for appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Assignment and placement of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Induction of new staff members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Supervision of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Appraisal of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Assessment of the plant implications of the instructional program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Determination of needed sites, buildings, and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Appraisal of present sites, buildings and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Determination of available funds for school plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Formulation of school plant needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Management of the plant development program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Finance and Business Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Determination of expenditures needed for the school program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Determination of the available funds for the school program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Development of the school budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Management of the school budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Accounting for income, expenditures, and property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF FIELD EXPERIENCE INVENTORY

### Operational Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual and/or Campus Initiated Experience</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1-3-5</td>
<td>0-1-3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7. Public Relations Continued)

- a. Assessment of desires and aspirations citizens have for the school
- b. Dissemination of information about the school
- c. Development of consensus on role of school in the community
- d. Development of consensus on role of other community agencies

### Administrative Processes

1. Planning
   - a. Determination of purpose
   - b. Use of relevant information
   - c. Development of means and procedures
   - d. Establishment of time limits and priorities

2. Organizing
   - a. Establishment of organization structure
   - b. Division of labor
   - c. Assignment of jobs
   - d. Delegation of authority
   - e. Agreement upon working relationships

3. Directing
   - a. Authorization and ordering of action
   - b. Penalizing inaction or abuse

4. Coordinating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Processes</th>
<th>Actual and/or Campus-Initiated Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(4. Coordinating Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Determination of people and things involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Diagnosis of relationships in time and space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Authorization of appropriate action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Controlling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Follow-up results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Appraise results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Redirection as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Situational Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Conditions</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ascertain location and size of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Determine number and composition of people in a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Analyze economic and tax resources of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Determine adequacy of roads or streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Assess condition and adequacy of school plants and other public facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Setting</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ascertain the values of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Assess the prestige criteria of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Study the leadership pattern of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Appraise the communication patterns of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Factors</td>
<td>Actual and/or Campus-Initiated Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2. Cultural Setting continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Note the relationships of one community to other communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Note family characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Study church relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Note governmental and political activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Assess business and economic activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ascertain health and welfare conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Assess play and recreation provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Face-to-Face Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Analyze the number and composition of such groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Study their attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Know their traditions and ways of working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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