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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Schools and school needs have come to public attention in an increasing number of ways in recent years. Problems of enrollment, housing, teaching methods, auxiliary services, and differences in ideology as to what is to be taught have taken the spotlight.

The spotlighting of these problems is an indication of the growing complexity of the business of education in this nation. As the complexity of the school system increases, so does the task of the educational administrator. The variety of skills and knowledges needed by the administrator has become almost greater than any one human might possess.

Along with the attention being given to school problems, has come a great deal of activity on what might be called the cutting edge of research in educational administration. The duties or functions performed by administrators deemed important in the past have been placed in new perspective by more recent thinking and research in the field. The man himself and his behavior in school situations have become the foci of attention.

Researchers in educational administration have been lead into studying behavioral sciences. They have found it to be a time consuming and sometimes fruitless approach. Yet among these researchers
one finds a tenacity and a kind of "faith" which compels further use of this approach. Some gains are being made even though it seems to some, and perhaps rightly so, that social science research is now at the point where physical science research was in the days when alchemy was in vogue. Skinner has stated that, "Human behavior is perhaps the most difficult subject to which the methods of science have ever been applied, and it is only natural that substantial progress be slow."

Recognizing the status of research on human behavior, this study attempts to use the approach in its application to educational administration. It attempts to observe, record, study, and analyze the behavior of one group of administrators, namely, ten Ohio executive heads, as they go about performing their professional duties.

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

This study is one of four parallel studies which deal with the behavior of educational administrators. Each deals with a different level of administrative responsibility. These levels are: the elementary school principal, the secondary school principal, the executive head, and the city school superintendent.

All of the studies have in common the testing of a portion of the findings made by the School-Community Development Study. If

---


2 The School-Community Development Study (1951-1956) was one of the Centers of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration sponsored by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
anything is to be learned from research in educational administration, the constructs developed must be tested and re-tested, refined and refined again with various samplings of the total population, namely, all educational administrators.

The four studies cover a variety of administrative situations. Each follows the same methodology, and each tests the same hypotheses. Inherent in the design of the studies was the assumption that the four levels of administration were essentially the same so far as their usefulness in testing the previous research findings was concerned.

Three years were spent in gathering the data which were to produce the critical areas being tested here. These findings as well as others produced during the same period of research are set forth in a monograph published by the School-Community Development Study. Both the methodology and findings of that research will be summarized in Chapter III of the present study.

The personnel of the School-Community Development Study desired to have certain findings tested and examined by persons who would be able to work independently of the Study and who would design a different approach to the problem. As a result, four graduate students and their adviser accepted the commission to re-examine a portion of the findings.

---

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study (1) to determine whether the administrative behavior of executive heads can be described through classification of their behavior within the framework of the critical areas; and (2) to determine the relationship of variations in behavior in the critical areas to the general effectiveness of executive heads. The critical areas were:

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

These critical areas were formed and named through the research effort of the School-Community Development Study. They were to be tested in a wider population and at several levels of administration.

The Hypotheses

Two hypotheses were formulated from the purposes of this study. They were (1) that the critical areas of administrative behavior found by the School-Community Development Study to exist in its cooperating centers do exist in administrative situations occurring in schools
served by executive heads, and behavior in these situations can be described within the framework of the critical areas; and (2) that the administrative behavior of executive heads judged to be more effective will vary quantitatively and qualitatively within the critical areas from that of executive heads judged to be less effective.

Assumptions Underlying the Study

A number of assumptions were made in construction of the design of the study. These were (1) the effectiveness of the executive head is determined by the quality of his behavioral acts; (2) behavioral acts can be observed, recorded, differentiated, and classified; (3) behavioral acts can be observed by a researcher under conditions which closely approximate the normal behavior of the executive head; and (4) the administrative effectiveness of an executive head can be judged by associates who have worked with him, each judge determining his own criteria for making a judgment.

III. IMPORTANCE OF THE METHOD

This study was an attempt to use the methods of science to study human behavior - specifically the behavior of educational administrators. Science is a search for order, for uniformities, for lawful relations among events in nature. It begins by observing single episodes, but it passes on to the general rule - to scientific law.4

4Skinner, op. cit., p. 3.
Behavior is observed in an attempt to move beyond the behavior itself to building constructs which explain it. If some uniformity could not be found in the world, conduct would remain haphazard and ineffective. Science sharpens and supplements this experience by demonstrating more and more relations among events and by explaining them more and more precisely.\(^5\)

More than mere description of events is necessary. The scientific approach requires that an attempt be made to discover order, to show that certain events stand in lawful relation to other events. There are those who insist that a science of human behavior is impossible, that behavior has certain essential features which forever keep it beyond the pale of science. This argument may disuade many people from further inquiry, but it is not likely to have any effect upon those who are willing to try and see.\(^6\)

The methods of science have been enormously successful wherever they have been tried in physical science. Their application to human affairs is certainly a feasible move. Skinner states:

> If we can observe human behavior carefully from an objective point of view, and come to understand it for what it is, we may be able to adopt a more sensible course of action . . . .

> It is understood that there is no point in furthering a science of nature unless it includes a sizeable science of human nature because only in that case will the results be wisely used.\(^7\)

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 3.
\(^6\)Ibid., p. 7.
\(^7\)Ibid., p. 5.
The basis of a science of human nature must be in the observation of human behavior. All of our relevant empirical generalizations must refer sooner or later to some aspect of concrete action or the situation of action. Bales continues to make his point, as he states:

This is true whether the generalizations are made about personality, social system, or culture. Generalizations about any of these three types of systems or structures are at least one step removed (by abstraction) from the more complex and ultimate stuff we can all observe: activity addressed to persons and things. The observation of social interaction and its situation is the common starting ground for all of the social sciences.

A vague sense of order emerges from any sustained observation of human behavior. The process of producing a definiteness in that vague sense of order is a difficult one. Bales describes a process of weaving back and forth between the sense of order, which he calls theoretical formulation of categories, and empirical trial of the formulation:

A beginning was made on the strictly empirical ad hoc level, by attempting to find out whether or not categories could be invented on the spur of the moment to characterize remarks being made. Almost immediately, of course, repetitions began to occur, and so a preliminary list of categories was built up. The list was ordered according to theoretical pre-conceptions, and was tried again empirically.

Empirical generalizations can be made only in terms of observations of some kind, and observations can be made only in terms of concepts of some kind. Observers do not differ in that some use


9Ibid., p. 31.

10Ibid., p. III.

11Ibid., p. 32.
concepts and some do not. Observers do differ in that some use certain concepts and some use certain other concepts and hence may observe different things about the same ultimate stuff. It is common-place that in a scientific procedure it is necessary to examine and define as carefully as possible the concepts which one uses, instead of simply taking them for granted.12

In the case of this study, the first stages of category making and classification had been performed in the research which the study seeks to test. However, a portion of the category making was inherent to the design of this study. An examination and defining of the categories were also a part of the design.

A fact embodies both scientific observations and a known theoretical framework into which those observations are fitted.13 It was the attempt of this study to test a theoretical framework by use of the method of scientific observation. The research was both quantitative and descriptive, as neither could be used singly to exhaust the data. Both were found to be valuable in analysis of the data, and both have been used increasingly in social science research. Regarding the use of quantitative methods, Allport reports studies in which methods were applied the analysis to psychological documents. A recent review of the literature in this field shows that

The structure of the personality of one individual on the basis of a collection of personal documents . . . is of

12Ibid., p. 32

considerable importance . . . It sets forth a new conception of a "population" for statistics: a population of events and traits within the boundaries of one person. If the initial promise of this method is fulfilled, it will supply an important bridge between the statistical and clinical points of view. 14

A new conception of a population for statistics may also be the behaviors of a person as he goes about his work. Instead of the necessity for having a quantity of persons or their scores on a test to make up a population, one person may well provide the population, depending upon the data gathered about him. As previously stated, the descriptive approach to social science research has gained considerable favor recently—witness the case study approach used in social administration, social psychology, sociology and education. Possibilities of further development of the descriptive method are evidenced by the statement of Shartle:

The fact that leader behavior and group behavior can be reliably described is encouraging for future investigations. One can approach problems descriptively without involving himself or his subjects in commitments concerning who's [sic] behavior or what behavior is good or poor. The investigator simply wishes descriptions of what takes place. 15

Value judgments on the part of the researcher did not enter into the presentation of the findings. They did, however, enter into interpretations and conclusions made from the findings. Description of the behavior of educational administrators included in this study


15 Carroll I. Shartle, "Leadership Aspects of Administrative Behavior" (Presidential Address, Division of Business and Industrial Psychology, American Psychological Association, September, 1950), p. 23 (mimeographed).
was made on the basis of what was observed to have taken place.

Observation followed by statistical and descriptive analysis of the data gathered was applied to the study of behavior in this research project. The method, however crude and unrefined, was used because it gave hope that an increased knowledge of administrative behavior would be its fruit.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF SUCCEEDING CHAPTERS

Chapter II contains a definition of the terms used in this study, as well as definitions of the nine critical areas of administrative behavior. Chapter III surveys the literature pertinent to this problem by tracing the various approaches to the study of leadership and administrative behavior. Chapter IV explains the methodology of this study and cites the literature on research methods as precedent for the methods used. Chapter V presents data pertinent to the first hypothesis while Chapter VI presents data having to do with the second hypothesis. Chapter VII presents certain data pertinent to neither hypothesis. Chapter VIII contains the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations resulting from the study.
CHAPTER II

DEFINITIONS OF CRITICAL AREAS OF
ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR

The main purpose of this chapter is to set forth the definitions of the nine critical areas of behavior. The School-Community Development Study staff had categorized large numbers of behavioral descriptions in each of the nine areas. Definitions were to be found in behavior terms by reading the behavioral data in each area. One of the first jobs undertaken by the research team testing the rationale of the areas was to provide a dictionary-type definition for each area. After reading the behavioral materials found for each area, the team attempted to put the meaning of the area into a definition containing a sentence or two. As the analysis of the data gathered in the observations proceeded, examples were added to clarify the meaning of the definitions. These are shown with the definitions in an attempt to spell out the characteristics of the area.

Before consideration of the definitions of the nine areas, it is appropriate to check certain terms used in the research.

I. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Executive head. The administrator of a local school district in Ohio. Each local school district is under limited jurisdiction of a
county board of education as well as the jurisdiction of its own board of education. The executive head is sometimes termed a local school executive or local superintendent of schools.

**Subject.** Any one of the ten executive heads whose behavior was observed and recorded for purposes of this study is a Subject. In the behavior description, the Subject is referred to by an S.

**Administrative behavior.** That behavior of the administrator having to do with the performance of the duties of his office and the furthering of school purposes. This definition needs some explanation at this point. Coughing, sneezing, eating, or other behaviors purely physiological in nature were not recorded unless some aspect of this behavior seemed to interfere with or affect his administrative behavior. Behavior was observed while the subject was "on the job" during the school day or at board of education meetings.

**Critical areas.** The critical areas form a system postulated to represent a useful system for classifying the administrative behavior of any educational administrator. The term category is used synonymously with critical areas. Nine areas were presented to the research team for testing. Definitions and explanations of these areas are as follows:

**Setting goals** is fixing, formulating, or helping to formulate objectives, aims, purposes, or points toward which movement can be directed.

An executive head is setting goals when he:
1. Sets deadlines by which time a specified state of progress or accomplishment is to be accomplished.

2. Describes conditions which he, as the administrator, wishes to bring about: changed social climate, changed physical setting, changed attitudes of school or community personnel, and number and type of staff members.

3. Identifies or describes changed behavior toward which effort can be directed: more parental participation in school affairs, no fighting on the playground, and improved teaching.

4. Sets up standards of achievement in such matters as the academic, attendance, athletic, and musical.

5. Indicates the professional status to which he aspires or to which he aspires for his associates: membership in organizations, election to office, certification, and acquiring degrees.

6. Sets forth statements of the desired end-products of the school's operation.

7. Modifies or extends existing goal statements.

8. Suggests solutions to present problems in such a way that the suggestion represents a goal to be attained.

9. Approves goals suggested by others.

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

This concept embraces supporting, and abiding by policies emanating from higher echelons of authority. It includes enforcing, or modifying existing policies at the administrator’s own level. It includes explaining and interpreting existing policies to people when their intentions or behavior challenge these policies or point up a need for new ones.

An executive head is making policy when he:

1. Sets or establishes precedent by his behavior in a unique situation.

2. Sets forth or verbalizes principles which are to guide the actions of himself, the school staff, pupils, or community members having participatory relationship with the school.

3. Permits use of school facilities by community members and other educators.

4. Affirms and follows policies, procedures, and instructions from the board of education.

5. Interprets or explains existing policies to staff and community members.

6. Deviates from established policies or procedures because of compelling circumstances.
7. Sets, or reminds personnel of, deadlines in recurring situations such as periodic reports.

8. Seeks clarification of or suggests changes in established operational procedures.

9. Makes decisions in crises which involve a challenge to existing policies.

10. Proposes new ways or changes in meeting the requirements of a situation.

11. Agrees to cooperate with policies proposed or established by others and which affect the school program.

12. Enforces, emphasizes, or acts in accordance with existing modes of operation and policy.

13. Accepts gifts and contributions on behalf of the school from community sources.

Determining roles is deciding, designating, assigning, describing, resolving, modifying, or controlling the relationships which persons have to tasks or jobs.

An executive head is determining roles when he:

1. Defines, explains, or interprets a person's role to him, or gives him instructions, advice, or orders.

2. Suggests to, outlines to, or tells others what to do as an extension of or modification of their role. This includes giving permission to someone to do something suggested by that person as an extension of or modification of his role.
3. Explains or interprets a person's role to another person.
4. Explains or interprets his own role to another person.
5. Makes verbal and physical corrections of behavior.
6. Supervises another person's performance of his role or behavior.
7. Controls the behaviors of others through compliments, expressions of approval, warnings, manipulating social pressure, threats, man-handling, and other disciplinary action.
8. Behaves in an effort to secure a better conception of, and improvement in his own personal-professional role; attending professional meetings and conferences, and participating in in-service courses and training programs.
9. Acts in response to specific roles assigned to him or which he was invited to take; such as member of curriculum committee, panel discussion member, and service club officer.
10. Assigns himself a role or offers to do something. Accepts a role assigned to him by the board of education or county superintendent, or volunteers to do a job.
11. Performs duties for which others on the school have been employed, such as typing, duplicating, filing, mopping floors, dusting, giving tests or repairing.
12. Asks a person to do a job or perform some duty for the school.
13. Suggests employment or dismissal of specific people to the board of education.
14. Helps students determine their roles in the school program by helping them register for classes.
15. Asks for approval of his own role (past, present, or future) by those to whom he is responsible.

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

An executive head is coordinating administrative functions and structure when he:

1. Carries through, supports, or reinforces administrative actions begun by himself or someone else.
2. Settles competitive demands for time or facilities: scheduling, keeping a calendar of events, constructing and using an agenda, and making and keeping appointments.
3. Requisitions and allocates supplies and materials.
4. Arranges for the repair of facilities or equipment.
5. Plans events and activities.
6. Carries through plans by assembling or controlling the appropriate factors of people, time and facilities.
7. Makes reports as needed by the board of education, county superintendent, or governmental agency.

8. Arranges for the presence of persons at appointed places and times.

9. Rings a bell signalling the movement of people.

10. Inspects work being done by checking it against the contract under which it is being done.

11. Checks written or oral reports made to him.

12. Looks for an item which has been mislaid.

13. Keeps routine office records, writes checks from the school activity fund, accepts money given him for deposit or safe-keeping in the school office.

14. Gives persons entering the office items which are kept in the office when not in use.

15. Fills out or signs report blanks such as eligibility lists.

Appraising effectiveness is evaluating or analyzing the worth or status of an educational activity in terms of its effects or its relationship to its objectives; it is determining the effectiveness of persons, the roles they are performing, or are expected to perform; it is verifying the continuing existence of property and arrangements.

An executive head is appraising effectiveness when he:

1. Formulates judgments concerning aspects of the school program or the performance of roles by participants in school affairs.
2. Points out a specific lack or need in some part of the school program.

3. Expresses preference or non-preference for specific materials or procedures.

4. Assays or appraises the reasons for changes which have occurred in the school program or in the behavior of personnel.

5. Seeks other judgments concerning change and growth.

6. Appraises an idea or a suggestion made by someone.

7. Evaluates teaching materials and their use.

8. Engages in research procedures.

9. Analyzes test data.

10. Makes inspections of the school plant, facilities, and the general functioning of the school program.

11. Notes or recognizes change – either growth or regression.

12. Evaluates the competence and conduct of students.


14. Appraises the progress of work being done in connection with the school program; for example: a building under construction.

15. Appraises his own effectiveness and his own conduct in a situation.

16. Appraises situations pertaining to the welfare of the school program. This is a kind of "sizing up" a situation or condition. It might be referred to as a
"diagnosis" in which the executive head tries to ascertain what is right or wrong.

17. Makes judgments regarding persons, organizations, or programs outside the school program yet affecting the school program.

Working with community leadership to promote educational improvement is identifying and utilizing for educational ends any sources of power, influence, status, prestige, authority, and control, present in the community.¹

An executive head is working with community leadership when he:

1. Identifies or seeks to identify, existing power groups or persons.

2. Exerts leadership in, or gives support to the formulation of a new power structure.

3. Solicits support, financial and moral, for specific school purposes; as: purchases of new equipment, passage of tax levies, and contributions to a school fund.

4. Seeks specific services for the school-community from government agencies, civic groups, merchants' organizations for traffic control devices, playground facilities, and additional police and fire protection.

¹This area was termed using power and influence at an earlier stage of School-Community Development Study research.
5. Asks people to write senators and representatives about school legislation.
6. Asks lay leaders to help attain goals.
7. Accepts advice from groups or persons in the community.
8. Suggests projects for groups or persons wishing to aid the schools.

**Using the educational resources of the community** is utilizing persons, organizations, groups, facilities, objects, materials, or wealth in the school-community having an educational potential so as to provide more effective learning experiences for children. The concept includes strengthening both the instructional and service program through utilizing resources. Persons within the school organization used in a capacity other than their official assignment are considered resources. Thus a teacher may share a hobby with children in other classrooms who are studying related material.

The concept also includes the "larger community" rather than the geographical boundaries of the school district. Resources from state and nation may enter the school program.

An executive head is using the educational resources of the community when he:

1. Purchases or secures from the community supplies and equipment for educational purposes which are unavailable through regular channels.
2. Secures the loan of articles, materials, or lands for learning purposes.
3. Arranges for school personnel to visit places and to conduct interviews in the community.

4. Arranges for community members to share special skills, experiences, and hobbies with school personnel.

5. Provides for special professional skills not available within the school, such as medical, dental, psychiatric help.

6. Makes available to the school his personal educational resources, as pictures, films, objects, and hobbies.

7. Invites speakers to appear before groups connected with the school.

8. Recommends resources such as books and articles to teachers.

9. Provides for resource people to help the board of education.

10. Distributes brochures or pamphlets published in the interests of education in order to further the school program. National Education Association or Ohio Education Association materials are examples of this kind of literature.

11. Arranges for support of a learning experience for children by groups having a special interest in the subject of that learning experience.

Involving people is causing, seeking, or inviting those persons in the school-community who have a potential for strengthening the
educational program, to participate in, or become associated with school and community affairs. The concept of involvement denotes participation rather than just interest on the part of individuals who are the objects of this kind of behavior. The concept also includes efforts to discourage the participation of those persons whose motives are questionable or whose ability to participate is doubtful.

An executive head is involving people when he:

1. Is a member of or seeks membership in community organizations.

2. Solicits support for the school from large groups of people.

3. Forms or fosters organizations and committees whose task is to deliberate and advise on problems faced by the school.

4. Makes speeches or appears on programs in support of the school-community relationship.

5. Encourages and invites school personnel and/or community members to participate in school sponsored activities.

6. Collaborates with community leaders and agencies in jointly sponsored school-community activities.

7. Engages community members or patrons to perform unskilled and unpaid functions in the school enterprise. Such functions as: cafeteria workers, clinic aids, room mothers, and chaperones.

8. Recruits members for the teaching profession.

10. Invites and encourages community and school personnel to participate in making suggestions, plans, and decisions, and in evaluating and revising the school program.

11. Makes plans to involve people in school affairs.

12. Asks students to help in solving specific problems or making specific decisions.

13. Asks teachers or custodians what they would advise in a specific situation.

14. Asks co-workers to criticize and/or approve a plan he has formulated.

Communicating is the deliberate interchanging or transferring of thoughts, opinions, or information concerning the educational program through speech, writing, or signals.

An executive head is communicating when he:

1. Writes or drafts messages, memoranda, bulletins, brochures, and messages written as a reminder to himself in order that he not forget something.

2. Provides for the mechanical media for communication; such as: duplicating, dispatching messengers, delivering communications personally, using the telephone, and getting, sorting, and distributing the mail.

3. Makes announcements of fact in written or verbal form, including use of a school sound system.

4. Channels communications passing through the office, for example, relaying messages, and distributing directives.
5. Exchanges of information through discussion, conversation, answering questions, and sharing materials.

6. Seeks information by studying, questioning, or more formal means, such as using blanks, forms, or schedules.

7. Gives information through bulletins, announcements, memos, circulars, and messages.

8. Receives information from written materials and from persons.

9. Reviews and summarizes plans and procedures for other persons.

10. Verifies information by seeking authenticity, checking on reception, and editing.

11. Goes into a classroom or other place in search of a person.

These definitions were essential to the categorization of the data and to the findings produced by the data. Before presenting the findings of this study, it is necessary to review the literature of educational administration through its various stages to the emphasis on leadership and administrative behavior. A portion of the definitions presented pertain to the methodology used in the study. The latter will also be presented before the findings are considered.
CHAPTER III

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature of the field of education contains a great many words exhorting its readers to be democratic administrators. These books are valuable contributions to a fund of knowledge. They produce conviction and the will to act in accordance with the principles enunciated. In many cases these works display fine logic and cogent arguments. The "preaching" is very effective in creating beliefs and attitudes about what constitutes "good" educational administration. These works say much about administrative behavior but most statements are based only indirectly upon results of research. They stem from political or educational philosophies and contain their implications for action.

I. THE LITERATURE OF EXHORTATION

A few examples of this type of literature may be pertinent to this discussion. Frequently one finds leadership in school administration related to the value system of Democracy. Statements such as the following are found:

Democratic leadership seeks to develop people who will become increasingly better skilled in solving their problems.1

Statements made by these authors are likely to be somewhat nebulous in their meaning especially if the reader is looking for precise guides for behavior:

Leadership, if it is to be effective in enriching the lives of all who come in contact with the school system, must have a keen sense of the direction of the good, the true, the just, the beautiful, the right, and must be able to encourage the development of this sense of direction in others.2

The ideal conduct of educational administrators is described by Campbell3 and Yauch4 as being that which allows leadership to be diffused among all those persons in the situation. Campbell says that the . . . "titular head remains in the picture but his role is not that of dictating programs but evolving programs."5 Yauch says: "If teachers are better able to think through their own problems without too much help from the principal, proper leadership has been exercised."6

This seems to be a favorite theme followed by a large number of the writers in the field. Along this line of approach, one author

2Ibid., p. 528.


5Campbell, op. cit., p. 34.

6Yauch, op. cit., p. 52.
asked one hundred teachers this question: "If you could tell your boss how to be a better boss, what would you say to him?" From the answers to his question, the author concluded:

What these teachers want, apparently, is a superintendent who will take all the advice that is offered and then act on his own judgment . . . They want a superintendent who recognizes that teachers will be more loyal and more enthusiastic, will put forth more effort, and do a better job of teaching, if the superintendent will take the trouble to let them know that he respects their judgment, considers their interests, and wants their advice on all matters in which they and he have a common concern. 8

This is an example of the thinking found in the literature, namely, tying administrative behavior to the value system of our democracy. It is also an example of the informal kind of research used as a basis of making a point.

Miel follows through with a further delineation of educational administration in terms of democratic values when she contracts leadership by an elite with democratic administration. She rejects the former as a sterile concept and dubbs those who use it as "badadministrators." The latter she upholds and describes as taking its roots in the democratic theory which is that: "in the last analysis authority resides in the group, although it is delegated as occasion demands." 9

---

8 Ibid., p. 41
The writers who exhort generally list principles of good administration as guides to behavior. Such principles as these are enunciated:

1. Those who might be affected by the policy should share in the determination of its nature.\(^{10}\)

2. The faculty is a complex social group which requires expert handling.\(^{11}\)

3. Democracy is primarily concerned with human relations; therefore a most important consideration is the principal's dealings with teachers individually and collectively.\(^{12}\)

Admittedly, such principles have been conceived through a study of administrative behavior and have been set forth for the purpose of improving that behavior. There is a definite place in educational administration for the literature of exhortation. The values set forth yield a frame of reference with which to view educational administration. Much thinking has gone into this literature. It has had an impact upon the behavior of many administrators. Yet, it is true that the literature contains more refined and detailed research studies of the problem.

II. THE TASK APPROACH

Outlines followed by works in the field of educational administration show such topics as these being discussed: financial management of the school, public relations, organization of pupil personnel

\(^{10}\)Miller and Spalding, op. cit., p. 528.
\(^{11}\)Yauch, op. cit., p. 19.
\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 11.
services, organization of staff personnel, and building the school plant. These are topics of keen interest to administrators because they refer to his tasks or duties as an administrator. They are jobs that he must perform or oversee.

This approach to the study of educational administration must have been useful because of its widespread use by writers and teachers. Neither has it lost its usefulness in present day thinking about the construction of a theory of educational administration. A notable example of this is found in the report of the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. This report lists fifty-two critical tasks to be performed by the administrator. These tasks are part of a competency pattern described in the report. The critical tasks were listed under eight areas. The areas and sample critical tasks are as follows:

Instruction and Curriculum Development
- Providing for the Determination of Curriculum Objectives
- Relating the Desired Curriculum to Available Time, Physical Facilities, and Personnel

Pupil Personnel
- Initiating and Maintaining a System of Child Accounting and Attendance
- Providing Health Services

Community School Leadership
- Helping to Develop and Implement Plans for the Improvement of Community Life
- Determining and Rendering Services Which the School Can Best Provide in Community Improvement with and through the Cooperation of other Agencies

---

Staff Personnel
Providing for the Recruitment of Staff Personnel
Selecting and Assigning Staff Personnel

School Plant
Developing a Comprehensive Plan for the Orderly Growth and Improvement of School Plant Facilities
Developing an Efficient Program of Operation and Maintenance of the Physical Plant

School Transportation
Providing for the Safety of Pupils, Personnel, and Equipment
Developing an Understanding and Use of the Legal Provisions Under which the Transportation System Operates

Organization and Structure
Working with the Board of Education in the Formulation of Public School Policy and Plans
Designating Appropriate Operational Units With the School System

School Finance and Business Management
Administering School Purchasing
Formulating a Salary Schedule.

There is no doubt that the educational administrator has tasks to perform. It was once thought that these tasks were central to any study of educational administration. However, tasks do not tell the whole story, as evidenced by the way in which they have been used by researchers at the Southern States Center of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. Tasks are only part of the picture, the whole of which is a competency pattern. This new approach does not discredit the task approach. None of the new approaches do so. They serve to show other facets of the phenomenon of educational administration.

\[^{14}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 125-156.}\]
III. TRAIT ORIENTATION

For a time the theory of traits went hand in hand with the theory of tasks in adding up to success in administration. Leaders in any field of endeavor were thought to be those who possessed certain traits and that possession of combinations of these traits almost automatically meant that one would be a leader. Thus a person who possessed the proper set of traits and was familiar with and able to perform the tasks was sure to be a successful administrator.

The matter of leadership traits has been thoroughly researched by social scientists. In 1948, Stogdill surveyed the research in this area. He found studies relating to many traits. Among these were: physical and constitutional factors as height, weight, appearance, physique and appearance; intelligence; self-confidence; sociability; ambition; dominance; and surgency. As a result of these studies, it was concluded that:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of his possession of any one particular pattern of personality traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics, activities, and goals of the group of which he is the leader.

It was further stated that the studies had failed to produce any consistent pattern of traits which characterize leaders. These findings do not mean that traits have nothing to do with leadership.


\[16\] Ibid., p. 889.
In fact there was "abundant evidence that members' personalities do make a difference to group performance and there is every reason to believe that they do affect that aspect of the group's behavior to which the leadership concept applies."17 Along the same line, Gordon states:

Conceivably, the situationists may be overlooking the possibility that at least some traits predispose their possessors to positions of leadership, or at least increase the chances of their becoming leaders in most situations.18

All these data seem to add up to a rejection of the notion that all leaders possess a magic trait pattern which has been the sole ingredient of their leadership. Few are willing to discard the notion that traits do play a part in the leadership complex even though it might be dependent upon other components in the situation as well as in the leader himself.

If one were to place sole dependency in the trait pattern approach, his research would be that of devising instruments to identify the pattern in individuals or in seeking the means of developing certain traits in individuals. Those who have studied the matter of preparation for leadership know that there is far more to it than that.

The problems which appear to Stogdill as needing investigation are those "relating to factors which condition social participation, insight into situations, mood control, responsibility, and transferability of leadership from one situation to another."19 Stogdill has

17Ibid., p. 889.


also stated that leadership "appears to be a working relationship among members of a group in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion."²⁰

The emphasis upon the leader in relation to the group is important. After all, along with leaders there are followers. Many groups impinge upon the work of the educational administrator. It seems appropriate, therefore, to glance briefly at what the literature has to say in this area.

IV. GROUPS AND GROUP LEADERSHIP

Much has been written about leadership from the point of view of the group. The term "leader" assumes that there be a group; else whom is the leader to lead? Just what the role of that leader in the group is, has been a point of considerable discussion and research.

Views regarding groups and group leadership range between two extremes. On the one end of the continuum there are those who hold to the concept that leadership passes among members of a group and resides with the various members at different times. The concept, in its most extreme form, precludes all status leader position in the group. One phase of this type of concept of leadership is explained by Gordon when he describes the interactionist approach:

A potential "leader" of a group somehow must perceive what it is the group wants, he must contribute something that will move the group closer to that goal and finally his contribution must be "accepted" before he can be said to have

²⁰Ibid., p. 66.
patterned the group behavior. Thus a leader also must be led, in that he is influenced by the behavior of the group members to the extent that group’s norms, problems, and goals actually determine the kind of contribution that will pattern the group’s behavior. In this sense, leadership is truly a process of interaction.21

Any person who follows this pattern becomes the leader of the group at least for the moment. Leadership emerges from the group and is shared by its members. Each is led by the others.

The other end of the continuum is one which sees one person or small group of persons leading the group constantly. This concept has to do with leadership being thought of as a "right" or privilege to be exercised only by those born into the favored class or caste. Little emphasis will be placed upon this concept, as it has fallen into disrepute in the democratic nations of the world.

The greatest discussion and research in the matter of groups and group leadership takes place somewhere about the middle of the continuum. There are comparatively few advocates of the concepts found at either end. Perhaps a definition of the group is essential to the understanding of the matter. A functional group has been defined as "two or more organisms interacting in the pursuit of a common goal in such a way that the existence of many is utilized for the satisfaction of some needs of each."22

Leadership has been defined in terms of the leader’s effect upon the group. Gouldner defines a leader as being:

21Gordon, op. cit., p. 51.
22Cibb, op. cit., p. 879.
any individual whose behavior stimulates patterning
of the behavior in some group. By emitting some stimuli, he
facilitates group action toward a goal or goals, whether the
stimuli are verbal, written or gestural.23  

This definition of leadership differs from the interactionist
approach in that nothing is said about the leader's being influenced
in his behavior by the group. One might add, however, that inherent
in the definition is some interplay between the leader and the
group. Homans further describes the relationship between the leader
and the group. He states that "the leader brings his group from one
social state to another through giving orders that govern, in greater
or less degree, the behavior of the members; at least giving orders is
a part of what he does."24  

According to Homans, the leader has authority when his orders are
obeyed. He states that authority is gained not only by democratic
methods:

... The fact is that leadership in a group may be at
one time abrupt, forceful, centralized, with all communica-
tions originating with the leader, and at another time slow,
relaxed, dispersed, with much communication back and forth
between leaders and followers. Each mode is acceptable,
appropriate, and authoritative, but each in different
circumstances.25  

These statements may sound as though Homans represents the
dictatorship end of the continuum. The concept he presents is not one


24George C. Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace

25Ibid., p. 419.
The concept does have a place for the leader's gaining authority through the consent of the followers. The leader must maintain a "moving equilibrium," which is described as being, . . . "such that disobedience to the orders of the leader will be followed by changes in other elements tending to bring the system back to the state the leader would have wished it to reach if the disobedience had not taken place."26 Maintaining this state depends largely upon leading with the consent of the followers.

A leader must have the ability to analyze a social situation. This ability is far superior to any set of rules for human behavior. Prefacing his list of characteristics of leadership, Homans states that there are no rules for human behavior that apply in every situation without limit or change. The list is revealing in that it sums up his concept of leadership.

1. The leader will maintain his own position.

2. The leader will live up to the norms of his group.

3. The leader will lead.

4. The leader will not give orders that will not be obeyed.

5. In giving orders, the leader will use established channels.

6. The leader will not thrust himself upon his followers in social occasions.

7. The leader will neither blame, nor, in general, praise a member of his group before other members.

26Ibid., p. 422.
8. The leader will take into consideration the whole situation.

9. In maintaining discipline, the leader will be less concerned with inflicting punishment than with creating the conditions in which the group will discipline itself.

10. The leader will listen.

11. The leader will know himself.27

This list needs an expanding and explaining which it is not possible to give here. The concept of leadership represented by Homans has been given as an example of what the literature has to say about groups and those who lead them.

V. THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

Leadership has also been viewed from the standpoint of functions or forms of activity. Students of administration in business and industry as well as in education have attempted to classify and describe the activities of their executives. Barnard in business and Sears in educational administration are representative of this kind of thinking.

Barnard lists three executive functions. These are: to promote the system of communication, to promote the securing of essential efforts and third, to formulate and define purpose.28

27Ibid., pp. 424-440.

The first function involves a scheme of organization and executive personnel. The processes by which the function is accomplished are chiefly the selection of men and the offering of incentives; the techniques of control permitting effectiveness in promoting, demoting, and dismissing men; and the securing of an informal organization in which the essential property is compatibility of personnel.29

The second function includes bringing persons into cooperative relationship with the organization and the eliciting of the services after such persons have been brought into that relationship.30

The third function cannot be accomplished by any single executive alone. With the others in the executive organization, he formulates, re-defines, breaks into details, and decides in the innumerable, simultaneous, and progressive actions that are the stream of synthesis constituting purpose or action.31

Sears has noted five clearly definable forms of activity. These are: planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling.32

Planning means the determination of values, the setting of goals in relation to values, and the determination of means for reaching the goals. Organizing is carrying through the plan which is

---

29 Ibid., pp. 226-227.
30 Ibid., p. 227.
31 Ibid., p. 231
the means of reaching the goals. Directing is the application of a degree of authority in getting things done. The status leader sees to it that certain jobs are performed in a specific manner by a specific individual or individuals. Coordinating is the process of getting the various parts of the operation working together. Controlling means grasping the entire situation and setting its direction. Control of the group effort is indicated when there is movement toward the goal.

The concept of administrative process is a useful one in terms of thinking of a job to be done. It enables the administrator to study his purposes and actions, and as a consequence, improve the effectiveness of his administration.

As one looks over these elements of the administrative process, he is immediately impressed by the fact that they are verbs. They are action words. Action means that there is behavior. To arrive at the classification behavior must have been the starting point of much of the recent research on the matter of leadership. The review of this research will be considered next.

VI. LEADER BEHAVIOR

There has been a general shift from the task or function approach in the study of leadership to the behavioral approach. Recently the leader has been defined as one who engages in leadership behaviors. Hemphill and Carter have done extensive research in this area and in 1952 put forth this definition:
To lead is to engage in an act which initiates a structure in the interaction of others as a part of the process of solving a mutual problem.33

Leaders, then, are to be identified by the relative frequency with which they engage in such acts. Shartle stated that leader behavior could be described reliably and in such terms that behavior differences could be shown in quantitative terms.34

Shartle takes note of the fact that higher-level occupations, and particularly those with so-called administrative duties, have not been investigated by researchers to any great extent.35 These occupations require greater research ingenuity and longer research study in order to discover facts which may be useful. Researchers from economics, psychology, and sociology have been involved in studying leader behavior. A great deal of this work has been done through the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University.

Shartle and Stogdill, of the Personnel Research Board, started their investigations with this assumption:

Persons who occupy positions which are commonly presumed to demand leadership ability are proper and likely subjects for the study of leadership.36

---

33Gibb, op. cit., p. 881.

34Carroll L. Shartle, "Leadership Aspects of Administrative Behavior" (Presidential Address, Division of Business and Industrial Psychology, American Psychological Association, September, 1950), p. 23 (mimeographed).


36Gibb, op. cit., p. 881.
This assumption, that status leaders are to be the subjects for the study of leadership, has been criticized. Gibb suggests other ways for the determination of subjects for the study of leadership. Those persons who are the focus for behavior of group members, those who exercise influence over others, or those who are identified by sociometric choice might be better subjects than status leaders. And yet, the assumption is a very convenient one and a logical starting point for an investigation of groups having a high degree of organization.

The same problem applies to the study of leadership in educational administration. What better subject or focus of attention than the administrator himself? It would seem that one cannot avoid consideration of the status leader in any study of leadership. Administrators are status leaders, and in order to study educational administration one must accept the assumption stated by Shartle and Stogdill.

The researchers of the Personnel Research Board became interested in what the status leader did and with whom he worked. It was found that the various activities performed could be classified into categories. These classifications became nine dimensions of leader behavior. Since these dimensions had not been researched intensively, they were termed a priori.

37Ibid., p. 881.
38Shartle, op. cit., p. 11.
Considerable work was done in the construction of scales which would test the dimensions. Hemphill and Coons constructed the original form of the scales termed as the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Halpin and Winer reported the development of an Air Force adaptation of this instrument. Their use of the instrument condensed the nine dimensions to four. These were: consideration, the extent to which the leader is considerate of the men who are his followers; initiating structure, the extent to which the leader organizes and defines the relation between himself and his fellow members or subordinates; production emphasis, the extent to which he stresses getting the job done; and sensitivity, being a socially acceptable individual.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, referred to as the LBDQ, is an instrument which gets at the leader behavior of an individual as seen by those "above" and "below" his rank. In addition, another form of the LBDQ gives the leader an opportunity to describe his own leadership ideology.

As further testing with the LBDQ was done, two dimensions emerged as being fundamental. These were consideration and initiating structure. These dimensions are close to a statement made some years ago by Cartwright and Zander, to whom it appeared that all group

---

39 Gibb, op. cit., p. 892.
40 Ibid., p. 892.
objectives could be subsumed under two headings: (1) the achievement of some specific group goal; and (2) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself.\textsuperscript{41}

The two dimensions were tested in a series of studies with aircraft commanders and their crews. One of the initial findings of these studies was that superiors and subordinates were inclined to evaluate oppositely the contribution of the leader behavior dimension to the "effectiveness" of leadership. Superiors valued initiating structure, while subordinates valued consideration.\textsuperscript{42} It was determined that the "successful" leader is the man who furthers both group maintenance and group achievement.\textsuperscript{43}

Christner and Hemphill, making a similar study, concluded that:

\textit{... the members of crews whose commanders scored high on both consideration and initiating structure tended to develop more favorable crew attitudes than members of crews led by commanders who scored low on both leader behavior dimensions.}\textsuperscript{44}

Another interesting finding was taken from a study of the leadership ideology of aircraft commanders. Halpin, who made the study,


\textsuperscript{42}Andrew W. Halpin, \textit{The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents} (Columbus, Ohio: School-Community Development Study, C.P.E.A. in Ohio, The Ohio State University, 1956), p. 24.

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., p. 24.

states that the commanders clearly recognized the desirability of scoring high on both dimensions of leader behavior, but the relationship between the commanders' statement of how they should behave and their behavior as described by their crews was negligible.\textsuperscript{45}

Hemphill, in using the LBDQ on a university campus, found that the greater the departure of the actual behavior of the department head on either dimension from the norm of what members of his department conceived as ideal behavior in this dimension the poorer was the administrative reputation of the department. Departments with good reputations were those whose leaders scored high on both dimensions.\textsuperscript{46}

Halpin used the instrument to compare aircraft commanders and school superintendents. His findings indicate that aircraft commanders tend to initiate more structure and show less consideration for members of their groups. The leaders in the two groups who are "not effective" differ in their shortcomings. The commanders tend to show less consideration than is desirable, whereas superintendents tend to be remiss in not initiating sufficient structure.\textsuperscript{47}

Halpin also used the instrument to determine the relationship between the superintendent's own perception of how he behaves on the


\textsuperscript{46}Halpin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 21.

initiating structure and consideration dimension, the board's perception and the staff's perception; and the corresponding relationship between his, the board's and the staff's belief of how he should behave as a leader.48

He found that the leadership ideology of the board and staff members and of the superintendents themselves is the same. "Effective" or "desirable" leadership behavior is characterized by high scores on both initiating structure and consideration.49

Regarding the quality of the behavior exhibited by superintendents Halpin stated:

It is heartening to find that approximately one-fifth of the superintendents in the present sample approach the "ideal" in the eyes of both their boards and staffs, and only four per cent of these superintendents are categorized, both by their boards and staffs, as "ineffective" leaders.50

Halpin further described his findings as indicating that far too many superintendents allow their principal responsibilities to become obscured by a mass of details and trivia, with the result that they abdicate their leadership roles and allow themselves to devolve into mere functionaries.51 In connection with this observation, Halpin expressed a lack which researchers in educational administration feel

---


49 Ibid., p. 79.

50 Ibid., p. 79.

51 Ibid., p. 81.
keenly. There is considerable need for dependable, objective criteria of "effective" school administration. Work has been done along these lines. Garland searched the literature to develop nine success criteria. These criteria were spelled out in behavioral terms and field observations were made in order to see whether the administrative behaviors which comprise the success criteria could be found at the field action level.

The success criteria developed by Garland are as follows:

1. Educational administration employs a creative approach to matters of educational concern.

2. Educational administration promotes and secures the professional growth of people connected with and related to the educational enterprise.

3. Educational administration manifests high ability in the assessment of values, purposes, needs and in their translation into realistic educational goals.

4. Educational administration exhibits skill in appraising the manner in which existing situational factors will affect the attainment of goals.

5. Educational administration establishes and maintains an appropriate climate which enables effective contributions by those involved.

6. Educational administration initiates and maintains procedures and structure which enable broader participation in the administrative process.

7. Educational administration secures an effective utilization of all available resources.

---

52 Ibid., p. 82.

8. Educational administration envisions the totality of administration and integrates its component elements to secure established objectives.

9. Educational administration provides for systematic review of all phases of the educational venture and effects desirable reconstruction.\(^5\)

After delineating the criteria in behavioral terms, he observed a number of administrators at work. Those administrators selected had been ranked by a jury. The administrators represented three kinds of positions; the executive head, the elementary principal, and the city superintendent. Garland found that leadership in educational administration can be viewed in terms of administrative behaviors.\(^5\)

Other investigations into the problem of what kind of behavior makes for effective administration were those of Medsker and Buffington.\(^5\) As the basis of these studies the investigators used the critical incident technique developed by Flanagan.\(^5\) This technique is described thus:

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 211-213.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 213.

\(^5\)Teachers and Parents Describe the Effective Principal's Behavior," Administrator's Notebook, University of Chicago, Vol. IV, No. 1 (September, 1955)

By an incident is meant any type of observable type of
human activity which is sufficiently complete in itself to
permit influences and predictions to be made about the person
performing this act. To be critical, the incident must be
performed in a situation where the purpose or intent of the
act seems fairly sufficiently definite so there is little
doubt concerning its effects. 58

The investigators asked parents and teachers what the elementary
principal did when he behaved in an effective manner, and when he
behaved in an ineffective manner. Medsker found that teachers thought
the principal was behaving in an effective manner when he provided
leadership for teachers, worked with and for children, maintained
constructive relationships with the community, provided for the
effective administration of the school program, and worked effectively
with individual parents.

Buffington found that parents thought the principal was behaving
in an effective manner when he developed effective relationships with
parents' groups and the community, worked with and took care of
children, and knew parents and gave them assistance.

Both investigators noted that the emphasis for both groups was
upon personal relationships. They also noted that neither group cited
critical incidents having to do with supervising and improving
curriculum or instruction. 59

Another study used the reactions of teachers to administrator
behavior as a means of gathering data on what kind of behavior is

58 Administrator's Notebook, loc. cit.
59 Ibid.
effective. Jenkins and Blackman report studying two kinds of behavior; planning and problem solving behavior and behavior with the faculty.\(^{60}\) In regard to the first kind, they report that teachers tended to give higher ratings on items dealing with curriculum study and morale to principals who were judged to be administrative-centered in their approach to planning than to those who were more interested in fostering good relations. When routine administrative practices were considered the teachers gave higher ratings to the principals who were "human relations building" in their approach.\(^{61}\)

Some of the results of the study of behavior with the faculty were:

The principals who were rated as giving some attention to the tasks at hand while putting greater emphasis on teacher growth had teachers who showed somewhat higher morale and more satisfaction with the curriculum work than did those principals rated as giving attention primarily to teacher growth. Principals rated as giving attention primarily to the tasks at hand ranked as least effective.

On the whole, there was the lowest morale (except for sense of contribution) in schools where communication was low and the principal was not participating in the curriculum activities.\(^{62}\)

\(^{60}\)David H. Jenkins and Charles A. Blackman, Antecedents and Effects of Administrator Behavior (Columbus, Ohio: School-Community Development Study, C.P.E.A. in Ohio, The Ohio State University, 1956), p. 10.

\(^{61}\)Ibid., p. 75.

\(^{62}\)Ibid., pp. 75-76.
Another finding, which is similar to what Halpin found on this point, was that there are almost no significant relationships between verbalization of democratic attitudes and the effectiveness of the administrators. These persons who express democratic attitudes are not always the effective administrators.

VII. THE CASE STUDY APPROACH

The emphasis on administrative behavior is manifested in many ways. One of the best known manifestations is that of the case study approach. Two recent books have presented the approach and recommend its use in the pre-service and in-service preparation of administrators. Anderson and Davies have compiled a series of case studies covering the broad gamut of the administrator's extensive daily contacts. The cases are followed by questions for discussion and each chapter presents a follow-up text that focuses attention on basic techniques and principles of democratic administration. Instead of the principles providing the starting point, behavior is looked at first.

Sargent and Belisle have used the case approach also, and have gone into greater detail in explaining the reasons for its use. They state that the aim of the method is "to develop behavior, not merely knowledge." "It is all too plain," they state, "that knowing about

---

63Ibid., p. 76.


the kind of leader behavior that is conducive to group productivity,
in the light of social science knowledge, is something different from
behaving in terms of such knowledge.\textsuperscript{66}

In further explaining the reasons for advocating use of the case
method, Sargent and Belisle state:

In general, the case method has arisen in response to the
feeling that the organization of knowledge, of training, and
even of function in administration has previously reflected
too greatly an emphasis on learning abstractions and
generalizations about aspects of administration. These have
all too frequently lacked the qualities associated with
rigorous development of knowledge. At the same time, consider­
atation of these generalizations has been largely divorced from
the specific human contexts in which the data underlying them
alone occur.\textsuperscript{67}

For these reasons, these men hold the view that the training for
administration must concern itself centrally with the development and
test of behavior.\textsuperscript{68}

Concern with better methods of preparing educational adminis­
trators has lead the Southern States C.F.E.A. Center personnel to take
a close look at the matter of administrative behavior. This staff
worked on the problem of obtaining a description of competency. The
tried traits or dominant characteristics, a job success formula, the
job analysis approach, and the critical incidents technique. The
last was found to have promise.

\textsuperscript{66}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{67}Ibid., p. 35.
\textsuperscript{68}Ibid., p. 62.
The result of individual thought and group work among members of this staff was "that competency in educational administration results when an individual exhibits behavior that enables him to perform a particular administrative task in the most desirable manner."

VIII. BEHAVIOR AND EVALUATION

The interest in behavior in the field of education is not limited to educational administration. Briefly, consideration of two instances will serve to illustrate this point. Shane and McSwain in their description of methods of evaluation of the elementary school curriculum, give the steps in making an evaluation. Note particularly steps four through seven in this listing:

1. Isolation and description of the problem(s) to be studied.

2. Clarification of values bearing on the problem(s).

3. Development of criteria for study of the problem(s).

4. Expression of the criteria in terms of the behavior sought in children.

5. Establishment of situations in which children's behavior can be studied as the school seeks to modify it to conform with the desired citizenship outcomes.

6. Employment of instruments to gather behavioral data to be studied in order to decide whether or not children's behavior is becoming changed significantly.

---

69 Pierce and Merrill, et al., op. cit., p. 46.
7. Analysis of behavioral changes, if significant, to determine whether or not these changes are comparable with the values sought by the school.

8. Implementation of decisions reached in view of the findings made by the staff.70

Behavior, then is the base from which one must move in a program of evaluation. The American Council on Education makes the same point in its attempt to help teachers understand children. It is the thesis of this group that "... teachers have not been trained to evaluate behavior scientifically ..." and that they have "... the habit of dealing with children on the level of subjective judgment and personal bias ..."71 A large part of the book was given over to explaining the scientific method of reporting behavior. It was the attempt of the authors to build skill in observation and recording actual behavior rather than recording behavior with emotionally charged words.72

IX. RESEARCH IMMEDIATELY PERTAINING TO THE PRESENT STUDY

The immediate background of the present study has its roots in the behavioral approach to a problem. The problem has to do with the study of educational administration with a view toward its


72Ibid.
improvement. The School-Community Development Study, sponsored by a grant of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and The Ohio State University, has been concerned with researching this problem. It is not possible here to describe fully the research design of the School-Community Development Study, but a brief sketch will indicate how the present study ties in with the larger scheme of research.

The central problem of the School-Community Development Study was to

... identify the factors in the total administrative situation which alter, modify, or in any way affect administrative behavior; to study the nature of these effects with a view toward improving administrative behavior through the objective use of the knowledge.73

After a survey of the existing literature, the first step in the research approach was the selection of school-community situations in which administrative behavior could be observed first hand. In these situations, observers recorded what was seen, heard, and felt.74 A body of facts and opinions about related elements in educational administration was built up. These data, called contact reports, were gathered over a period exceeding two years. This was followed by the process of analyzing the reports. Out of the analysis came two significant kinds of information. The first was a set of observable administrative behaviors that are of critical importance in the

73 Ramseyer, et al., op. cit., p. 7.
74 Ibid., p. 10.
improvement of the educational program in the situations observed. These were referred to as critical areas of administrative behavior. The second contribution of the analysis was the identification of factors which are presumed to affect the quality of administrative behavior in the critical areas.\textsuperscript{75}

The critical areas of administrative behavior were the first result of the content analysis of field notes. These areas represent a system for classifying the observations made. The reason for the attempt to make this classification is given by Harris:

In order to study the phenomenon of educational administration, it is necessary to develop acceptable descriptive terminology for scientists who wish to work in the field. An essential task is to develop a series of labels which adequately describe administrative behavior. The next logical step is the identification of the conditions under which this behavior occurs or the conditions which affect this behavior. An appropriate set of labels is required for this purpose also.\textsuperscript{76}

The staff of the School-Community Development Study has made it clear that these areas may not be complete, that they may not be discrete, and that their utility requires further testing through repeated observations of educational administration in a variety of school-community situations.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{75}Ibid., p. 14.

\textsuperscript{76}Lewis E. Harris, "A Theoretical Framework for the Study of Administrative Behavior," The Graduate School Record-The Ohio State University, IX, No. 6 (October, 1955), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{77}Ramseyer, et al., op. cit., p. 20.
It is the purpose of the present study to test this scheme of organizing and describing administrative behavior. Three other studies have been designed similarly to do the same job at various levels of administration. These levels are the elementary principalship, the secondary principalship, and the city superintendency.

---


80 John E. Hartzler, "Critical Areas of Administrative Behavior of City School Superintendents" (Dissertation in preparation, The Ohio State University).
CHAPTER IV

THE METHODOLOGY OF GATHERING AND PROCESSING THE DATA

A complete description of the methods used in this study is necessary to understand the data gathered and the conclusions reached. As previously mentioned, this study has been carried on at one of several levels of educational administration. This particular level is one which may be found in Ohio under the label "executive head." The label is peculiar to Ohio, but the level of administration is not. An explanation of the meaning of the title "executive head" will show that the job performed by a person holding that title is common to many areas.

I. THE POSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE HEAD

The word "executive head" comes from Ohio Law and refers to the administrator of a local school district. A local district is one which ordinarily has no population center of over 3000 persons or a total school district population of less than 3000 persons. This is not always the case, however, as some districts have chosen to remain as local districts even though they legally qualified for a different designation. Section 3311.03 of the Ohio Revised Code states that
each school district, other than a city school district, exempted village school, county school district, joint high school district, or joint vocational school district, shall be known as a local school district.

Local school districts are under the general supervision of the county board of education and county superintendent. The law provides the framework for a portion of the supervision, but a large share depends upon the traditions in the county and the desires and abilities of the county superintendent. In each local school district, there is a board of education with whom the executive head works. This board is given rather wide powers in controlling the affairs of the local district.

Executive heads are a combination principal and superintendent. Legally he is not the superintendent, yet he meets with a board of education and performs many of the same duties he would if he were not under the supervision of a county superintendent. On the other hand he performs duties generally considered to be the province of a principal especially if the school is one of small enrollment. The dual nature of the executive head's job will be seen in the descriptive analysis of the data gathered in this study.

II. SELECTION OF THE COUNTIES

The first job in carrying out the gathering of data was the selection of counties from which to get a list of executive heads who might serve as subjects of observation. Several items were taken into
consideration in the choice of counties. These items can be set down in the form of a list of criteria:

1. Counties with a large number of urban centers as well as counties with a large number of rural areas.

2. Counties in which school district reorganization has recently taken place as well as counties in which it has not.

3. Counties in which county superintendents have worked with executive heads in study group situations as well as counties in which this has not occurred.

4. Counties made up of a large number of local school districts as well as those made up of a few local districts.

5. Counties in which a large number of districts were among the wealthier of the state as well as counties containing poorer districts.

Seven counties were selected on the basis of the criteria. These were seen to be representative of the various types of situations in which the local districts of a county might find themselves. No attempt was made to find seven counties representative of the State of Ohio because of the large number of criteria upon which representativeness might conceivably be based.

The researcher visited the county superintendent in each of these counties. The project was explained and a request made for approval to observe certain executive heads, as yet undetermined, in the county.
All superintendents were responsive to the research plan and readily granted permission, conditioned, of course, on the approval of the executive head to be observed.

III. SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

During the interview with the county superintendent certain information was obtained concerning the executive heads in his county. This information was applied against criteria set up for selection of a list of executive heads from which the sample would be chosen. These criteria were:

1. The executive head has full time administrative responsibility except for a maximum of teaching two class periods per day.
2. The executive head has no full time principal to aid in carrying out administrative duties.
3. The executive head is in charge of a district in which there are grades one through twelve or in which there are definite plans for provision of educational opportunities at all these grade levels.

In the seven counties there was a total of seventy-five executive heads. Applying these criteria to the men lowered the list to fifty.

The fifty men were not selected in terms of any factors of training or experience, but upon factors pertaining to the counties and local districts in which they found themselves. The names of these men were placed upon a ballot which was sent to a group of selected jurors.
IV. THE NATURE OF THE GROUP OF JURORS

Before describing the judging procedure, it is appropriate to describe the nature of the group of jurors. Each juror was guaranteed anonymity, and his ballot was seen only by members of the research team consisting of the four men doing research studies at the various administrative levels. This guarantee seemed necessary to the obtaining of honest judgments.

The group of jurors consisted of:

1. The county superintendent in each of the seven counties
2. City or exempted village superintendents in the seven counties
3. Supervisors employed by the Ohio State Department of Education who had inspected schools in any of the seven counties
4. Representatives of the Ohio Education Association who were professionally acquainted with executive heads in the seven counties
5. Representatives of the Ohio High School Principal's Association who were professionally acquainted with executive heads in the seven counties
6. Representatives of Ohio institutions of higher learning who had had opportunity to be professionally acquainted with executive heads in the seven counties
7. Representatives of the School-Community Development Study who had become professionally acquainted with men in the seven counties
8. Professors of educational administration who had participated in the preparation of executive heads in the seven counties.

Thirty-four jurors representing the above classifications were asked to respond to the ballot. No one juror was expected to be able to rate all fifty executive heads. However, the ratings of all jurors were expected to produce a pattern which could be used in carrying out the design of the study.

V. A DESCRIPTION OF THE BALLOT

The ballot sent to each of the jurors contained these instructions:

1. Column A contains the names of certain executive heads in Ohio local school districts. The school name and county further identify the executive heads.

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

3. Column C contains categories by which the executive heads may be described. The quality being described is "over-all administrative effectiveness." Place a check mark in the sub-column (of Column C) which best describes each executive head checked in Column B.
A cover letter to the juror explained that field studies now being developed as a part of the research program of the School-Community Development Study required the use of the composite judgment of a panel of educators. The letter also informed the jurors that the focus of attention of the study was upon administrative behavior and not upon the administrator as a person.

No criteria were given the jurors. Each was able to make his own definition of the term "over-all administrative effectiveness" and use it in making his judgments. The most prominent of the reasons for allowing each juror to define the term, was the high probability that the use of criteria would bias the judgment in favor of or against the critical areas. If there was any possibility that administrative behavior could be described within the rationale of the critical areas, any statement of criteria would include statements alluding to the areas.

Each person has his own definition of effectiveness, and for some of the jurors a list of criteria may have had little or no effect upon the outcome of the judging. For these jurors there would have been little use in presenting the list.

Neither research nor practice has produced a complete and exhaustive list of criteria by which to judge administrative effectiveness. Any list presented, therefore, must necessarily be incomplete. Presentation of the most complete list possible would have burdened the juror with a great deal of study before making the judgment and might have caused him to say, "Mr. Black is a most effective administrator if judged by Criterion A, but if judged by Criterion L, he is not."
After looking at the considerations on both sides of the issue, it was decided to leave the decisions regarding over-all administrative effectiveness in the hands of the juror. If the judgments of the jurors showed a clear pattern, the criteria used by the jurors in defining the term could be viewed as being similar.

VI. RESULTS OF THE BALLOTING

Jurors were asked to rate those men whom they were able to judge by placing them in quarters. Each juror was asked to place one-fourth of the executive heads whom he was judging at each of the quarters. Thus composite results would show one-fourth of the checks in each of four columns. Those who received the largest number of checks in Column C-1 were the executive heads judged to be least effective and those receiving the largest number of checks in Column C-4 were judged most effective.

This would make it possible to select executive heads from each end of the "effectiveness continuum." Five were selected by the research team from each end in order that the two groups be as "far apart" as possible.

Table I shows the distribution of judgments resulting from the balloting. Quarter 1 indicates a judgment of least effective while quarter 4 indicates a judgment of most effective.

It is evident that jurors did not follow directions, in that total judgments were not equal in the four quarters. As a consequence, it was not possible to choose five executive heads in either the first
### TABLE I

**DISTRIBUTION OF JUDGMENTS OF EXECUTIVE HEADS RESULTING FROM THE BALLOTING OF JURORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Head Code Number</th>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Head Code Number</th>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 49 68 116 85
or fourth quarters who had received judgments totally in agreement. It was necessary to choose the two groups by moving into the second and third quarters.

Those executive heads who seemed to be possible choices for the sample of ten were given index numbers determined by multiplying the number of judgments in each quarter by the quarter number, adding the products and dividing by the total number of judgments. The index is actually an average quarter rating. Table II indicates the ratings and indices of the ten executive heads in the sample selected.

The number of possible jurors having been exhausted, it was not possible to produce more conclusive results in the judgments. With the relatively small number of jurors it was not possible to show that the addition of more jurors would not have altered the results of the balloting. However, two groups of five executive heads were chosen as the sample. And, as previously explained, the groups were chosen to represent both ends of the continuum created by the results of the balloting.

Executive heads do not seem to be as widely known as superintendents of city and exempted village schools. It was not possible to find jurors who were able to judge all persons on the ballot. In spite of this fact, judgments did fall into a pattern usable in the research design.

The reluctance of the jurors to place men in the first quarter is understandable. The ballot did ask the juror to make a forced choice in order that the two groups would be as far apart as possible.
### TABLE II

QUARTER RATINGS OF THE SAMPLE SELECTED AS A RESULT OF THE BALLOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Head Code Number</th>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Administrators judged to be less effective appear above the dotted line in ascending order of their judged effectiveness. Administrators judged to be more effective appear below the dotted line in descending order of their judged effectiveness.*
In all probability some jurors said to themselves, "This man isn't the least effective administrator I ever knew or could imagine, therefore I can't put him in the first quarter." An attempt had been made to inform jurors that the ratings were to be relative. That is, the men were to be ranked in terms of their relationship, in the judgment of the juror, to the other men being rated. The number of men on the ballot could not possibly include the most effective and least effective administrator each juror ever knew or could imagine.

Since jurors did not fully comply with the forced choice, it was necessary to force the choice for them by reaching into the second and third quarters to obtain the sample.

The observer did not see the results of the balloting prior to the time the observations were carried out. Other members of the research team selected the sample and the names were given to the observer in alphabetical order. This was done to avoid any possible prejudice on the part of the observer in recording the data. Any differences found between the two groups would not be as likely to stem from bias in recording the data.

At the end of the observation period, the observer set down the membership of the two groups as he thought the jurors had determined it. The list of the observer and that of the judges coincided, lending strength to the indication that the jurors did differentiate between the two groups.
VII. THE METHOD OF OBSERVATION

The data gathered were behavioral incidents. As previously explained, the phenomenon being studied was administrative behavior. The method used was observation of behavior. This method of collection has had comparatively little use in research in education. It is time consuming and in some cases expensive to carry out. The questionnaire and interview schedule have been the more popular techniques.

Because the use of the method of observation is the foundation of this study, it is essential that it be discussed thoroughly. Heyns and Zander reported that within the last few years there has been a great increase in the use of observational methods in the study of social phenomena.¹ They state that these experiences have indicated that direct observation of social behavior can provide reliable and conceptually meaningful data in field studies as well as in laboratory experimentation.

Goode and Hatt point out that most of the knowledge which people have about social relations is derived from observation.² These researchers go on to say that science begins with observation and must ultimately return to observation for its final validation.³ In fact,

³Ibid., p. 119.
there seems to be general agreement among researchers as to the basic usefulness of the method in scientific research.

The Limitations of the Method

As with any other research method, observation has its advantages and its limitations. Its limitations are to be considered first. One of the initial questions regarding the method has to do with the effect of the observer upon the situation and upon the behavior of the person or persons being observed. Goode and Hatt state: "The observer always affects the resulting observations in some fashion, but it is usually found that after an initial period of restraint due to the presence of observers, or awareness of their presence, the participants act naturally."4 Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook refer to the same problem when they state:

To be sure, people under observation may, if they know they are being observed, deliberately try to create a particular impression; but, even so, it is probably more difficult for them to do things than to say things differently than usual.5

Yet, we must admit a degree of influence of the observer upon the observed. In the present study, the researcher consciously refrained from value judgments in order that his value-system would effect as little as possible, the behavior of the subject. However, it cannot be shown that the mere presence of the observer did not have its

---

4Ibid., pp. 127-128.

effect upon the behavior of the subject. Nor can the length and amount of this influence be measured for each subject. Skinner states the case and makes the clearest defense of the observational method on this point:

There are . . . ways in which the observer and the observed interact. Study distorts the thing studied. But there is no special problem here peculiar to human behavior. It is now accepted as a general principle in scientific method that it is necessary to interfere in some degree with any phenomenon in the act of observing or analyzing it, and he must certainly take this effect into account. But behavior may also be observed with a minimum of interaction between subject and scientist, and this is the case with which one naturally tries to begin.  

Another limitation of the observational method is its inability to reveal the thoughts of a person unless they are expressed in some kind of behavior. Shartle illustrates this difficulty:

An executive may smoke his pipe and look into space for a half hour. If one describes his activity as "pipe smoking," he may miss a description of the formulation of a plan for the purchase of a two million dollar building.  

However, thought which occurs at one point in time may be translated into behavior at another point in time. It is only as thought influences behavior that evidences of it can be determined. Instruments

---


7Carroll L. Shartle, "Leadership Aspects of Administrative Behavior" (Presidential Address, Division of Business and Industrial Psychology, American Psychological Association, September, 1950), p. 12 (mimeographed).
designed to determine the characteristics of the thought of a person may or may not get at what the person is thinking. No scientist has claimed that any research method gets at thought fully and completely without chance of error. This study was directed at administrative behavior, and of a necessity "mind reading" was left out of the picture. Those thoughts which did not influence behavior during the period of observing the subject did not appear in the data.

Another limitation of the observational method has to do with time. The spontaneous occurrence of an event can seldom be predicted so that one can be present to observe it. Furthermore, the possibility of applying observational techniques is limited by duration of events.\(^8\) This is involved in the problem of sampling. What important behaviors occurred while the subject was not being observed? Were the behaviors observed representative of the behaviors being exhibited by the subject? These questions cannot be unequivocally answered. The subjects were observed in a large variety of situations and the time of the day as well as the days of the week during which observations were made were varied purposely. Each subject was observed for as large an amount of time as was possible considering the limitations of travel and finances. Some important behaviors may have occurred while the subject was not being observed due to the fact that behavior goes on and on. There is reason to suspect that the behaviors observed during

\(^8\)Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 131.
the period of observation were representative of behaviors constantly occurring since the men had no reason to change their activities and it was evident to the observer that many of the activities were part of an on-going stream of events.

There is another side to the coin. Recording the spontaneous occurrence of an event may be difficult because of the observer's inability to predict its occurrence, yet perhaps the greatest asset of the observational method lies in the same area. All too many research techniques depend entirely upon retrospective or anticipatory reports on human behavior by the subjects of study. In such cases reports are usually made in a reflective mood, in which the respondent is somewhat detached from the stresses and strains which influence what he says or does in the ordinary course of events.9 The very fact that spontaneous occurrence is being observed gives the data a genuineness not found in these collected by other methods. One might not get all the data there are to get, but that which one gets is derived first hand from the occurrence.

Another difficulty of the observational method is found in this question: "What should be observed and recorded?" There are some simple answers to this question: "Everything" or "matters related to the purpose of the investigation," etc. The first is virtually impossible, and the second begs the question.10 A meaningful answer to

9 Ibid.
10 Ibid., p. 134.
the question is difficult to give. One cannot say that all behavior on
the part of the subject was observed and recorded during the period of
observation. A sneeze, a cough, small movements of fingers and hands,
blinking of the eyes, etc., did not become a part of the data. In this
study the question was answered in this way. The term administrative
behavior was defined and the types of behavior pertaining to it were
listed in Chapter II. "Pertinent" is the keyword in selection. Was
the behavior pertinent to what was defined as administrative behavior?
If it was, it became a part of the data. Thus it was a matter of the
judgment of the researcher as he applied the criteria of types of
behavior as to whether a given behavior was recorded.

The observer is a mediator between the actual occurrence and the
data.11 As mentioned, he may affect the behavior by his presence or by
interfering with it in some way, or, on the other hand, he may affect
the data by either his skill at observation or his recording procedures.
The latter is a limitation which influences all research methodology.
The data gathered reflect the skill of the researcher. This study
represented an attempt to observe scientifically the phenomenon of admin-
istrative behavior.

Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook state:

Scientific observation is distinguished from non-scientific
observation by its place and purpose within the set of inter-
related activities which constitute scientific inquiry rather
than any quality of the act of observing. This means that

11Goode and Hatt, op. cit., p. 21.
observation becomes a scientific technique to the extent that it (a) serves a formulated research purpose, (b) is planned systematically rather than occurring haphazardly, (c) is systematically recorded and relates to more general propositions rather than presented as a set of interesting curiosa, and (d) is subjected to checks and controls with respect to validity, reliability and precision much as all other scientific evidence.\(^{12}\)

It is only when observation takes on these scientific aspects that the observer himself will produce minimal bias in the data. The research purpose and planned observation are described elsewhere. The data were recorded chronologically on small cards as behavior was occurring. As soon as the day of observation was over the day's notes were reviewed. The scribblings and key words written on the small cards were expanded into more comprehensive notes. The researcher was forewarned about techniques in this area by Goode and Hatt, who stated:

> In any event, the record must be relatively complete, and almost certainly will not be complete without the use of notes taken during the day, and a conscientious attempt to make a full log at the end of the day. It is a frequent failing to believe that a comment or occurrence is so striking that it will not be forgotten.\(^{13}\)

**VIII. THE METHOD OF RECORDING THE DATA**

As soon as possible the log was dictated onto the tapes of a dictaphone transcriber where it remained until a typist was ready to place it upon paper.

\(^{12}\)Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

\(^{13}\)Goode and Hatt, *op. cit.*, p. 124.
The data gathering process was subjected to certain checks. The research team members made frequent checks on the comparability of the data. At one point an independent researcher made a check on the comparability of the data in the four studies. It was not possible to send two or more researchers into a school situation at the same time in order to check reliability of the data. Time was a factor in this, as well as the imposition on the subjects. It was thought that having two observers "trailing" an administrator would present a situation too awkward for satisfactory observation.

In connection with scientific observation, Goode and Hatt recommend that the controls placed on the observer be reported in order to protect the work from later attack. By reporting how he made his observations, under what conditions, when, and so on, he makes it possible for others to know the limitations of his data, and to repeat the observations. For this reason the observation method used in this study will be described later in this chapter. The advantages of the observational method in general are to be listed before going on to the discussion of this study specifically.

The Advantages of the Method

The observational method is independent of the subject's ability to report as well as independent of the subject's willingness to report. In this case, however, the method was not independent of the

14Goode and Hatt, op. cit., p. 127.

15Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook, op. cit., p. 132.
subject's willingness to be observed. The method imposed no special assignment or request for work on the part of the subject. All subjects were cordial and welcomed the observer. There was no resistance on the part of the subjects to the research.

In writing about the observational method, Lundberg points out a distinct advantage but tempers it with a limitation:

The advantages of personal investigation are perhaps present in the highest degree where the entire study is performed by a single investigator provided he is animated by scientific ideals. This usually insures uniformity of approach and interpretation throughout the study as well as the steadying influence of sole responsibility for the accuracy of the results. In many cases it may also mean that the study profits from the enthusiasm and care of a person deeply interested in the results. Of course, there may also be danger in personal interest. A person may become so enamored of his hypothesis as to render him incapable of practical and objective observation. But even this is a failing which is least likely to be present in a person of scientific training and ideals.\textsuperscript{16}

Observation of behavior allows the study to become a personal investigation rather than an impersonal one. The sample being studied is not simply a list of names and addresses, they are real persons behaving in real situations. There is an element of personal attachment on the part of the researcher not found in other types of data gathering procedures. Personal interest in the research is heightened, and the danger of influx of a good deal of subjectivity does exist. Yet, the advantages of personal investigation are greater than its dangers,

especially if the researcher is conscious of the dangers and seeks to avoid the pitfall of bias in recording the data.

Perhaps the greatest asset of observational techniques is that they permit the recording of behavior simultaneously with its spontaneous occurrence.17 This point has been made in connection with the limitation of the method, but needs further emphasis. Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook make the following statement regarding this asset:

. . . The degree to which one can predict behavior from interview and test data is limited. In contrast, observational techniques yield data that pertain directly to typical behavior situations. Where the social scientist has reason to believe that such factors as recall and detachment may significantly distort the nature of this evidence as he needs it for a research purpose, he will always prefer observational methods.18

With other methods of research, the one who did the behaving is the mediator between the behavior and the data. Recall and detachment from the immediacy of the behavior must be taken into consideration as limitations of the data gathered by such methods. With the observational method, the observer is the mediator between the behavior and the data. In this case, however, the handicaps of recall and detachment are not nearly so acute. Objectiveness is more easily obtained than when the data comes through the thought process of the one doing the behaving. In the study of groups, for example, it is often found that members of the group cannot describe their own behavior accurately.19

17Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook, op. cit., p. 131.
18Ibid.
19Ibid., p. 517.
The individual is little different from the group in the problem of reporting behavior. Observers are used when no other means is adequate for obtaining behavioral data.

Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook discuss three types of observational techniques, each particularly appropriate to a specific set of conditions.20 A distinct advantage of the observational method is its flexibility to fit the research purpose. The three types are participant observation, systematic observation, and observation in standardized experimental or test situations. Participant observation is especially indicated for exploratory purposes when it is necessary to know more before systematic procedures can be used. This type of observation was done by members of the School-Community Development Study staff in its initial exploratory period. Staff members became participant-observers in a series of cooperating field centers. From this type of observation came field notes which through content analysis produced the nine critical areas of administrative behavior.

The second type of observational techniques is systematic observation, which is indicated when the purpose of a study is description or diagnosis in terms of categories which can be anticipated before the collection of data begins. It is appropriate after some exploration through participant observation. This is the type of technique used in gathering the data for this study.

The third type, observation in standardized experimental or test

20Ibid., pp. 133-134.
situations, is indicated where other forms of observation or other techniques of data collection have provided enough information so that the researcher is in a position which permits him to arrange a situation to suit his purpose — a position in which he can so control the circumstances that he can guarantee the observability of the relevant factors and the elimination of disturbing factors. This type of observation has not been used in this study and in all probability will not be used extensively in the study of administrative behavior. The most fruitful place to study administrative behavior seems to be in its natural habitat — the school situation. Some method of control of the school situation will be necessary before the method of using the standardized experimental situation can be used effectively.

The Observations of this Study

The research design of this study called for a series of observations of each executive head in the sample. The first visit to each member of the sample was comparatively short, lasting from twenty minutes to an hour. During this time the executive head was told that certain findings of the School-Community Development Study were being tested in a larger population. He was requested to permit the researcher to "follow him around" for a period of time. He was told that other executive heads were being observed by the researcher and that they were in larger schools, smaller schools, rural areas, urban areas, recently re-organized districts and districts which had not been changed in recent years. The anonymity of the jurors was completely
protected and no member of the sample was aware of the balloting which had preceded the observation period.

During the orientation visit, arrangements were made to return for a half day period on a specified date. In some cases arrangements were made for all the observations to be made. Each member of the sample was observed one morning, one afternoon, and one full day. Each observation was made on a different day of the week. The length of the various observations varied only slightly, each half day visit being about three hours in length. Some complications arose in working out the observation schedule. On one occasion the executive head called his office about one half hour after the researcher arrived saying that he was ill and would not be able to be at school. On another occasion, the executive head found it necessary to leave in the middle of the morning for a visit to the hospital to which his mother had been confined since the previous weekend. In both cases it was necessary to make the observation on another day.

There were four occasions upon which the researcher momentarily "lost out" in observing the behavior of the executive head. These occurred when persons asked to see him alone. There was no socially acceptable way to hear the conversation and the researcher deferred to the wishes of the person desiring to see the executive head. In no case did the executive head initiate a request to be "left alone" with an interviewee, and in all cases the executive head told the researcher what had transpired in the private conversation.

One difficulty encountered with a few of the executive heads,
was their tendency to talk with the researcher about a variety of subjects rather than going about their duties as if the researcher were not there. The researcher emphasized to each member of the sample that he should go on with his regular duties. When one considers the total amount of time spent in observation, only a small amount of it was spent in this type of activity. For those men who did engage in this activity, it was evident they did so with other visitors also.

Four executive heads, two among the more effective group and two among the less effective group, were observed in what were called special observations. These were board of education meetings. Each of these was attended by the researcher from eight o'clock P.M. to eleven-thirty P.M. even though in no case had the meetings been concluded at the time of departure.

In addition to these observations, a meeting of the executive heads of one county with their county superintendent was attended. Attending this meeting were two executive heads from each group. The behavior of each of these four men during the meeting was recorded.

The observations were made over a period of seven weeks and necessitated almost daily trips to schools included in the sample. On most days it was possible to schedule two half day observations by visiting schools which were fairly close to each other. The noon period gave ample time to eat lunch quickly and travel to the next school.

All behavior on the part of the executive head which was pertinent to his position as administrator of the school was recorded. Within the framework of pertinency to his school position the following
kinds of observations were recorded.

That which was done and said by the executive head formed the largest share of the data. In all cases the direct object of his action was also recorded. Printed or written materials pertaining to a present situation and written by the executive head were accepted as data as they indicated behavior occurring in the immediate past pertaining to a present situation.

The words "behavior occurring in the immediate past pertaining to a present situation" are important to the definition of the observations recorded by the researcher. There were instances of executive heads' telling the researcher about occurrences five, ten, or even twenty years ago. These were not included in the data as they were not substantiated in any present situation nor did they have any observable effect on any present situation.

No attempt was made to interview others in the situation but their behavior became a part of the data as they behaved in interaction with the executive head. What others said or did usually became the setting for the administrator's behavior.

When things occurred which the researcher did not understand, he asked questions about them. For example, it was not possible to hear what the other party to a telephone conversation was saying. When the topic being discussed was not evident from the remarks of the executive head, he was asked about it at the close of the conversation. The researcher already had recorded the words of the executive head, and the explanation of the topic made it possible to make sense out of them.
Any inferences or interpretations of the behavior observed were kept separate from the remainder of the data. The emphasis was upon the item rather than interpretation for several reasons. First, behavioral data were being sought. Second, time was limited during the observation period as the researcher had all he could do to keep a running account of behavior as it occurred. Third, the researcher was forewarned about the problem by Goode and Hatt, who pointed out that "... too often the temptation exists to record the interpretation merely because it seems more meaningful."\(^{21}\) There was a concerted attempt to resist this temptation.

The data gathering process was one of the most interesting phases of this study. It gave the researcher opportunity to get into a variety of schools and to get acquainted with a number of schoolmen in the State. It also gave him opportunity to delve more deeply into studying the observational method as a useful research technique.

IX. PUTTING THE DATA INTO USABLE FORM

At the close of the observation period, the data had been transcribed from the dictaphone tapes onto sheets of paper. The most feasible plan for handling the data was found to be that of placing the observation records on cards. The cards used were those manufactured by the McBee Corporation. These cards allowed the sorting and manipulation necessary to studying the data. The particular card used was the

\(^{21}\)Goode and Hatt, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 125.
McBee Keysort \(3\frac{3}{4}\) inches x \(7\frac{1}{2}\) inches. All edges of the card contain a series of small holes which allow a sorting rod to pass through. A punch, designed to remove a wedge shaped portion of the card between the edge and the hole, is used to code the card. When the sorting rod is used, the cards punched properly fall away while those not punched remain on the rod.

These cards were found to be of considerable value as the center area was available for the data. To make these cards useful, two steps were necessary. The observation records which had been transcribed from the tapes onto paper had to be edited thoroughly. Spot checks were made to make certain of the accuracy of the typists. The material was then perused for mistakes in punctuation or misunderstanding of words in transcription. All material at this stage was in the chronological order of its occurrence.

The next step involved "breaking the data into suitable pieces." The amount of material each card was to contain was established through setting up criteria for what was termed a "unit of behavior."

These criteria were:

1. The behavior expresses a single action or thought.
2. The behavior is made up of a sentence or series of sentences about one subject.
3. The behavior is made up of the largest categorizable unit of behavior.

The unit of behavior was preceded on the card by a description of the situation surrounding the behavior. For example the description
might include the words of the person to whom the executive head was talking. Those things which preceded or prompted the behavior became a part of the description.

Several units of behavior were necessary to make up what was called an incident. An incident was made up of a complete sequence dealing with a person or group of persons. A telephone conversation or a meeting with a group of persons were examples of incidents. Some of the shortest incidents were synonymous with units of behavior. Other incidents were made up of as many as thirty units of behavior.

X. CODING THE DATA

After the data were placed upon the cards, it was necessary to code them. As mentioned, the cards could be punched for ease of coding. The code included the number of the executive head, the time of the observation, the direct object of the behavior, and source of the data. Ten spaces were reserved to identify the executive head by number. The first five included the group judged less effective and the second five included those judged more effective. The time of observation section included spaces for the orientation visit, the morning visit, the afternoon visit, the all day visit, and the special visit. The direct object of the behavior included ten spaces:

1. Pupils
2. Teachers and principals
3. Non-certificated personnel
4. Persons employed by the school for a specific job
5. County superintendent and board of education
6. Parents, Parent-Teacher Association, and school patrons
7. Other community members
8. Other educators
9. Salesmen and company representatives
10. No person.

The sources of the data were listed in three spaces. These were:

1. Seen and heard by the observer as they occurred
2. Told the observer by the executive head
3. Printed or duplicated and issued by the executive head.

Each card was numbered in accordance with the number of the executive head and the time of visit. The entire group of cards was numbered consecutively. There were found to be 2241 units of behavior. The purpose for numbering the cards was the ease it would give to returning them to a basic position following changes for categorizing and other analysis. The numbering also allowed the incident to be arranged into the proper sequence of its units of behavior.

XI. CATEGORIZATION OF THE DATA

After cards were coded and numbered the job of categorizing was performed. The coding spaces on one side of the card were used to identify the category into which the card had been placed.

Categorization was done in accordance with the definition of categories presented in Chapter II. The list of examples following the
category definitions was formed by use of items determined by School-Community Development Study research and was expanded by the writer as the categorization proceeded.

Categorization was a time-consuming process but the time spent was worthwhile when one considers the cruciality of the step. The value of the research project was largely dependent upon the care with which this step was carried out.

The categorization process was an attempt to impose a system upon observable facts. A major task in any science is the development of systems of classification, a structure of concepts, and an increasingly precise set of definitions for these terms. The system of classification arises from the empirical phenomena which the social scientist can observe and record. These empirical phenomena are the data gathered for this study. Bales refers to "empirical generalizations" in describing the kind of operation performed in this study:

It is assumed that the goal of the social scientist is to discover "empirical generalizations" about human behavior and to show that these observed uniformities are special cases or special combinations of more abstract and more general propositions. Generalizations can be made only in terms of regularities of "something" with regard to "something else." If these "somethings" are ideas or symbols, our generalization is simply a kind of assumption, definition, or syntactical statement. It is a generalization or, more exactly, a syntactical proposition about our theory, and not a generalization about what we observe. On the other hand, if the "somethings" are phenomena which can be observed directly or indirectly, the statement of their connection with each other is called an "empirical generalization."

\[22\textit{Ibid.}, \textit{p. 9}.\]

\[23\text{R. Freed Bales, } \textit{Interaction Process Analysis} \textit{ (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950), p. 31.}\]
In the case of this study the "somethings" were directly observed phenomena. Bales goes on to divide these under two heads: (1) action or interaction i.e. the overt behavior of concrete human individuals, and (2) situation. He describes situations as those things to which action is addressed—the self, other individuals, physical objects, etc., which may be said to comprise the concrete situation of action for the acting individual.\(^2\text{ibid.}\)

In this study the data were arranged in such a manner that the overt behavior was presented in context with the situation to provide the basis of categorization. The behavior was given major weight in determining the category. The situation was described in order that the overt behavior could be better understood. The influence of the situation upon the overt behavior will be discussed in later chapters, and it is sufficient to say here that this study looked at overt behavior as the outstanding basis determining the category into which an item was to fit.

As previously stated, one of the purposes of this study was the testing of a set of categories set up by previous research. Much work had been done in gathering data on empirical phenomena prior to the time that the categories were set up. The previous research had encompassed several years of observation and recording of the observations in a variety of school-community centers. These data were gathered with no pre-conceived scheme of categorization. After

\(^{2\text{ibid.}}\)
the period of data gathering, a content analysis was made. Out of the analysis came the nine categories which this study was designed to test. The categories had been defined behaviorally through the "piling up" of a large number of behavioral acts for each category. No dictionary type definitions had been formed. The behavioral definitions were useful in getting the "concept" of the meaning of each category. From this point the dictionary type definitions in Chapter II were formed. As the data were analyzed the behavioral definitions were expanded.

XII. TESTING THE RELIABILITY OF CATEGORIZATION

A test of both the accuracy of categorization, and the quality of the definition of the category is found in a categorization of the researcher's cards by others. This was done largely as a check on the reliability of the categorization. Ten per cent of the cards were used for this purpose. These were selected by use of a table of random numbers. Cards had been numbered consecutively, and the use of the random numbers table produced 224 cards which were in close proportion to the number of cards for each executive head and the number in each category.

The three other members of the research team were given the cards, a dictionary type definition for each category, behavioral type definition for each category, and a listing of the numbers of the cards

in the sample. Each person worked without any other aid in determining
the category into which each card was to be placed.

In 116 of the 224 cases all members agreed upon the category of
the card. In 65 of the cases three out of four agreed upon the
category of the card. In only two cases did all members of the team
place the card in four different categories. Thus in 76.33 per cent of
the cases at least three out of four agreement was reached.

An analysis of the frequencies for each team member in comparison
to the frequency distribution was made by the use of the Chi-square
test. The comparison was made by use of the following formula:26

\[ x^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E} \]

The frequencies of the writer will be referred to as distribution
R. The distributions of the checker are referred to by use of the
letters A, B, and C. The results of this test are as follows:

- R with Checker A - \( x^2 = 6.3600 \)
- R with Checker B - \( x^2 = 1.8523 \)
- R with Checker C - \( x^2 = 6.9867 \)
- R with the Mean - \( x^2 = 3.5640 \)

These low values indicate that, entering the Table with seven
degrees of freedom, there is no significant difference between R and
any of the checkers or the mean of the checkers. A value of 14.067

26M. J. Moroney, Facts From Figures (London: Penguin Books,
would have been needed to indicate a significant relationship at the .05 level. Thus a high reliability was indicated in the categorization of the data.

This means that others, who have been given some orientation as to the meaning of the categories, would be able to make highly similar decisions as to the category into which a particular set of units of behavior will fit.

Following the reliability check the data were further studied. The most effective and least effective groups were compared as to the frequency of behavior in the areas. The areas themselves were studied as to whether differences between the two groups were evident in the character of the data in each. These steps in the analysis will be spelled out in following chapters as the findings of the study are presented.

---

27Arkin and Colton, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
CHAPTER V

THE FRAMEWORK OF THE CATEGORIES AND ITS
RELATIONSHIP TO BEHAVIOR

It was hypothesized that the observed administrative behavior could be described within the framework of the categories. It is the purpose of this chapter to present the findings of this study in relation to that hypothesis.

The hypothesis was a difficult one to test for the reason that the framework was a mental construct. Whether or not the data fit into the categories depends to some extent upon the orientation of the person doing the categorizing. There first must be an understanding of the rationale of the categories. This problem was little different from the one faced in the biological sciences. The novice was first informed of the taxonomy and given definitions of its various parts. Categorization of actual living things can be done by the student after the orientation period.

The taxonomy of biology has been defined and re-defined over the years. This has been done until there are few disagreements among experts as to either the definitions of the various parts or the place of any given living thing in the taxonomy. This was not the case with the taxonomy tested in this study. It had not had the advantages of being studied, tested, and used over a long period of time. This set of categories was in its nascent state as all ideas are at one time
or another. Its definitions were not fully refined, and its concepts are not fully delineated. This study was designed to give the framework of the categories one of its first tests.

I. A NEW CATEGORY EMERGES

The 2241 units of behavior were categorized by use of the definitions and descriptions of each of the categories as given in Chapter II of this study. The categorizer placed each unit of behavior into the appropriate category or laid it aside as not categorizable. As the process continued, there grew up a small stack of units not placed in any of the nine categories. These were re-read and studied. They were found to contain such items as these: (Note: Use of the letters in the illustration denotes the executive head being observed.)

S visited with the local businessman regarding some home remodeling plans and fishing in a nearby lake.

Pies were being collected for a carnival and S joked with a teacher about giving him a piece of one of the pies.

As S was leaving the building, he saw the mother of a senior boy sitting in a car near the building. He visited with the mother about the seniors who were at that time on their trip.

These kinds of behaviors fit under none of the categories. To include these, a new category was created. It was named "Fostering Human Relations" and defined as recognizing the personal integrity, dignity and worth of individuals in the school-community through social interaction. The executive was fostering human relations when he:

1. Observed common social amenities; greeting, welcoming, begging pardon, thanking.
2. Behaved in a supporting fashion toward other people; congratulating, encouraging, giving assurance, sympathizing.

3. Engaged in personal conversations with persons in the school-community; chatting, joking, teasing, "kidding," visiting about common acquaintances, asking about the health of others, discussing sports.

4. Arranges the physical setting and facilities to facilitate interpersonal and group identification, awareness, and exchange of thought.

5. Extends personal or institutional hospitality beyond common social amenities.

6. Encourages persons to talk or ask questions, and attempts to create an atmosphere of freedom to discuss issues.

7. Tells stories to others, namely, personal experiences or jokes not designed to make a point but to bring amusement.

8. Does personal favors for staff and community members.

This category was added as a tenth one to the framework. With its addition, all of the units of behavior were placed into categories.

Several considerations attendant to the categorization must be explained in order that the hypothesis be tested fully. Even though each unit of behavior could be categorized, there were still other indications of the adequacy of the framework to describe administrative behavior.
II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

Table III shows the frequency distribution of units of behavior in each of the categories listed in rank order of their total frequencies. It was apparent that each of the categories included some behaviors. This was evidence of the exhaustiveness of the framework. It was equally apparent that there was a wide range between the categories receiving the lowest and highest number of units of behavior. Frequencies of two of the categories are low enough to indicate that not all ten members of the sample were observed to behave in them.

Over one-half of the behaviors appear in two categories. Nearly eighty-five per cent of the behaviors are found in the first four categories. The unevenness of the distribution is well illustrated by these facts. Quantitatively, certain categories of behavior are far more important than others. It does not follow, however, that this is also true in a qualitative sense, as a category which includes only a small number of behaviors may be one in which those behaviors are crucial in the success of the educational enterprise.

III. THE CONSISTENCY OF FREQUENCIES AMONG THE SAMPLE

Another indication of the adequacy of the framework to describe the administrative behavior observed was the way in which the frequencies of the categories were distributed for each administrator observed. Table IV shows the distribution and percentages of behaviors in each category for each of the ten executive heads. These data indicated
# TABLE III

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE UNITS OF BEHAVIOR BY CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>71 4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Roles</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Effectiveness</td>
<td>27 4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure</td>
<td>24 9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Human Relations</td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Maintaining Policy</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Goals</td>
<td>8 3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving People</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Community Leadership</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Educational Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2241</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Executive Head</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Roles</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Effectiveness</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Human Relations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Maintaining Policy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Goals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving People</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Community Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Educational Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Totals</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>99.9</th>
<th>99.9</th>
<th>99.8</th>
<th>100.1</th>
<th>99.7</th>
<th>99.8</th>
<th>99.9</th>
<th>99.9</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>99.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
that there was not a great deal of variance among the men as the
categories in which there was most frequent behavior. There was a
"sameness" among the patterns of the ten men which indicates that the
frequencies caught a gross pattern of behavior applicable to adminis­
trators at this particular level. This point is better illustrated in
Table V which indicates the rank ordering of the categories for each
of the ten men. It was noted that two of the categories were ranked
either first or second in the behavior frequencies of each of the ten
men. It was also noted that the following category varied only one
rank and that the next categories had a preponderance of similar
ranks. These data indicate that there is a pattern of frequency which
runs rather consistently through the behavior of the ten men. This
pattern supports the contention that there is some adequacy of the
framework to describe administrative behavior.

IV. THE RELIABILITY CHECK

The results of the reliability check have been noted in Chapter
IV of this study. The check was a part of the findings as well as the
methodology. One of the ways to test whether administrative behavior
can be described through the framework is to determine whether others
will get similar results through use of definitions and descriptions
used by the first categorizer.

It is not necessary to repeat the findings of the check. The
results of applying the Chi-square test to the distributions show
that others would be able to make highly similar decisions as to the
categories into which the units of behavior will fit. The categories
## TABLE V

**RANK ORDER OF CATEGORY FREQUENCIES OCCURRING IN THE BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE HEADS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Executive Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Administrative Functions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Administrative Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Human Relations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Maintaining Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Goals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving People</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Community Leadership</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Educational Resources</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are defined with sufficient precision that others, with some orientation
to the concepts, would be able to place units of behavior into the
categories in a highly similar manner. It also indicates that the
behaviors were not forced into categories in order to be able to de-
scribe the behavior observed within the framework.

V. THE DISCRETENESS OF THE CATEGORIES

Although the categories are defined with sufficient precision
to allow high reliability in categorization by others, they are not
precise to the point of discreteness. Complete discreteness would
mean that a properly trained categorizer could place every unit of
behavior in the proper category and that there would be no disagreement
among categorizers. This condition has been achieved in the classifica-
tion of some man-made objects, for example machine parts. It has been
almost achieved in the biological sciences; it is being achieved in
the field of physics where new elements continue to fall into place
on the periodic chart.

The discreteness achieved in the framework does not approach that
of the physical sciences. Illustration of some of the problems
presented in the categorization of the behaviors show reasons for the
failure to attain complete discreteness.

Appraising Effectiveness

The following behaviors have been placed in the category
Appraising Effectiveness. The categorizer would still place them in
that category but questions arise which might cause another categorizer
to place them in a different category.

S answered a phone call from the principal of a high school in another city. He answered the questions of the principal by saying that the boy had done nothing since he arrived. "He seems to have no interest, but is no discipline problem. I can't seem to get hold of him. It is hard to get answers from him. He never acts up in class. He hasn't made too many friends here, and he has gotten acquainted with what I would call an undesirable friend."

Here the executive head was appraising the effectiveness of a student who had recently entered the school. He has made some judgmental statements regarding the boy's conduct and work. Yet in a sense he was simply giving information to the principal regarding the student. Presumably the information was given in answer to questions asked by the principal. The executive head formulated judgments as he talked, as there was no indication that he had previously prepared a statement. The major emphasis of the behavior was upon the evaluation, yet the executive head was giving information at the same time. One might ask this basic question, "How can one evaluate without giving information to those who hear the evaluation?"

Another behavior taken from the Appraising Effectiveness category presents a similar problem.

The music teacher explained to S a proposed schedule for next year saying that he and the principal had talked it over. They were proposing that boys and girls meet two days a week for the high school chorus and that they meet on Friday combining boys and girls. S said, "We are going back to the things we used to do and the music teachers at that time did not like the arrangement. Perhaps you could have more periods for chorus at more times during the day. Are you satisfied with the way it is this year?" The music teacher said that he was.

In this case, the virtues of two types of scheduling arrangements were being appraised. The essential problem had to do with the best
way of working out the music schedule. Yet there was also an involvement problem. The teacher and principal had worked out a proposed solution which the executive head wanted them to consider further and perhaps reject. The behavior could be construed to be one which concerned the way in which the executive head was involving the music teacher in the scheduling decision.

Still another behavior drawn from the Appraising Effectiveness category illustrates the problem in using the category framework.

S showed the mother a drawing made by her son. The drawing was to be used in planning a new section of the bleachers for the football field. He complimented the woman on her son's work and said that he was a very fine boy. S said, "But he has one little habit which I suppose you have noticed. He doesn't seem to be able to stick to his work in order to get it done quickly." The mother said that she had noticed her son's slowness.

While appraising the conduct and work of the boy, the executive head was also fostering human relations by the way in which he told the mother. First he had pleasing words to say about the boy, then he stated the difficulty which he thought the boy had. Judging what he said means the behavior is one of Appraising Effectiveness. Judging how it was said, the behavior seems to be in the area of Fostering Human Relations. There is a subtlety in the way in which something is said which is hard to judge. By judging the way in which something is said, a value judgment is placed upon it. It was decided that value judgments would not be a part of the categorization procedure.

Communicating

The category Communicating presented a similar type of problem in discreteness. Examples of it can be seen in the following cases.
The secretary asked S, "Is Faye to pay for her cheerleading uniform?" S said, "Yes, she'll pay $12.75." (The girl had been truant from school during the season and was dropped from the cheerleader group after the uniforms had been purchased.)

Actually the executive head was answering the secretary's request for information. One is not able to determine whether he made the decision when the question was asked or whether he had made it earlier. If one assumes he made it earlier, he was passing on information and the behavior falls in the category of communication. If on the other hand, he made the decision as he answered the question, his behavior would fall in the category of Making and Maintaining Policy. The former assumption was made in making the categorization because there is no way of ascertaining whether the decision was made earlier or by whom it might have been made. It was obvious that he was giving information.

Several behaviors placed in the category of communication had elements which made them possibilities for the category of Determining Roles.

S asked the prospective teacher, "If you sign a contract will you consider that final, or will you be signing another somewhere?" The candidate assured him that she would not sign another. S said, "Well, I ask that of all candidates."

Here the executive head has asked for information and yet has indicated to the candidate, at least in part, what would be expected of her, or what her role would be if she signed a contract. Again one finds a kind of subtlety which is hard to determine precisely. One can only conjecture as to his reasons for asking the question. Perhaps unfortunate experiences with other candidates have caused him to "be
on the lookout" early in the relationship. Another subtlety comes in his reply to her answer which has to do with role also. In saying that he asks that of all candidates, perhaps he was really saying, "I didn't think you were the kind to do such a thing but I thought I would ask the question so that you understand your role when you sign the contract."
The elements which would place the behavior in the "role" category are elusive enough that it was designated as a Communicating item.

The two behaviors which follow illustrate the way in which information may be given or questions asked in what may be construed to be an attempt to influence role.

S said to the girl who had been truant from school, "These boys are doing you an injustice by inviting you to ride in their autos."

S asked the girl who had been truant from school, "What are you going to do about it?" The girl said that she would try to do better.

Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure

This category contains behaviors which present a similar problem in categorization. The behaviors below were determined to be assembling and controlling the appropriate factors of people, time, and facilities. This falls into the category of Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure. At the same time the executive head was determining roles by asking persons to do certain things.

S said to the prospective teacher, "We could leave it like this; we'll do a little waiting. If you are undecided, wait until the 27th. I should have a "yes" or "no" answer by that time."

The P.T.A. members and S had arranged a time for S to meet with the Committee working on the by-laws. S said, "Send me a copy beforehand and I'll have a chance to look it over."
The following two behaviors placed in the category of "coordinating" might be construed to be Communicating.

S then made a tour of the elementary rooms. He paused at the door of each room. He said, "I usually make this tour each morning in order to find out whether the teachers need anything."

S asked the elementary principal whether he had a supply of cards for work permit applications. The principal said that he had.

In both cases the executive head was seeking information. Yet both behaviors were a part of requisitioning and allocating supplies and materials.

The next two behaviors, placed in the category of "coordinating," have some of the elements of Fostering Human Relations.

S carried a package of meat for the woman teacher from her car to a house across the street where food was being prepared for the school carnival.

S answered a telephone call. The principal of an elementary school called to ask if it was all right to dismiss school early on Friday because of a special program to be held at their school. Both schools used the same buses in such a manner that both would have to dismiss early. S told the principal, "It will be all right to run the buses early on this account. You have cooperated with us during the year and we will be glad to help you. It is very satisfactory with me."

The package was carried by S as a common social amenity, and as a personal favor. The second behavior was one of behaving in a supporting fashion toward another person. Yet the first behavior was one of assembling the appropriate facilities and the second one of scheduling. The net effect of his behavior was that of coordinating administrative functions and structure.
Determining Roles

Some behaviors in Determining Roles could be construed as being simply Communicating. These consist of giving information but the information has to do with the roles of others.

One of the custodians in the group asked S, "Do you expect us to work on Saturday?" S said, "No, just five days a week."

While talking to the salesman about school furniture, S said to him, "You'll have to see my new business manager regarding supplies. He'll have charge of that area from now on."

One of the students asked S, "Will we be able to take driver training?" S said, "That course is open to seniors only because we must limit the enrollment."

S said to the prospective teacher, "If some courses are given this summer in extension, would you take them?" The teacher said that she would.

In giving instructions for pre-registration, S said, "Every student must take four full subjects." He said to the seniors, "Whether or not you have enough subjects without it to graduate doesn't make any difference. I don't care how many credits you have."

Other behaviors categorized as Determining Roles contain elements of Appraising Effectiveness.

S spent ten minutes helping the high school girls sort inventory cards. A portion of that time was spent in watching them sort cards.

S said to the high school principal, "I noticed the coaches made a clear division between baseball and track this spring. I've seen boys who can do both." The principal said, "I left it up to the coaches."

The above behaviors have to do with supervising and evaluating the roles of others. So the basic question arises. "If the behavior is one of appraising the effectiveness of a role, in which category is the
behavior placed?" The question is rather arbitrarily answered by
deeming role determination as being spotlighted in the behavior.

It is conceivable that a behavior could have the elements of both
Determining Roles and Involving People. The following is an example of
this.

The board of education had decided that the teachers would
be given the responsibility of recommending how much money was
to be paid for each extra-curricular activity carried on by
teachers. A teacher came in to see S and said, "I can't
estimate the amount of time I spend on this activity." S said,
"Just make a general estimate for the year. The board feels
the faculty should decide this. Of course, you can't go too
high or the board will throw it in the wastebasket." The
teacher said, "Yes, I understand that, but it's a little
difficult to decide on this."

Here the executive head is attempting to describe the role of the
teacher in making recommendation to the board. Yet the behavior also
has to do with the involvement of persons in decision making. One
might assume that the executive head was explaining the teacher's
role in an attempt to make the involvement more successful. In other
words, he was explaining to the teacher how he (the teacher) was
involved in helping to decide amounts to be paid for sponsoring extra
curricular activities.

Still another behavior in the Determining Roles categories is
akin to the category called Using the Educational Resources of the
Community.

A mother and an elementary school teacher entered the office
and explained to S the situation regarding the son who had been
a problem in the school for some time. As they talked, S
suggested that the boy be taken to the guidance clinic. He said,
"You know some think you are sending them because they are queer,
but that isn't the case at all." The mother responded that she understood. She favored the idea of getting help through the guidance clinic.

The main point of the executive head's suggestion is that the mother should take the child to the clinic, which has to do with the mother's role in regard to her child's difficulty. Yet in doing so he was bringing into play a community resource not available within the school.

**Involving People**

Some behaviors in this category also border on being in other categories. The following one seems to be a matter of involving people in setting goals:

S said to the businessman and athletic director, "What will we set as the deadline to see what this group can solicit?"

The next one reflects a process of Involving People in policy making.

S said, "Whenever we get new faculty members, we take up old problems again and rehash them. We do this just to get them to make their own decisions. I will say to them, 'This has been the policy in the past, do you want to continue it?"

Another behavior seems to illustrate Communicating about Involving People.

S said to the prospective teacher, "We try to be democratic here. We have a local teachers' association and the board is going to call in a committee of the association. They will invite a salary committee to come in and it will be made up of people in all salary brackets on our schedule."

In each of these behaviors the involving of people in decision making or plan making is the dominant theme, yet each has elements of
other categories. The behavior cannot be placed in a category with the
degree of absoluteness needed to make categorization by several people
agree completely.

Making and Maintaining Policy

This category contains behaviors which might be classified into
other categories. The behavior which follows has some elements of
Determining Roles.

A boy entered the office and reported buying a small item
for the school. S said, "You didn't have a school purchase
order and we can't write you a check for twenty five cents.
The merchant wouldn't accept your word on charging it to the
school either. You must have a purchase order when you buy
anything for the school. You've learned something here today.
Next time you purchase something for the school, get a purchase
order first."

The executive head did explain to the boy his role in buying
anything for the school, but he did it in order to maintain the policy
that purchase orders be used whenever items are purchased for the
school.

Another problem in this category is one in which a phone call was
made as a matter of policy.

S called a parent whose elementary school child had been
absent. He said, "How's Trudy?" He asked the parent whether
the sickness of the girl was a reaction to the polio shot,
and said, "You called the Health Department, didn't you?" In
answer to the parent he said, "I'm glad it wasn't a reaction
to the polio shot." (S calls parents after children are absent
three days.)

The executive head was requesting information about the child and
thus the behavior might be placed in the Communicating category. Yet
this was one of several calls made in maintaining his policy of calling
after three days of absence.
Another behavior in the area of Making and Maintaining Policy might be seen as Involving People.

A teacher entered the office with a paper which she asked $S$ to read. It was a note outlining a proposed policy on giving flowers at the death of members of the family of either students or faculty members. The teacher mentioned the three teachers who helped her formulate it. $S$ told the teacher it looked very good and said, "It seems to cover everything. My secretary will type it."

Here the teachers were involved in making the policy about giving flowers. The behavior is one point in the involvement of the teachers but it is not the initial point. The point at which this behavior occurs is the one at which the policy was being made. For this reason, the decision was made to categorize this behavior as one of Making and Maintaining Policy.

Setting Goals

The final category in which one finds the problem of discreteness is that of Setting Goals. The behavior which follows might be considered an example of involving people in setting goals.

$S$ said to the clerk, "Next year we will log these trips and it will be the responsibility of the bus supervisor to keep track of them." The clerk suggested that a trip ticket be kept for each one. $S$ said, "That's a good idea."

The executive head accepted the idea of another person in setting the goal for next year's conduct of affairs. Yet the essential thing being done in the behavior was to set the goal, namely, to work out the plan of operation which was to solve the problem at hand.

The next behavior combines elements of Communicating and Making and Maintaining Policy with Setting Goals.
While the board of education was discussing the purchase of new school buses, S asked the bus supervisor on what runs the hydramatic buses were being used. After the bus supervisor answered him, S said, "Then we are using the hydramatic on runs where we have the fewest stops." S suggested that it be changed next year.

The executive head set a time by which a specified state of progress or accomplishment was to be achieved. In doing so he changed the policy of the way in which the buses were to be used. The request for information from the bus supervisor was considered as being the executive head's way of introducing his suggestion.

The illustrations from certain categories taken directly from the data have described the problem of discreteness. The framework does not have the adequacy to place all behaviors absolutely and finally into only one category. It is adequate however, to do just that with a large number of the behaviors.

VI. THE COORDINATENESS OF THE CATEGORIES

Related to the discreteness of the categories is their coordinateness. Discreteness had to do with the relationship of the category framework to the behaviors in the data. Coordinateness has to do with the relationship of the categories to each other. The question being asked here is, "Are the categories of the same rank or order?" The central problem here is finding whether categories cut across each other in such a way as to make some of them useless. By one definition, for example, communication is a part of all behavior. Whenever behavior occurs in the presence of another person, communication occurs. The very
fact that the subject is seen behaving means communication is present.

If communication in the case of this study had been so defined, that category would have outranked all others and virtually all of the behaviors would have been categorized as Communicating. The crux of this matter is the definition of the categories. As they have been defined in this study, the categories do not overlap to the extent that one outranks another.

Each category points out a different dimension of the phenomenon of administrative behavior. Just as a physical object can be viewed from social dimensions, so can the behavior of school administrators. Perhaps a social phenomenon has more dimensions than a physical object.

If one thinks of the categories in terms of dimensions, the concept of the categories having rank or order becomes less meaningful. Dimensions have no rank or order, as they are different aspects of the same thing.

The concept of coordinateness also means that there is a sameness about the items of a group. Sameness means that there is some unifying characteristic or feature possessed by all items. The unifying characteristic of the categories is the possibility that they may be different dimensions of the same phenomenon.

This sameness prevails throughout the category framework. The fact that, with the addition of one category, all behaviors were classified within the categories means that the framework is a way of classifying the behaviors within the phenomenon.
There is one way in which the categories may be differentiated. Some of the categories emphasize the verb in the definition. These verbs are appraising, communicating, coordinating, and involving. The remainder of the categories emphasize the noun. These nouns are roles, human relations, policy, goals, educational resources, and community leadership. This differentiation has no particular import since verbs as well as nouns can be used to describe behavior. There are verbs and nouns in the name of each category except Communicating. To denote a behavior fully there must be a verb which shows some action, as after all, behavior is action. Generally, there should be an object of the action, as action must be in relation to something in order to have meaning.

There is another way in which the categories might be differentiated. Certain critical areas seem to be tasks while others are processes. Those which seem to the writer to be tasks are the categories which emphasize the noun, except for that of Fostering Human Relations and Working With the Community Leadership. These critical areas along with those emphasizing the verb seem to be processes.

A task refers to a specific job to be done, and by that definition, making a policy, setting a goal, using an educational resource, determining a role are all tasks performed by an educational administrator. A process refers to an on-going series of actions such as characterize communicating, coordinating, appraising, working with community leadership, fostering human relations, and involving people. When these occur they do not result in the job being done each time, they are means for doing a job.
The search for some kind of internal consistency in the critical area framework has produced four main ideas; (1) the categories, because of the way in which they have been defined, do not overlap to any great extent, (2) the categories may be coordinated in the sense that it is possible they are different dimensions of the phenomenon of administrative behavior, (3) the categories can be differentiated in terms of a noun-verb emphasis, and (4) the categories can be differentiated in terms of a task-process classification. The data of this study threw light on the problem of internal consistency in a secondary manner. Working with the behavior cards has brought the problem into sharper focus. The data of this study do not decide the question of whether or not there is an internal consistency to the category framework. It is evident that there are several measures which can be applied to determining internal consistency, but the data of this study do not do much more than suggest the need for further investigation of the problem of the coordinateness of categories.

VII. THE FRAMEWORK AS A THEORY

It is appropriate to inquire whether the category framework is or has any possibilities of becoming a theory of educational administration. Before attempting to discuss the inquiry, it is necessary to determine what a theory actually is and why it is needed.

The need for a theory of educational administration has been expressed by students of the field. Chase and Guba have observed that "the articles which do report genuine research display very little unity,
indeed, there not be any theoretical unit within even a single study."\(^1\)
They have stated that "until the integrity of the theory-practice relationship is generally recognized, research will limp along without the frame of reference necessary to organize available."\(^2\)

Along the theory-practice line the statement of Coladarci and Getzels is pertinent. A theory is

\[\ldots\] a systematic framework capable of providing guidance for decision making at points of choice \ldots. It is by this process of theory guiding practice and practice, in turn, guiding theory, that we shall be able to build up a reliable body of practice, theory, and research of general applicability in administration \ldots.\(^3\)

It is evident that there must be a close relationship between theory and practice. Griffiths states that "we have a good theory when we have established a set of principles upon which action may be predicated."\(^4\) He further states that when a person theorizes

he is expressing the results of his observations and \ldots he is inferring that because of his past observations he can predict some future happening.\(^5\)

Still another requirement of a theory is that it be a logical organization of facts.\(^6\)


\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Arthur P. Coladarci and Jacob W. Getzels, The Use of Theory in Educational Administration (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1955), p. 15.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 5.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 8.
There are, then, three requirements set forth in the literature cited. A theory must have some predictive value, it must provide guidance at points of decision, and it must be a logical organization of facts.

In its present state the category framework has little predictive value. Use of the framework will not allow one to state that "if this is done, that will happen as a result." There are no cause-effect hypotheses forming a part of the category scheme. As administrative behavior is studied further, it may well be that hypotheses having a predictive value can be made and tested.

The second requirement, that of providing guidance at points of decision, may have to do with the values which one applies to educational administration. It may well be that in the future predictions can be made. If this course of action is taken, that will be the result. It is still a value question as to whether to take the course of action or not. Some guidance on values will be needed if the administrator is to take the best courses of action. The category framework contains no definition of what an administrator should or should not do. The behaviors of the more effective and less effective administrators begin to create a guide to behavior in the various categories. It is through continued study of behavior that guidance for points of decision may be gained. The category framework will aid in making the guides for behavior easier to comprehend and use since it provides a way of organizing the information.

The third requirement, that of providing a logical organization
of facts, is one which the category framework meets in part. The framework is an organization of facts. The facts consist of the units of behavior. The units of behavior were organized by classifying each of them in terms of the category framework. The facts are organized, but the matter of logical organization is a moot question. The discussion regarding coordinateness of the categories is pertinent here. There was little evidence to the effect that there is an internal consistency in the category framework. This kind of consistency would provide logic for the organization. The data of this study suggest that studies be designed to test the category framework in this respect.

The category framework does not meet completely all three requirements of a theory of educational administration. There is evidence to indicate that the framework does have possibilities in contributing to a theory. From its use, cause-effect hypotheses may be developed, and guides for behavior can be formulated. The logic of the organization remains to be shown by further research and refinement of the categories.

VIII. SUMMARY

The data presented in this chapter were those pertaining to the first hypothesis of this study. Six ways of looking at the data were studied. These ways were the criteria used in determining whether the observed administrator behavior could be described within the framework of the categories.

It was found that an additional category called Fostering Human
Relations was needed in order to place all observed behavior in a category. The frequency distribution showed that all categories included some behaviors, but that all members of the sample observed did not behave in all categories. Over one-half the behaviors appeared in two categories. A rank ordering of frequencies of behavior in the categories indicated that each executive head produced a similar pattern of behavior in the category framework.

The reliability check produced further evidence that, given the definitions of the categories, other persons will categorize behaviors in a highly similar manner. Even though high agreement can be attained, the framework does not have sufficient discriminatory power to allow classifying every behavior absolutely and finally into only one category. Behaviors found in the data were used to illustrate this problem of discreteness of the categories.

A search was made for some kind of internal consistency in the category framework. Several measures were applied in an attempt to determine whether or not the categories were coordinate. The data of this study did not decide the question of internal consistency.

Finally, the matter of the category framework as a theory of educational administration was discussed. Three requirements of such a theory were presented, and the way in which the framework meets them was outlined. The category framework did not meet completely the three requirements, but did show evidence of having possibilities in contributing to a theory.
CHAPTER VI
DIFFERENTIATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR
WITHIN THE CATEGORIES

The second hypothesis of this study had to do with the differences between the more effective and less effective groups revealed by the framework. It was hypothesized that the administrative behavior of the executive heads will vary qualitatively and quantitatively within the critical areas. If the framework reveals a difference between the two groups, and allows the research to pinpoint the various facets of that difference, the category framework will serve a very useful purpose.

I. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In order to determine whether or not the framework does differentiate between the two groups, it is necessary to study both qualitative and quantitative aspects of the data. Statistical methods provide ways of looking at both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the data. The first of these is the frequency distribution in each category for each of the two groups. Group A represents the men judged to be more effective and Group C represents the men judged to be less effective.
Frequency Distribution

Table VI shows the frequency distribution which resulted from counting the behaviors observed among the members of the sample. The table reveals that Group C members exhibited more behaviors than Group A members. Group C members were "busier" than the others. They moved about a great deal and performed a number of detail duties. Their activities were more rapid-fire than were those of Group A members. For these reasons they garnered a greater number of behaviors over the same length of observation period as the other group.

The table also shows that four members of Group A exhibited fewer behaviors than the members of Group C who exhibited the fewest behaviors. This fact indicates that the tendency for Group A members to exhibit fewer behaviors was not sporatic. No member of Group C exhibited fewer than two hundred behaviors while four out of five Group A members exhibited fewer than two hundred behaviors.

Group C members behaved more frequently in seven of the ten categories. In three categories, Involving People, Setting Goals, and Using the Educational Resources of the Community, the members of Group A exhibited the greater number of behaviors. These categories did not show a substantial difference between the two groups. Since the difference between the groups was not large in the three categories, and since the larger number of behaviors in the remaining seven categories resulted, in part, from the fact that Group C members had more behaviors to distribute among the categories, the analysis of differences between the groups from the standpoint of frequencies alone does not bear a great deal of fruit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group A Executive Heads</th>
<th>Group C Total</th>
<th>Group A &amp; C Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Effectiveness</td>
<td>38 18 33 24 19 132</td>
<td>28 20 43 38 13 142</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>64 67 96 41 47 315</td>
<td>60 80 70 69 120 399</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure</td>
<td>6 10 17 15 37 85</td>
<td>27 67 22 25 23 164</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Roles</td>
<td>41 37 61 36 52 227</td>
<td>54 105 82 59 133 433</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Human Relations</td>
<td>20 7 14 6 3 50</td>
<td>12 11 4 12 11 51</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Maintaining Policy</td>
<td>7 5 12 1 1 26</td>
<td>9 1 4 1 6 21</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Goals</td>
<td>3 6 13 12 5 39</td>
<td>16 16 4 9 14 59</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving People</td>
<td>5 10 20 9 1 45</td>
<td>4 8 13 6 7 38</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Educational Resources of the Community</td>
<td>- 1 - 1 2 4</td>
<td>1 - - 1 - 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Community Leadership</td>
<td>- - - - - 0</td>
<td>1 - 2 2 4 9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184 161 266 145 167 923</td>
<td>212 308 244 227 327 1318</td>
<td>2241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage Distribution

The percentages of the total behavior in each group belonging to the individual categories provide a better basis for noting differences. Table VII lists these percentages. It is evident that Group A members behaved in certain categories to a greater extent of their total behaviors than did Group C members. Group A members had greater percentages in Appraising Effectiveness, Communicating, Fostering Human Relations, Setting Goals, Involving People and Using the Educational Resources of the Community. Group C members had greater percentages in Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure, Determining Roles, Making and Maintaining Policy, and Working with Community Leadership. The first three of the categories in which Group C members had greater percentages embody many reasons for the difference between the two groups. In the "coordinating" category one finds behaviors having to do with office routine, in the next two categories one finds Group C members meeting a multitude of problems as they arise with less regard for solutions which might prevent similar problems from arising again and again. Meanwhile, Group A members were occupied with longer term plans as they appraised the program and set goals.

These explanations of the percentage differences should not be taken to mean that all behavior in the "coordinating" and "role" categories was of the type described, nor that all behaviors in "appraising" and "setting goals" were long-term. These categories include these types of behavior as well as others. The qualitative differences between the two groups will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group A Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Group C Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Effectiveness</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>29.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Roles</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>32.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Human Relations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Maintaining Policy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Goals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving People</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Educational Resources of the Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Community Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                                        | 923               | 100.00     | 1318              | 100.00     |
Rank Order

The differences between the two groups in terms of frequencies are also illustrated by use of rank ordering. Table VIII contains the frequencies and rank order of the categories by each of the groups. It reveals that the ranks for each category vary no more than two. In fact, the ranks vary only by one for all categories except for "Making and Maintaining Policy." Even though the pattern as indicated by percentages shows clear differences, the over-all ranking shows that there is a consistency about the rank order of the categories by the groups in terms of frequency.

Chi-square Test of Significance

Still another method was used to compare the frequencies in the categories of the two groups. The Chi-square test was applied to the two frequency distributions. The Chi-square of the difference between Group A and Group C yielded a figure of 35.921, which with seven degrees of freedom means that the difference is significant beyond the 0.1 per cent level.

Because of the requirement that each cell of the contingency table contain a frequency of at least five, it was necessary to combine two categories, Using the Educational Resources of the Community and Working with Community Leadership, with the Category Involving People.1

---

### TABLE VIII

**Frequencies and Rank Order of the Categories by the Two Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group A Frequency</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Group C Frequency</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Roles</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Effectiveness</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Human Relations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Goals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Maintaining Policy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving People</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Educational Resources of the Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Community Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highly significant difference found between the distributions of the two groups is perhaps the sharpest indication that the category framework does differentiate between the two groups. The question then arises as to whether certain categories contribute more than others to the difference, and which categories show significant differences between the two groups.

Applying the Chi-square test to those categories which have sufficient frequencies that the test can be used, one finds that one category Determining Roles shows a significant difference beyond the 0.1 per cent level. The test yielded a figure of 16.07 which was entered on the table with one degree of freedom. This is a highly significant difference in frequency. Another category Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure shows a significance approaching the one per cent level. A Chi-square test yielded a figure of 6.26 which was also entered on the table with one degree of freedom. These were the only categories in which differences exceeding the five per cent level occurred, and in both of them Group C members held the greater frequency. In one category, that of Communicating, a difference approaching the five per cent level was found. The test yielded a figure of 2.47 which was under the 3.841 needed to attain the five per cent level. Again Group C members had the greater frequency, as indicated by Table VIII. It is evident that three categories have contributed the weight which makes the category framework differentiate in a statistically significant manner between the two groups.
II. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

It is not possible to exhaust the data gathered in this study through exclusive use of statistical methods of analysis. Actual illustration by use of quoting what was said and done by the executive heads enables one to get a clearer picture of the differences found between the two groups within the categories.

The critical areas are studied separately, and the qualitative differences, if any, are described. It is difficult to apply a value system to the behaviors observed in this study. Yet quality is related to values and some values must be applied in order to determine qualitative differences.

One might say that the values used to differentiate quality arose in an inductive manner. As the cards of each group were read and re-read, the writer asked himself what kinds of behavior seemed to be most characteristic of each. The value entered in when the kind of behavior was determined. Why was a particular value selected? Because the data threw light on it as being a point of difference.

No attempt is made here to test statistically significant differences. In many cases there are not enough behaviors to make statistical treatment possible. But more important is the fundamental question as to whether statistical treatments are the only tests of significance. It is conceivable that a behavior may occur only once and yet be extremely significant to everyone in the social matrix. One telephone conversation with a parent or one correction of a student's
behavior may color a person's estimate of the effectiveness of the executive head.

The fact that one group performs an act more than another may also be highly significant even though numbers are so low that no statistical treatment may be applied. The fact that one county had 101 automobile accidents during the past year and another of about the same size had 100 makes little statistical difference. It does make a human difference, especially if my accident is number 101 in the first county.

All this is said in order to make the point that this portion of the research is based on qualitative considerations which have little base in quantitative methodology. It is to state further that descriptive research as well as statistical treatment, is useful in the analysis of data.

For purposes of this description, the two groups of executive heads will continue to be referred to as A and C, Group A being the administrators judged to be more effective and Group C those judged to be less effective. Use of the letter S in the descriptions indicates the executive head being observed.

**Appraising Effectiveness**

The behavior of the two groups in this category differed in several ways. Group A members were freer in making complimentary statements as they appraised effectiveness. A member of this group also tended to ask others for their thinking as he formulated his own
appraisal. Group A members tended to appraise the effectiveness of procedures or existing arrangements to a greater extent than behavior of specific people such as students or teachers. The members of Group A made few inspectorial visits of the school plant.

The qualities displayed by Group A were also evident in the behavior of the members of Group C, although to a lesser extent. It should also be said that some behavior found among Group A members displayed qualities quite the opposite of those listed above; however, this was far more prevalent among Group C members.

Examples of the qualitative differences between the two groups in the category of Appraising Effectiveness are necessary to illustrate specific behavioral differences. The following are quoted directly from the data cards.

Complimentary and uncomplimentary statements. Group A members exhibited the following behaviors:

S pointed out two good features of the plan which the athletic director had presented. He said, "Your set-up sounds good."

S listened to the members of the reading group with which the teacher was working. S listened to each member of the group read a paragraph aloud in his reading book. S then told the group that they read very well.

The clerk asked S to read a letter he had written to the State Supervisor of School Lunch programs regarding the excess amount in the cafeteria fund of the school. S read the letter and said, "That's fine."

In talking to the president of the board of education about the commencement exercises, S said, "I think the caps and gowns added a lot and the students did well in memorizing their little speeches."
After making a phone call to Chicago to a person he had met through the County Superintendent, S said, "Our County Superintendent wants us to meet all the people in education we can. That's the kind of good leadership he gives us."

When S completed reading he said, "This is one of the finest speeches I have ever heard given." Board members nodded their approval.

Not all occasions called for compliments on the part of members of Group A.

S asked the teachers and cooks why there was a delay of 12 minutes in the cafeteria line. The illness of the secretary meant that no one was there to take the money and punch the tickets as students went through the line. Children and teachers stood by patiently for 12 minutes. S said, "They were a bunch of wooden Indians."

While walking through the hall, S met a member of a neighboring community. The neighboring community has an elementary school and sends high school students to S's district on a tuition basis. The man explained to S his reason for favoring combining his district with S's district. S told the man, "We would be happy to work with you on it, but everytime we meet together we find Mr. Hutchinson too domineering." The man said, "Yes, he thinks you are trying to put something over on him, but I realize we could have a much better school if we combined."

Group C members tended to "gripe" more than they complimented.

While looking over report forms filled out by teachers, S said, "What they had better do at O.S.U. is to get some of these report forms that we have to fill out and teach these people how to fill them out."

The secretary reported that Mr. Justice of the Community refused to have his children take the polio vaccination. He had said, "They're not going to make guinea pigs out of my kids." S remarked, "They need a shot for hydrophobia more than one for polio."

S said, "Our other elementary school still has outdoor toilets and the common washbasin for all students. Why they don't fix it up, I don't know. They are very complacent."
A teacher entered the office and reported that one of the students did not report to the sixth period study hall. S said, "And what burns me up, I just let him go home the other day, now he skips out without permission."

S said, "The coach knows he is leaving and he doesn't give a darn. He lets his kids run loose. Then he tries to give me the impression that he is running after students from other classes. Oh well, I guess that's the way the world wags."

Some Group C members saw the brighter side.

The County Superintendent entered the office. S reported to him the resignation of the history teacher. S said, "He certainly will be a hard man to replace. He has done an excellent job for us. He makes history and literature so interesting that the children want to read their lessons. That's really something."

S said to the coach. "The Seniors have selected Fred as the best citizen. I couldn't have made a better choice myself."

Getting the appraisals of others. Group A members sought the thoughts of others in formulating judgments or in appraising a situation with a view toward making a decision.

S said to the president of the board, "I had the people involved in last summer's recreation program write an evaluation. Our changes in the program are based on these."

S explained to the clerk who had not been at the board meeting that the first item of business concerned a music camp held each August. S said, "We met with the Music Booster representatives. Both the incoming and outgoing officers were present and we evaluated the camp. We were told that there was not enough activity, that after a day of playing their instruments children needed to have recreational activity to get rid of their extra energy."

A third grade teacher entered the office and S showed her the types of seats illustrated in the brochure. One seat provided space for two children at one large desk. S asked the teacher what she thought of that type of seat.
Group A members sometimes appraised actions without getting the opinions of those who were a part of the action. As an example:

In speaking of the rental of caps and gowns, S said to the seniors, "You chose the most expensive kind. I don't know why. You could have gotten them for $2.25."

The few examples of getting the thinking of others in appraisal among Group C members stemmed largely from one meeting of an executive head with a group of teachers.

S said to the group of elementary teachers, "Now how about writing workbooks? Is there anyone who wants to depart from the Zaner-Blosser books?" None of the teachers responded.

S asked the group of elementary teachers if there was anyone who wanted to depart from the spellers they were using. One of the teachers asked, "Why couldn't we buy them for students?" S cited the law that the school board could not buy any items used only once.

Group C members were prone to make judgmental statements without getting the thoughts of others.

Regarding tests which were purchased by the county office and were used in turn by the schools, S said to a neighboring executive head, "I won't buy tests together again."

S looked over the commencement program given him by a high school student. S said, "They don't have anything here, "I'll have to do it myself. She was to work it out with the sponsor and the music teacher, but this isn't any program."

Appraising procedures or specific people. Although members of Group A did a great deal of appraising specific people, they appraised procedures to a greater extent than Group C. The following typify their appraisal of procedures:

While talking to the P.T.A. member who was charged with the responsibility for forming the by-laws of the P.T.A. S said, "This whole thing rather worries me because I
wonder if it will be done by a representative group. Have you thought of that? Perhaps you could check the by-laws to see if there is anything in there that might cause embarrassment."

In talking over the summer recreation program with the local businessman and the athletic director, S said, "We might consider the scope of our program. Last year we had just the two centers." The businessman said, "Yes, that was our biggest criticism."

While talking to a prospective teacher, S said, "It's hard to get people interested in music, but once you get it started, it is O.K. It is difficult to have instrumental music on the elementary school level. When the students get out of the 8th grade, they go off to high school but now that we will have a high school in the district we will be able to keep them. We have employed a man to work on instrumental music in our elementary schools."

Regarding the weekly reports made by elementary teachers, S said, "There have been a few teachers who like to use these reports for griping but most of them tell the good things as well as the bad ones. They are very willing to fill them out because they know that items regarding upkeep are quickly taken care of."

Group A members appraised the actions of specific people more favorably than members of Group C. Examples of Group A remarks were:

S said to the board, "Our history teacher is resigning to work on his degree. I would rather have a good teacher and lose him than wonder how to get rid of a poor one."

In regard to the principal of one of the schools, S said, "We would like to promote him. It's so hard to get a man in the elementary school and he has done a good job. He is ambitious but not offensively ambitious and we'd like to put him in one of our better buildings."

S showed the mother a drawing made by her son. The drawing was to be used to plan a new section of the bleachers for the football field. He complimented the woman on her son's work and said that he was a fine boy. S then said, "But he has one little habit which I suppose you have noticed. He doesn't seem to be able to stick to his work in order to get it done quickly." The mother said she had noticed her son's slowness.
Group C members did appraise procedures to some extent. The following were examples of this.

S went over bid forms submitted to the school by suppliers of equipment. S explained that each year the needs of the school regarding papers of all kinds, pencil sharpeners, pencils, ink, etc., are listed and submitted to companies for bids. He said, "This really pays."

After observing the diagraming of sentences in a classroom, S said, "Maybe I'm old fashioned but we take scholarships. It produces results."

S said, "Every year I think I'll do something different on this exam business but the kids break loose no matter what you do. I guess it is the same all over. One of the women in the grocery store asked the janitor what these kids are doing downtown. She asked if we aren't having school anymore. That was the only complaint I heard."

Group C members referred to specific persons in many of their appraisals.

A large share of these were unfavorable to those being appraised.

One of the board members asked S, "What about Mr. X?" S said, "There isn't much to do about him. He still has some time on his contract. He does some of his extra duties but not all that we are paying him for. He did keep a kid from bleeding to death by placing his finger at the proper point on his arm."

S said, "We have a good student body, but I had to expel two boys recently. They constantly annoyed teachers. I walked into a study hall and one of them was crawling in the aisle on all fours. I jerked him up and he took a swing at me. The board supported my action in sending him out of the school. Later the second boy pulled a similar trick. Both boys now have working permits."

While walking to one section of the building S noted that several students were sitting out on the grass under a tree with a teacher. S said, "They are having music out there, but I don't know how much they are learning." Regarding the teacher, S said, "I hope she moves on."

After talking to the boys who had skipped school, S said, "I wish they'd just have kept on coming down the street rather than running away. They must think I'm stupid or something. They knew I could see them."
There were some favorable appraisals of persons. For example:

\[ S \text{ said to the board of education, "There is one teacher in our system who should get a raise. She really works. She stays after school and does all kinds of things for us."} \]

**Inspectorial visits of the school plant.** All instances of school plant inspection by members of Group A had to do with inspection of buildings under construction or installation of new equipment.

\[ S \text{ checked the installation of bleachers in the new gym. Three men were assembling them. S commented on the good quality of the bleachers.} \]

\[ \text{While checking new cafeteria equipment, S remarked to the architect that he would not have purchased the milk cabinet if he had to do it over again. S said, "The milk supplier would be willing to furnish the milk cooler to our specifications free for being able to supply the milk."} \]

Members of Group C were occupied with inspections in the realm of custodial duties.

\[ S \text{ checked a fountain which was producing rusty water.} \]

\[ S \text{ entered the boys rest room. He noticed that a grill had been unscrewed and said, "I'll have to ask the janitor to put a couple of screws in there." S also checked for writing on the walls alongside the toilets.} \]

\[ S \text{ checked the condition of the bleachers on the football field. He said, "I believe these bleachers will need another coat of paint this summer."} \]

**Communicating**

Distinct differences between the groups presented themselves in the study of behaviors in the critical area called Communicating. Members of Group A were found to initiate rather than simply receive or relay communication, although they did some of the latter. Some Group C
members seemed almost preoccupied with the handling of the mail. The latter group was called upon to answer many questions bordering upon the level of trivia and detail. They also requested much information from others which was on the same level. Dealing with detail seemed to be characteristic of the behaviors of Group C in communicating.

**Initiating as opposed to relaying or receiving communication.**

Members of Group A used a large share of their Communicating behaviors to initiate communication.

S told the principal that several parents had been requesting a six weeks summer school term. He told him he did not know whether the board could afford it, and that it would probably have to be on some sort of tuition basis.

S called a roofing contractor. He said, "I don't know much about roofing but I'll have to get an estimate so I can fill out these rehabilitation forms."

S said to one of the teachers, "Are you all set in your assignments for the summer school term?" The teacher said that she was and S responded, "That's good."

S asked the typing teacher, "Have you been to any new departments or gotten any university advise regarding setting up a department?" The teacher replied that she had, and that she wished to have students start their work on manual machines.

S told the secretary to tell the janitor about the trouble with the front door.

S called the building contractor in the area to find out how many homes he was going to build. He did this in order to complete a report being sent to the U. S. Office of Education.

S wrote an announcement regarding a trip to a Cleveland Baseball game in June and placed it on the bulletin board.

S wrote a note to the agriculture teacher asking him about the purchase of the saw.
Members of Group A also acted as receivers and relayers of communication but to a far lesser extent than they initiated communication.

S answered the phone. He took a message for one of the teachers and wrote a note to him.

The high school principal informed S that they were saving money on textbooks next year. He said, "We are going to buy enough for large sections and then trade them around. We will also get some reference books." S said, "That's good."

A cook asked S about the schedule for next week. S told her, "We will have full days of school on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, and dismiss early Thursday."

The architect called S to tell him that arrangements had been made to travel to Chicago on Thursday in order to get the building plans approved. S wrote down the time of leaving and arriving.

Group C members also initiated communication.

S asked the secretary, "Did we sell our pens for $2.75?" She answered, "Yes."

S told the teacher that he had called the parents of the students who were absent that day that their illness was not a result of the polio shots.

S told the elementary teachers, "I am working on a faculty bulletin. It will contain dates and closing-day tasks. You will be receiving it next week."

S told a group of seniors who had entered the office that they would have practice for graduation at 3:00 that afternoon.

S entered an elementary classroom and asked the teacher if she wished to use a standardized test of her final examination. S said, "It should have gotten here sooner, but it didn't." The teacher said, "I have my own tests already made and I think that they would be better for a final examination. I would have been glad to give them earlier."

But Group C members seemed to ride with the tide of incoming communications.
S answered the telephone. It was a call for a student. S said, "He went uptown to eat and is not in the school building. May I have him call you?" S took the number of the caller.

A girl entered the office and asked for the cellophane tape. S said, "The juniors have it in the gym."

A teacher entered the office and wanted to know where the slide projector was. S told her where it was and that it was available to her.

A boy entered the office and told S that the speech teacher wished to use the recorder for class next period. The boy said that the teacher did not know how to operate the recorder and that none of the boys did either. S said, "I don't have time to run it. Mrs. X is the only other one who can run it and she is busy. I put a new tape on it and the last time I used it the tape was in a million pieces."

The music teacher entered the office and asked S about the school schedule for the last week of school. S said, "We will have two days of school that week and those are for examinations."

A teacher asked S whether a certain student had withdrawn from school. S said, "Yes, he withdrew last week."

One of the students asked S what economic geography was. S said, "It has to do with countries and where they are located. I can't really tell you much since I never took the course."

Many requests made to Group C members could have been answered in communications initiated by the executive heads. Since this was seldom done, they received many more requests for information.

Dealing with the mail. All members of Group A spent some time reading or looking over the day's mail.

S looked over the mail which had been sorted by the secretary and opened the pieces of mail which he deemed to be important.
S looked over the morning's mail, sorting out letters and ads.

S went to the post office to get the mail. He took a portion of it to his own home on the way back to school. However, members of Group C seemed to spend a great deal of time and effort getting, sorting, and reading the mail.

S went to the post office with the outgoing mail and brought back the morning's mail.

S sorted the morning's mail marking some pieces of it to go to teachers.

S sorted the morning's mail.

S got the rest of the mail in the school's boiler room. The mail had been deposited there by the janitor.

S sorted the morning's mail.

S got the rest of the mail in the school's boiler room. The mail had been deposited there by the janitor.

S put the mail that he had sorted into the teacher's mail boxes.

S went to the post office to mail letters and get the morning mail. S brought the mail to the car, sorting it there. Finding a post card which was put into the wrong box, he returned it to the post office.

S sorted the mail. He placed an invoice in the clerk's mailbox.

Kinds of information given by the subject. Behaviors of the two groups differed considerably as to the kinds of information with which they dealt. Group C members seemed to be called upon to "dish out" much information having to do with trivia. The following illustrations indicate the type of information which can be called trivia.

S entered the third grade room and made an announcement to the students that they could go to the baseball game the next afternoon. He told them that there would be a five cent admission charge and the bus would be leaving at 3:30. He also said that the seniors were going to sell pop, potato chips and candy, and that they should bring extra money if they wished to buy any of these.
S answered the phone. He took a message of the first
grade teacher regarding the purchase of ice cream bars the
following day.

A girl entered the office and asked if S had put extra
money into an envelope which she had. She said, "I have
$1.80 over what I should have for selling the tickets." S
replied that he put $1.50 in and that he had used the money
for a bake sale. S told the girl that it was all senior
money anyway and the discrepancy of $.30 might have been
his mistake in making change at the bake sale.

A girl came into the office and asked S if the shorthand
class were meeting today. S answered that it was.

A teacher entered the office and asked to use the tape
recorder. S told her where the recorder was kept.

A small boy came into the office and asked whether two
Eversharp had been found. S looked in his drawer and replied
that nothing had been brought in.

In some instances, Group C members dealt with information above the
level of trivia.

S entered the room where a teacher was helping the
freshman class to register. A boy asked if advanced algebra
would be given the next year. S said, "If there are enough
who want it, we will give it. Are there five students who
will take it?"

A girl came in to register. She said, "I don't know
what I want to take." S gave the girl several alternatives
as to what to take among the elective courses and described
several courses to her.

The level of information with which the members of Group A dealt was
generally above the level of trivia.

S went over the Kuder Preference Test results with a
student. S explained to him that he was high on interest
in social service work and medicine.

S told the prospective teacher that a raise in pay
depended upon what the state legislature would do regarding
increased funds for schools. S showed the teacher a salary
schedule and pointed out the various stages and increments in the schedule.

S answered the phone. The editor of the local newspaper called to ask the result of the school enumeration. S said, "I have only the survey taken and will have to go over it with the principals. I won't be able to announce anything until I go over the enrollment projection."

One of the board members asked S why the combined bid of Krause and Pigura was so much less than their separate bids on the general contract and the electrical work. S said, "They are able to combine labor for the two jobs and can run the thing together. He raised the electrical bid so that he was sure he wouldn't get it alone."

The music teacher told S about a job offer which he had from a neighboring school. S said, "At the present time, I don't see any additional help for the music department. We won't be able to hire a separate vocal teacher."

A teacher asked S whether the district scholarship tests included just the finalists. S replied that they did.

Not all information given by Group A members was above the level of trivia.

S told the secretary to tell the janitor about the trouble with the front door.

S answered the phone. He said, "I don't know whether he is here yet or not," and went to sound system where he called a teacher to the phone.

Kinds of information asked for by the subject. Information was sought by Group A members in a variety of areas. The instructional program, extra class activities, professional activities, business matters, prospective teachers, insurance, and legal procedures were the subjects about which these men had questions.

Exemplory of their queries were these behaviors:
S asked the teacher, "How did your students do in the 8th grade test?" The teacher reported the scores and said he was satisfied with their performance.

S asked the principal, "Did you decide about the 7th grade repeaters?" The principal said, "We haven't made a final decision on all of them yet, but there is one boy we know we are going to have to keep back."

S said to the prospective teacher, "On our present schedule, we could pay $3100. Would you work for that?" The teacher said that even though she had been getting $3200 the previous year she would work for that.

While talking to the assistant state superintendent of public instruction on the phone, S asked him, "Do you remember the recent bus accident in our county? It has prompted county schools to re-assess their insurance programs. We are considering raising our insurance liability on buses to $300,000. Yet I see that would not be compatible with statute. If we were to get a company that would insure up to $300,000 would they be able to back out on us since the law says that $100,000 is the limit? S also asked him about spending money for the increased protection. S asked, "Will the auditor make a finding on this?"

S asked the typing teacher, "Have you been to any new departments or gotten any university advice regarding setting up a department?" The teacher replied that she had and that she wished to have students start their work in manual machines.

Members of Group C asked about a different set of areas. They made queries about the arrival of the mail, finding materials in the school, testing arrangements, why students misbehave, scheduling classes and registering pupils, prospective teachers, and the whereabouts of students. Examples of their questions were these:

S asked the secretary, "Have the diplomas come in yet?" The secretary said, "No," and S said, "Has the mail come in this afternoon?"

S said to the girl who had been truant from school, "Did your mother know that you left school on Monday?"
S entered an elementary classroom and asked the teacher if she wished to use a standardized test for the final examination. S said, "It should have gotten here sooner but it didn't." The teacher said, "I have my own tests already made out and think they would be better for a final examination. I would have been glad to give them earlier."

S entered a second grade classroom and asked whether any of the boys served as patrol boys. None of them did. S said, "I didn't think so."

S asked a teacher, "Did you order anything? We have a package at the freight station from Philadelphia and I don't remember ordering anything." The teacher said she hadn't ordered anything.

S asked a teacher how much of his work in entering grades had been done. The teacher told S that students had handed in their make-up work. S said, "Very good."

S entered the gymnasium and spoke to two boys who were decorating the room for the banquet. S asked how they were coming along and if they needed any materials.

S asked the prospective teacher if the X school was progressive or traditional, and whether the chairs were in straight rows. The prospective teacher said, "Yes, the chairs are in straight rows."

Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure

The critical area of Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure reveals differences between the two groups which have to do with details and trivia also. Although the members of Group A did exhibit some behaviors having to do with office routine, Group C members showed a marked tendency to make this a dominant activity. Group A members scheduled their time and made appointments to see others, while Group C members did not. Group A members worked out agendas for meetings and learning activities while Group C members scheduled classes and special student activities.
Keeping routine office records. Members of Group A did spend some time taking care of office routines. These behaviors occurred even when a secretary was employed.

S wrote checks from the activity fund.

S wrote requisition forms for bills and entered expenditures in a large account book.

S listed the gasoline bills for each of the buses. He added the bills for each bus and entered them on the record.

Members of Group C were almost profuse in their exhibition of behaviors of this type. A great deal of time was spent handling money and office records.

S wrote a check for the potato chips and asked that the man stop next week as the junior class might have an order.

A student presented a bill and asked S to write a check for it. S wrote a check.

A student brought some money to the office. S wrote a receipt and gave the student the change.

A student librarian brought ten cents into the office and gave it to S. She told him that it was a payment of a fine. S put it into the money bag in the safe.

S took the attendance slips from the clip on the office door and used the adding machine to add the number of children who were to eat in the cafeteria.

S entered a record of the day's attendance on the permanent record forms.

A student gave S the money earned at a class party. S checked the amount and put it in a sack. S wrote a receipt for the money.

S gave the checks which he had written for the activity fund to his secretary to be mailed.

Supplying requests for small items. There was some behavior of this type among Group A members.
A teacher asked for 2 sets of tests. S went to the file and got them for her.

A student entered the office and asked S for a pay order. S gave her a small tablet containing pay orders.

A student entered the office and asked S for a folder for typing papers. S got the folder for her.

Group C members were occupied with this kind of behavior to a greater extent.

A student entered the office and asked for a stapler. S got the stapler from a drawer and gave it to her.

A student entered the office and asked for four rubber bands. S got them out of his desk drawer and gave them to her.

A student entered the office and asked for an envelope in which to mail a check. S gave the student an envelope.

A student entered the office and asked for a Scotch tape dispenser. S gave it to her.

A student entered the office and asked for a slide rule. S went to the cupboard to get one and gave it to the boy.

A teacher entered the office and asked S for the glue. S went to the storage shelf and gave the teacher the glue.

Making appointments. Group A members were observed to schedule their time and make appointments for persons to see them.

S answered the phone. He said that he would be happy to see the caller on Tuesday. The caller was from the State Department of Education and wished to talk to S about the rehabilitation program. S made a notation regarding the appointment.

A salesman wished to talk to S about tires for the school buses. S said, "I'd like to talk to you, but I'm pretty busy now. Would you come back after school this afternoon?" The salesman agreed to do so.

S made an appointment to see the prospective teacher at 11:00 the next morning. He took her phone number in case of a change in his plans.
As S was checking equipment, the athletic director of the school came to S and asked for an appointment to see him at 1:00 that afternoon. S agreed with the time of the appointment and said, "I'll see you at 1:00 o'clock."

The members of Group C made no appointments in scheduling their time. During the period of observation no person asked any member of this group for an appointment.

**Making agendas and schedules.** Members of Group A were observed to be working on agendas for meetings and upon the scheduling of meetings and learning activities for pupils.

The teachers' meeting was to be held at 3:45 that afternoon. S worked on his agenda for the meeting. He worked out the instructions he was to give them for filling out the annual statistical report.

S prepared the agenda for the board meeting. He took the agenda items from a small bound book in which he had written the items previously.

The music teacher asked S about the possibility of a beginners band made up of 5th and 6th grade students. S said, "When can you work with these elementary students? What do you do the last period of the day? The 5th grade teacher would be available at that time for the junior band." S also asked the music teacher what his music schedule was for the first period when students might be released for band practice.

S went to the English teacher's room and asked if it would suit her to give the class a standardized test at 1:30 that afternoon. The teacher said it would suit her.

Members of Group C were concerned mainly with working out class schedules and arranging for special activities.

S worked on the schedule for high school classes for next year. He attempted to change from an eight period day to a six period day without adding teachers.

S worked on a semester test schedule in which he was combining two periods into one, spreading the schedule of one day over two.
A teacher entered the office and asked S, "When does the baseball team leave this morning?" S said, "At 9:00." The teacher said, "At 9:00? When will we practice for graduation? We'd better bring the seniors in this afternoon." S said, "All right, we can have them practice at 3:00."

S placed his proposed schedule of classes and his course of study sheet side by side to compare them. After a period of study he said, "I think I have this ready for mimeographing."

S worked on the high school schedule for the following year. He combined vocational agriculture classes and farm shop classes and worked out a new schedule for vocational agriculture and home economics.

A teacher showed S the schedule for practice for graduation exercises that morning. S approved the schedule and said that there might be some complication with putting up the chairs. S said, "But we'll work that out."

Determining Roles

Several qualitative differences are evident in the critical area Determining Roles. Group A members tended to see their own roles in an optimistic light, were less harsh in their correcting of student's roles, and took occasion to explain and interpret roles to others in the situation.

Group C members were faced with many role problems. These had to do with pupils and teachers and were of the "what shall I do next?" variety. Group A members seemed to be more adept at delegating authority in a manner broad enough to avoid a large share of the detailed matters of role dealt with by Group C members. Criticisms of others roles by Group A members were directed to the person or persons concerned, rather than being withheld or muttered under the breath.
The illustrations which follow indicated some of the greatest differences between the two groups to be found in any category.

Subject's concept of his own role. Group A members were observed to be enjoying their positions and making positive statements about their work.

S said, "If a man can't leave the school without his absence being noted, he isn't doing much of a job. It's so easy to get lost in small potatoes in school administration. They say a lot of men even count money. It's the job of the executive to find out what the important jobs are. You have to give a person responsibility and get out of the way and see what he does about it."

S said, "I'm developing a staff--surrounding myself with the best persons possible, and I'm delegating authority as fast as it is possible."

The statements made by Group C members regarding their roles were more negative in character.

S said, "You'll probably see me counting pennies for the school cafeteria or selling tee shirts. They have practically made us a store here."

S said, "I like teaching better than administration. I have my application in for an overseas teaching job. I wouldn't mind this if I had a secretary to help with the work. My wife says that's all I do anymore."

S said to the board of education, "I don't know how I can do my administrative job and still spend so much time teaching those children. It is not that I don't like teaching. I love it but I just can't do it all. I don't have any chance to see what kind of teaching is going on in the school. I can't take care of parents and attendance problems."

After the teacher had left the room, S said to the board of education, "You have heard what he has had to say. Do what you will. I'm not going to tell you what to do. Far be it from me to tell you what to do. If I ever try to tell you
what to do I want someone to put me in my place." Board members discussed the matter and decided to remain agreed that the teacher's contract should not be renewed for the following year.

Correcting students' roles. Members of both groups felt themselves called upon to correct the behavior of students who had gotten "out of line." Group A members did less of this and did it in a more calm manner.

Two boys came into the office just as S walked in. One said, "We were playing a game." The other said, "We were standing in line playing a game." S said, "Do you know what happened to you the last time you were in here?" The boys said, "Yes." S took them to a classroom where he said they could "cool their heels for awhile."

While S was walking through the hall he stopped a boy running in the opposite direction. S reminded the boy not to run in the hall.

S placed his hands on the shoulders of a boy who was out of order in the cafeteria line. He placed him at a different spot in the line.

Group C members were often found telling students what to do or what not to do in harsh terms. Special assignments or threats were used.

S heard a commotion in the hall and left the office to see what the difficulty was. He said, "Come on boys, let's get going. You know where to go."

Four boys entered the office and said that they needed excuses to get into science class. S said, "Where are the excuses I gave you yesterday?" The boys said that the teacher was not there yesterday and they left their excuses at home. One of the boys said, "I left it in my other pants." S said, "I'm not going to write you an excuse. I'm tired of writing excuses for you. Get your books and come to the study hall."

A boy entered the office and said that he had been tardy to class. S asked the secretary to give the boy an admission slip and told the boy to get a book and return to the office. S told the boy, "I'll give you an assignment since you have been so careless."
S said to the girl. "How can a nice girl like you get mixed up with a bunch of boys like that?" He added, "I hope that I can count on you because when the attendance officer was at your place the last time he said that the next time he came he would have to issue a court order. That would be a shame on your parents. They want you in school."

S said to a boy sitting with a girl on the next bench. "You ought to go home with Evans. You could get some work done too."

Three girls entered the office. S asked them, "Where did you get to yesterday?" Each said she had gone home to work. S said, "You three deliberately walked out. That's nothing but pure truancy. What bus do you ride on?" The girls told him. S said, "You're going to have to make up some time. When you get here in the morning, report to Mrs. X's room and stay there until school begins. Do that for the rest of this week and next."

A bell rang during the noon period and S was standing in the hall. S said to the students, "The bell has sounded, act accordingly." The students continued on their way to classes.

Interpreting a role to others. Several behaviors on the part of Group A members had to do with the attempt on the part of the subject to explain the role of one person to another person.

While talking to a salesman about school furniture S said to him, "You'll have to see my new business manager regarding supplies. He'll have charge of that area from now on."

S said to the group of custodians, "Each of you men knows your school best, but if we are going to have a team this summer we need a lead man. It will be easier for us to communicate with you if there is one man in charge. It was discussed with the board of education and I would like to ask you, Walt, to be the lead man."

A mother who was concerned about her daughter in junior high school talked to S. The mother said that the daughter was not able to settle down to work and was not doing her work as well as she should. S said to the mother, "There are about six or seven girls going through the stage where they aren't interested in anything." S advised the mother to have patience in the
matter and that the daughter would outgrow some of the
tendencies. S referred to a group that was the same last
year but had developed enough to make a big change since that
time.

Group C members did not interpret the role of one person to another
person.

**Criticism of others' roles.** Subjects found it necessary to
criticize the roles others were playing or had played. Group A members
were direct in their statements to persons whose actions they sought
to criticize.

The science teacher reported to S that the balance had
been broken again. S said, "You should keep the room locked
except when you are in it."

S said to the teacher, "I'd suggest that we pick our
singers a little better." The music teacher said that he would
cut the chorus to 25 members.

S said to the teacher, "Maybe the site of the trip should
be selected more carefully. Why don't you think this over
more. We don't want to get fouled up on trips because it
might be the trip to end all field trips. The State Department
of Education has issued a new directory and it is rather
pointed. You might study the thing and see what you come up
with." The teacher asked S if he was refusing to allow them to
go. S said, "It wouldn't be advisable to go."

S said to the teacher who had received notice of not being
re-employed, "You know your subject matter, but your human
relations are sometimes miserable. In dealing with the
situation you helped contribute to the problem rather than the
answer."

The bus supervisor and the athletic director entered the
office to speak to S regarding the number of trips actually
taken by the baseball team and the number of trips which the
bus drivers had asked to be paid for. S said to the bus
supervisor, "I believe we left this in your hands. I under-
stand you left the keeping of the records up to the drivers,
which would normally be good but it looks as though there is
some difference of opinion."
Group C members did not criticize or make direct suggestions to the members of their staffs. Any dissatisfactions which they had with their roles were not expressed directly to them.

Assigning roles to persons. One of the most evident differences between the two groups lies in the assignment of roles. Although the members of Group A did assign roles to many individuals, they tended to deal with groups of persons or to assign another person a responsibility thus avoiding the large number of behaviors which followed when the subject "did it himself."

S entered the senior home room and asked students to hand in forms given to them a few days ago, regarding their work intentions for the future. The forms were made especially for commercial students.

After S checked model numbers on the contracts and on the wood lathes and found they didn't agree, S asked the architect to check on the difference between the models ordered and the models delivered.

S asked the cafeteria manager to use the prices from the list for the last school building built in the district to figure the approximate cost, and to get him a typed copy of the equipment list within two days. He asked her to describe the equipment desired so that a bidder could look at the item and know what was wanted. He asked that the list be more detailed than it was at the present time.

S asked the elementary school principal to get permission from the military authorities to put in the equipment. S also asked the authorities about lighting the buildings of the barracks school.

S told the elementary principal to write a synopsis of the graduation exercises the previous evening for publication in the weekly paper. S said, "Write it in story form and then you and I will go over it together."

S asked the principal to get some girls to assemble the various parts of the diploma folders.
After the architect and S had explained to the contractor where they wanted the fill to be placed on the school ground, S said to the city inspector, "You'll be around, Dick, to keep track of this, won't you?" The inspector said, "Yes."

S asked the vocational agriculture teacher about having a group of boys take down a fence which was on a knoll and which S contemplated having cut by grading machinery which was being operated in an adjacent lot. The teacher said the boys would take down the fence.

Group C members exhibited a few "role assigning" behaviors. They did deal in some cases with groups of persons rather than individuals.

There were few instances of these men's delegating authority.

S arrived at the elementary school in the district with materials to be delivered to some of the teachers. S said, "I think I'll deliver some of this stuff personally. I should be able to throw it all in the principal's lap. I'll give him the standardized test sheets and he can break the bad news to the teachers that they have to be entered on the permanent records."

A boy came into the office and asked about drapes for the windows on the stage. S said, "Go over to my home and tell my wife to get the drapes and hooks out of the back bedroom."

S gave the school custodian instructions as to when to put up chairs on the gymnasium floor. He told him how to place the rows and to put steel chairs in front of the wooden ones. He said that a total of 350 chairs would be needed and asked him to start gathering chairs today in order to have them ready to put down on the floor.

S told the students from the neighboring school who were registering for courses, "We want you to do well here. I know who are the good students. We have no sympathy with those who are lazy. We have more sympathy for those who don't have the natural intelligence to do the work."

In giving instructions for registration, S said, "Every student must take four full subjects." He said to the seniors, "Whether or not you have enough subjects without it to graduate doesn't make any difference. I don't care how many credits you have." S said, "If you have a B average, you can take five subjects."
Members of Group C were faced with a multitude of small situations in the area of role. They seemed to deal with role problems and situations in rapid order.

A boy entered the office and told S that he had lost the heel of his shoe. The boy asked S if he could go down to the shoe shop to have it fixed. S said, "All right, but come right back to the study hall."

A boy gave S a bat found on the playground. Another boy told S where the bat belonged and S took it to the second grade room.

A senior boy entered the office and wanted an excuse to go home to plow. S said, "You'll have to be back to practice this afternoon at 3:00."

A boy asked S for permission to leave the school since he had no more exams. S said, "Go ahead, get out of here."

A student entered the office and asked to use the phone. S gave her permission to do so.

S went out to the bus drivers to give them travel permits for the day. He gave bus drivers instructions and discussed with them the best route to the zoo.

A girl came into the office asking permission to leave during the fourth period. S refused permission and said that the girl could go at noon.

S said to the student, "You had better take French II, as one year won't do you any good if you want to go on to school." The girl took his advice and registered for French II.

While he was registering, S suggested that the boy take biology. The boy accepted the suggestion.

S took the list of persons who had books due for the bookmobile and said, "I'll have to get them." The music teacher offered to do it but S said that he would do it.

S asked the custodian to give the industrial arts teacher a new push broom.

Group A members also exhibited the same kind of behaviors, but to a far less extent.
S wrote an excuse for a boy to go to town to buy poster paper.

A girl asked S if she might use the phone. S granted her permission to do so.

The principal asked, "Would it be possible to attend the graduation exercise of my old elementary school tomorrow at 2:00?" S said, "Yes, of course, you go ahead."

After the farmer agreed to spraying the thistles and poison ivy along the fence rows, S said, "When you are spraying for dandelions would you go over the school yard?" The farmer said, "How much of it would you like to have done?" S said, "Do the whole thing."

**Fostering Human Relations**

The handling of human relations by members of the two groups differed in several ways. Group A members were freer with compliments to those with whom they were working. They were more prone to joke, laugh, and "kid" with their associates. The behavior exhibited in this area by members of Group C was characterized by the observation of accepted social amenities, although there was some behavior in the items mentioned as characterizing Group A.

**Observing social amenities.** Social amenities include the common courtesies afforded persons as the executive head comes in contact with them. Members of both groups were polite, expressed appreciation, thanks, and greeted people in halls, and streets as they passed them. The following are illustrative of this kind of behavior by Group A members.

S told the paint company representative that he appreciated his trouble.
S sat with a group of teachers at the dinner table and visited with them during the noon meal. Group C members had brief encounters, and there were fewer extended conversations with persons. One might characterize these as passive contacts with persons.

A teacher entered the office and gave S her report. S thanked her for it.

A teacher entered the office and reported getting a new projector bulb in a nearby city. S thanked him for getting the bulb.

On his way in and out of the post office, S greeted a citizen with, "How are you this morning?"

A student entered the office and asked to use the phone. She said she did not know how to use a phone of that type and S got the number for her.

The secretary looked out of the window and said, "I see that he got started mowing." S said, "Yes, he did."

S greeted children as he walked through the halls and cafeteria.

Complimenting. Group A members seemed to make it a point to give sincere compliments to persons in the situation. They also passed along compliments they had heard others make.

S called the county superintendent and said, "I want to thank you for the wonderful address you gave last night. I was proud of the whole situation and heard an awful lot of fine remarks afterwards, which I appreciate."

S complimented the representative on the work that the Alcoholics Anonymous Organization had done the last year.

S said to his secretary, "I just heard a compliment about you. The president of the board saw you for the first time last evening and complimented me for selecting you as a secretary." The secretary thanked S.
S complimented the architect on the work he had done in designing the gym. S said, "It worked out fine. The acoustics were very good and the microphone also worked out very well."

Group C members complimented to a smaller extent.

S complimented the girls on their senior play posters. He said, "Those are nice looking signs, girls."

S complimented his secretary on the job of typing she had done on the course of study sheet handed to the students.

Joking and laughing. Group A members made witty remarks, told jokes, teased persons, and laughed more readily than did Group C members.

Pies were being collected for a carnival and S joked with a teacher about giving him a piece of one of the pies.

Three students dressed in Roman costumes came into the office. They put a cardboard wreath on the head of S and gave him a piece of cake. S uttered a few "Latin" words and joked with the students. The students invited S to come to their Latin room where they were having a "Roman Holiday."

A salesman for whom S was going to give the order for furniture in the new elementary building entered the office. S joked with him before giving him the order.

After inquiring about the banquet decorations, S told the student a story about a German who was asked how his potato crop was. The German answered, "We have some that are the size of eggs, others that are the size of marbles, and then there are some small ones too." S and the students laughed.

S said, "Maybe we could give the head man a little title, 'Dean of Latrines.'" S and board members laughed.

After asking the principal to check on a problem, S kidded him about his job of umpiring a baseball game.

Group C members also did some of this:

S joked with cooks in the cafeteria as he got a cup of coffee there in the middle of the morning.
S said jokingly to the teachers, "We will have a picnic on May 24th—working on our reports."

S talked to children in the cafeteria as he was finishing his meal. S said to one of the children who had not eaten his jello, "Why don't you eat your jello? It makes your hair grow." The child laughed.

S began his discussion with the class by saying, "Maybe we are assuming too much but we will assume that everyone will pass." S said this jokingly and the students were amused.

**Involving People**

Analysis of the category Involving People can be made more accurately by use of an approach somewhat different from that of previous ones. Two ways in which the groups can be differentiated are indicated when two questions are asked: Who was involved by the executive head? In what kinds of decisions were these people involved?

Who was involved. Group A members involved custodians, teachers, community members, a secretary, an architect, and a sales person. Group C members involved only teachers, community members, and students.

The problems in which people were involved. Along with the wider variety of persons involved on the part of Group A members there was involvement in a wider variety of problems, concerns, and decisions. It can also be noted that the importance of the matters about which people were involved differentiated the two Groups. Group A members involved people in salary matters, choice of personnel, and school program problems as indicated by the following behaviors:

S asked the principal to make some recommendations for personnel for coaching football.
While looking over the recommendations of the industrial arts teacher, S said, "I asked the industrial arts teacher for these recommendations. He recommends that the boys be in shop two period each day. It will be necessary for us to hire another teacher for half-time work. I have an industrial arts teacher in mind whom I may be able to get."

S got a map of the district and placed it before the athletic director and a local businessman. The men discussed possible areas for a third playground site. They decided that the third site should be another elementary school playground as toilet and water facilities would be available.

In talking to the high school principal and commercial teacher about equipping the typing room, S said, "How about our feelings about machines? Do you like one brand better than another? Which electrics do you like?" After receiving a response, S said, "Suppose we start with 25 machines, what should be the division between electric and manual machines?"

While talking to his secretary, S showed her a list of payments for extra duty agreed upon by the board of education. S said that a teacher committee had listed the number of hours spent in each activity and had recommended a specific amount for each activity.

Group C members involved people in items of a more immediate nature which can be judged to be of less importance than the above items. Group C members involved people in decisions about graduation and baccalaureate exercises, parties, banquet invitations, and a trip to the zoo.

S was in the local Methodist Church arranging the baccalaureate program. As the seniors arrived he talked over the procedure with a teacher. He said to the students, "How do you want to line up?" There was some discussion and confusion.

S talked with the teacher who was the junior class sponsor. He asked her whether members of the Board of Education had been invited to the junior-senior banquet. The teacher said, "That is an idea, but I never knew of its happening before." Pupils who were working with the teacher expressed opinions regarding the idea. The teacher said, "It's up to you, S."

The first four grades of the elementary school were to take a trip to the zoo, but the weather was rainy and there was some question as to whether it would rain for the remainder of the
day. S asked the group of teachers whether they wanted to go or not. One of the teachers said, "I couldn't get the mothers to take another day off if we didn't go." Another teacher said, "We have everything ready to go." Another teacher said, "The children are all ready to go." S then said, "Let's go," and the teachers made ready to leave for the trip to the zoo.

S said to the elementary teachers, "At the last teacher-school board party we decided to have another before the end of the school year. Can anyone suggest a date for it?" No date was suggested by the group.

S asked the group of seniors whether they wanted the five year old children to head the processional for both baccalaureate and commencement exercises. S said, "It's up to you, but I'd just as soon not have them lead the processional for baccalaureate." The group decided that the two children would lead the group only for commencement.

S said to the seniors who were practicing for the graduation exercises, "If you practice a little more now you won't need to come back tomorrow." S gave the students their choice as to when to practice on Saturday. The students chose to practice on Saturday morning.

There was one instance in Group C of involving persons in decisions somewhat above the level of those just described.

S said to the teachers, "I don't believe we will divide the grades, but we three should get together on the matter of splitting grades." S explained the problem to the group. He said, "You may want to group for reading ability, or reading readiness, or you may want to mix better and poorer students."

Making and Maintaining Policy

The big point of difference between the two groups in Making and Maintaining Policy is the person toward whom behavior is directed. Group C members have a large number of their policy problems and decisions with students, while Group A members have policy problems and decisions with several groups. Nearly all behaviors in each group had to do with
maintenance of policy rather than the actual making of policy. Some evidence is available as to how policy actually gets made in the school situations of the two groups.

**Policy problems and pupils.** Group A members did have some policy problems having to do with pupils but these generally involved problems referred to them by teachers and parents.

A note from a teacher described a boy in the fourth grade as being bored with the work and getting straight A's in his classwork. Included were achievement test scores and intelligence quotients. The teacher also stated that the boy had adjusted socially especially with the more intelligent members of the class. The teacher asked that the boy be allowed to skip a grade. S answered that the board of education has a policy that no student shall skip grades. In his reply, S said, "I realize that the policy is not flexible but the line must be drawn somewhere. We feel that individual differences must be met at the grade level to which the child is assigned."

The elementary principal told S that the parents of one of the children had moved into the neighboring school district but wished to have their child finish the school year in the same school. S said, "We operate on the philosophy that it is good for the child to stay. We'll charge them no tuition for the rest of the year."

Among Group C members policy problems having to do with students were more numerous and were varied in character. Not only were problems referred through parents and teachers, but members of this group dealt directly with students in many instances.

A teacher entered the office and reported that one of the girls in her class brought her little sister of pre-school age to school. S went to the room and explained to the girl that her sister would have to be taken home since little brothers and sisters could only be brought to school on the last day of school. S took the girl and her sister home where he gave the same explanation to the mother. S said, "I'm sorry about it."
One of the girls asked whether she could take her invitations without paying for them. S said, "It's not that I don't trust you as an individual, but it is something we don't do around here."

A girl entered the office and asked for an excuse to leave the school at 3:00 in order to get her hair cut. S said, "We don't excuse for that. See me at noon."

A child entered the office and said, "Is it O.K. if Janice visits me today?" S said, "Not today. This is examination day. She can come on Friday."

A boy asked permission to go home to work. S gave the boy permission to do so, and said, "During the last period of the day any farmers or students who live in town can go home. We find that it cuts down a lot on our absences."

S related that a mother called him a few days ago. Her son had gotten a work permit several weeks earlier and been working full time. The mother wanted to know when the boy could take his exams so that he could get his credits. She told S that the county office had told her that the boy could take the exams. S said, "I told her the county office is not running this school and as long as I am superintendent here the boy won't take his exams. If the Board of Education wants him to take his exams, they'll have to get another superintendent." I called the county office later and they hadn't told her any such thing.

S said to the teacher, "Our policy here is that we do not encourage detention of students in a grade nor do we encourage promotion so that everyone can pass."

S checked yesterday's absence list with the day's absentee list and said, "If anyone is absent for more than three days, I check." He said, "I see the Burns children have been absent three days; I'll have to check on them."

Policy problems and staff members. The behaviors of Group A members indicate their use of staff members to help in policy formation as well as their concern for the welfare of the school's program.

"I get to the buildings often," S said, "because many times teachers want to talk things over with you. Yesterday I went to one of the schools where a physical education teacher talked to me about getting a leave of absence in order that he might work for the county recreation program."
S said that the Board of Education has a policy on field trips. He said, "We ask that the trips be planned in advance, be related to the work of the class, that the experiences of the trip be used in the work of the class, and that written reports be centered around them."

In referring to a special meeting of the board of education next week, S said, "I'll review these cases with the principal before the board meeting. No principal recommends that a teacher not be rehired unless that principal has worked closely with the teacher during the year and unless the matter has been thoroughly discussed with the teacher."

S went to the file and got out some film order forms. S said, "We usually do this earlier in the year, but I forgot." The order form instructed the teacher to order films for showing only on Thursdays. A limit of ten films for each teacher was placed by S.

Group C members made statements about policy and explained policy as a result of inquiries by staff members.

One of the teachers asked S, "Do we have to have a picnic?" S said, "No, but if we are going to have a picnic and use the buses we will have to plan it ahead of time."

One of the teachers asked S whether they should order books for the second semester as well as the first. S said that when different workbooks are to be used for the second semester ordering them should be delayed as he did not like to tie up board money in workbooks over a long period of time.

The matter of using books completely was brought up by one of the teachers. S said, "Public relations would say, don't buy anything you don't use. I think the public will buy anything that we will use, but if you don't use five pages, there are five pages to be accounted for next year."

How policy gets made. The ways in which Group A members work to get policy made are indicated in the following examples. Checking through with others and studying the matter were characteristic of their behaviors.

A teacher entered the office with a paper which she asked S to read. S read the paper. It was a note outlining a proposed policy on giving flowers upon the death of members of
the family of either students or faculty members. S told the teacher that the plan looked good. The teacher explained that three other teachers had helped her work it out. S said, "It seems to cover everything. I'll have my secretary type it."

The P.T.A. president had requested that a teacher be present at an all-day meeting. This would mean excusing the teacher from school for the day. S called the P.T.A. president and said to her, "It's my feeling that it would be fine for her to attend the council meeting but this matter involves all the school and I would like to discuss it with the principal. Could we make the assumption that we will be able to work out something? My feelings are positive but we might establish a precedent here that we couldn't follow through."

S asked board members, "Did you read the material given to you last week on the athletic set-up? Are there any comments on it?" Not all members had read the material, and S said, "Will you underline any part you want to and we'll talk it over at our regular meeting. I want to work this up and make it a policy."

Making policy was a matter of simply making a decision for the members of Group C.

The secretary entered the office and reported a call from a news reporter, wanting news from the school. S explained that certain girls in the school got all the news and represented certain area newspapers. The secretary said that the paper represented by the caller was a new paper in the school district. S said that he would channel all news to the girls previously assigned.

S said, "We use the public address system right now almost anytime during the day, but next year we are going to have all our announcements in two announcement periods. We shouldn't interrupt classes."

While working on the class schedule S said, "It used to be that I would register students and then make my schedule, but I reached the decision to make my schedule and then sign up my students."

Group C members also asked their boards to make policy but with varying success.

S told the Board that it was necessary to send a statement to the county superintendent stating age of school
children. S explained that some are going back two or three months at a time in admitting first graders. He said, "I'd just as soon go back from January 1st to September 1st by the beginning of the 1956 school year. The County Board of Education wants this in writing." Board members did not wish to do this and decided to push the starting age back to November 1st for the next year and September 1st for the following year. S said that plan would be all right with him.

S asked the board whether the day off given to boys for hunting could be made to apply only to the first day of the hunting season. S said that it is very difficult to keep the record when boys are allowed to take one day of hunting anytime during the year. The request of S was granted.

Setting Goals

The quality of goal setting behavior differed between the two groups. The data indicate that Group A members' goals were held clearly in mind, tended to be long range rather than short range, and to be backed up by plans of action. Goals were set regarding building programs, personnel changes, curriculum, salaries, custodial tasks, and getting school equipment. There was no apparent difference between the two groups as to the subject of the goal. They all set goals about the things listed above.

Clarity of goals. Group A members knew what they wanted as indicated by these goal setting statements.

S said to the board of education and the architect, "We want to get this building rolling. This is the best season of the year to build."

S answered the phone. It was a call from the solicitor of the village who was working on the project of getting 5,000 voters to register in order that the village can become a city. In discussing the matter, S said, "The school is vitally interested in it." S and the solicitor discussed the plan to use a questionnaire with the school enumeration in order to get more information about possible voters.
S said to the athletic director, "Next year we will have a written policy on this and we will not authorize any trips except those you sign."

In regard to the hiring of a librarian for the school, S said to the high school principal, "I'd almost rather hire a beginner than a person with a Master's Degree and many years of experience. We'll save money, and if we can get the right person, we'll work out a grant-in-aid for her to go to Columbia summers in order to get her degree in library science."

The goal setting of Group C indicated some degree of haziness about goals, and about ways of working them out.

S said to the Board, "Some schools have gone up to 9 and 10 years on their salary schedules, but 6 years of experience is our limit. I think we need another operating levy."

After reading the list of teachers and commenting upon each teacher, S asked the Board of Education, "Well, what are we going to do about salary for the works? I don't know just how far we can go."

In referring to one of the teachers, S said, "I'd like to give her a two-year contract if she will take it. She has already asked me how much more I could offer her for next year. S reported to the Board that he told her, "Not much." S said, "I'm not sure how much time she has left on her contract."

As the Board was discussing an operating levy for the next year S said, "Do you want to go for a new bond issue while you're at it? Build an elementary school in the middle of the district and burn down the old elementary school."

Long-term goals. Group A members were concerned about long-term goals.

In discussing with the high school principal and the commercial teacher, the purchase of equipment for the typing room, S said, "What ultimately are we trying to do in regard to the ratio between manual and electric machines? Is half and half a possibility?"

Pointing to the map, S said, "Ideally, if we had playgrounds here and here, we'd be all set."
S looked over plans for the first unit of the new high school. He explained the advantages of the plans and the three directional expansibility of the building. He said that the gymnasium would probably be added next and the unit containing the auditorium last.

S said to the Board, "Gentlemen, I am wondering about an idea. I may be crazier than usual but shouldn't we let bids for a classroom building with adds [add alternates] for a cafeteria and four additional classrooms? That way we could build the cafeteria if we had sufficient funds. We should have more figures in order to think about this, but I think we should consider it. There are digging outfits in the district which are working on sanitary sewers. This means more houses. Maybe I am crazy but I think if you had to make a choice between having half-day sessions and feeding children at noon, most of you would say that we'll feed them somehow but we want them in school. I wish you would think about this. It is a little farther thinking than usual."

S said, "Wouldn't any annual report look good printed with that sort of equipment?" S was referring to the addressograph-multigraph machine.

Group C members also dealt with long-term goals, but these did not seem to have crystallized to the point of the goals expressed by Group A.

While considering the future building program, S said, "We are going to speak to the architect about using the economies which cut costs by about fifty per cent. Some still think that interior walls must be load bearing."

S told the agriculture teacher, "I would like to see how interested the students are in farm shop. Maybe we can start a course."

S told the Board that there would be 75 ninth graders in the school after next year. Board members discussed this and agreed that in a few years twice the room would be needed in the school building. S said to the Board, "If we could build an elementary school on the next lot our problem would be solved."

While driving through a section of the district, S said, "This area is to be laid out in lots. We will have to build a school out there someday."
S said, "The Board has purchased five acres in back of the school. We will use this for an elementary playground. I would like to get the playground away from in front of the building."

As he prepared the registration record, S said that when he came to the school, some seniors were taking freshman subjects and courses were being alternated so that they could all be given. S said, "I have cut out a lot of that alternating. Someday we will have each class taking its own subjects, I hope. At least these are my plans."

Short range goals. Group A members had short range goals and plans to accomplish them.

S said, "Shall we proceed in setting up and organizing a schedule for them?" Board members approved.

S said, "Did we ever talk about putting fans in the teachers' room? Now is the time to put them into the building." Board members agreed that it should be done at this time.

S answered the phone. He told Mr. Blank of the Health Department that he was in the midst of making plans for giving the Salk vaccine to the students. He said, "I want to wrap this process up in a neat package."

Group C members concerned themselves to a greater extent with short range goals. Even these seemed to lack definiteness and revealed little or no planning to carry them out.

S walked to the side of the lot on which the elementary building was placed. A large pile of tin cans and branches was located just over a knoll. S said, "I'm going to have to see that that is cleaned up. I don't know how it got started but we are going to have to get rid of it."

After filling out the college application form, S said, "I'd like to get this girl a scholarship. She is the valedictorian of her class."

S and the county superintendent discussed prospects of getting teachers from a nearby college.

Not all of the short range goals in Group C were indefinite and without plan.
S said, "Why couldn't we use the Town Hall for classes?" One of the Board members said that the Town Hall would be too hard to heat. S suggested that the band could practice in the Town Hall and that instruments could be kept there. S said, "It would be cheaper to build cabinets there and to buy heaters for the room."

S talked with the school's custodian about refinishing the halls during the summer. The custodian agreed that the job would have to be done this summer.

Using the Educational Resources of the Community

It is difficult to draw any clear cut qualitative difference between the two groups in this area since the amount of data is so limited. From that which is available, it would seem that Group A members drew resources directly into the program of the school.

S explained that a local minister had been asked to help with the marriage course, and said, "You don't have to go 50 or 100 miles to find people you can use in your program."

S said that he was preparing for one of the special events for children. Each child has two days in the Ohio Forestry Camp in the spring of the year. The Board of Education subsidizes the program and the Isaac Walton League, several garden clubs, and the Audubon Society help with the project. People from Antioch College, the Ohio Forestry Association, The Ohio State University, and the State of Ohio have also been brought in to help with the program.

The behaviors in Group C do not show the bringing of resources into the school program directly.

S said, "I have passed out the small Ohio Survey reports to community lay leaders." The report was entitled, "Johnny's Report Card," and was a capsule digest of the Ohio Survey Report.

The secretary reported to S a conversation which she had with Captain Mauck of the State Highway Patrol regarding a no parking sign for the school drive. The secretary said she was
told she should call the county for such a sign. S said, "It's O.K. with me. If the county has them all made up, we should get it there."

Working With Community Leadership

Group A members had no behaviors in this area. As a consequence it is not possible to draw any differences between the groups. However, the behaviors in this area for Group C do help to indicate the characteristics of the Group. A portion of the behaviors indicated difficult situations.

S pointed out the Town Hall, and said, "That Hall is a hot bed. The School Board has now deeded over half interest in it to the township trustees. The people are afraid that if the school district changes they won't get to keep their community hall."

S drove through a poor area of the school district. He said, "Ninety per cent of our discipline problems come from this area. We are organized here to put the screws on these seedy characters. We are organized to get rid of certain families. The firemen's organization, the constable, and the sheriff cooperate to try to get these people to move."

Other behaviors indicate cooperation or possibilities of cooperation with leaders in the community.

S went to the office of the manager of a local plastic factory and asked him for approval of a plan whereby the local Booster Club was to run the swimming pool for the summer. The manager was responsive to the idea and said, "You can have it, glad to be rid of it."

S said, "I belong to the Lion's Club and they help the school a lot. They want a list of things to do for the school this summer. I'm making the list for them."
III. SUMMARY

It was the purpose of this chapter to present data pertaining to the second hypothesis of the study. It was hypothesized that the administrative behavior of the executive heads will vary quantitatively and qualitatively within the critical areas or categories.

The quantitative data were examined with respect to frequency distribution, percentage distribution, rank order, and the Chi-square test of significance. It was found that the more effective administrators, termed as Group A, exhibited fewer behaviors than the less effective administrators, termed as Group C. Group C members behaved more frequently in seven of the ten categories. A percentage distribution showed a better basis for noting differences. Percentages of their respective total behaviors for Group C were higher than those of Group A in only four categories. The reasons for this were to be found in the descriptive data.

Rank ordering of the frequencies for both groups showed the ranks to vary no more than two. A general consistency of frequency distribution was indicated by the rank order. The Chi-square test indicated a highly significant difference between the two groups in terms of their frequencies in the categories. The test, when applied to the frequencies of the two groups in each category, showed two categories, Determining Roles and Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure, to be significant at the 0.1 per cent level and one per cent level respectively. In both of these categories Group C members had the greater frequency of behaviors.
The data were then examined from a descriptive viewpoint. In each category, the behaviors of the two groups were compared and the differences noted. The differences were then illustrated by setting down the contents of the card in the body of the text.

Behavior in the category Appraising Effectiveness showed that Group A members appraised more positively, tended to be more complimentary, and did not "gripe" as much as Group C members. Group A members got the appraisals of others, appraised procedures more readily than specific people, and spent less time in building inspection for custodial maintenance.

The category Communicating revealed that the more effective administrators were predominantly initiators of communication rather than receivers or relayers. Although Group A members dealt with the mail at times, Group C members spent a great deal of time getting, sorting, opening, and reading the mail. Group C members dealt with trivia and detail as they communicated, while Group A members concerned themselves more with the instructional program, extra-class activities, professional activities, and similar topics.

In the category of Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure it was found that Group C members tended to concern themselves with office routine and supplying requests for materials. Group A members scheduled their time, made appointments and made agendas and schedules.

Group A members were observed to interpret the roles of others, to criticize others' roles less harshly, and to assign roles to others
more readily than Group C members. The latter group expressed more dissatisfaction with their own roles, and corrected students sharply. Group A members directed their statements of role criticism to the individual concerned, while the less effective men expressed the criticism in other ways. Group C members were faced with a rapid order series of role determining situations as problems of students' roles gravitated to them.

In the category of Fostering Human Relations, Group A members were observed to be more prone to joke, laugh, and "kid" with associates. Group C members tended to observe social amenities without going on to show friendliness beyond common courtesy. Group A members tended to compliment persons more freely than the other group.

Group A members involved a greater variety of persons than did Group C members. Along with this, there was involvement in a greater variety of problems, concerns, and decisions by the more effective men.

Behaviors in the category of Making and Maintaining Policy were directed toward specific persons or groups of persons. Group C members policy behaviors had to do with students while those of Group A had to do with a variety of persons and groups. Checking first with others and giving study to the matter were characteristic of the way in which more effective administrators made policy. For Group C members, this tended to be simply a decision making behavior.

Group A members held their goals more clearly in mind and tended to set long range rather than short range goals. Both groups set goals regarding building programs, personnel changes, curriculum, salaries,
custodial tasks, and getting school equipment, but the goals of the more effective men were usually backed up by a plan of action.

It is difficult to draw anything conclusive in the way of qualitative differences between the groups in the categories of Using the Educational Resources of the Community and Working with Community Leadership. These categories contained only a few behaviors. The behaviors in the former category did seem to indicate that Group A members were better able to draw resources directly into the school program. The latter category had no behaviors on the part of Group A members. Thus it was not possible to list differences between the groups. A portion of the behaviors on the part of Group C had to do with difficulty situations while the remainder indicated cooperation with leaders of the community.

The reader of this summary may get an impression about the differences between the groups unlike the impression given in the chapter. Reference to the data in the chapter will show that the case is not all "black and white." Less effective administrators sometimes performed acts which characterized the more effective ones. The reverse was also true.
CHAPTER VII

DATA PERTINENT TO NEITHER ORIGINAL HYPOTHESIS

During the course of the data analysis it was ascertained that there were findings which seemed to have importance but were not directly pertinent to either hypothesis of the study. These findings had to do with differences between the two groups of executive heads and with the way in which the study itself was carried out. These findings cannot be overlooked as they have implications which further support and supplement those resulting from the testing of the two hypotheses.

I. DIRECT OBJECT OF THE BEHAVIOR

Almost every action was made with reference to someone. The executive head was talking to a student, his secretary, a teacher, a salesman, or other person when he behaved. It was appropriate to ascertain whether a difference between the more effective and less effective men existed in the direct object of the behavior. Table IX shows the classes of persons toward whom there was behavior and the frequency of behavior for each executive head. These behavior frequencies total slightly higher than the actual number of behaviors.
### TABLE IX

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE DIRECT OBJECT OF BEHAVIOR OF THE TWO GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated Staff</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Certificated Staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed on Specific Contract</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Superintendent or Local Board of Education</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Patrons</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Educators</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesmen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Person</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>970</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because certain behaviors had more than one direct object. For example, if the executive head was talking to both pupils and teachers, the direct object tally would be placed in both the student and certificated staff classes.

The table shows one difference between the two groups which stands out above the others. The more effective men behaved far less with students as the direct object of action than did the less effective men. More than any other class, students were the direct object of the behavior of Group C members. Certificated staff members were the direct object of behavior of Group A members more than any other class. Group A members had a greater percentage of behaviors toward all classes of people except students.

It is evident that the pattern of behavior as far as the direct object is concerned is considerably different in the two groups. More effective men worked through professional staff members in getting things done. They also had more contact with parents and school patrons. Those employed on a specific contract included contractors, plumbers, electricians, and other tradespeople. The contacts with these people were greater on the part of Group A members. Group A members had more contacts with salesmen than did Group C members. Thus the contacts of the more effective men were more varied and better spread among the persons who make up a school situation.
II. NUMBER OF BEHAVIORS IN THE INCIDENTS

As explained in the discussion on methodology, the unit of behavior was used as the basis of analysis of the data. Several units of behavior were sometimes necessary to make up what was called an incident. An incident was made up of a complete sequence dealing with a person or group of persons. The shortest incidents were synonymous with units of behavior. Other incidents were made up of as many as thirty units of behavior.

An analysis was made of the two groups in terms of the number of behaviors which were a part of incidents containing two or more behaviors. Table X shows the frequency of behaviors for each executive head. The first column contains the number of behaviors synonymous with incidents. The second contains the number of behaviors which were only a part of one incident. Group C members have over twice as many units of behavior which are single units, that is, which do not belong with any other unit of behavior in forming an incident. Even though their total number of units of behavior was less, Group A members had more behaviors forming only a part of one incident. A general consistency among members of each group is indicated by the fact that for single units the Group A member having the largest number of behaviors still has fewer than the Group C member with the fewest behaviors.

Application of the Chi-square test to the frequencies of the groups produces a figure of 31.400 which is significant beyond the 0.1
TABLE X
SINGLE UNITS OF BEHAVIOR AND BEHAVIORS MAKING UP INCIDENTS AMONG THE TWO GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Units</th>
<th>Parts of Incidents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group C Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>941</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
per cent level. This highly significant difference between the two groups is representative of certain qualitative differences. Group C members behaved in rapid order going from one person to another or from one subject to another in rapid succession. No one person, group of persons, or subject received sustained attention. Many different problems received their attention, but only fleeting attention was given to them. In some cases the problems were of such a trivial nature that even fleeting attention may not have been justified.

The statements above characterize Group C members generally. There were times when concentrated and lengthy attention was given to persons or problems by members of the group. For the most part, as indicated by the quantitative data, the characterization of Group C members is representative of their behavior.

Group A members were able to give more sustained attention to the items with which they dealt. Then behavior was less "choppy" and the men moved at a more deliberate pace. More time was taken to study and consider problems. The Group A member did not come into contact with as many persons, but his contacts were more sustained and perhaps closer.

III. SOURCES OF THE DATA

The behavioral data for this study have been derived from two main sources; those things seen and heard by the observer as they occurred and those things told the observer by the executive head. One other source, those things printed or duplicated and issued by the executive head, was used to some extent.
It was thought that there might be some difference between the groups as to source of data since Group A members were slightly more prone to explain what was going on at the school situation. A Chi-square test of the distributions yielded a figure of .0984 which indicates there is no significant difference in source of data between the groups.

The preponderance of the data was made up of those things seen and heard by the observer as they occurred. For Group A, 89.02 percent of the data was gained in this manner. For Group C, 90.37 percent of the data was gained in this manner. One would expect this to be true since the study was one of administrative behavior. Materials printed or duplicated indicated behavior having occurred recently enough to influence the present, and those things told the observer by the executive head also represented behavior occurring recently enough to explain the present.

IV. ADEQUACY OF OBSERVATION TIME

Another kind of check made on the data had to do with the adequacy of the observation time. For this purpose only the half day and full day visits were used. The orientation and special visits were not used. A kind of split-half method was used to determine whether the amount of time spent in observation was adequate. It was assumed that the observation time would be adequate if a highly similar pattern of frequencies in the categories occurred in the first and second halves of the time. Half day observations were done first
and full day observations last. If the observations of the latter half virtually repeated the frequency of behaviors of the first half, one might conclude that the half day visits were sufficient, and that the time spent on the full day visits was not necessary.

The two distributions were compared by use of the Chi-square test and a difference significant beyond the one per cent level was found. The figure was 23.19 and entered on the table at seven degrees of freedom. Thus the latter half of the observations were necessary to study. There is no proof that more observations would not have made resulting distributions still different. Still more observations would be needed to show that a different frequency distribution was not being added to the data.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter was used to bring together certain "loose ends" which had direct application to neither original hypothesis. These findings were considered important to a complete view of the framework and the methodology of the study.

The importance of the first two items considered in the chapter rests upon their ability to differentiate between the two groups of executive heads. These points of differentiation do not have to do directly with the category framework. These differences could have been noted without its use as a point of departure.

The first item was that of the direct object of the behavior. It was found that the less effective executive heads behaved in
relation to students more than any other classification of persons. More effective men behaved toward professional staff members more than any other classification of persons. The pattern of behavior toward other classifications also showed that the contacts of the more effective men were more varied and better spread than those of the less effective men.

A second item which dealt with differences between the groups was explored in this chapter. Some units of behavior stood alone as incidents in themselves, others were only part of a group of units of behavior which went to make up an incident. It was found that the units of behavior of the more effective men were significantly more attached to other units of behavior going to make up an incident. The Chi-square test produced a figure of 31.400 which was significant beyond the 0.1 per cent level. The less effective men behaved in rapid order, fleeting from one problem or person to the next. The behavior of the more effective men was sustained and more considered in relation to problems and people.

There were two main sources of data for this study. Those things seen and heard by the observer as they occurred, and those things told the observer by the executive head formed the bulk of the data. It was determined that there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of the sources from which the behaviors were derived. Neither group showed a significantly greater tendency to tell the observer things which were to become a part of the data.

A check on the adequacy of the amount of observation showed that the second half of the observations did not produce a frequency
distribution of categories highly similar to that of the second half. The Chi-square test produced a figure of 23.19 which was significant beyond the one per cent level. The second half of the observations were necessary to the study. There is no indication that more observations would not have made resulting distributions still different.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The behavior of administrators in school situations has become the focus of thinking and research in the field of educational administration. Recent developments have caused the study of behavior to be looked upon as having genuine possibilities for unlocking knowledge about educational administration. Skills developed by the social scientist are being applied increasingly to problems in the field of education. The study of human behavior presents many problems which the physical sciences have overcome, but nevertheless useful techniques are available and as research continues human behavior may lose its mysteries much as many aspects of physical science have.

I. THE PROBLEM

This study was one of the four parallel studies which dealt with the behavior of educational administrators. Each dealt with a different level of administrative responsibility. The levels were: the elementary school principal, the secondary school principal, the executive head, and the city school superintendent. The studies had in common the testing of a portion of the findings made by the School-Community Development Study.
It was the purpose of this study (1) to determine whether the administrative behavior of executive heads can be described through classification of their behavior within the framework of the critical areas; and (2) to determine the relationship of variations in behavior in the critical areas to the judged effectiveness of executive heads.

The critical areas were:

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

These were to be tested in a wider population and at several levels of administration.

The hypotheses to be tested were (1) that the critical areas of administrative behavior found by the School-Community Development Study to exist in its Cooperating Centers do exist in administrative situations occurring in schools served by executive heads, and the behavior in these situations can be described within the framework of the critical areas; and (2) that the administrative behavior of executive heads judged to be more effective will vary quantitatively and qualitatively within the critical areas from that of executive heads judged to be less effective.
II. THE METHOD

To test these hypotheses, it was necessary to find subjects to observe. It was determined that observing ten executive heads at work would provide a sufficient sample for the purpose. First, seven counties were selected in accordance with a set of criteria. Certain criteria were applied to the executive heads within the seven counties and a list of fifty men resulted. The names of these men were submitted to a panel of thirty-four jurors. Each juror rated those men with whom he was professionally acquainted.

The quality which the juror was asked to rate was "over-all administrative effectiveness." No criteria were given him to use as a basis of rating since their use might have biased judgment in favor of or against the critical areas. The juror rated those executive heads whom he knew by placing each in one of four quarters. The first quarter was to contain those judged to be least effective, and the fourth quarter those judged to be most effective.

The judgments were analyzed and five most effective and five least effective men were chosen. Thus each end of an "effectiveness continuum" was represented. These men were asked permission to be observed for a period of several days. All of them were cordial in their willingness to cooperate. At the time the data were collected the researcher did not know the ratings of the men.

During the period of observation, the executive heads were followed nearly everywhere they went. Only when others requested privacy did the observer leave the scene. Every behavior of the
administrator was noted briefly on small cards. At the close of each
day's observation the notes were used as a basis for dictating the
data gathered. Recording machines were used to facilitate getting
the data into permanent form as soon as possible after the observation.
Two half day visits, one full day visit, an orientation visit and, for
four executive heads, a visit to a board of education meeting comprised
the observations.

The data were placed on McBee Keysort Cards for easy handling.
The observations were broken down into "units of behavior." One unit
was placed on one card. The criteria for determining a unit of
behavior were applied to the data and a total of 2241 behaviors were
produced.

The critical areas were defined and example behaviors were listed
to guide category action of the behaviors. Each behavior was placed in
a critical area. Ten per cent of the cards were chosen by a random
sampling method and submitted to the researchers doing parallel
studies. Using the definitions and examples, each researcher
categorized the data independently. A high reliability was indicated
as the categorization of the cards by each person was very similar.

No attempt has been made in this summary of the problem and the
method of gathering and analyzing the data to justify or support the
steps. For discussion of each step, the text found in previous
chapters must be consulted.
The findings of this study will be summarized in three sections. These are the findings having to do with the first hypothesis, those pertaining to the second hypothesis, and those related to neither hypothesis but having importance for this study.

Findings Related to the First Hypothesis

1. With the addition of one new category, or critical area, all observed behaviors were placed in the framework.

2. Because of the nature of the behaviors in it, the additional category was termed Fostering Human Relations.

3. The category, Fostering Human Relations, was defined as recognizing the personal integrity, dignity, and worth of individuals in the school-community through social interaction.

4. All categories included some units of behavior.

5. Not all of the ten executive heads behaved in all categories.

6. Over one-half the units of behavior appeared in two categories, Communicating and Determining Roles.

7. Nearly eighty-five per cent of the units of behavior were found in four categories, Communicating, Determining Roles, Appraising Effectiveness, and Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure.

8. Frequency distribution of the units of behavior in the categories for the ten men showed a sameness among the patterns. A rank ordering of the frequencies for each executive head showed each category to have a preponderance of similar ranks.

9. Three other persons categorized a sample of the data, and a
check showed high reliability among the categorizers. The Chi-square test revealed no significant differences between the three other categorizations and the original done by the researcher.

10. It was found that the category framework was not adequate to determine placement of every unit of behavior absolutely and finally in only one category.

11. The coordinateness of the categories is dependent upon the definition of each category and upon the measure which is applied to determining the internal consistency of the category framework.

12. To meet the requirements of being a theory of educational administration, the category framework must enable one to predict the result of a given action, provide a guide for behavior in terms of choosing values, and present a logical organization of facts. The framework does not at present enable prediction. It contains the start of a guide to behavior, and provides an organization of facts which requires further research to determine how logical it is. Possibilities of the category framework's meeting the three requirements are in evidence but require further study.

Findings Related to the Second Hypothesis

For purposes of analysis, the five men judged to be more effective were termed Group A, while the five judged to be less effective were termed Group C. The findings with regard to the second hypothesis were as follows:

1. Group C members exhibited more units of behavior than members of Group A.
2. Group C members behaved more frequently in seven of the ten categories.

3. In three categories, Involving People, Setting Goals, and Using the Educational Resource of the Community, the members of Group A exhibited the greater number of behaviors.

4. Group A members behaved in certain categories with a greater percentage of their own total behaviors than did Group C members. These were: Appraising Effectiveness, Communicating, Fostering Human Relations, Setting Goals, Involving People, and Using the Educational Resources of the Community.

5. Group C members behaved in certain categories a greater percentage of their total behaviors than did Group A members. These were: Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure, Determining Roles, Making and Maintaining Policy, and Working with Community Leadership.

6. A rank ordering of the category frequencies for both groups revealed differences of not more than two ranks for any category. The over-all ranking indicated a consistency of behavior in the categories found in both groups.

7. A comparison of the frequency distributions of both groups in the categories produced a Chi-square of the difference of 35.921. This difference is significant beyond the 0.1 per cent level.

8. One category, Determining Roles, showed a difference between the two groups significant beyond the 0.1 per cent level. Another category, Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure showed a difference significant beyond the five per cent level. The category, Communicating, approached significance at the five per cent
9. Descriptive analysis of the groups in the category Appraising Effectiveness showed the following characteristics. Group A members:

   a. Were freer in making complimentary statements and tended to "gripe" less.
   b. Tended to ask others for their thinking in formulating appraisals.
   c. Were likely to appraise procedures or existing arrangements rather than the behavior of specific people.
   d. Appraised the actions of specific people more favorably.
   e. Made inspections of new buildings or installations rather than of buildings in terms of custodial duties to be performed.

10. Descriptive analysis of the groups in the category Communicating revealed distinct differences. Group A members were characterized by:

   a. Initiating more than receiving or relaying communication.
   b. Spending less time and effort in dealing with the mail.
   c. Giving information to others which was above the level of trivia.
   d. Seeking information about the school program and business procedures rather than arrival of the mail, the whereabouts of students and scheduling classes.

11. The category Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure gave evidence of differences between the groups which can be
summarized as follows. Group C members:

a. Showed a marked tendency to make the keeping of routine office records a dominant activity.

b. Were occupied to a greater extent with supplying requests for small items such as cellophane tape dispensers, staplers, and the like.

c. Interviewed all persons as they came into contact with them and made no appointments for others to see them later.

d. Were concerned mainly with working out class schedules and arranging for special student activities rather than with agendas for meetings.

12. Several differences were noted in the category Determining Roles. Group A members, more than Group C members:

a. Tended to make positive statements about their own roles.

b. Corrected the behavior of students less often and did it less harshly.

c. Explained the role of one person to another person.

d. Were direct in their statements to persons whose actions they sought to criticize.

e. Assigned roles to individuals and groups rather than doing the job themselves.

f. Were not called upon to deal with role problems in the multitude of small situations with which Group C members were faced.
13. The category Fostering Human Relations produced several differences. Group A members:

a. Were freer with compliments to those with whom they were working.

b. Were less passive and more animated in their contacts with persons.

c. Joked and laughed with associates more readily.

14. The groups were differentiated in the category Involving People by the asking of two questions: Who was involved by the executive head? In what kinds of decisions were these people involved? Group A members:

a. Involved a wider variety of persons.

b. Involved persons in a wider variety of problems, concerns, and decisions.

c. Involved persons in matters of greater importance such as salary matters, choice of personnel, and school program problems in contrast to decisions about parties, banquet invitations, and the way in which the seniors were to line up for graduation exercises.

15. Specific differences between the two groups were found in the category Making and Maintaining Policy. Group C members:

a. Faced policy problems largely having to do with students.

b. Explained existing policy to staff members rather than using them to help in policy formation.

c. Made policy by making a decision alone or by asking the board of education to make it.
16. The quality of behavior in the category Setting Goals differed between the two groups. Group A members more than Group C members:
   a. Tended to hold goals clearly in mind.
   b. Were concerned about long-term goals.
   c. Had short range goals which were accompanied by plans to accomplish them.

17. The amount of data in the category Using the Educational Resources of the Community was so limited that clear cut differences could not be drawn. It was noted that Group A members drew resources directly into the program of the school.

18. Group A members did not behave in the category Working with Community Leadership. The behaviors of Group C indicated both difficulty situations and situations of cooperation with community leadership. No comparisons could be made between the groups in this category.

Findings Related to Neither Hypothesis

There were several findings of the study which did not have to do with either original hypothesis. Three of these findings were considered pertinent to the analysis of the differences between more effective and less effective executive heads. A fourth finding was pertinent to the methodology of the study.

1. The two groups differed notably in the classes of persons toward whom their behaviors were directed. More than any other class, students were the direct object of behavior of less effective men. For the more effective men, certificated staff members were the most
frequent direct object of behavior. The more effective men spread their behaviors over more classes of persons.

2. The unit of behavior was used as a basis of analysis of the data. Several of these were sometimes necessary to make up an incident. An incident was the complete sequence of behaviors dealing with a person or group of persons. The shortest incidents were synonymous with units of behavior. An analysis of the two groups was made in terms of the number of behaviors which were a part of incidents containing two or more behaviors as well as the number of behaviors which stood alone as incidents. The difference between the groups was significant beyond the 0.1 per cent level producing a figure of 31.400. The less effective men behaved in rapid order going from one person to another or from one subject to another in quick succession. The more effective men had more sustained and considered contacts with persons.

3. Behavioral data for this study were derived from two main sources; those things seen and heard by the observer as they occurred, and those things told the observer by the executive head. The frequency distributions of sources of units of behavior for the two groups were tested by use of the Chi-square test. The test produced a figure of .098; which indicates no significant difference between the groups from the standpoint of data describing them.

4. A comparison of the frequency distribution of the categories in the half day visits and the full day visits showed that a significantly different distribution was produced by the second half of
the observations. Doing only half of the observations would not have been an adequate observation period. In addition, there is no proof that more observations would not have made resulting observations still different.

IV. THE CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of this study have been derived from the findings regarding both hypotheses and from the findings related to neither hypothesis. The conclusions reached were as follows:

1. The nine critical areas of administrative behavior did not fully describe all administrative behavior observed in this study.

2. An additional critical area or category termed Fostering Human Relations was needed in order that the framework had the adequacy to encompass all observed behaviors.

3. The nine critical areas of administrative behavior found by the School-Community Development Study to exist in its Cooperating Centers did exist in administrative situations in schools served by executive heads.

The findings of this study indicated that there was some behavior in each of the nine categories, even though all executive heads did not behave in all categories. The conclusion that the nine categories did exist in the behavior of the observed executive heads is true in a minimal sense when considered in the light of the first two conclusions. The critical areas were found to exist in varying amounts in the behavior of executive heads. Later conclusions will serve to
illustrate this point further.

4. There were varying amounts of behavior in the categories, and the fact that the variation was highly similar among all administrators observed, indicates that a total pattern of administrative behavior was caught by the framework of the critical areas.

Generally, the administrators observed in this study behaved in about the same way with regard to frequency of units of behavior in the categories. In other words, a category in which one administrator behaved frequently was just as frequently behaved in by the other men in terms of a rank ordering of category frequencies. No administrator behaved frequently in a category in which his fellows behaved infrequently.

5. The critical areas are defined and described adequately enough to obtain high reliability in categorization of behaviors but are not defined and described to the point at which complete agreement among checkers was reached.

6. The question of internal consistency or coordinateness of the categories was one which the data of this study did not answer.

The critical area framework is a way of classifying or organizing the observed behaviors. Whether it is consistent in terms of some measure of consistency remains a problem for further investigation.

7. The critical area framework is not, in its present state, a theory of educational administration as it does not fully meet the requirements of a theory.
Further use and study of the framework may allow it to contribute to the formulation of a theory.

8. Some categories were more dominant than others in terms of the frequency of behavior in them.

Just why behavior was more frequent in some categories while behavior in other categories almost fades out of the picture is a question which can only be answered by saying that the findings represent what administrators were observed to be doing. Perhaps the administrators were not observed at the proper time to be seen behaving in certain categories. Perhaps administrators simply do not behave much in certain categories.

9. Two critical areas, Determining Roles and Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure, showed a significant quantitative and qualitative difference between more effective and less effective administrators and were retained in the category framework.

These categories possess the strongest reasons for being retained in the framework because they show the less effective administrators behaving significantly more frequently in them as well as marked differences which can be identified descriptively.

10. One critical area, Communicating, showed a statistical difference approaching significance and a marked descriptive difference between the more effective and less effective administrators and was retained in the category framework.

This area showed less effective administrators behaving more frequently to an extent approaching significance, and revealed marked description differences.
11. Five critical areas showed marked descriptive differences and were retained in the category framework. These were: Appraising Effectiveness, Fostering Human Relations, Involving People, Making and Maintaining Policy, and Setting Goals.

Even though these categories did not show statistically significant differences between the more effective and less effective administrators, there were descriptive differences which could not be ignored. These descriptive data indicated that behavior of the two groups could be differentiated within these categories. These qualitative differences were revealed by the subjective judgments of the writer who applied to the data a set of values resulting from his preparation and experience in the field of educational administration.

12. The categories, Using the Educational Resources of the Community and Working with Community Leadership, showed no significant statistical or descriptive differences between the more effective and less effective groups and were not retained as separate entities in the category framework.

These categories showed a very small number of units of behavior as not all administrators behaved in them. Largely because of the lack of behavior it was not possible to see any clear cut differences between the groups in these categories. The fact that there was a little behavior in these categories causes one to conjecture that there may actually be a greater amount of such behavior. Ways must be devised of ascertaining whether there is a greater amount of it. Perhaps administrators must be observed during nearly all of their waking hours.
13. To the extent that effective administrators are those judged to be effective, these were the kinds of behaviors which the data of this study indicated were the more effective ones: The more effective educational administrator is cognizant of the opinions and judgments of others as he considers problems and makes decisions and at the same time he initiates ideas, holds goals more clearly in mind, and seems to have an over-all plan in mind. He is free with sincere compliments and approval of the roles of others and is able to delegate authority to others relieving himself of many minor decisions. The more effective administrator plans his work by making appointments and working out meeting agendas, attends to problems above the level of detail and trivia. And finally, he looks optimistically upon the work that he is doing as he derives satisfactions from it.

14. To the extent that less effective administrators are those judged to be less effective, these were the kinds of behaviors which the data of this study indicated were the less effective ones. The less effective educational administrator makes appraisals and decisions either by himself or with the help of those to whom he is responsible. He spends a large share of his effort in keeping routine records, getting and sorting mail, supplying requests for small items and dealing with detail and trivia. He takes care of a multitude of problems as they arise and allows his daily schedule to be governed by them. He tends to have a more pessimistic outlook toward his work and is more critical of persons than of methods or procedures.

15. More effective and less effective administrative behavior
can be differentiated by an analysis of the classes of persons toward whom the behavior is directed.

The findings indicate that the contacts with persons by more effective men were wider and more varied as well as being directed at staff members more than any other class of people. The less effective men directed their behavior toward students more than any other class of people. This finding raises a question which has importance for other findings as well. To what extent does the situation influence the behavior of the administrator? Do the less effective men behave toward students because the situation in which they find themselves demands it? Or do they do it because they do not know how to work on the problems through the staff, or because they do not delegate authority? The data of this study do not answer these questions, but this matter must be recognized in the development of criteria for the defining of effective administrative behavior.

16. The behavior of more effective administrators was characterized by behaviors which are linked together because of being about the same subject or directed at the same person or persons and had to do with larger problems. The behavior of less effective administrators was characterized by behaviors which occurred in series but were unrelated to each other in terms of subject or persons toward whom the behavior was directed and had to do with minor problems.

The day of the more effective administrator was smoother with less change of pace, while the day of the less effective men seemed to be "choppy" and hurried. The latter men were "busier" and perhaps actually worked "harder" than the more effective ones.
17. Differences between the more effective and less effective men cannot be attributed to any differences in sources of the data. The findings showed that there was no significant difference in the source of the behavioral data between the two groups of administrators. Nearly all the data were derived from those behaviors seen and heard by the observer as they occurred.

V. THE IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The implications and recommendations arising from the findings and conclusions of this study will be made in three sections; those which are pertinent to further research, to practicing administrators, and to preparation programs for educational administrators. The suggestions made here result from a considerable length of time spent in handling and studying the data, and are interpretations of what the data seem to mean for research, practice, and preparation programs as well as an attempt to devise a plan of action showing how to use the results of the study.

For Further Research

Recommendations and implications for further research arise from the findings and conclusions regarding both hypotheses and those which have to do with neither hypothesis. It is suggested that:

1. The following categories, as they are defined by this study, be retained in the critical area framework:

   Determining Roles

   Coordinating Administrative Functions and Structure
Communicating
Appraising Effectiveness
Fostering Human Relations
Making and Maintaining Policy
Setting Goals

These critical areas were found to be either quantitatively or qualitatively significant and were found to have a substantial number of behaviors. The definitions of the nine original categories were developed through study of School-Community Development Study data, and were expanded, modified, and interpreted through the data of this study. These areas are defined as well as the data of this study will allow. Two categories, Using the Educational Resources of the Community and Working with Community Leadership were dropped as separate entities from the critical area framework.

This is recommended because there were a very few behaviors in these categories, and because the two groups could be differentiated neither quantitatively or qualitatively in them. There simply was not sufficient evidence brought forth by the data gathered in this study to properly classify them as critical areas.

2. A new category based on Involving People be formed, and that the concepts of using the educational resources of the community and working with community leadership be subsumed under the new category.

The writer is not willing to drop the concepts of the two categories being combined with that of Involving People. The fact that there were some behaviors in these critical areas may mean that the
behavior occurs at times other than those during which the subjects were observed.

3. A new category called Involving People and Material Resources be added to the critical area framework. This category is defined as; identifying, seeking, and using those persons, groups, or materials existing in the school-community, and having a potential for strengthening the educational program.

The examples of behavior for this category are made up of those given in the original definitions of the categories placed together to form one listing. The data of this study indicate that this new critical area would show significance between the more effective and less effective administrators in the qualitative sense. For purposes of the Chi-square test the frequencies of the two dropped categories were added to the frequency of Involving People, and that category with the addition did not show a statistically significant difference between the two groups.

4. The revised critical area framework be studied in another population of educational administrators in order to;
   a. test the categories retained in the category framework.
   b. test the significance of the newly formed category.
   c. ascertain whether the two dropped categories should be retained in the framework.
   d. ascertain whether there are other critical areas.

5. The methodology for studying the critical area framework include observation of administrators during nearly all his waking hours.
Certain crucial or significant behaviors may occur during the evening when the administrator gets a phone call from a patron, goes to a club meeting, meets someone on the street, goes to a school play. Not all the behavior found in these cases will be administrative behavior as defined in this study, but those administrative behaviors observed may reveal a strikingly different category designation than those behaviors occurring during the school day.

6. The methodology for studying the critical area framework include a technique for relating the situation to the behavior of the administrator.

A very neat question is posed by the matter of the influence of the situation upon behavior. How much assistance does the administrator have? What is the social level of the people in the community? How wealthy is the school district? What material facilities does the administrator have? Is the less effective administrator forced by his situation to behave the way he does? Or is the situation poor at least in part because the less effective administrator did not change it or allowed it to become that way? Just which is the cause and which effect must be deciphered by further study.

7. The methodology for studying the critical area framework include a technique for relating the man himself to the behavior of the administrator.

The physical and mental health as well as the competencies possessed by the administrator must be viewed in relation to behavior. Both his suggestion and the one relating to studying the situation
have to do with the factors affecting educational administration hypothesized by the School-Community Development Study. Administrative behavior is conditioned by, dependent upon, or varies with certain identifiable factors according to the proposition set down in that research.\(^1\) The way in which these factors affect behavior is subject to further test.

8. The methodology for studying the critical area framework include a technique for refining the definitions of the categories in an attempt to create a taxonomy through which one hundred per cent agreement can be reached by trained categorizers on the placement of a given sample number of units of behavior.

The definitions of the category can be perfected through using them to categorize additional data. The perfection of the definitions will allow units of behavior to be more easily identified as belonging to a given category.

9. The critical area framework be applied to the behavior of more effective and less effective administrators in order that a set of principles for effective administrative behavior evolved.

There would be a build up of a body of evidence as to what the effective administrator actually does if a series of studies were designed to get at the behavior of the man in the school situation. These data would provide invaluable clues for the behavior of other administrators. Study of less effective behavior will have its implications for

\(^1\)John A. Ramseyer, et al., Factors Affecting Educational Administration (Columbus, Ohio: School-Community Development Study, C.P.E.A. in Ohio, The Ohio State University, 1955), p. 97.
the behavior of other administrators also.

10. The study of administrative behavior be continued in order to search for testable hypotheses which will allow prediction of the results of a given course of action.

The development of a theory of educational administration depends largely on the development of the means of prediction. The study of behavior seems to be the key to this development. The science of chemistry includes the study of certain elements and compounds and predicts the results of combining them in various ways. Perhaps certain behaviors combined in various ways will be revealed to lead to predictable results.

11. The search be continued for some measure of the coordinate­ness of the critical area framework, and the categories be so formed that they fit the criteria of the measure.

The internal consistency of the framework is dependent upon being consistent in relation to something. Just what that "something" is, remains a moot question.

12. The matter of the direct object be studied further to ascertain exactly how the person or persons toward whom the action is directed influences the effectiveness of the administrative behavior.

Big points of differentiation in this study were the persons toward whom the more effective and less effective administrators' behavior was directed. The reasons for this difference must be investigated. The cause may be situational, in part; it may be a lack of ability to delegate authority; or it may be a lack of understanding
one's role. If it really makes a difference as to the persons toward whom behavior is directed, the implications for the administrator will be widespread.

13. That a larger population of more effective and less effective men be used to test again the difference between the two groups as to the number of units of behavior standing alone as incidents or being part of a group of behaviors making up an incident.

It may be asked whether all less effective behavior is made up of more uninterrelated behaviors. The finding of this study must be confirmed by further observation of behavior.

14. The parallel studies of behavior at the four administrative levels be compared and composite findings, conclusions, and implications be made.

This study, being made at one administrative level, is a part of a four studies of administrative behavior. The four levels were the city superintendent, local executive head, secondary principal, and the elementary principal. The findings which are the same or similar in each study will be materially strengthened since the weight of evidence is several times greater. On those points at which the findings differ further investigation will be indicated. Some indication as to the sameness of administration at the various levels will result from a comparison of the studies.

For Practice

The data gathered for this study were taken from administrators "on the job." It is fitting that suggestions be made to persons in
administrative positions as a result of analysis of that data. It is suggested that:

1. The critical areas be used as the framework through which an administrator might view his own administrative behavior.

The critical areas are a type of self-analysis tool with which to discover gaps and identify strong points of behavior. As the administrator reflects upon the events of the day or of the week, he may ask himself, "What was the quality of my communicating behavior? Were there ways in which I could have improved it?" He may ask similar questions about other categories. Simply being reminded that there is a category called appraising effectiveness may cause the administrator to make appraisals of parts of the educational program which would not have been appraised otherwise.

The critical area framework provides a kind of "earth satellite" from which to view administrative behavior. It is a check point against which the administrator may reflect upon his behavior.

2. The framework be used by the administrator in planning action upon a problem or task.

The administrator who is looking ahead at a building program may well use the framework in getting a total picture regarding what is to be done. He may ask himself, "What needs to be done in each category regarding the building program?" Thinking about Involving People and Material Resources may bring to mind sources of help which might otherwise have been left unused. Thinking about Determining Roles may bring questions to mind about the role of the architect or
bond attorney which the administrator will be enabled to clear up early in the planning.

The framework is a way of thinking about the administrator's behavior and his job. It can be used to view the past, the present, and the future. It is a series of lenses useful for getting a better look at educational administration.

3. The quantitative and qualitative differences between the more and less effective administrators in the categories be used to guide behavior.

Both the findings and conclusions of this study have to do with these differences. Examples can be given of the way in which they can be used to affect behavior. The writer has found himself starting to sort the morning mail at which time he said to himself, "You could be spending your time much more profitably - you have many more important things to do." The writer then made arrangements for the secretary to open and place the mail on his desk.

The administrator who finds himself determining a multitude of roles will stop to ask himself how he can set-up a structure which will get rid of the multitude of role problems. Perhaps it will be a matter of delegating authority individually or in groups to teachers or even students.

4. The significant difference in direct object of behavior be noted and administrators work through the professional staff members and cultivate wide and varied contacts.

This suggestion not having to do directly with the category framework is nevertheless pertinent to the behavior of the
administrator. The effective administrator works with a variety of people in the school situation and works with his professional staff more than any other group. Improvement in instruction will come as he works with teachers and other professional staff members. Improvement in community support will come as he works with school patrons in the community. He cannot neglect any group, but he must select the pattern which will get the important things done.

5. Administrators examine their own behavior with respect to the number of units of behavior which do not belong with other units in making up incidents.

Administrators having many unrelated behaviors probably seldom sit down with anyone to think through a problem. Perhaps the problems concerning individuals which come at the administrator one right after the other could be avoided by one good bulletin to teachers or students. The administrator must find ways of freeing himself of the detail and trivia which cause a series of unrelated behaviors. The important decisions of school operation are not made by that kind of behavior.

6. Local groups be established for the study of administrative behavior and that after proper rapport has been established, members of a group observe each other by using the methods of this study. The written record can be used as a basis of discussion analysis and improvement of behavior.

There would be considerable value in small discussion groups among administrators which take as their project the study of
administrative behavior. The proper rapport means that no person in
the group would feel threatened by discussion of his behavior. An
administrator would be helped in self-analysis by use of this
procedure. Behavior of unknown administrators could also be used as
the basis of discussion if examination of his own behavior became
threatening to anyone.

7. Administrators be given the opportunity to observe both
more effective and less effective administrators at work. It has been
customary that teachers be observed in their work. Beginning teachers
have observed master teachers as they guided the learning activities
of pupils. Much can be learned by getting into a variety of school
situations and observing the way in which other administrators behave.
Many men who are successful administrators do not write extensively,
nor does anyone describe their behavior in the literature. Unless
these men become teachers later in life, their influence is lost
except to those working in the school situation with them. The observa-
tion of their behavior by other administrators would serve as an
additional means of getting general benefit from the capabilities of
the more effective administrator.

Although observation of more effective administrators is of more
benefit to the observer, it is the writer's opinion that much can be
gained from observing the behavior of less effective administrators.
As in the case of observing any administrator, interpretations must be
made by the observer and choices as to which behavior to emulate or not
to emulate will also have to be made.
For Preparation Programs

One of the ultimate purposes of a study of this sort is to make suggestions for the improvement of preparation programs for educational administrators. The recommendations and implications for preparation are:

1. That the student become familiar with the category framework for use as a way of viewing the field of educational administration.

   As mentioned in the implications for practice, the category framework is a way of thinking about educational administration. Knowing the concepts included in it will allow its being put to practical use as the prospective administrator observes the behavior of others and behaves in school situations himself.

2. That students of educational administration be taught to use the critical areas as a framework for looking at their own behavior and for planning action on a problem.

   More than familiarity with the concepts of the category framework is needed to put them into use. Practice in analyzing behavior from administrators unknown to the student, as well as applying the framework hypothetical problems, will aid the student to be able to use the framework as a practicing administrator.

3. That students of educational administration be given an opportunity to test and refine the critical area framework through observation of administrative behavior.

   The opportunity to test and refine the framework means that the student will get practice in using it. The greater the testing the more
likely will be the perfection of the framework.

4. That the differences between more effective and less effective administrators be the basis for making the student aware of the leadership functions he is to perform and helping him not to become a "glorified office boy."

As more is learned about what kind of behavior makes for effective administration, students of the field must benefit from the knowledge. Knowing what effective acts are will be of immeasurable aid to the prospective administrator. Eventually, a definition of effective administration will be evolved and the preparation program geared to producing administrators who behave in accordance with the definition.

5. That course work in techniques of research in the behavioral sciences be required for students of educational administration.

If the student is to be able to study and analyze behavior intelligently, he must possess skill in manipulating statistical tests and interpreting the data as well as setting up the research design used to gather the data. Such a course should utilize resource persons from such a field as psychology and sociology, and others utilizing skills in social science research. The student should do a small original research project in the course. This does not mean the preparation of a research paper utilizing the literature alone. It is a study in which raw behavioral data are gathered and analyzed. The course should consume a full school year and meet at least four hours per week. The student should get into school situations to study the behavior of administrators.
6. That candidates for preparation programs be selected partially upon the basis of the administrative behavior they have exhibited.

At present, many candidates for preparation programs are in administrative positions. As these persons express their interest entering the program, there should be included in the data of evaluation, the results of observing the prospective administrator in action. These data would aid in making the decision as to whether the candidate should be admitted.

7. That the administrator-in-preparation be observed in an administrative situation in which he is a kind of interne doing a portion of the work of the regularly employed administrator.

Students in the sciences are required to perform certain operations under supervision and observation to be sure that at least minimal competency is possessed. Prior to graduation, the student should be called upon not only to write his answers to questions but to behave. This will indicate whether the student is ready to enter the profession at the appropriate level and will provide some indications of the success of the preparation program.

8. That the candidates for the doctorate in educational administration be admitted as classes which stay together for at least two full years of preparation.

In order to provide the recommended courses and experiences in a sequence which will make the preparation meaningful, the interruptions of being in school and out of school must be stopped for a period. The
student of educational administration must "live with it" as he studies it. To have the sequence of preparation in research skill and the time to observe administrative behavior as well as to go into a situation as an interne, a substantial period of time is necessary.

This may be looked upon as both in-service and pre-service preparation. It is in-service because it comes after some administrative experience. It is pre-service because it comes prior to future service. It is not in-service in the sense that it occurs during service in a school system. The recommendations for this type of in-service education have been outlined in the section on implications for practicing administrators.
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