DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the
Graduate School of The Ohio State
University

By

PAUL MILLER, B.S. in Education, M.A.

The Ohio State University
1951

Approved by:

Ward G. Reeder
Adviser

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation has been made possible through the cooperative efforts of many people. To my adviser, Dr. Ward G. Reeder, and to my committee composed of Dr. Harold Alberty and Dr. Lowry Harding I owe especial thanks for the guidance and inspiration given during the early planning phases and the later presentation of materials in this research.

To Dr. T. C. Holy, Director of the Bureau of Educational Research, and to his secretary, Mrs. Martha Bidwell, I am indeed grateful for the use of the Bureau's facilities throughout the data-gathering part of this study.

I am greatly indebted to Dr. C. L. Shartle, Director of the Personnel Research Board; his secretary, Mrs. Katherine Dockeray; his colleagues, Dr. Melvin Seeman, Dr. Ralph Stogdill, and Dr. John K. Hemphill, for material assistance in planning, analyzing, interpreting, and gathering the data for this interdisciplinary, leadership project. Also, I wish to extend my deep appreciation to William Janes, graduate student, for the help in organizing material for IBM tabulation.

Last, but certainly not least, I am thankful to my wife, Fay, and my family for the patience, perseverance, interest, and support I received constantly throughout the writing of this dissertation.

Paul Miller

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I	A LEADERSHIP STUDY	1
	The Problem of This Study.	3
	Need for the Study	3
	Definitions.	4
	Scope of the Study	6
	Research Related to This Study	8
	Books Pertinent to the Problem	10
	Magazine Articles	10
	How This Study Differs from Others	11
	Limitations	12
II	THE PROCEDURE	13
	Related Methodology	13
	Methodology of This Study	15
	Superintendents' Invitations.	18
	An Overview	18
III	CRITERIA OF LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR.	20
	Sources of Leader-Behavior Descriptions	20
	Selecting the Statements	22
	The Jury of Experts	27
	The Final Leader-Group Behavior Descriptions.	30
	The Criteria Selected for Democratic Principal- Staff Behavior	54
	The Inquiry, Principal-Staff Leadership in Ohio High Schools	64
	The Criteria for Evaluating the Adequacy of the Leadership of the Principal	74
	Democracy and Adequacy	76
IV	THE CRITERIA APPLIED	79
	Criteria for Adequacy Applied	79
	Total Adequacy	82
	The Democratic Criteria Applied	83
	Form 5A	85
	Recording Data	86
	Scoring the Criteria	86
	How Democratic Are the High Schools?	88
	Basic Information Concerning Teachers	92
	Significance of the Data	93
	Item Analysis	104
	Criteria Most Characteristic and Least Characteristic of Schools	111
	Democracy and Adequacy	132

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

CHAPTER	Page
V	THE RESPONSIBILITIES, ADEQUACY, DEMOCRACY, AND STATUS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS. 134
	Introduction 134
	Invitations to Principals. 134
	The Inquiry to Principals. 136
	Coding 137
	Basic Information Concerning Principals and Schools 137
	Time Analyses. 156
	Status as Seen by Principals 163
	Status from the Teachers' Standpoint 172
VI	DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY RELATED TO LEADERSHIP FACTORS. 180
	Introduction 180
	The Data 180
	The Formula for Coefficients of Correlation . . . 181
	Procedure for Calculating the Coefficients of Correlation 182
	The Significance of the Coefficients of Correlation 185
	Correlations of Democracy and Adequacy with Basic Information 186
	Democracy and Adequacy Related to Status Factors . 189
	Time Factors Related to Democracy and Adequacy . . 192
	The Relationship of Adequacy to Democracy 194
	Reliability of the Criteria. 196
VII	MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS. 198
	Introduction 198
	Purpose of the Study 198
	Criteria of Democratic Leadership. 199
	The Functional Adequacy Criteria 204
	Basic Information 206
	Time Studies 208
	Status Factors 209
	Significant Relationships. 211
	Significant Findings and Conclusion I Con- cerning Criteria. 213
	Significant Findings and Conclusions II and III Concerning the Criteria Applied. 214
	Significant Findings and Conclusion IV Concerning Time Studies. 215
	Significant Findings and Conclusion V Con- cerning Status Factors 215
	Implications 216
	Recommendations 218

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

CHAPTER	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	219
AUTOBIOGRAPHY	228

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
I	DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATIONS MADE BY JUDGES WHO SCREENED THE CRITERIA WHICH INCLUDED THE TEN CONSISTENCY ITEMS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY	25
II	EVALUATIONS MADE BY JUDGES WHO SCREENED THE CRITERIA WHICH INCLUDED CONSISTENCY ITEMS RELATED TO AUTOCRACY	26
III	CLASSIFICATION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF THE SCORES MADE ON THE 134 DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPAL-STAFF BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS EVALUATED BY A JURY OF THIRTY AUTHORITIES IN THE FIELD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND SELECTED AS CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC GROUP BEHAVIOR FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY	51
IV	CLASSIFICATION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF SCORES MADE ON SEVENTY-FIVE ITEMS REJECTED AS CRITERIA FOR PRINCIPAL-STAFF BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS EVALUATED BY A JURY OF THIRTY AUTHORITIES IN THE FIELD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION	53
V	LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS SELECTED AS CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF THE IDEAL DEMOCRATICALLY ADMINISTERED SCHOOL.	55
VI	LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS REJECTED.	61
VII	THE ADEQUACY OF 218 CITY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS SEEN BY THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS IN 88 OHIO CITIES. . .	81
VIII	TOTAL ADEQUACY SCORES MADE ON FORM 3 FOR THE 218 CITY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.	83
IX	THE DISTRIBUTION OF FORM 5A'S ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS PER SCHOOL.	85
X	DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON FORM 5A AS AVERAGED FOR SCHOOLS AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS. . .	88
XI	DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION II OF FORM 5A CONCERNING FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS AS AVERAGED FOR SCHOOLS AND AS INDICATED FOR INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS . .	89
XII	DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION III OF FORM 5A CONCERNING THE ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS AS AVERAGED FOR EACH SCHOOL AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS.	90

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE	Page
XIII DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION IV OF FORM 5A CONCERNING THE PRINCIPAL AS AVERAGED FOR EACH SCHOOL AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS	91
XIV DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION V OF FORM 5A CONCERNING THE TEACHING STAFF AS AVERAGED FOR EACH SCHOOL AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS. . .	92
XV SEX OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THAT OF TEACHERS GIVING SCHOOLS LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	96
XVI AGE OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THAT OF TEACHERS SCORING SCHOOLS WITH THE LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	96
XVII MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHERS COMPARING ALL TEACHERS WITH THAT OF TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	97
XVIII NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	97
XIX THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THAT OF TEACHERS GIVING HIGHEST AND LOWEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	98
XX THE NUMBER OF YEARS ALL TEACHERS HAVE SPENT IN THE PRESENT HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH THE YEARS SPENT BY TEACHERS GIVING HIGHEST AND LOWEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	99
XXI SUBJECTS TAUGHT BY ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH SUBJECTS TAUGHT BY TEACHERS GIVING SCHOOLS LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	100
XXII THE NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS OF COLLEGE TRAINING WHICH ALL TEACHERS HAVE HAD COMPARED WITH THE HOURS OF TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	101
XXIII DEGREES OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES	101

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE	Page
XXIV THE COLLEGE TRAINING PERIODS OF ALL TEACHERS COM- PARED WITH THOSE OF TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	103
XXV THE NUMBER OF LEADERSHIP POSITIONS HELD BY ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF POSITIONS OF THOSE TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.	104
XXVI THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134 CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR	107
XXVII DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS.	122
XXVIII CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS .	127
XXIX SCORES ON THE DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA MOST CHARACTER- ISTIC OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	130
XXX SCORES ON THE DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTER- ISTIC OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	131
XXXI THE PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS AGREEING WITH THE CRITERIA USING THE TWO EXTREME RESPONSES AS THE UNIT OF MEASURE AND COMPARING HIGH AND LOW DEMOCRACY WITH HIGH AND LOW ADEQUACY.	133
XXXII THE ORGANIZATION OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS	148
XXXIII THE ENROLLMENTS OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS	149
XXXIV THE NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS . .	150
XXXV THE NUMBER OF MEN ON THE FACULTIES OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS.	151
XXXVI THE AGES OF TEACHERS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS . . .	152
XXXVII THE AGES OF PRINCIPALS COMPARED WITH FACULTIES IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS.	152

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE	Page
XXXVIII DEGREES HELD BY PRINCIPALS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS. .	.153
XXXIX ARMED SERVICE OF PRINCIPALS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS.	.154
XL ECONOMIC LEVEL OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOL LOCALITIES. .	.155
XLI THE PER CENT OF TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS IN CONTACT WITH PEOPLE AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	.156
XLII PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY THE AVERAGE PRINCIPAL IN CONTACT WITH PEOPLE.	.158
XLIII PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS IN VARIOUS TYPES OF INDIVIDUAL EFFORT.	.159
XLIV PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY THE AVERAGE PRINCIPAL PERFORMING FOURTEEN ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS ESTABLISHED AS CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	.160
XLV THE MEAN PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY OHIO HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN PERFORMING VARIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT CLASSIFICATIONS OF SCHOOLS.	.161
XLVI THE MEAN PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT ON FOURTEEN ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS BY PRINCIPALS OF ALL SCHOOLS RELATED TO ADEQUACY AND DEMOCRACY.	.162
XLVII STATUS ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	.166
XLVIII STATUS PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP. .	.166
XLIX SUPERINTENDENTS' STATUS AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	.167
L PRINCIPALS' OWN STATUS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP	.168

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE	Page
LI TEACHER STATUS AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO ADEQUACY AND DEMOCRACY.	169
LII SUPERINTENDENT AND TEACHER STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS AND AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY . .	170
LIII SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPAL STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS AND AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY.	171
LIV TEACHER-PRINCIPAL STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	172
LV STATUS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AS SEEN BY TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	173
LVI STATUS OF THE PRINCIPAL AS SEEN BY TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN THE SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	174
LVII STATUS OF TEACHERS AS SEEN BY THEMSELVES IN ALL SCHOOLS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN THE SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	175
LVIII SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPAL STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN THE SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP . . .	177
LIX PRINCIPAL-TEACHER STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	178
LX SUPERINTENDENT-TEACHER STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN THE SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP OF PRINCIPALS.	179
LXI BASIC INFORMATION CONCERNING 169 OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS AND 501 TEACHERS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION.	187
LXII BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT 501 TEACHERS AND 169 OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS REPORTED BY TEACHERS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION.	188

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE	Page
LXIII STATUS FACTORS AS SEEN BY THE PRINCIPAL RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND TO ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION.	190
LXIV STATUS FACTORS AS SEEN BY TEACHERS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND TO ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION.	191
LXV TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS IN CONTACT WITH PEOPLE RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	192
LXVI TIME SPENT BY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ON FOURTEEN ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP.	193
LXVII THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS EVALUATED BY SUPERINTENDENTS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AS SCORED BY TEACHERS.	195
LXVIII DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP	196
LXIX INTERCORRELATIONS OF THE SCORES MADE ON THE DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP	197
LXX AVERAGE DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA SCORES.	200
LXXI DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE BY SCHOOLS AND GIVEN BY TEACHERS.	201
LXXII THE ADEQUACY OF PRINCIPALS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY.	205
LXXIII THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS AGREEING WITH THE CRITERIA AND RELATED TO ADEQUACY.	206
LXXIV SCORES MADE ON CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO SCORES MADE ON CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTERISTIC OF SCHOOLS AND RELATED TO THE ADEQUACY OF SCHOOLS.	207
LXXV BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHERS.	207
LXXVI BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHERS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY.	208

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

TABLE		Page
LXXVII	SIX FUNCTIONS RANKED ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT IN PERFORMING THE FUNCTION IN SCHOOLS WITH THE MOST DEMOCRACY COMPARED WITH ALL SCHOOLS AND RELATED TO ADEQUACY.	209
LXXVIII	STATUS FACTORS CONCERNING SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS AND RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY . .	210
LXXIX	FUNCTIONAL ADEQUACY RELATED TO DEMOCRACY.	212
LXXX	TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS ON FUNCTIONS RELATED TO ADEQUACY AND DEMOCRACY.	212

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		Page
1	Data Collection Schedule for Principal-Staff Leadership Study.	17
2	Facsimile of the Letter Inviting City Superintendents of Schools in Ohio to Participate in This Leadership Study.	19
3	Judges Who Participated in the Preliminary Screening of Democratic and Autocratic Leader-Group Behavior Descriptions in the Order of Their Participation.	22
4	The Jury of Experts Who Evaluated the 209 Criteria.	28
5	The Frequency of Response by the Experts and the Scores Made on 209 Criteria.	31
6	Principal-Staff Leadership in Ohio High Schools, Form 5A.	65
7	Fourteen Administrative Functions Used by Superintendents to Evaluate Ohio City High School Principals	77
8	Facsimile Letter to Superintendents of City Schools Which Accompanied Form 4.	80
9	Facsimile Invitation to Teachers After Data Had Been Received from Principals and Superintendents	84
10	The Invitation Sent to 243 Ohio City High School Principals to Participate in This Leadership Research.	135
11	Inquiry Sent to Ohio City High School Principals, Form 3.	138
12	Arrangement of Data Recorded by IBM Tabulator from Which $\sum x$'s for Correlations Were Obtained.	183
13	Arrangement of Data Summarized by IBM Tabulator to Provide $\sum x^2$'s and xy 's for Correlations.	184
14	A Portion of the Work Sheet from Which Basic Data Were Taken to Calculate Coefficients of Correlation.	184

CHAPTER I

A LEADERSHIP STUDY

The Personnel Research Board of The Ohio State University is conducting a ten-year program of research in the field of Leadership. Three years of the ten are being devoted to education. The Bureau of Educational Research at The Ohio State University is cooperating in the educational phase of the program.

Early in the planning of the series of analyses the inter-disciplinary approach was used. Personnel from education, psychology, sociology, and economics met to discuss aspects of the problems involved. The writer attended these discussions. As a result, this leadership study was planned under the sponsorship of the two agencies mentioned above.

In educational administration there has been developed a vast amount of literature about the democratic leader as opposed to the autocratic type. McClure¹ examines the dilemma in this regard:

If I step out and take the lead as the Board of Education expects then I am a Hitler--a dictator who is bent upon suppressing the worthy initiative of an earnest professional group. On the other hand, if I wait for suggestions to come from the same professional group then nothing happens, and I know that the time will come speedily when the community will be saying that the schools are out of date.

How does one resolve such a condition?

¹North McClure, "Administrative Dilemmas," American School Board Journal, Volume 103 (November, 1941), pp. 17-18.

John Dewey¹ indicated in 1937 that thirty years previous to that time no provision was made for the participation of teachers in the administration of the school. He said at that time: "The issue of authoritarian versus democratic methods in administration remains with us and demands serious recognition." How does a principal provide for teacher participation in school administration?

Baxter and Cassidy² express the belief that people are confused about the role of a leader in a democratic society. They say there is no clear conception for selecting democratic leaders or standards of conduct for leaders charged with the responsibility for leadership.

Such confusion is probably the result of the mixing of many different cultures which arose out of essentially autocratic conditions during the early beginnings in America. Democracy and its concept of freedom is relatively new to the world. Since the past influences the present and the future actions of man, any great deviation from the past tends to confuse. It is not uncommon to hear references made to the need for strong leaders like those in the "good old days". Many times this means a despot-like leader.

Busch³ sums up this trend of thought very well when he says:

Lip-service is done to the democratic conception of life but much of the apparent acceptance of democratic ideals is ritualistic rather than realistic administrators rely heavily upon dominance adulation is given the leader that gets things done

¹"Democracy and Educational Administration," School and Society, Volume 45 (April, 1937), pp. 457-62.

²Bernice Baxter and Rosalind Cassidy, Group Experience the Democratic Way, pp. 1-13.

³Henry M. Busch, Leadership in Group Work, pp. 121-122.

unless authoritarianism is harsh it is a comfortable way of dealing with problems.

Such thinking has lead to the organization of this study of leadership especially as it relates to democracy and the American high school.

The Problem of This Study

This study is a part of a larger research in leadership conducted by C. L. Shartle and staff of the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University. Principal-staff relationships as found in Ohio city high schools will be studied. The basic question to be answered is: How adequate are Ohio city high schools in terms of criteria for adequacy of leadership and for democratic leader-group behavior? The question implies three phases of research: (1) the development of criteria for evaluating democratic leader-group behavior in terms of adequacy and democracy, (2) the application of the criteria to Ohio city high schools, (3) studying the relationships between the criteria of democracy and the criteria of functional adequacy as related to basic data such as time factors; information about teachers, principals, and school; and status of school personnel.

Need for the Study

The need for such a research is manifold: (1) high schools in general and Ohio city high schools in particular have not been included in past leadership studies; (2) greater objectivity in the evaluation of democratic leader-group behavior would be helpful; (3) a valid basis for educating school administrators for democratic leadership is necessary.

Both Butterworth¹ and Hartman² express such needs in their reviews of educational research. Hartman says:

The literature is mountainous, inchoate, and highly uneven in value. One portion is defensive or protective against 'de facto' tyranny, another portion, of classroom democracy Apparently it is a fact that the history of democracy is learned within institutions that are tight little dictatorships.

Time Magazine of March 13, 1939, presents a similar point of view when it reports: "No U. S. citizens are fonder of praising democracy than the heads of that most authoritarian institution, the U. S. school."

These are serious criticisms of an institution which is generally supposed to be the very bulwark of American democracy. This study should either dispel this criticism or provide information to improve the situation.

Coming from an age when mechanical skills have gone far beyond man's own ability to control himself, any refinement of social skills should be a contribution.

Definitions

Terms used in this research are clarified below:

A leader in democracy is one who influences group action toward shared goals.³

1

Julian E. Butterworth, "Some Fundamental Conceptions, "Review of Educational Research, Volume XIII, No. 4 (October, 1943), pp. 367-371.

2

George W. Hartman, "Interrelations of Education and Democracy," Review of Educational Research, Volume XVI, (February, 1946), pp. 81-93.

3

R. M. Stogdill and C. L. Shartle, "Methods for Determining Patterns of Leadership Behavior in Relation to Organization Structure and Objectives," Journal Applied Psychology, Volume 25 (June, 1948), pp. 286-291.

Adequacy is defined in terms of functions a principal should perform.

An autocratic leader is one who influences the group to act toward his objectives or those of a select few.

The leader studied in this research is the city high school principal.

The group refers to the city high school teaching staff.

High school is the school organization above the sixth grade in any of its combinations, e.g., 7-12, 9-12, or 10-12. High school and secondary school are used synonymously.

Status¹ may be defined as relative position within a hierarchy involving ordering of individuals on an inferiority-superiority scale with respect to the comparative degree to which they possess or embody some attribute or characteristic.

Time factors refer to the per cent of time principals spend in individual effort, in contact with people, or upon the performance of administrative functions.

Differences are described as significant which occur at or above the .05 level of probability and highly or very significant if at the .01 level of probability.

Status attitude² refers to preferences of an individual in status-involved situations, e.g., status differences should be made clear in an organization. Competition for status is a good thing.

¹ Melvin Seeman and R. T. Williams, A Status Factor Approach to Leadership, p. 6.

² Ibid., p. 10.

Status perception¹ is the extent to which a person maximizes or minimizes status differences in American society.

Scope of the Study

The research is limited to Ohio city high schools. The attitudes of the superintendent, teachers, and principal provide the basic data. All principals, all superintendents, and approximately ten per cent of the teachers were given opportunity to participate.

The following basic questions indicate the scope:

1. How democratic are Ohio city high schools?

In order for this question to be answered criteria will be developed in order to make necessary evaluations. The application of the criteria to the high schools in an objective manner is a purpose of this research.

2. How adequate are Ohio city high school principals?

During the early stages of the researches made by the Personnel Research job analyses established functions² in order to make time study profiles of the work patterns of various types of leaders. These functions are adapted to this study. If a principal meets his responsibilities entirely in terms of these functions, he is adequate.

3. Is there a relationship between the adequacy of principals as seen by superintendents and the democracy in schools as seen

¹

Ibid., pp. 10-12.

²

Carrol L. Shartle, Ralph M. Stogdill, and Donald Campbell, Naval Leadership, pp. 17-35.

by teachers?

The fundamental hypothesis of this study is: that democracy increases as adequacy increases.

4. How are time factors related to adequacy and democracy?

Time analyses¹ were established to study the individual effort of leaders and the amount of time spent in contact with people. Therefore, work patterns of democratic leaders should provide a valuable contribution to training programs of future leaders.

5. How is status related to adequacy and democracy?

Seeman² says: ". . . . that the question of who becomes leader, how the leader leads, and how his leadership is evaluated, are hypothetically seen as bound up with the social class origins, perceptions, and identification of both leader and follower." The relationship of democracy and adequacy of leadership to such factors as leader status perception, leader status attitudes, as well as to differences which may occur in the status hierarchy, become of paramount interest in this study.

6. Are there significant relationships between adequacy - democracy and certain basic information such as age of teachers, size of schools, etc.?

¹

Ibid., pp. 76-78.

²

Melvin Seeman, op. cit., p. 8.

Research Related to This Study

Beery¹ compiled and edited a list of concepts concerning democracy and prepared an instrument which was submitted to six different groups. He concluded that substantial agreement exists about democratic theory.

Bimson² made a very comprehensive study of the literature to evolve seventeen widely quoted principles of democratic administration.

The experimental approach was used by Lippitt³ when he tested classroom climates in terms of autocratic and democratic behavior techniques of leaders. This study is considered by many as a significant contribution toward quantifying democratic leader behavior. The conclusion is reached that democratic leadership behavior had a significantly better influence upon the pattern of member behavior than did autocratic techniques. In a sense the research under discussion is a study of the democratic climate of a larger group.

Democracy as related to the participation of teachers in the administration of the school has been studied by Courtis⁴ for the National Education Association. He found that teachers wanted to participate more than they had been able to achieve.

¹

John R. Beery, Current Conceptions of Democracy, pp. 49-51.

²

Oliver H. Bimson, Participation of School Personnel in Administration, 117 ff.

³

Ronald L. Lippitt, An Analysis of Group Reaction to Three Types of Experimentally Created Social Climates, pp. 226-232.

⁴

S. A. Courtis, E. T. McSwain, and Nellie C. Morrison, Cooperative Principles and Practices, Eleventh Yearbook of the Department of Supervision and Direction of Instruction, Washington, D.C., NEA 1938, p. 350.

A research conducted by Moser¹ among 660 teachers, 90 administrators in 103 California elementary and secondary schools resembles this study in many respects. Four types of participative effort ranging from group decision to administrative decision were established by Moser. Fifty functions were listed. Each respondent was asked to rate each function and mark the type of participation permitted and the type desired. Conclusions report that greater satisfaction was shown where greater participation existed; that greater participation occurred in small schools; that short-tenure teachers report greater participation than others; that the greatest change is made by arbitrary decision of administrators but with less satisfaction to the group.

In a study for the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary schools, Weber² analyzes the most promising cooperative techniques. Those techniques encouraging teacher participation were more promising than those originating with the administration. Correlation of certain promising practices with cooperative techniques and traditional techniques showed a coefficient in favor of the former.

Members of the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University have contributed much research related to this study. Stogdill's³ review of the literature is exhaustive. Hemphill's⁴ dimensions of

¹ Wilbur E. Moser, "Do Teachers Help Run the Schools?" The Nations Schools, Volume XXIII, No. 1 (January, 1939), pp. 51-52.

² C. A. Weber, "A Summary of the Findings of the Sub-Committee on In-Service Education of Secondary School Teachers," North Central Association Quarterly, Volume XVII (January, 1943), pp. 281-287.

³ Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," The Journal of Psychology, Volume 25, pp. 35-71.

⁴ John K. Hemphill, Situational Factors in Leadership, pp. 34-37.

leadership are significant. Shartle's¹ time studies are useful. Leadership behavior descriptions² are helpful.

Books Pertinent to the Problem

In addition to the above research, many books have been written relative to the subject. Pigors³ is quoted often. His descriptions are used extensively in developing the criteria of this study. The superiority of leadership over dominance is stressed by him; however, his point of view does not specifically encompass educational leadership. Tead's⁴ and Bogardus'⁵ general treatises on the subject were quite useful. Both writers provide descriptions of various types of leaders.

In the field of education Deering⁶, Koopman, Miel and Misner⁷, and Yauch⁸ set forth the principles of democratic leadership.

Magazine Articles

In passing, mention is made of a few of the many magazine articles which aid the discussion of democracy in school administration.

1

Carrol L. Shartle, et al, Naval Leadership, pp. 16-34.

2

Leadership Behavior Descriptions, Preliminary Form 1, 6-49.

3

Paul J. Pigors, Leadership or Domination, 354 pp.

4

Ordway Tead, The Art of Leadership, 308 pp.

5

Emory S. Bogardus, Leaders and Leadership, 325 pp.

6

Inah Deering, Let's Try Thinking, 199 pp.

7

G. Robert Koopman, et al, Democratic Administration, p. 3.

8

Wilbur A. Yauch, Improving Human Relations in School Administration, 300 pp.

Barham¹ develops degrees of participation; Cocking² eulogizes democratic participation; Hill³ defends the administrator in terms of legal responsibility; McFarland⁴ points to misconceptions of democracy which cause a chasm between teachers and administrators; and Strayer⁵ sets up a program to accomplish democratic administration.

How This Study Differs from Others

The chief difference between this study and others is its focus upon the principal of the high school and his faculty. This research also cooperates in an inter-disciplinary way with current research in status and time analyses. Most leadership studies have been directed toward the superintendent of schools.

Baxter⁶ believes that the principal is the chief climate-making factor of the group. This study devotes its major portion to the examination of leadership acts as related to the principal.

Since the high school is an accepted American educational institution and since an institution is often "the lengthened shadow of a man"

1

Thomas G. Barham, "Democracy in School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 104 (June, 1942), pp. 15-17.

2

W. D. Cocking, "Satisfaction from Democratic Leadership," School Executive, Volume 68 (October, 1948), p. 7.

3

Henry T. Hill, "Superintendents and Democratic School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 99 (September, 1939), pp. 19-21.

4

Kenneth W. McFarland, "Some Mistaken Notions of Democracy in School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 99 (October, 1939), pp. 12-22.

5

George D. Strayer, Jr., "Why Not Turn To Your Staff," School Executive, Volume 58 (June, 1939), p. 9.

6

Bernice Baxter et al, loc cit., p. 9.

in the words of Alexander Pope, this study should make a contribution to the field of secondary school administration because neither the principal, as a leader, nor the high school as a group, has been studied extensively in regard to democratic leadership.

Limitations

To undertake such a study requires the gathering of data based upon the attitudes of people. In this case, dependence is placed upon superintendents, principals, and teachers. The procedure was organized in such a way as to produce the most valid data possible. To this end the next chapter shows how the data were gathered.

CHAPTER II

THE PROCEDURE

The problem as stated in Chapter I implied the development of criteria, applying the criteria, and testing hypotheses which appear related to the criteria. A yardstick with which to measure democracy in Ohio city high schools was needed. Several studies have been made which helped us to develop the plan for this research.

Related Methodology

Pistor¹ had a similar problem confined to classroom democracy. A rating scale of 120 practices of democracy in classroom situations was developed by him. These practices were validated by a jury of one hundred.

Lentz² submitted 480 items concerning democracy and autocracy to seven judges and then selected 104 items upon which the judges were unanimously agreed. These items were then presented to 750 youth. Fifty items based again upon unanimous choice of these youth were chosen for the final check list to be used as a test of democracy in other situations.

¹
Frederick Pistor, "A Standardized Measure of Classroom Democracy," Journal of Educational Research, Volume 35 (November, 1941), pp. 183-192.

²
Theodore F. Lentz, "Democratization, Autocratization, and the Majority Point of View," Journal of Psychology, Volume 16, pp. 3-12.

Knauft¹ constructed and used weighted check-list rating scales for managers in industrial situations. A list of 197 items was prepared from an original 600 statements. Twenty-five managers rated each of the items on a 9-point scale. All statements with a QD value² greater than one were eliminated. Two lists of 27 statements each and with scale value differences of .3 were prepared. These scales are reported to compare favorably in reliability with those constructed and refined by more tedious and refined item analysis methods.

Hemphill³ built a questionnaire concerning the situational factors of leadership after studying 87 anecdotes about "good" and "poor" leadership. Dimensions for analyzing the data were submitted to four judges for validation. These dimensions have become a basic part of the research done by the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University.

Beery⁴ studied current conceptions of democracy in four steps, namely:

1. Compiling of short statements about the meaning of democracy.
2. Organizing the statements into questionnaire form.
3. Submitting the inquiry to various groups to get

1

Edwin B. Knauft, "Construction and Use of Weighted Check-list Rating Scales for Individual Situations," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 32 (February, 1948), pp. 63-70.

2

QD value means quartile deviation value.

3

John K. Hemphill, loc. cit., pp. 34-37.

4

John R. Berry, op. cit., pp. 49-51.

agreement or disagreement.

4. Analyzing the returns of agreement and disagreement.

The above studies made use of the jury, the scale, the check list, and the questionnaire. All of these techniques are used in this research in democratic leadership.

Methodology of This Study

An outline of the steps taken to provide answers for the questions of this study appears below:

Step I - Criteria were developed to evaluate democratic and/or autocratic behavior:

1. Leader-group behavior descriptions were secured from the literature of students of the subject.
2. Lists were edited, arranged, and submitted to a jury to screen the most characteristic traits of democratic and autocratic leader-group behavior.
3. Statements having complete approval of the judges were selected.
4. The mimeographed list was re-edited, re-arranged, and re-submitted to another jury of experts in secondary education to evaluate only in terms of an ideal democratically administered high school.
5. Items which had 70 per cent agreement of the jury of experts were used as criteria in an inquiry directed to city high school teachers.

Step II - An inquiry was developed to determine the adequacy of city high school principals in terms of the functions they should perform:

1. This inquiry was sent to city superintendents of schools.

Step III - A job analysis form was developed for city high school principals to provide data concerning time spent in contact with people, time spent in individual effort, time spent on the various functions, status factors, and other basic information.

Step IV - A data collection schedule was planned as shown in Figure 1.

1. Invitations to participate in the study were sent to each of the Ohio city superintendents of schools, to high school principals in those cities whose superintendents indicated a willingness to participate, and finally to a sample of teachers in those high schools where the principal indicated a willingness to participate.
2. Inquiries went to superintendents, principals, and teachers who had accepted invitations.
3. Follow-ups were sent to those who delayed responding.

Step V - An analysis procedure was established.

1. Data were coded to fit IBM cards and score sheets.
2. Progressive digitizing¹ was used to provide basic information for correlations.

¹ Walter L. Deemer, Aviation Psychology Program Research Reports, Records, Analyses, and Test Procedures, Report No. 18, Chapter III.

Figure 1

Data Collection Schedule for Principal-Staff Leadership Study

<u>Form</u>	<u>Explanation</u>	<u>Date Sent</u>	<u>Date Returned</u>
1	Invitation letter to 79 city superintendents	Nov. 1	
1A	Return post card reply	Nov. 1	Nov. 15
*1B	Special invitation for 34 superintendents	Jan. 1	Feb. 1
1C	Post card follow-ups to invitations	Nov. 16	
2	Invitation letter to principals	Nov. 16	
2A	Return post card reply to invitation	Nov. 16	Dec. 1
2B	Post card follow-up of Form 2	Dec. 2	
3	Time and basic for principals	Dec. 2	Jan. 15
3A	Return envelope for Form 3	Dec. 2	Jan. 15
3B	Post card follow-up of Form 3	Jan. 16	
4	Function evaluation by superintendent	Jan. 16	Feb. 15
4B	Return envelope for Form 4	Jan. 16	Feb. 15
4C	Post card follow-up of Form 4	Feb. 15	
5	Invitation to teachers	Jan. 20	Feb. 15
5A	Inquiry to teachers	March 1	April 1
5B	Return envelope	March 1	April 1
5C	Post card follow-up of Form 5A	March 20	
5D	Post card follow-up of Form 5A	April 2	

Note: In addition to the above schedule, special follow-ups were made wherever advisable.

*A selected number of cities participated in this study and another research at the same time. Materials were synchronized in order to avoid confusion.

Superintendents' Invitations

The first step taken to get this leadership study underway was to send a letter to each of the 113 Ohio city superintendents inviting them to participate in the research. The facsimile of this letter is shown in Figure 2. The letter shows the purpose of the study, describes briefly what is required, and asks permission to send similar invitations to high school principals and a selected group of teachers.

In reply to the invitation 88 superintendents responded favorably.

T. C. Holy, Director of the Bureau of Educational Research, permitted his name to be used throughout the study for which the writer is deeply grateful. The high percentage of returns is no doubt due to the high esteem with which the Bureau of Educational Research is held by educators.

An Overview

In the chapters which follow, each step is explained in detail. In Chapter I was established the problem. Chapter II outlined the procedure. Chapter III will be devoted to developing the criteria for adequacy and democracy. Chapter IV will deal with the criteria applied to high schools. Chapter V will show job analyses of principals' positions. Chapter VI will provide relationships of democracy and adequacy to other basic factors. Chapter VII will bring the study to a conclusion. A selected bibliography appears at the end of the dissertation.

Figure 2

Facsimile of the Letter Inviting City Superintendents of
Schools in Ohio to Participate in This Leadership Study

November 1, 1949

Dear Superintendent,

The Bureau of Educational Research of The Ohio State University cordially invites you and your high schools to participate in a state-wide study involving all Ohio cities. It is a part of a ten-year leadership research program being conducted at the University, three years of which are being devoted specifically to educational leadership.

The purpose of this study is to determine the conditions under which our high school principals operate. All data will be treated in a strictly confidential manner. Names of schools and of persons will in no way be revealed. The findings will be added to the total picture with the hope of providing information leading to an improved training for the nation's future leaders.

Having been a teacher, a principal, and a superintendent, I realize that you have many demands upon your time, but I am also aware of the great need for basic research of this kind, especially in the field of educational leadership. Therefore, with your permission we will extend a similar invitation to each of your high school principals and to a selected group of their teachers to furnish the needed data.

Each principal will be asked to furnish information concerning himself and his school. Each of the selected teachers will check a list of 150 items about leadership situations. You, as superintendent, will be provided fifteen brief statements about high school administration to evaluate. These materials are designed to take a minimum of time to gain a maximum of results.

An addressed post card is enclosed for your convenience in replying to this invitation. Please check it in the appropriate square and mail not later than November 15.

Thanking you in advance for your willingness to cooperate in what we believe is a very important study, I am

Very cordially yours,

T. C. Holy, Director

CHAPTER III

CRITERIA OF LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

To isolate in so far as possible the characteristics of leader-group behavior as they apply to a democratic situation and to establish criteria for the evaluation of leadership is the two-fold purpose of this chapter. The literature and persons connected with leader-groups provided the descriptions. Judges evaluated them. After careful analysis a final set of characteristics was selected to describe the ideal democratically administered high school. Administrative functions form the basis for evaluating the adequacy of leadership.

Sources of Leader-Behavior Descriptions

Since autocratic and democratic behavior seem to be contrasted and since descriptions by persons associated with leaders as well as statements found in the literature need careful analysis, the following questions were used as guides to the analyses:

1. What beliefs would a democratic or autocratic leader hold highest in his scale of values?
2. How would such leaders operate, i.e., what administrative techniques and devices would he use?
3. What personal qualities would the leader have?
4. What would the followers be like?

The study of the literature and personal descriptions continued until duplications made any further research appear to be of little

useful purpose. Many sources¹ were used in addition to information provided by interested persons.

As a sample, an analysis of material by Pigor² provided contrasting descriptions useful to our purpose:

<u>Democratic Leadership</u> <u>Depends on</u>	<u>Autocratic Domination</u> <u>Depends on</u>
1. Simple fellowship	1. Social status
2. Common goals	2. Individual goals
3. Education	3. Drill repetition
4. Growth	4. Results
5. Responsible workers	5. Docile, compliant workers
6. Leader, a part of group	6. Leader, aloof from group
7. Mutual understanding	7. Inherent distrust
8. Mutual stimulation	8. Adjustment of conflicting interests
9. Cooperation	9. Compromise
10. Statesmanship	10. Politics
11. Unity for achievement	11. Division to conquer
12. Pointing out needs	12. Ordering things done
13. Scientific information	13. Secretive aims
14. Control by authority based on facts	14. Control by prestige based on power
15. Liberating human energy	15. Routinized control
16. Integration of diverse purposes	16. Monopoly of power

¹

See the Bibliography, pp. 218-227.

²

Paul Pigor, loc. cit., pp. 75-100.

For each statement, a simple sentence was composed, coded, and placed on 3 x 5 cards. All sources were analyzed similarly until a pack of 1,179 cards was established--769 for democratic leader-group behavior items, 342 for autocratic leader-behavior descriptions, and 68 which fit neither one.

Selecting the Statements

The original pack of 1,179 statements was divided into eight packs of approximately 150 each. Added to each pack was a group of twenty statements identical to each pack. Each pack was placed in the hands of four judges for evaluation. The judges, shown in Figure 3, sorted the statements into four piles.

File 1 - Democratic leader-group behavior

File 2 - Autocratic leader-group behavior

File 3 - Neither one or two

File 4 - Either one or two

Figure 3

Judges Who Participated in the Preliminary Screening of Democratic and Autocratic Leader-group Behavior Descriptions in the Order of Their Participation

1. Clyde Parker	Superintendent of Schools	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
2. Hale C. Reid	Director of Curriculum	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
3. Donal Emery	Director of Guidance	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
4. Elizabeth Burianek	Counselor, Franklin High School	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
5. Ray Poindexter	Graduate Student in Education	Ohio State University
6. Earl Haggerty	Graduate Student in Education	Ohio State University

Figure 3 (continued)

7.	Eugene Stanley	Professor	Georgia State College
8.	Henry Jackson	Teacher	Savannah, Georgia
9.	Harold Eibling	Assistant Superintendent of Schools	Akron, Ohio
10.	Harry Armogida	Graduate Assistant in Philosophy	Ohio State University
11.	Darrel Holmes	Research Assistant, Bureau of Educational Research	Ohio State University
12.	Walter Albrecht	Graduate Student in Mathematics	Ohio State University
13.	John Shreve	Research Assistant, Bureau of Educational Research	Ohio State University
14.	Karl Boyer	Research Assistant, Bureau of Educational Research	Ohio State University
15.	John Greer	Elementary Principal	Gary, Indiana
16.	G. S. Hammond	Superintendent of Schools	Plain City, Ohio
17.	Nouri Jafar	Graduate Student in Education	Ohio State University
18.	Richard Featherstone	Graduate Assistant in Elementary Education	Ohio State University
19.	Arthur E. Wohlers	Principal of the High School	Carey, Ohio
20.	Roberta Edwards	Teacher	Columbus, Ohio
21.	Sister Mary Boaco	Graduate Student	Ohio State University
22.	Lucetta Gearhart	Graduate Student in Education	Ohio State University
23.	Caroline Newsom	Graduate Student in Education	Ohio State University

Figure 3 (continued)

24.	Harold L. Nichols	Superintendent of Schools	West Jefferson, Ohio
25.	Tom Weir	Graduate Student in Education	Ohio State University
26.	Orval Ulry	Research Assistant in Education	Ohio State University
27.	John Rhinehart	Superintendent of Schools	Perrysburg, Ohio
28.	George Hartman	Superintendent of Schools	Carey, Ohio
29.	N. T. Knight	Superintendent of Berle Union Schools	Fairfield County, Ohio
30.	John Evans	Superintendent of Schools	New Philadelphia, Ohio
31.	Frank Gottfried	Research Assistant in Education	Ohio State University
32.	Robert Wilson	Principal of the High School	Elyria, Ohio

After four judges had sorted a single pack, the twenty identical items were analyzed to find the consistency among them. Table I shows that on democratic leader-behavior responses the judges agreed upon 267 responses out of 320 or 83.4 per cent of the total.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATIONS MADE BY JUDGES WHO SCREENED THE CRITERIA WHICH INCLUDED THE TEN CONSISTENCY ITEMS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY

No.	Statements of Democratic Behavior	D	A	E	N
1.	The authority for action rests with the group.	30	0	0	2
2.	The group is able to operate effectively in the absence of the leader.	30	0	2	0
3.	The group participates with the leader in making the policies for the organization.	31	0	1	0
4.	Policies are made for the common good of the group.	27	0	4	1
5.	The work of the group is accomplished through the willing cooperation of the group members.	30	0	2	0
6.	The leader depends upon group intelligence.	31	0	0	1
7.	Action is initiated by the leader.	7	17	8	0
8.	The leader depends upon high morale for effectiveness.	23	2	6	1
9.	The work and benefits are shared by the members of the group.	30	0	2	0
10.	The leader liberates human energy for creative work.	28	0	3	1
Total responses		267	19	28	6

D - Democratic

A - Autocratic

E - Either D or A

N - Neither D or A

Table II shows that on autocratic or non-democratic leader behavior responses judges were in agreement on 85.9 per cent of the responses, or 275 of 320.

TABLE II

EVALUATIONS MADE BY JUDGES WHO SCREENED THE CRITERIA WHICH INCLUDED CONSISTENCY ITEMS RELATED TO AUTOCRACY

No.	Statements of Non-democratic Behavior	D	A	E	N
11.	The authority for leadership rests with the leader and a few key individuals.	1	28	2	1
12.	The operation of the group is ineffective in the absence of the leader.	1	28	2	1
13.	Policies are made by the leader.	0	32	0	0
14.	Policies are made for the primary purpose of getting results.	4	19	8	1
15.	The work of the group is accomplished by following plans outlined by the group.	1	27	4	0
16.	The intelligence of the group is regimented by the leader.	0	32	0	0
17.	Action is obtained through orders and commands.	0	32	0	0
18.	The leader depends upon obedience for effectiveness.	0	31	1	0
19.	The work and benefits are determined by the leader.	3	29	0	0
20.	Members are trained for their individual tasks by the leader.	3	17	11	1
Total responses		13	275	28	4

D - Democratic

A - Autocratic

N - Neither D or A

E - Either D or A

After further editing, eliminating duplicates, and removing the ambiguous statements, 209 descriptions remained which seemed to fit the following classifications:

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Democratic</u>	<u>Autocratic</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fundamental concepts	7	9	16
Principal description	48	83	131
Teacher group description	43	12	55
Organization	6	1	7
Total	104	105	209

Each statement was given a scale by which it could be evaluated in terms of an ideal democratically administered high school. These statements, together with scales and other descriptive material, were duplicated in order that they might be submitted to a jury of experts.

The Jury of Experts

The Dean of the College of Education at The Ohio State University, Dr. Donald P. Cottrell; the Dean of the College of Education at the University of Virginia, Dr. Lindley Stiles; Dr. D. H. Eikenberry, Professor of Education of The Ohio State University; and Dr. Frances L. Bacon, Professor of Secondary Education at the University of Southern California, were asked to name a jury of leaders in secondary education. Thirty-one persons, shown in Figure 4, were suggested. To each went an invitation to participate in the study. Thirty accepted the invitation. Thirty completed evaluations of the leader-group behavior descriptions.

Figure 4

The Jury of Experts Who Evaluated the 209 Criteria

1.	Dr. Vernon Anderson	Professor of Education	University of Connecticut
2.	Dr. Harold Benjamin	Professor of Education	University of Maryland
3.	Dr. R. K. Bent	Professor of Education	University of Arkansas
4.	Dr. Francis Bacon	Professor of Education	University of California at Los Angeles
5.	C. E. Blume	Principal, Central High School	Minneapolis, Minnesota
6.	Dr. Charles W. Boardman	Professor of Education	University of Minnesota
7.	Dr. William H. Bristow	Research Dept., Public Schools	New York City
8.	Dr. Harold B. Brooks	Washington Jr. High School	Long Beach, California
9.	Dr. Philip W. L. Cox	Professor of Education	New York University
10.	Dr. Harl R. Douglass	Director, School of Education	University of Colorado
11.	Dr. D. H. Eikenberry	Professor of Education	The Ohio State University
12.	Dr. Paul E. Elicker	NASSP, 1201 - 16th Street	Washington, D.C.
13.	Dr. Lloyd Elliot	Professor of Education	Cornell University
14.	Dr. Glen Eye	Professor of Education	University of Wisconsin
15.	Dr. W. R. Flesher	Bureau of Educational Research	The Ohio State University
16.	Dr. Will French	Professor of Education	Teachers' College, Columbia University

Figure 4 (continued)

17. Dr. Orin Graff	Professor of Education	University of Connecticut
18. Dr. Robert Gilchrist	Assistant Superin- tendent of Schools	Pasadena, California
19. Dr. Harold Hand	Professor of Education	University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois
20. Dean Paul Jacobson	College of Educa- tion	University of Oregon
21. Dr. Edgar G. Johnston	Professor of Education	Wayne University
22. Dr. Galen Jones	Director, Division of Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education	Washington, D.C.
23. Dr. S.E.T. Land	Professor of Education	University of California
24. Paul Misner	Superintendent of Schools	Glencoe, Illinois
25. Dr. Al. Oliver	Professor of Education	University of Pa.
26. Dr. Harold Spears	Assistant Superin- tendent of Schools	San Francisco, California
27. James Spinning	Superintendent of Schools	Rochester, New York
28. Dean Lindley Stiles	School of Educa- tion	University of Virginia
29. Curtis Threlkeld	Superintendent of Schools	South Orange & Maplewood New Jersey
30. Dr. Lawrence Vedevroe	Director, Bureau of Educational Services	University of Michigan Ann Arbor
31. Julius Warren	Superintendent of Schools	University City, Missouri

The Final Leader-Group Behavior Descriptions

After the inquiries to the jury had been returned, tabulations of the responses were made to find which items met the standards for keeping an item, namely:

1. Which items had concentrated frequencies at either extreme on the scale?
2. Which items were clear to the judges and had no editorial corrections?
3. Which items had the median and 70 per cent of the responses at one or the other extreme with only four responses marked elsewhere?
4. Which items scored above 40 after weighting the extreme responses ± 2 , the second and fourth responses ± 1 , and the middle or third response 0?
5. Which items should remain on a priori judgment alone?

The 209 descriptions together with frequencies of responses on the scales provided and the scores on each statement appear in Figure 5.

The first number is the score. The asterisk (*) indicates a non-democratic item. The number in each scale position indicates the frequency with which experts marked the scale position. For example, refer to the following statement in Section I.

Score

*8. Leadership ability is a gift that only few possess.

38	True <u>1</u>	Doubtful <u>8</u>	Untrue <u>20</u>
	(-2)	(0)	(+2)

This statement is non-democratic as the asterisk (*) shows. The weights have been placed below each position on the scale. Therefore, the score of 39 is found as follows:

$$(20 \times 2) - (2 \times 1)$$

In the case of statement No. 11 which is a democratic item and should be marked true, the score of 34 was found as follows:

$$(19 \times 2) - (2 \times 2)$$

Figure 5

The Frequency of Response by the Experts and the Scores Made on 209 Criteria

On the following pages you will find several simple statements concerning philosophy, school principals, teachers and high school organizations in general. With each statement there is a scale by which to evaluate each one in terms of what you consider to be the ideal democratically administered school. Please keep this in mind when you register your best judgment at that point which represents your most studied opinion at this moment. Place a check (✓) in the appropriate space.

- I. Which of the following ideas would be thought true by a great majority of the teachers in the ideally administered democratic school? (Check all statements.)

Score

- * 1. Participation in the administration of the school is an imposition upon teachers.

58 True 0 Doubtful 1 Untrue 29

- * 2. Cooperative endeavor requires moral qualities beyond the great majority of teachers.

52 True 9 Doubtful 3 Untrue 26

- * 3. It is impossible to participate intelligently out of one's field of teaching.

58 True 0 Doubtful 1 Untrue 29

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	4.	Every youth is entitled to develop to his maximum capacity without check or interference.		
22		True <u>17</u>	Doubtful <u>6</u>	Untrue <u>6</u>
	5.	Learning is the reconstruction of experience.		
32		True <u>20</u>	Doubtful <u>5</u>	Untrue <u>4</u>
	6.	Learning takes place in the process of doing.		
56		True <u>29</u>	Doubtful <u>0</u>	Untrue <u>1</u>
	7.	All individuals have the potential abilities to solve their common problems cooperatively.		
40		True <u>21</u>	Doubtful <u>8</u>	Untrue <u>1</u>
	* 8.	Leadership ability is a gift that only a few possess.		
38		True <u>1</u>	Doubtful <u>8</u>	Untrue <u>20</u>
	9.	No man or limited group of men are capable or good enough to control others without their consent.		
50		True <u>25</u>	Doubtful <u>4</u>	Untrue <u> </u>
	*10.	Leadership is confined to the thinking of a few capable individuals.		
48		True <u> </u>	Doubtful <u>6</u>	Untrue <u>24</u>
	11.	The educational program harmonizes with the needs of youth in the community.		
54		True <u>19</u>	Doubtful <u>9</u>	Untrue <u>2</u>
	12.	Most teachers are capable of managing themselves in group behavior.		
56		True <u>28</u>	Doubtful <u>2</u>	Untrue <u>0</u>
	13.	Educational opportunities equal for all youth are necessary.		
50		True <u>26</u>	Doubtful <u>2</u>	Untrue <u>1</u>

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

- *14. The efficient operation of the school depends upon centralized authority.
- 8 True 8 Doubtful 7 Untrue 12
- *15. Obedience to the principal supersedes personal wishes of the teachers.
- 24 True 2 Doubtful 13 Untrue 14
- *16. Working things out as a group is slow and inefficient.
- 38 True 1 Doubtful 8 Untrue 20
- II. How is the democratically administered school organized?
17. The school is organized around teacher-pupil committees.
- 31 A great deal 11 Fairly much 10 To some degree 7 Comparatively little 1 Not at all 0
18. A professional relations committee promotes the in-service growth of teachers.
- 45 Often 19 Fairly often 8 Occasionally 2 Once in a while 1 Very seldom 0
19. The arrangement of the school organization aids the cooperative efforts of the group.
- 56 A great deal 26 Fairly much 0 To some degree 0 Comparatively little 0 Not at all 0
- *20. Students follow the suggestions of their superiors.
- 20 Always 10 Often 19 Occasionally 4 Once in a while 1 Very seldom 0
21. Cooperation arises in the group from a mutual understanding of the common aims.
- 39 Always 10 Often 19 Occasionally 1 Seldom 0 Never 0
22. The "right" mental atmosphere exists in the school.
- 45 Often 20 Fairly often 5 Occasionally 2 Once in a while 0 Very seldom 0
23. The organization is cemented together by mutual loyalties.
- 50 A great deal 22 Fairly much 6 To some degree 2 Comparatively little 0 Not at all 0

Figure 5 (continued)

III. How does the principal in the ideally administered democratic school operate?

Score

24. He presents all sides of a question to the faculty.
47 Always 20 Often 8 Occasionally 1 Seldom 1 Never 0
25. He participates in discussions on the level with the rest of the faculty.
53 Fairly Often 24 often 5 Occasionally 1 Once in a while 0 Very seldom 0
26. He supports parents' organizations as a vital link between the home and the school.
59 A great deal 29 Fairly much 1 To some degree 0 Comparatively little 0 Not at all 0
27. He sympathetically counsels teachers and pupils with their personal problems.
53 Fairly Often 24 often 5 Occasionally 1 Once in a while 0 Very seldom 0
28. He invites others to participate in activities which affect them.
54 Always 24 Often 6 Occasionally 0 Once in a while 0 Very seldom 0
29. He frees others to plan and act cooperatively.
56 Fairly Often 26 often 4 Occasionally 0 Once in a while 0 Very seldom 0
30. He sees to it that the work of the teachers and the students is coordinated.
40 Always 16 Often 12 Occasionally 1 Seldom 0 Never 0
31. He furnishes leadership in developing the curriculum.
56 Fairly Often 27 often 2 Occasionally 0 Once in a while 1 Very seldom 0
32. He furnishes guiding suggestions for the cooperative planning of the faculty.
34 Always 8 Often 18 Occasionally 4 Seldom 0 Never 0
33. He sets a good example of cooperative behavior himself.
57 Always 27 Often 3 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

34. He encourages the free play of human intelligence.
- 58 Always 28 Often 2 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
35. He shows the teachers how to develop new and creative methods of teaching.
- 37 Fairly Often 13 often 9 Occasionally 7 Once in a while 1 Very seldom 0
36. He displays skill in the use of cooperative techniques.
- 58 A great deal 28 Fairly much 2 To some degree 0 Comparatively little 0 Not at all 0
37. He is well acquainted with his community and its problems.
- 59 A great deal 29 Fairly much 1 To some degree 0 Comparatively little 0 Not at all 0
38. He carries into action the program developed by the faculty.
- 53 Fairly Often 26 often 3 Occasionally 0 Once in a while 0 Very seldom 1
39. He expects the school to achieve as much as possible for each individual.
- 58 Always 28 Often 2 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
40. He abides by the decisions of the group.
- 39 Always 9 Often 21 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
41. He adapts himself to the existing conditions.
- 43 Always 17 Often 9 Occasionally 4 Seldom 0 Never 0
42. He shows appreciation for any contribution to the common program.
- 57 Always 27 Often 3 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
43. He admits error readily and willingly.
- 56 Always 26 Often 4 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
44. He stimulates self-direction in others.
- 54 Always 24 Often 6 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

45. He devises ways for the staff to act directly or through representatives.
- 49 Always 19 Often 11 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
- *46. He censors the activities of the teachers.
- 24 Always 0 Often 1 Occasionally 8 Seldom 17 Never 4
47. He keeps an open mind while the facts are being assembled.
- 55 Always 26 Often 3 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
- *48. He transfers teachers who oppose him.
- 35 Always 0 Often 0 Occasionally 4 Seldom 15 Never 10
49. He cements the faculty into a cooperative working whole.
- 53 Always 23 Often 7 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
- *50. He seeks to make a record for himself.
- 33 Fairly Often 2 often 1 Occasionally 3 Once in a while 8 Very seldom 15
51. He acts in terms of "we-ness" instead of "I-ness".
- 54 Always 24 Often 6 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
- *52. He blames the same members of the staff when things go wrong.
- 50 Always 0 Often 0 Occasionally 0 Seldom 6 Never 22
53. He applies compromise measures when needed.
- 29 Always 9 Often 11 Occasionally 10 Seldom 0 Never 0
- *54. He "rides" teachers who make mistakes.
- 59 Fairly Often 0 often 0 Occasionally 0 Once in a while 1 Very seldom 29
55. He helps others accomplish their common purposes.
- 50 Always 20 Often 10 Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	*56.	He treats teachers like cogs in a machine.					
		Fairly		Once in		Very	
58		Often <u>0</u>	often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	a while <u>2</u>	seldom <u>28</u>	
	57.	He generates the power of leadership in the school.					
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at	
55		deal <u>27</u>	much <u>2</u>	degree <u>0</u>	little <u>1</u>	all <u>0</u>	
	*58.	He keeps to himself.					
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at	
28		deal <u>0</u>	much <u>0</u>	degree <u>8</u>	little <u>16</u>	all <u>6</u>	
	59.	He develops in others the powers of carrying responsibilities.					
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at	
55		deal <u>26</u>	much <u>3</u>	degree <u>1</u>	little <u>0</u>	all <u>0</u>	
	*60.	He relies upon pressure to get things done.					
		Fairly		Once in		Very	
42		Often <u>0</u>	often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>6</u>	a while <u>6</u>	seldom <u>18</u>	
	*61.	He acts as a boss.					
46		Always <u>0</u>	Often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>2</u>	Seldom <u>10</u>	Never <u>18</u>	
	*62.	He plays one teacher against the other.					
		Fairly		Once in		Very	
58		Often <u>0</u>	often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	a while <u>0</u>	seldom <u>28</u>	
	*63.	He enjoys ruling the roost.					
54		Always <u>0</u>	Often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	Seldom <u>6</u>	Never <u>24</u>	
	64.	He places the welfare of youth above all else.					
54		Always <u>26</u>	Often <u>2</u>	Occasionally <u>1</u>	Seldom <u> </u>	Never <u>0</u>	
	*65.	He rules with an iron hand.					
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at	
54		deal <u>0</u>	much <u>0</u>	degree <u>0</u>	little <u>6</u>	all <u>24</u>	
	66.	He makes the teachers feel secure during the process of rapid change.					
52		Always <u>22</u>	Often <u>8</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	Seldom <u>0</u>	Never <u>0</u>	

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	*67.	He lords it over the other members of the staff.				
		Fairly		Once in	Very	
60		Often <u>0</u>	often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	a while <u>0</u>	seldom <u>30</u>
	*68.	He trusts the other members of the staff.				
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at
57		deal <u>27</u>	much <u>3</u>	degree <u>0</u>	little <u>0</u>	all <u>0</u>
	*69.	He indoctrinates the teachers with his ideas.				
		Fairly		Once in	Very	
24		Often <u>2</u>	often <u>1</u>	Occasionally <u>11</u>	a while <u>3</u>	seldom <u>13</u>
	*70.	He is austere and aloof from the other members of the staff.				
56		Always <u>0</u>	Often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	Seldom <u>4</u>	Never <u>26</u>
	*71.	He makes the decisions for the faculty.				
45		Always <u>0</u>	Often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>1</u>	Seldom <u>13</u>	Never <u>16</u>
	*72.	He schedules the work to be done by the staff.				
8		Always <u>1</u>	Often <u>7</u>	Occasionally <u>8</u>	Seldom <u>9</u>	Never <u>4</u>
	*73.	He exercises final and absolute authority in all matters.				
36		Always <u>1</u>	Often <u>1</u>	Occasionally <u>2</u>	Seldom <u>11</u>	Never <u>14</u>
	*74.	He discourages the teachers from pursuing their individual aims.				
		Fairly		Once in	Very	
54		Often <u>0</u>	often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>2</u>	a while <u>2</u>	seldom <u>26</u>
	*75.	He brooks no questioning.				
		Fairly		Once in	Very	
56		Often <u>0</u>	often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>1</u>	a while <u>0</u>	seldom <u>28</u>
	*76.	He acts without consulting the group.				
34		Always <u>0</u>	Often <u>0</u>	Occasionally <u>3</u>	Seldom <u>16</u>	Never <u>9</u>
	*77.	He uses a standard method of rating teachers.				
		Fairly		Once in	Very	
30		Often <u>2</u>	often <u>2</u>	Occasionally <u>4</u>	a while <u>4</u>	seldom <u>16</u>

Figure 5 (continued)

<u>Score</u>		
	*78.	He disregards the feelings of teachers in making decisions.
59		Fairly Once in Very Often <u>0</u> often <u>0</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> a while <u>1</u> seldom <u>29</u>
	*79.	He uses the ideas of others as his own.
44		Fairly Once in Very Often <u>2</u> often <u>1</u> Occasionally <u>1</u> a while <u>1</u> seldom <u>24</u>
	*80.	He relies upon his personality to accomplish his purposes.
29		Always <u>0</u> Often <u>2</u> Occasionally <u>6</u> Seldom <u>13</u> Never <u>9</u>
	*81.	He maintains control of the staff thru his own representa- tives.
43		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at deal <u>1</u> much <u>0</u> degree <u>3</u> little <u>7</u> all <u>19</u>
	82.	He is friendly and approachable with the teachers and pupils.
58		Always <u>28</u> Often <u>2</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u> Never <u>0</u>
	83.	He treats the teachers and the pupils with impartiality.
57		Always <u>27</u> Often <u>3</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u> Never <u>0</u>
	*84.	He refuses to compromise a point.
30		Always <u>0</u> Frequently <u>1</u> Occasionally <u>5</u> Seldom <u>17</u> Never <u>7</u>
	*85.	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
57		Fairly Once in Often <u>0</u> often <u>0</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> a while <u>3</u> Seldom <u>27</u>
	86.	He develops in others the power for initiating action.
60		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at deal <u>30</u> much <u>0</u> degree <u>0</u> little <u>0</u> all <u>0</u>
	*87.	He hesitates to commend teachers for their contributions.
58		Always <u>0</u> Often <u>0</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>2</u> Never <u>28</u>
	88.	He serves the human needs of the group.
55		Very Fairly To some well <u>25</u> well <u>5</u> Acceptably <u>0</u> extent <u>0</u> Poorly <u>0</u>

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	89.	He develops in others the power for planning their own actions.				
55		A great deal	Fairly much	To some extent	Comparatively little	Not at all
		<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	*90.	He follows routine to the letter.				
25		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>
	*91.	He uses his veto powers.				
27		A great deal	Fairly much	Occasionally	Very seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>
	*92.	He is sure that his way is the best.				
34		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>
	93.	He stresses the importance of high morale among the teachers.				
55		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>26</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	*94.	He is impersonal in his relations with the rest of his staff.				
9		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
	*95.	He acquires teachers for his staff on his own judgment.				
32		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>9</u>
	96.	He respects all youth regardless of their social or economic standing.				
60		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	97.	He refers problems to special committees for study and report.				
51		Fairly Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Once in a while	Seldom
		<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	98.	He holds informal conferences with teachers and pupils.				
56		Fairly Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Once in a while	Seldom
		<u>26</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	*99.	He places the welfare of the organization ahead of staff members.				
-15		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	*100.	He appoints the committees.				
- 3		Always	2	Often	7	Occasionally 13 Seldom 6 Never 1
	101.	He urges the faculty to participate in study groups.				
		Fairly				
41		Often	18	often	6	Occasionally 5 Seldom 1 Never 0
	*102.	He looks at leadership as a one way process.				
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at
47		deal	2	much	0	degree 0 little 3 all 24
	*103.	He draws a line between himself and others on the staff.				
		To a large To some Not at				
50		Definitely	0	degree	0	extent 1 Seldom 8 all 21
	104.	He explains his actions to the rest of the staff.				
37		Always	10	Often	17	Occasionally 2 Seldom 0 Never 0
	105.	He is patient with those who differ with him.				
56		Always	26	Often	4	Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
	*106.	He breaks rules he wouldn't permit others to break.				
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at
52		deal	0	much	0	degree 0 little 6 all 23
	*107.	He presents his own point of view to outsiders.				
5		Always	1	Often	5	Occasionally 9 Seldom 8 Never 2
	*108.	He plans the work for the other members of the staff.				
17		Always	2	Often	0	Occasionally 9 Seldom 11 Never 5
	*109.	He drills the teachers in the tasks they are to perform.				
		To some Not at				
35		Definitely	1	Frequently	0	degree 3 Seldom 9 all 14
	*110.	He outlines and directs each committee's work.				
		Not at				
39		Always	0	Often	0	Occasionally 3 Seldom 15 all 12
	*111.	He limits the activities of teachers.				
		To some				
27		Definitely	0	Frequently	1	degree 8 Seldom 12 Never 8

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

- *112. He relies upon his position as principal for prestige and authority.
 43 Always 0 Usually 0 To some extent 3 Seldom 9 Never 17
- *113. He places his personal welfare ahead of the rest of the staff.
 56 Definitely 0 Often 0 To some extent 0 Seldom 4 Never 26
- *114. He releases those facts that further his own cause.
 49 Always 0 Often 0 Occasionally 0 Seldom 9 Never 20
- *115. He gets his informations about the school from a few key individuals.
 40 Always 0 Often 1 Occasionally 4 Seldom 9 Never 16
- *116. He likes to be looked up to.
 31 Definitely 1 Usually 1 To some extent 7 Seldom 8 Never 13
- *117. He changes teacher assignments without consulting them.
 59 Often 0 Fairly often 0 Occasionally 0 Once in a while 1 Seldom 29
- *118. He rejects changes suggested by the teachers.
 41 Often 0 Fairly often 1 Occasionally 2 Once in a while 12 Seldom 15
- *119. He feels that he has superior knowledge about school matters.
 28 Definitely 0 Usually 1 To some extent 11 Seldom 7 Never 11
- *120. He keeps the teachers in line by coercion.
 56 Always 0 Often 0 Occasionally 0 Seldom 4 Never 26
- *121. He likes to focus attention upon himself.
 52 Definitely 0 Usually 0 To some extent 0 Very little 8 Not at all 22
- *122. He keeps each teacher in her proper place.
 25 Definitely 0 Usually 0 To some extent 2 Very little 6 Not at all 20
- *123. He insists upon the use of uniform procedures.
 25 Always 0 Often 1 Occasionally 10 Seldom 10 Not at all 8

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	*124.	He is a single-minded individual.				
44		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Not very much	Not at all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>17</u>
	*125.	He remains aloof from the rest of the staff.				
51		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Not very much	Not at all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>22</u>
	*126.	He pits one teacher against another.				
58		Often	Fairly much	Occasionally	Once in a while	Not at all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28</u>
	*127.	He insists upon meeting deadlines.				
- 9		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>
	*128.	He feels above the others on the staff.				
56		Definitely	Usually	To some extent	Not very much	Not at all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>26</u>
	*129.	He criticizes the others for their mistakes.				
27		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Seldom	Not at all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>
	*130.	He controls the rest of the staff from behind the scenes.				
43		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>17</u>
	*131.	He avoids group discussion of common problems.				
53		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>23</u>
	*132.	He dominates the other members of the staff.				
51		Definitely	Usually	To some extent	Very little	Not at all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>21</u>
	133.	He is easy to work with.				
58		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	*134.	He considers suggestions of teachers as criticisms.				
45		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>19</u>
	*135.	He criticizes the teachers before other members of the staff.				
59		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>29</u>

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	*136.	He insists on doing things his way.				
		To some Very Not at				
43		Definitely	Usually	extent	little	all
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>
	*137.	He asks that teachers follow pre-determined channels of organization.				
27		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>
	138.	He makes it possible for the students to participate in the administration of the school.				
		To some Very Not at				
55		Definitely	Usually	extent	little	all
		<u>26</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	139.	He is thoughtful and considerate of his associates.				
58		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>29</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	140.	He welcomes differing points of view.				
		To some				
55		Always	Usually	extent	Seldom	Never
		<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	*141.	He keeps the school apart from the community.				
		To some				
55		Definitely	Usually	degree	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>25</u>
	*142.	He expects teachers to comply with his wishes.				
		To some				
24		Definitely	Usually	extent	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
	*143.	He determines the policies by which the staff operates.				
34		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
	*144.	He plans the school program without the help of the teachers.				
51		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>21</u>
	*145.	He selects the necessary materials for the teachers.				
43		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>
	*146.	He selects the textbooks for the teachers' use.				
52		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>23</u>

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	*147.	He prepares the courses of study for the teachers.				
56		Always	0	Often	0	Occasionally 1 Seldom 2 Never 27
	*148.	He discourages teachers from occupying positions of leadership.				
60		Definitely	0	Usually	0	To some extent 0 Seldom 0 Not at all 30
	*149.	He keeps control of his staff in his own hands.				
34		Definitely	1	Usually	0	To some extent 5 Seldom 8 Not at all 14
	*150.	He sees that the rules are enforced.				
-21		Definitely	11	Usually	5	To some degree 6 Seldom 4 Not at all 2
	*151.	He favors those who go down the line for him.				
39		Definitely	0	Usually	1	To some degree 5 Seldom 6 Not at all 17
	*152.	He hesitates to delegate authority to others on the staff.				
50		Always	0	Usually	0	To some extent 0 Seldom 10 Not at all 20
	153.	He makes personal sacrifices for other members of the staff.				
44		Often	19	Fairly often	6	Occasionally 5 Seldom ___ Never 0
	154.	He listens to what others on the staff have to say.				
58		Always	28	Often	2	Occasionally 0 Seldom 0 Never 0
IV. <u>What part do teachers play in the administration of the school?</u>						
	155.	Teachers help develop policies thru referenda.				
36		Often	16	Fairly often	6	Occasionally 5 Seldom 0 Never 1
	*156.	Teachers are considered incompetent to develop policies.				
64		Definitely	1	Usually	0	To some degree 0 Seldom 2 Not at all 27
	157.	Teachers help select and evaluate the personnel on the staff.				
29		Often	13	Fairly often	8	Occasionally 4 Seldom 1 Not at all 2

Figure 5 (continued)

<u>Score</u>		
	158.	Teachers discuss problems with the principal.
		Fairly
60		Often <u>30</u> often <u>0</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u> Never <u>0</u>
	159.	Teachers in the minority have the opportunity to express themselves.
59		Always <u>29</u> Often <u>1</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u> Never <u>0</u>
	160.	Teachers are free to suggest policies for the improvement of the school.
60		Always <u>30</u> Often <u>0</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u> Never <u>0</u>
	161.	Teachers cooperate in their research upon common problems.
51		Always <u>22</u> Frequently <u>7</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u> Never <u>0</u>
	162.	Teachers are free to experiment with different methods of teaching.
55		Always <u>25</u> Often <u>5</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u> Never <u>0</u>
	163.	Teachers exercise authority in proportion to their responsibility.
48		Always <u>23</u> Often <u>5</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> Seldom <u>1</u> Never <u>1</u>
	164.	Teachers help the principal thru an advisory group.
		Fairly Once in
56		Often <u>26</u> often <u>4</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> a while <u>0</u> Seldom <u>0</u>
	165.	Teachers hold the spotlight.
		Fairly Once in
33		Often <u>16</u> often <u>5</u> Occasionally <u>4</u> a while <u>0</u> Seldom <u>2</u>
	*166.	Teachers insist that the principal outline their work for them.
		Fairly Once in
47		Often <u>0</u> often <u>0</u> Occasionally <u>6</u> a while <u>1</u> Seldom <u>23</u>
	167.	Teachers share common purposes with the principal.
		Fairly Once in
60		Often <u>30</u> often <u>0</u> Occasionally <u>0</u> a while <u>0</u> seldom <u>0</u>

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	168.	Teachers keep themselves professionally informed.					
54		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Not too much	Not at all	
		<u>26</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	
	169.	Teachers share with the principal in determining their conditions of work.					
56		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Not too much	Not at all	
		<u>27</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	170.	Teachers are free to initiate action toward common goals.					
54		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Not too much	Not at all	
		<u>26</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	171.	Teachers respect the majority rule.					
49		Always	Usually	Occasionally	Seldom	Not at all	
		<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	172.	Teachers participate willingly in a pre-school professional workshop.					
50		Always	Usually	Occasionally	Seldom	Not at all	
		<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	173.	Teachers acquaint themselves with the community as it relates to the school.					
57		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all	
		<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	174.	Teachers improve themselves through professional meetings.					
		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all	
		<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	175.	Teachers decisions carry weight.					
57		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	
		<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	176.	Teachers share their experiences with one another.					
59		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Once in a while	Seldom	
		<u>29</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	*177.	Teachers are propelled by aims not known to them.					
53		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Once in a while	Seldom	
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>25</u>	
	178.	Teachers are interrupted to take care of the principal's wishes.					
52		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Once in a while	Seldom	
		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>23</u>	

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	179.	Teachers accept responsibility for the results of cooperatively developed policies.					
58		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Very little	Not at all	
		<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	180.	Teachers accept the responsibility to help formulate policies.					
55		Definitely	Usually	To some extent	Very little	Not at all	
		<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	181.	Teachers feel secure in the school.					
57		Definitely	Usually	To some extent	Very little	Not at all	
		<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	*182.	Teachers have a feeling of self-respect in the school.					
57		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Seldom	Not at all	
		<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	*183.	Teachers assume responsibility for the welfare of others in the group.					
54		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Seldom	Not at all	
		<u>25</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	*184.	Teachers create opportunities for the personality development of their students.					
58		Definitely	Usually	To some degree	Seldom	Not at all	
		<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	185.	Teachers help induct new staff members into the faculty.					
58		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Not at all	
		<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	186.	Teachers share in cooperative projects among themselves.					
57		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Seldom	Not at all	
		<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	187.	Teachers get outside consultants when needed.					
44		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	
		<u>20</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	188.	Teachers help evaluate their own professional growth.					
56		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all	
		<u>28</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	189.	Teachers clarify faculty issues through faculty forums.					
55		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Once in a while	Seldom	
		<u>25</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

57	190.	Teachers critically evaluate the progress toward their objectives.				
		A great deal	Fairly often	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
		28	1	1	0	0
50	191.	Teachers discuss controversial issues among themselves and in the classroom.				
		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
		23	5	1	1	0
54	192.	Teachers assume responsibility for their freedom of action.				
		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
		25	4	1	0	0
59	193.	Teachers help promote group enterprises.				
		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
		29	1	0	0	0
54	194.	Teachers value the expert advice and service rendered by the principal.				
		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
		26	2	2	0	0
49	195.	Teachers help interpret the school to the public through an organized public relations program.				
		A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
		23	3	2	1	0
- 3	*196.	Teachers place the stamp of approval on the principal's plans.				
		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Not at all
		0	9	9	4	4
58	197.	Teachers help select textbooks.				
		Often	Fairly often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		28	2	0	0	0
- 4	*198.	Teachers ask the principal if the usual routine is to be varied.				
		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
		1	10	10	4	2
2	*199.	Teachers are compliant with the principal's wishes.				
		Always	Usually	To some extent	Seldom	Not at all
		0	10	10	4	4

Figure 5 (continued)

Score

	200.	Teachers help establish the standards of conduct for the school.					
		Fairly			Not at		
59		Often <u>28</u>	often <u>2</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	Seldom <u>0</u>	all <u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	201.	Teachers help plan the supervisory program.					
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at	
54		deal <u>24</u>	much <u>5</u>	degree <u>1</u>	little <u>0</u>	all <u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	202.	Teachers help construct the salary scale.					
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at	
46		deal <u>20</u>	much <u>6</u>	degree <u>4</u>	little <u>0</u>	all <u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	*203.	Teachers consider themselves unqualified to participate in running the school.					
		To some			Not at		
41		Definitely <u>2</u>	Usually <u>0</u>	extent <u>3</u>	Seldom <u>5</u>	all <u>20</u>	
	*204.	Teachers feel ill-at-ease in the principal's presence.					
		To some			Not at		
50		Definitely <u>1</u>	Usually <u>0</u>	extent <u>0</u>	Seldom <u>6</u>	all <u>23</u>	
	*205.	Teachers rely upon the authority of the principal.					
26		Always <u>0</u>	Often <u>1</u>	Occasionally <u>7</u>	Seldom <u>15</u>	Never <u>6</u>	
	206.	Teachers help select their supplies and equipment.					
54		Always <u>25</u>	Often <u>4</u>	Occasionally <u>1</u>	Seldom <u>0</u>	Never <u>0</u>	
	*207.	Teachers feel lost without the direction of the principal.					
33		Always <u>1</u>	Often <u>1</u>	Occasionally <u>4</u>	Seldom <u>12</u>	Never <u>12</u>	
	208.	Teachers meet to discuss matters of vital common concern.					
		Fairly					
58		Often <u>28</u>	often <u>2</u>	Occasionally <u>0</u>	Seldom <u>0</u>	Never <u>0</u>	
	209.	Teachers help organize the curriculum.					
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at	
58		deal <u>28</u>	much <u>2</u>	degree <u>0</u>	little <u>0</u>	all <u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

As a result of applying the five standards for selection to each of the 209 statements, 134 statements remained. Seventy-five items were rejected. Table III provides a classification of scores made on the 134 statements selected as criteria for democratic principal-staff behavior.

TABLE III

CLASSIFICATION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF THE SCORES MADE ON THE 134 DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPAL-STAFF BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS EVALUATED BY A JURY OF THIRTY AUTHORITIES IN THE FIELD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND SELECTED AS CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC GROUP BEHAVIOR FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY

Score Interval	Concepts		Organization		Principal		Staff		Totals		T
	D	N	D	N	D	N	D	N	D	N	
56-60	2	2	1	0	24	16	23	0	50	18	68
51-55	0	1	0	0	17	8	12	2	29	11	40
46-50	2	1	1	0	2	4	4	2	9	8	17
41-45	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	4
36-40	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
-35	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Totals	5	5	5	1	45	30	39	4	94	40	134

D - Democratic Items

N - Non-democratic Items

Median Score on the items is 56

Over half of the 134 statements or seventy-five of the items concern the principal himself; forty-three are related to the teachers and sixteen are related to the organization and fundamental concepts of the group.

About equal numbers of democratic items, forty-five and thirty respectively, refer to the principal and his staff while most of the non-democratic items, thirty altogether, are listed under the principal.

A majority, or sixty-eight items, scored in the interval of 56-60. A perfect score is 60 since there were thirty respondents and since the extreme positions, one and five, or the expected scores were given weights of two. Positions two and four were given weights of one; position three was weighted zero. Therefore, a score of 56 could mean twenty-six marking an item at the expected extreme with four others marking in the next position.

Only nine of the selected items scored less than forty-six. These nine statements were kept on a priori judgment.

Table ^{VI} IV shows the distributions of scores for the items rejected. The median score on these items is 32. Seventy-five items were rejected, forty-one of which were non-democratic and referred to the principal. Six items received negative scores.

For instance, in Item 100 of Figure 5, seven of the judges felt that the principal should "seldom" and/or "never" appoint committees. "Never" was the expected response; however, nine of the jury indicated that the principal should "often" and/or "always" appoint committees. This resulted in a negative score of 3.

In Item 127, fifteen of the jury indicated that the principal should "always" and/or "often" insist upon meeting deadlines; however, only seven marked "seldom" and/or "never" the expected response. The resultant score was a negative 9.

Sixteen of the jury marked "often" and/or "always" in reply to Item 99 while eight marked "seldom" and/or "never". This indicates a division of the jury on whether or not the welfare of the organization

should go ahead of the welfare of individuals. The score was a low positive 15.

TABLE IV

CLASSIFICATION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF SCORES MADE ON SEVENTY-FIVE ITEMS REJECTED AS CRITERIA FOR PRINCIPAL-STAFF BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS EVALUATED BY A JURY OF THIRTY AUTHORITIES IN THE FIELD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

Score Interval	Concepts		Organization		Principal		Staff		Totals		Grand Total
	D	N	D	N	D	N	D	N	D	N	
56-60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51-55	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	2
46-50	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	3
41-45	0	0	0	0	6	7	1	1	7	8	15
36-40	0	1	0	0	3	4	1	0	4	5	9
31-35	2	0	1	0	0	9	1	1	4	10	14
26-30	0	0	0	0	3	7	1	1	4	8	12
21-25	1	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	2	6	8
16-20	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
11-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6-10	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	3
1-5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2
-1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	6	6
Totals	3	3	1	0	15	41	6	6	25	50	75

D - Democratic

N - Non-democratic

A bare majority, or sixteen of the jury, looks to the principal to see that rules are enforced. Eleven felt that he should definitely do this. Item 150 gives the distribution of responses which resulted in a negative 21.

The jury was divided on Items 196 and 198. Item 196 indicates that teachers should place a stamp of approval on the plans of the principal; and Item 198 shows that teachers should often ask the principal to approve any change of their routine.

The jury was almost evenly divided concerning centralized authority as shown by Item 14. Twelve felt that the efficient operation of the school did not depend upon centralized authority while eight felt that it did. Seven were doubtful. Three indicated the statement was not clear.

The Criteria Selected for Democratic Principal-Staff Behavior

The selected and rejected criteria appear in two tables. The first, Table V, contains the 134 principal-staff descriptions which are most characteristic of the ideal democratically administered school; the second, Table VI, contains the 75 descriptions rejected. Both lists are arranged in descending order according to scores. Those statements with the highest scores appear at the top. Both lists are divided into four classifications--I, Fundamental Concepts; II, Organization; III, The Principal; IV, The Teachers. The statements in each classification are separated into those requiring positive responses and those requiring negative responses; A-democratic and B-non-democratic, respectively.

TABLE V

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS SELECTED AS CRITERIA MOST
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE IDEAL DEMOCRATICALLY ADMINISTERED SCHOOL

I-A Democratic Fundamental Concepts

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
56	12	Most teachers are capable of managing themselves in group behavior.
56	6	Learning takes place in the process of doing.
50	13	Educational opportunities equal for all youth are necessary.
50	9	No man or limited group of men is capable or good enough to control others without their consent.
40	7	All individuals have the potential abilities to solve their common problems cooperatively.

I-B Non-democratic Fundamental Concepts

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
58	3	It is impossible to participate intelligently out of one's field of teaching.
58	1	Participation in the administration of the school is an imposition upon teachers.
52	2	Cooperative endeavor requires moral qualities beyond the great majority of teachers.
48	10	Leadership is confined to the thinking of a few capable individuals.
38	8	Leadership ability is a gift that only a few possess.

II-A Democratic Organizational Characteristics

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
56	19	The arrangement of the school organization aids the cooperative efforts of the group.
50	23	The organization is cemented together by mutual loyalties.
45	22	The "right" mental atmosphere exists in the school.
45	18	A professional relations committee promotes the in-service growth of teachers.
39	21	Cooperation arises in the group from a mutual understanding of the common aims.

TABLE V (continued)

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS SELECTED AS CRITERIA MOST
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE IDEAL DEMOCRATICALLY ADMINISTERED SCHOOL

II-B Non-democratic Organizational Characteristics

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
20	20	Students follow the suggestions of their superiors. (Teachers dominate their students.)

III-A Democratic Principal Behavior Descriptions

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
60	86	He develops in others the power for initiating action.
60	96	He respects all youth regardless of their social or economic standing.
59	37	He is well acquainted with his community and its problems.
59	26	He supports parents' organizations as a vital link between the home and the school.
58	44	He stimulates self-direction in others.
58	39	He expects the school to achieve as much as possible for each individual.
58	36	He displays skill in the use of cooperative techniques.
58	34	He encourages the free play of human intelligence.
58	82	He is friendly and approachable with the teachers and pupils.
58	139	He is thoughtful and considerate of his associates.
58	133	He is easy to work with.
58	154	He listens to what others on the staff have to say.
57	68	He trusts the other members of the staff.
57	83	He treats the teachers and the pupils with impartiality.
57	33	He sets a good example of cooperative behavior.
57	42	He shows appreciation for any contribution to the common good of the educational program.
56	105	He is patient with those who differ with him.
56	57	He generates the power of leadership in others in the school.
56	43	He admits error readily and willingly.
56	29	He frees others to plan and act cooperatively.
56	31	He furnishes leadership in developing the curriculum.
56	98	He holds informal conferences with teachers and pupils.
55	138	He makes it possible for the students to participate in the administration of the school.
55	140	He welcomes differing points of view.
55	88	He serves the human needs of the group.
55	93	He stresses the importance of high morale among the teachers.

TABLE V (continued)

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS SELECTED AS CRITERIA MOST
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE IDEAL DEMOCRATICALLY ADMINISTERED SCHOOLIII-A Democratic Principal Behavior Descriptions (cont.)

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
55	89	He develops in others the power for planning their own actions.
55	59	He develops in others the powers of carrying responsibilities.
54	28	He invites others to participate in activities which affect them.
54	51	He acts in terms of "we-ness" instead of "I-ness".
54	64	He places the welfare of youth above all else.
53	27	He sympathetically counsels teachers and pupils with their personal problems.
53	38	He carries into action the program developed by the faculty.
53	25	He participates in discussions on the level with the rest of the faculty.
52	66	He makes the teachers feel secure during the process of rapid change.
51	97	He refers problems to special committees for study and report.
51	49	He "cements" the faculty into a cooperative working whole.
50	55	He helps others accomplish their common purposes.
44	30	He sees to it that the work of the teachers and the students is coordinated.
37	24	He presents all sides of a question to the faculty.
34	32	He furnishes guiding suggestions for the cooperative planning of the faculty.

III-B Non-democratic Principal Behavior Descriptions

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
60	67	He lords it over the other members of the staff.
60	148	He discourages teachers from occupying positions of leadership.
59	54	He "rides" teachers who make mistakes.
59	117	He changes teacher assignments without consulting them.
59	78	He disregards the feelings of teachers in making decisions.
59	135	He criticizes teachers before other members of the staff.
58	56	He treats teachers like cogs in a machine.
58	87	He hesitates to commend teachers for their contributions.

TABLE V (continued)

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS SELECTED AS CRITERIA MOST
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE IDEAL DEMOCRATICALLY ADMINISTERED SCHOOLIII-B Non-democratic Principal Behavior Descriptions (cont.)

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
58	126	He pits one teacher against another.
58	125	He remains aloof from the rest of the staff.
58	62	He plays one teacher against the other.
57	85	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
56	147	He prepares the courses of study for the teachers.
56	128	He feels above other members of the staff.
56	113	He places his personal welfare ahead of the rest of the staff.
56	120	He keeps the teachers in line by coercion.
56	70	He is austere and aloof from the other members of the staff.
56	75	He brooks no questioning.
55	141	He keeps the school apart from the community.
54	63	He enjoys ruling the roost.
54	65	He rules with an iron hand.
54	74	He discourages the teachers from pursuing their individual aims.
53	131	He avoids group discussion of common problems.
52	106	He breaks rules he wouldn't permit others to break.
52	121	He likes to focus attention upon himself.
52	146	He selects the textbooks for the teachers' use.
51	144	He plans the school program without the help of the teachers.
51	132	He dominates the other members of the staff.
50	103	He draws a line between himself and others on the staff.
50	152	He hesitates to delegate authority to others on the staff.
50	52	He blames the same members of the staff when things go wrong.
47	102	He looks at leadership as a one way process.
46	61	He acts as a boss.
42	60	He relies upon pressure to get things done.

IV-A Democratic Staff Behavior Descriptions

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
60	158	Teachers discuss problems with the principal.
60	160	Teachers are free to suggest policies for the improvement of the school.
60	167	Teachers share common purposes with the principal.

TABLE V (continued)

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS SELECTED AS CRITERIA MOST
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE IDEAL DEMOCRATICALLY ADMINISTERED SCHOOL

IV-A Democratic Staff Behavior Descriptions (cont.)

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
59	193	Teachers help promote group enterprises.
59	159	Teachers in the minority have the opportunity to express themselves.
59	176	Teachers share their experiences with one another.
59	200	Teachers help establish the standards of conduct for the school.
58	185	Teachers help induct new staff members into the faculty.
58	174	Teachers improve themselves through professional meetings.
58	208	Teachers meet to discuss matters of vital common concern.
58	209	Teachers help organize the curriculum.
58	197	Teachers help select textbooks.
58	179	Teachers accept responsibility for the results of cooperatively developed policies.
58	184	Teachers create opportunities for the personality development of their students.
57	190	Teachers critically evaluate the progress toward their objectives.
57	173	Teachers acquaint themselves with the community as it relates to the school.
57	175	Teachers decisions carry weight.
57	181	Teachers feel secure in the school.
57	182	Teachers have a feeling of self-respect in the school.
57	186	Teachers share in cooperative projects among themselves.
56	188	Teachers help evaluate their own professional growth.
56	164	Teachers help the principal through an advisory group.
56	169	Teachers share with the principal in determining their conditions of work.
55	189	Teachers clarify faculty issues through faculty forums.
55	180	Teachers accept the responsibility to help formulate policies.
55	162	Teachers are free to experiment with different methods of teaching.
54	206	Teachers help select their supplies and equipment.
54	192	Teachers assume responsibility for their freedom of action.
54	194	Teachers value the expert advice and service rendered by the principal.
54	183	Teachers assume responsibility for the welfare of others in the group.

TABLE V (continued)

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS SELECTED AS CRITERIA MOST
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE IDEAL DEMOCRATICALLY ADMINISTERED SCHOOL

IV-A Democratic Staff Behavior Descriptions (cont.)

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
54	168	Teachers keep themselves professionally informed.
54	170	Teachers are free to initiate action toward common goals.
53	201	Teachers help plan the supervisory program.
51	161	Teachers cooperate in their research upon common problems.
50	191	Teachers discuss controversial issues among themselves and in the classroom.
49	195	Teachers help interpret the school to the public through an organized public relations program.
48	163	Teachers exercise authority in proportion to their responsibility.
46	202	Teachers help construct the salary scale.

IV-B Non-democratic Staff Behavior Descriptions

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
54	156	Teachers are considered incompetent to develop policies.
53	177	Teachers are propelled by aims not known to them.
52	178	Teachers are interrupted to take care of the principal's wishes.
50	204	Teachers feel ill-at-ease in the principal's presence.
47	166	Teachers insist that the principal outline their work for them.

TABLE VI

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS REJECTED

I-A Democratic Fundamental Concepts Rejected

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
34	11	The educational program harmonizes with the needs of youth in the community.
32	5	Learning is the reconstruction of experience.
22	4	Every youth is entitled to develop to his maximum capacity without check or interference.

I-B Non-democratic Fundamental Concepts Rejected

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
38	16	Working things out as a group is slow and inefficient.
24	15	Obedience to the principal supersedes personal wishes of the teachers.
8	14	The efficient operation of the school depends upon centralized authority.

II-A Democratic Organization Items Rejected

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
31	17	The school is organized around teacher-pupil committees.

II-B Non-democratic Organization Items Rejected

(None)

III-A Democratic Principal Behavior Items Rejected

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
55	47	He keeps an open mind while the facts are being assembled.
49	45	He devises ways for the staff to act directly or through representatives.
45	134	He considers suggestions of teachers as criticisms.
44	153	He makes personal sacrifices for other members of the staff.
43	41	He adapts himself to the existing conditions.
41	101	He urges the faculty to participate in study groups.
39	40	He abides by the decisions of the group.
37	104	He explains his actions to the rest of the staff.
37	35	He shows the teachers how to develop new and creative methods of teaching.
29	53	He applies compromise measures when needed.

TABLE VI (continued)

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS REJECTED

III-B Non-democratic Principal Behavior Items Rejected

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
49	114	He releases those facts that further his own cause.
45	71	He makes the decisions for the faculty.
44	79	He uses the ideas of others as his own.
44	124	He is a single-minded individual.
43	136	He insists on doing things his way.
43	130	He controls the rest of the staff from behind the scenes.
43	145	He selects the necessary materials for the teachers.
43	81	He maintains control of the staff through his own representatives.
43	112	He relies upon his position as principal for prestige and authority.
41	118	He rejects changes suggested by the teachers.
40	115	He gets his information about the school from a few key individuals.
39	151	He favors those who go down the line for him.
39	110	He outlines and directs each committee's work.
36	73	He exercises final and absolute authority in all matters.
35	48	He transfers teachers who oppose him.
35	109	He drills the teachers in the tasks they are to perform.
34	92	He is sure that his way is the best.
34	143	He determines the policies by which the staff operates.
34	149	He keeps control of his staff in his own hands.
34	76	He acts without consulting the group.
33	50	He seeks to make a record for himself.
32	95	He acquires teachers for his staff on his own judgment.
31	116	He likes to be looked up to.
30	77	He uses a standard method of rating teachers.
30	84	He refuses to compromise a point.
29	80	He relies upon his personality to accomplish his purposes.
28	58	He keeps to himself.
28	119	He feels that he has superior knowledge about school matters.
27	129	He criticizes the others for their mistakes.
27	137	He asks that teachers follow pre-determined channels of organization.
27	111	He limits the activities of teachers.
27	91	He uses his veto powers.
25	123	He insists upon the use of uniform procedures.
25	122	He keeps each teacher in his proper place.
24	142	He expects teachers to comply with his wishes.
24	46	He censors the activities of the teachers.
24	69	He indoctrinates the teachers with his ideas.

TABLE VI (continued)

LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS REJECTED

III-B Non-democratic Principal Behavior Items Rejected (cont.)

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
23	90	He follows routine to the letter.
17	108	He plans the work for the other members of the staff.
9	94	He is impersonal in his relations with the rest of his staff.
8	72	He schedules the work to be done by the staff.
5	107	He presents his own point of view to outsiders.
-3	100	He appoints the committees.
-9	127	He insists upon meeting deadlines.
-15	99	He places the welfare of the organization ahead of staff members.
-21	150	He sees that the rules are enforced.

IV-A Democratic Teacher Behavior Items Rejected

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
51	172	Teachers participate willingly in a pre-school professional workshop.
44	187	Teachers get outside consultants when needed.
36	155	Teachers help develop policies through referenda.
33	165	Teachers hold the spotlight.
29	157	Teachers help select and evaluate the personnel on the staff.

IV-B Non-democratic Teacher Behavior Items Rejected

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Statement</u>
49	171	Teachers respect the majority rule.
41	203	Teachers consider themselves unqualified to participate in running the school.
33	207	Teachers feel lost without the direction of the principal.
26	205	Teachers rely upon the authority of the principal.
2	199	Teachers are compliant with the principal's wishes.
-3	196	Teachers place the stamp of approval on the principal's plans.
-4	198	Teachers ask the principal if the usual routine is to be varied.

The Inquiry, Principal-Staff Leadership in Ohio High Schools

Each of the 134 criteria selected to evaluate democratic leader-group behavior was provided with a scale and incorporated into an inquiry known as Form 5A, Principal-Staff Leadership in Ohio High Schools, which appears in Figure 6. This inquiry appears on pages 65 through 73. Section I is devoted to basic information concerning the teacher. Section II records how teachers believe their colleagues think about certain fundamental democratic concepts. In Section III the teacher may evaluate the school organization. Section IV provides behavior descriptions with which the principal can be compared. Section V furnishes descriptions concerning teachers. Section VI is designed to secure information about community relationships as it relates to status which is described in Chapter V about the principal.

Figure 6**Principal-Staff Leadership in Ohio High Schools**

Sponsored by

The Bureau of Educational Research

and

The Personnel Research Board

The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

The Statements which follow make it possible to describe leadership in high schools as it relates to their philosophy, organization, principal, teachers, and community relationships. They do not judge whether leadership is good or bad. We simply want an objective description of what actually is the case.

School Code _____

Teacher Code _____

Thank You

The Bureau of Educational Research and the Personnel Research Board of The Ohio State University wish to thank you in advance for your acceptance of an invitation to participate in this study of secondary schools in the State of Ohio. Superintendents and principals have also provided basic data.

This is the final and very important step in this research project. In this inquiry you will find several statements concerning the educational philosophy, the organization, the principal, and teachers in high schools. You are expected to describe your school situation in terms of these statements. They have been very carefully selected by the help of fifty-eight competent persons in the field of secondary education.

Reliable data are the objective of this study. It is not our purpose to embarrass any person or school. Names of persons and places are not involved. The code is the only identification mark. Obviously the reliability and validity of this research will depend largely upon the care with which you check each item. We wish to emphasize that these materials are **STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL**. Therefore, mark each statement with complete freedom and in terms of your best judgment concerning your school.

DIRECTIONS:

Place a check (✓) on the scale accompanying each statement at that point which represents your best judgment. Be sure to check every item.

When you have finished, return the inquiry to T. C. Holy, Director, The Bureau of Educational Research, 204 Arps Hall, The Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio. An envelope is provided for your convenience.

Now, proceed without hesitation to describe your school situation in terms of the statements on the succeeding pages.

11. Single check (✓) each of the positions which you now hold; and double check (ⓧ) each one that you have held.

Officer in the local teachers organization _____	Other leadership positions: _____
Teacher's organization committee chairman _____	_____
Faculty committee chairman _____	_____
Officer in the local teachers organization _____	_____
Member of the principals' advisory committee _____	_____

Section II To what extent do the teachers in your high school agree with the following statements?

1. All normal individuals have the potential abilities to solve their common problems cooperatively.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

2. Leadership ability is a gift that only a few possess.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

3. Participation in the administration of the school is an imposition upon teachers.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

4. Learning takes place in the process of doing.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

5. No man or limited group of men is capable or good enough to control others without their consent.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

6. Most teachers are capable of managing themselves in group behavior.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

7. Educational opportunities equal for all youth are necessary.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

8. Cooperative endeavor requires moral qualities beyond the great majority of teachers.

Strongly	Tend to		Tend to	Strongly
Agree _____	Agree _____	In between _____	Disagree _____	Disagree _____

9. It is impossible to participate intelligently out of one's field of teaching.

Strongly Tend to Tend to Strongly
Agree Agree In between Disagree Disagree

10. Leadership is confined to the thinking of a few capable individuals.

Strongly Tend to Tend to Strongly
Agree Agree In between Disagree Disagree

III How is your high school organized?

1. A professional relations committee promotes the in-service growth of teachers.

Often Fairly often Occasionally Once in a while Very seldom

2. The arrangement of the school organization aids the cooperative efforts of the group.

A great deal Fairly much To some degree Comparatively little Not at all

3. Teachers dominate their students.

Always Often Occasionally Once in a while Very seldom

4. Cooperation arises in the group from a mutual understanding of the common aims.

Always Often Occasionally Seldom Never

5. The "right" atmosphere exists in the school.

Often Fairly often Occasionally Once in a while Very seldom

6. The organization is cemented together by mutual loyalties.

A great deal Fairly much To some degree Comparatively little Not at all

IV. How does the principal in your high school operate?

1. He tries to present all sides of a question to the faculty when necessary.

Always Often Occasionally Seldom Never

2. He "rides" teachers who make mistakes.

Often Fairly often Occasionally Once in a while Very seldom

3. He helps others accomplish their common purposes.

Always Often Occasionally Seldom Never

4. He treats teachers like cogs in a machine.

Often Fairly often Occasionally Once in a while Very seldom

5. He generates the power of leadership in others in the school.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___
6. He helps the faculty cement itself into a cooperative working whole.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
7. He keeps an open mind while the facts are being assembled.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
8. He welcomes differing points of view.
 Always ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
9. He keeps the school apart from the community.
 Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
10. He avoids group discussion of common problems.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
11. He makes it possible for the students to participate in the administration of the school.
 Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Very little ___ Not at all ___
12. He is thoughtful and considerate of his associates.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
13. He listens to what others on the staff have to say.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
14. He criticizes teachers before other members of the staff.
 Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
15. He plans the school program without the help of the teachers.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
16. He stresses the importance of high morale among the teachers.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
17. He selects the textbooks for the teachers use.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
18. He dominates the other members of the staff for personal reasons.
 Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Very little ___ Not at all ___

19. He sets a good example of cooperative behavior.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

20. He encourages the free play of human intelligence.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

21. He remains aloof from the rest of the staff.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Not very much ___ Not at all ___

22. He holds informal conferences with teachers and pupils.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

23. He acts in terms of "we-ness" instead of "I-ness".

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

24. He discourages teachers from occupying positions of leadership.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

25. He shows appreciation for any contribution to the common program.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

26. He admits error readily and willingly.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

27. He brooks no questioning.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

28. He acts as a boss.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

29. He refers problems to special committees for study and report.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

30. He prepares the courses of study for the teachers.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

31. He is easy to work with.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

32. He plays one teacher against the other.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

33. He expects the school to achieve as much as possible for each individual.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

34. He changes teacher assignments without consulting them.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

35. He makes the teachers feel secure during the process of rapid change.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

36. He lords it over the other members of the staff.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

37. He trusts the other members of the staff.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

38. He forces the teachers into line.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

39. He participates in discussions on the level with the rest of the faculty.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

40. He supports parents' organizations as a vital link between the home and the school.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

41. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

42. He develops in others the power for initiating action.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

43. He hesitates to commend teachers for their contributions.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

44. He respects all youth regardless of their social or economic standing.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

45. He hesitates to delegate authority to others on the staff.

Always ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

46. He furnishes leadership in developing the curriculum.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

47. He furnishes guiding suggestions for the cooperative planning of the faculty.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

48. He focuses attention upon himself.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Very little ___ Not at all ___

49. He sympathetically counsels teachers and pupils with their personal problems.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

50. He invites others to participate in activities which affect them.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

51. He rules the roost.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

52. He places the welfare of youth above all else.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

53. He rules with an iron hand.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

54. He looks at leadership as a one way process.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

55. He draws a line between himself and others on the staff.

Definitely ___ To a large degree ___ To some extent ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

56. He stimulates self-direction in others.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

57. He is austere and aloof from the other members of the staff.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

58. He discourages the teachers from pursuing their individual aims.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

59. He develops in others the power of carrying responsibilities.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

60. He relies upon pressure to get things done.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

61. He is patient with those who differ with him.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

62. He breaks rules he wouldn't permit others to break.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___

63. He displays skill in the use of cooperative techniques.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___

64. He is well acquainted with his community and its problems.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___

65. He carries into action the program developed by the faculty.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

66. He blames the same members of the staff when things go wrong.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

67. He is friendly and approachable with the teachers and pupils.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

68. He treats the teachers and the pupils with impartiality.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

69. He places his personal welfare ahead of the rest of the staff.

Definitely ___ Often ___ To some extent ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

70. He pits one teacher against another.

Often ___ Fairly much ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Not at all ___

71. He frees others to plan and act cooperatively.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

72. He feels above the others on the staff.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Not very much ___ Not at all ___

73. He serves the human needs of the group.

Very well ___ Fairly well ___ Acceptably ___ To some extent ___ Poorly ___

74. He develops in others the power for planning their own actions.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___

75. He disregards the feelings of teachers in making decisions.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Very seldom ___

V What part do teachers play in the administration of the school?

1. Teachers assume responsibility for their freedom of action.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___
2. Teachers help promote group enterprises.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___
3. Teachers discuss problems with the principal.
 Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
4. Teachers are interrupted to take care of the principal's wishes.
 Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___
5. Teachers help induct new staff members into the faculty.
 Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___
6. Teachers share in cooperative projects among themselves.
 Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___
7. Teachers help evaluate their own professional growth.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___
8. Teachers clarify faculty issues thru faculty forums.
 Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___
9. Teachers have a feeling of self-respect in the school.
 Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___
10. Teachers acquaint themselves with the community as it relates to the school.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___
11. Teachers improve themselves thru professional meetings.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___
12. Teachers value the expert advice and service rendered by the principal.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___
13. Teachers help interpret the school to the public thru an organized public relations program.
 A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

14. Teachers meet to discuss matters of vital common concern.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

15. Teachers help organize the curriculum.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___

16. Teachers are propelled by aims of the principal.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

17. The minority has the opportunity to express itself.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

18. Teachers are free to suggest policies for the improvement of the school.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

19. Teachers accept responsibility for the results of cooperatively developed policies.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Very little ___ Not at all ___

20. Teachers accept the responsibility to help formulate policies.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Very little ___ Not at all ___

21. Teachers feel secure in the school.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Very little ___ Not at all ___

22. Teachers help select textbooks.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

23. Teachers critically evaluate progress toward their objectives.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___

24. Teachers are free to discuss controversial issues among themselves and in the classroom.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ ^{Comparatively} little ___ Not at all ___

25. Teachers assume responsibility for the welfare of others in the group.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

26. Teachers feel ill-at-ease in the principal's presence.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some extent ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

27. Teachers help establish the standards of conduct for the school.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

28. Teachers are considered incompetent to develop policies.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

29. Teachers insist that the principal outline their work for them.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

30. Teachers share common purposes with the principal.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

31. Teachers keep themselves professionally informed.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Not too much ___ Not at all ___

32. Teachers share with the principal in determining their conditions of work.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Not too much ___ Not at all ___

33. Teachers are free to initiate action toward common goals.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Not too much ___ Not at all ___

34. Teachers help select their supplies and equipment.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

35. Teachers exercise authority in proportion to their responsibility.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

36. Teachers help the principal thru an advisory group.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

37. Teachers cooperate in their research upon common problems.

Always ___ Frequently ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

38. Teachers are free to experiment with different methods of teaching.

Always ___ Often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

39. Teachers create opportunities for the personality development of their students.

Definitely ___ Usually ___ To some degree ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

40. Teachers help plan the supervisory program.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

41. Teachers help construct the salary schedule.

A great deal ___ Fairly much ___ To some degree ___ Comparatively little ___ Not at all ___

42. Teachers' decisions carry weight.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

43. Teachers share their experiences with one another.

Often ___ Fairly often ___ Occasionally ___ Once in a while ___ Seldom ___

Section VI Community Relationships

The following questions have to do with the community relationships of school people. Please place a check mark (✓) at one of the marked-off points along the scale to indicate your answer. For most of the questions there are seven points along the scale. You may mark at one of the described alternatives or between them. Even though some of the questions may be difficult to answer, please give us your best guess. Place your check mark at the division points.

1. How would you characterize the job of the school superintendent in your community in respect to the following:

1a. the general prestige of the office of the superintendent

Very high in prestige Fairly high Moderately low Quite low

1b. the degree of influence the superintendent has in community affairs

Very high degree Fairly high Moderately low Quite low

1c. the social position the superintendency carries in the community

Very high Fairly high Moderately low Quite low

1d. the economic position in the community the superintendency affords

Very high Fairly high Moderately low Quite low

2. Please check the place on the scale to indicate the social position of the principal.

HIGH MIDDLE LOW

3. Considering total income from all sources and present assets, where would you place the principal on the following scale?

High Above Average Below Average Quite low

4. How would you describe the residential area in which the principal lives?

Among the Better Areas Above Average Below Average Among the Lower Areas

5. If you were asked to use one of the six names for the social class of the principal, in which would you say he belonged?

Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower
Upper Upper Middle Middle Lower Lower

6. How would you characterize the job of the public school teacher in your community at the present time in respect to the following:

- 6a. the prestige of the position

Very Fairly Moderately Very
High High Low Low

- 6b. the degree of influence teachers have in community affairs

Very Fairly Moderately Quite
High High Low Low

- 6c. the social position of teachers in the community

Very Fairly Moderately Quite
High High Low Low

- 6d. the economic position of teachers in the community

Very Fairly Moderately Quite
High High Low Low

7. From an economic standpoint what per cent of income earners in the community is doing better than the average teacher?

25% or less __; 26-35 __; 36-45 __; 46-50 __; 51-60 __; 61-70 __;

70% or better __.

8. Place a check mark at the point on the scale which indicates the social position of the superintendent in your community.

HIGH MIDDLE LOW

9. How would you characterize the residential area in which the superintendent lives?

Among the
Better Areas

Above
Average

Below
Average

Quite
Low

10. From an economic standpoint, what per cent of the income earners in the community would you estimate is doing better than the superintendent?

5% or less __; 6-10 __; 11-15 __; 16-20 __; 21-25 __; 26-35 __;

36% or more __.

11. If you were asked to use one of the six names below to designate the social class of the superintendent, where would you say he belonged?

12. Considering the total wealth of all individuals, where would you place the superintendent along the scale?

The Criteria for Evaluating the Adequacy of the Leadership of the Principal

At the beginning of the Leadership Studies by the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University job analyses were made of leader-group relationships under the direction of C. L. Shartle in order to establish work patterns for comparing leaders at different levels in an organization or between organizations. Certain administrative functions or activities were classified. At a Symposium on "Cooperation and Conflict among Living Organisms", September 13, 1948, in Washington, D.C., Dr. Shartle described these activities in detail:

. In our studies we are testing the hypothesis that persons in high formal organizational status perform acts which rank high in leadership and that leadership can be better understood by finding what persons in such roles do. About 200 persons have been studied in 10 structures. We have applied the method of job analysis which has had wide use and which if properly utilized seems to obtain reliable data. This involves the observation of the member of the group, a review of his communications, conferences with his associates in the organization, and a noting of the interpersonal relationships involved in carrying out the functions of the organization. Most of the persons thus studied have been individuals in high organizational positions, as president, chairman of board, vice president, treasurer; and in the military, commandants, department heads, and division heads. We are now studying persons in high organizational status in education such as college presidents, deans, superintendents of schools, principals and the like.

From the descriptions of the activities of these persons the activities have been classified under 14 groups. They are as follows:

1. Inspection of the organization, defined as acts of direct observation of installations, buildings, equipment, facilities, operations, services or personnel.
2. Planning - acts concerning the preparation for and making decisions which will affect the goals of the organization as to volume or quality of business or service.
3. Evaluation - acts involving the consideration and evaluation of data, plans, decisions or performances in relation to

the aims, policies, standards and achievements of the organization.

4. Public relations - acts designed to inform outside persons regarding the program and functions of the organization, to obtain information regarding public sentiment, or to create favorable attitudes toward the organization, including personal contacts, public addresses, radio appearances, press conferences, as well as letter writing with a public relations aim in view.

5. Professional Consultation - acts of giving professional advice and specialized assistance on problems of a specific or technical nature to persons both within and outside the organization.

Other classifications include Investigation and Research, Preparation of Procedures and Methods, Interpretation of Plans and Procedures, Supervision of Technical Operations, Coordination, Personnel Activities, Negotiations, and Technical and Professional Operations.

By using the questionnaire method and by checking against job analysis materials, each person in the organization indicates the proportion of time spent on each activity, it is possible to compare patterns of activities. These patterns can be specified quantitatively and they represent variables which may be studied in relation to a large number of other factors. An indication has also been made concerning the persons with whom the individual spends most time in getting work done.

This work pattern of responsibilities was applied to the study of Naval Leadership¹ successfully.

A basic assumption of this study is that a principal is entirely adequate as a leader if he satisfied his superintendent that he has completely met the responsibilities described in terms of fourteen administrative functions presented in Figure 7. These functions compare favorably with those established by educators. Lewis² establishes sixteen

¹ Carroll L. Shartle, Ralph M. Stogdill, and Donald T. Campbell, Naval Leadership, pp. 18-34.

² E. E. Lewis and Oscar H. Williams, Creative Management for Teachers, pp. 132-140.

functions very similar to those used as criteria in this study. Baker¹ gives thirty-eight specifications under four basic criteria for effective school management. Reighley² developed seventeen criteria of administrative function which closely resemble those established for this research.

Each function was provided a scale designed to establish how adequately the superintendent of schools thought that principal was functioning. Form 4 reveals the characteristics of the instrument from which the adequacy of a principal was established.

Democracy and Adequacy

There are 134 criteria for teachers to evaluate democracy of principal-staff relationships in secondary schools. There are fourteen administrative functions for superintendents to use in establishing how adequate a principal performs as a leader. The application of these criteria will be presented in the next chapter and related to other basic factors.

1

S. Harry Baker, "Criteria for the Determination of Effective Secondary School Management," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Volume 39, No. 131 (May, 1945), pp. 3-12.

2

Henry Herbert Reighley, "A Functional Analysis of the School Principalship," pp. 14-21.

Figure 7

**Fourteen Administrative Functions Used by Superintendents
to Evaluate the Adequacy of Ohio City High School Principals**

This evaluation sheet has been prepared for you as superintendent to complete. In a few minutes you will be able to determine objectively how adequately the major administrative functions and responsibilities are being met in the high school under consideration as they relate to the principal as the leader.

Please keep in mind this question: How adequate is the high school principal in regard to the administrative responsibilities and functions listed. Check the one point on the scale that best represents your studied judgment.

-
1. Inspection (Observation of the school in order to determine conditions)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
 2. Research (Gathering and the preparation of data to determine progress)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
 3. Planning (Short term and long range planning)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
 4. Preparing procedures (Outlining methods, making suggestions, listing alternatives)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
 5. Coordination (Developing team play, integrating activities for the purpose of efficiency and economy)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
 6. Evaluation (Analysis of reports, information, correspondence, making decisions, judging school progress and educational growth)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
 7. Interpretation (Clarifying and explaining matters to those concerned)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___

Figure 7 (continued)

8. Supervision (Seeing that the work gets done)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
9. Personnel (Selection, in-service training, control, relations, rapport)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
10. Pupil personnel (Attendance, scheduling, counseling, control)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
11. Public relations (Interpreting the school to the public, selling the educational program)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
12. Professional performance (Teaching, operating equipment, writing, speaking, participating in professional organizations)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
13. Professional consultation (Helping other principals, assisting other educational agencies)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
14. Materials and supplies (Requisitioning, inventorying, maintenance)
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___
15. Other _____
 Entirely___ Fairly___ To some degree___ Only slightly___ Not at all___

Return to Dr. T. C. Holy, 204 Arps Hall, The Ohio State University,
 Columbus 10, Ohio

THANK YOU!

CHAPTER IV

THE CRITERIA APPLIED

Introduction

While the criteria in the previous chapter were being developed, other data such as information about the city high schools, time studies, and status material came from principals. Adequacy evaluations came from superintendents. Both sets of materials came at separate intervals. After these data were received from principals and superintendents, Form 5A containing the democratic criteria shown in the previous chapter was sent to teachers.

In this chapter the adequacy of principals is studied and established. The democracy in high schools is examined and evaluated. Both adequacy and democracy are related to each other. Schools rating high and low in both adequacy and democracy are compared in terms of basic information about the teachers.

Criteria for Adequacy Applied

Superintendents were sent the Adequacy Check List, Figure 7, shown in the previous chapter, and accompanied by the letter shown in Figure 8. Superintendents were asked to check how adequately the major administrative functions were being met by the principal of the city high school under his supervision. Eighty-eight superintendents responded by providing evaluations of 218 principals.

Figure 8

Facsimile Letter to Superintendents of City Schools
Which Accompanied Form 4

Dear Superintendent:

Your principals have responded splendidly to the invitation to participate in this study. They have furnished certain basic data concerning themselves and their schools. Now it is time to evaluate briefly how well the functions and administrative responsibilities in a given high school are met.

As I stated in my original letter all data are strictly confidential. Names and schools are only used here to help you to identify the situation and to help us in placing the data in the proper statistical "mill". No references will be made to these afterwards. Therefore, you may feel free to mark the enclosed sheets frankly. We want as accurate data as it is possible to obtain.

There will be a sheet for each one of your cooperating principals. On this sheet you will find fifteen statements concerning the major administrative responsibilities of principals. With each statement you will find a scale along which you may check how the principal rates. Place a check mark at the point which in your best judgment represents a fair evaluation.

Your prompt attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated. This evaluation will complete your part in the study. Thanks again.

I am

Cordially yours,

T. C. Holy,
Director

Upon receipt of the adequacy evaluation an adequacy score was established for each principal. Each point on the adequacy scale was given a numerical value as follows: entirely adequate, 1; fairly adequate, 2; to some degree adequate, 3; only slightly adequate, 4; and not at all adequate, 5. Therefore, a principal who received an "entirely adequate" rating on all fourteen functions would receive an adequacy score of fourteen (14).

In Table VII is shown how the principals as a whole rated on each function. Of the 218 principals, 53.2 per cent were "entirely adequate" on Inspection; while only 22.9 per cent were "entirely adequate" on Personnel.

TABLE VII

THE ADEQUACY OF 218 CITY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
AS SEEN BY THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS IN 88 OHIO CITIES

No.	Administrative Function	Percentages of Principals				
		E	F	T	O	N
1	<u>Inspection</u> (Observation of the school in order to determine conditions)	53.2	33.9	9.2	3.7	0
2	<u>Research</u> (Gathering and the preparation of data to determine progress)	27.2	45.1	21.2	6.5	0
3	<u>Planning</u> (Short term and long range)	37.2	44.0	16.1	2.2	.5
4	<u>Preparing Procedures</u> (Outlining methods, making suggestions, listing alternatives)	31.7	45.9	19.2	3.2	0
5	<u>Coordination</u> (Developing team play, integrating activities for the purpose of efficiency and economy)	38.1	40.7	17.0	4.2	0
6	<u>Evaluation</u> (Analysis of reports, information, correspondence, making decisions, judging school progress and educational growth)	33.9	44.1	18.8	3.2	0
7	<u>Interpretation</u> (Clarifying and explaining matter to those concerned)	34.9	44.9	16.1	4.1	0
8	<u>Supervision</u> (Seeing that the work gets done)	33.0	48.6	16.1	2.3	0
9	<u>Personnel</u> (Selection, in-service training, control, relations, rapport)	22.9	52.8	18.8	5.5	0
10	<u>Pupil Personnel</u> (Attendance, scheduling, counseling, control)	44.5	40.8	13.3	1.4	0

TABLE VII (continued)

THE ADEQUACY OF 218 CITY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
AS SEEN BY THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS IN 88 OHIO CITIES

No.	Administrative Function	Percentages of Principals				
		E	F	T	O	N
11	<u>Public Relations</u> (Interpreting the school to the public, selling the educational program)	29.4	45.4	18.3	6.9	0
12	<u>Professional Performance</u> (Teaching, operating equipment, writing, speaking, participating in professional organizations)	28.0	45.4	18.8	7.8	0
13	<u>Professional Consultation</u>	30.3	39.9	20.2	8.7	.9
14	<u>Materials and Supplies</u>	54.1	32.6	11.0	2.3	0

E - Entirely Adequate; F - Fairly Adequate;
T - To Some Degree Adequate; O - Only Slightly
Adequate; N - Not at all Adequate

Total Adequacy

Total adequacy scores were coded for IBM tabulation. These scores are shown in Table VIII. The mean score of 27.5 indicates a score between "entirely" and "fairly" adequate. The table shows that 12.8 per cent of the principals are "entirely" adequate; 63.4 per cent are "fairly" adequate, and 23.8 per cent are adequate "to some degree". These data indicate that superintendents give principals a good rating. Principals are evidently doing a fairly good job in the eyes of their superintendents.

TABLE VIII

TOTAL ADEQUACY SCORES MADE ON FORM 3 FOR
THE 218 CITY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Code	Interpretation of Adequacy	Score Interval	All Schools	%	Cumulative Per Cent
9	To Some Degree	50 or	2	.9	
8		46 - 49	5	2.3	
7		42 - 45	7	3.2	
6		38 - 41	11	5.1	
5		34 - 37	27	12.3	23.8
4	Fairly	30 - 33	26	12.0	
3		26 - 29	26	12.0	
2		22 - 25	37	17.0	
1		18 - 21	49	22.4	63.4
0	Entirely	Under 18	28	12.8	12.8
Totals			218	100.0	100.0
Mean			27.5		
Standard Deviation			8.5		

The Democratic Criteria Applied

Invitations similar to the facsimile shown in Figure 9 were sent to 1,016 teachers of whom 944 indicated a willingness to participate in the study and were sent the inquiry Form 5A shown previously. Of these, 632 returned inquiries, 622 of which were usable. The per cent of return of those receiving inquiries is 65.8 per cent. This compares favorably with original plans to sample 10 per cent of the 9,563 teachers.¹ A sample return of at least 500 or 5 per cent would have been acceptable.

¹
Educational Directory, School Year 1948-1949, State of Ohio, p. 47.

Figure 9

Facsimile Invitation to Teachers after Data Had
Been Received from Principals and Superintendents

Dear Teacher:

The Bureau of Educational Research of The Ohio State University cordially invites you to participate in a state-wide leadership study involving all the high schools in Ohio cities. Your superintendent of schools and high school principal gave their permission for us to extend this invitation to you. They have already accepted similar invitations.

The purpose of this study is to determine the conditions under which the high school principals in the State of Ohio operate. This study is one of a number in a ten-year research program. Three years of this period are being devoted specifically to educational leadership. All data will be treated in a strictly confidential manner. Names of schools and of persons are in no way used for comparative purposes. The findings will be added to the total picture with the hope of providing information leading to an improved program of training for the nation's future leaders.

I realize of course that you have many demands upon your time, but I am also aware of the great need for basic research of this kind, especially in the field of educational leadership. Therefore, I hope you will accept this invitation to cooperate in the study yourself. One of ten of your co-workers is also being invited to participate.

Each of the selected teachers will be asked to check a list of 150 items concerning leadership situations. Your superintendent has provided an evaluation of fifteen statements about the functions of leadership. Your principal has furnished some basic information relating to himself and his school. He sent us a directory of the teachers from which your name was selected. These materials were designed to take the minimum of effort to gain the maximum of results.

An addressed post card is enclosed for your convenience in replying to this invitation. Check it in the appropriate space and place it in the return mail.

Thanking you in advance for your willingness to cooperate in what we believe is a very important study, I am

Very cordially yours,

T. C. Holy
Director

Table IX indicates the distribution of Form 5A's by school. The mean number of respondents shown per school is 3.8. Sixty-five schools returned no inquiries, while sixty-five schools furnished 195 replies for evaluation. Only twenty-six schools had but a single respondent. On the other hand, twenty-seven schools had five or more replies.

TABLE IX

THE DISTRIBUTION OF FORM 5A'S ACCORDING TO
THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS PER SCHOOL

Number of Responses Per School	Number of High Schools	Number of Teachers Responding
9	2	18
8	3	24
7	3	21
6	9	54
5	10	50
4	31	124
3	65	195
2	60	120
1	26	26
0	65	0
N	274	632
Median		3.8

Form 5A

Form 5A is the key to this research. It consists of several sections: Section I, basic information concerning teachers; Section II through V, the criteria of an ideal democratically administered school by which teachers were asked to compare schools; and Section VI, community relationships as they pertain to status.

Recording Data

Upon return of each inquiry, information in Section I was coded, entered on a roster for a later transfer to IBM¹ cards as items 59 through 69. Sections II through V were scored in a manner to be described in the next paragraph. These scores were coded, entered on a roster to become items 70 through 74 on IBM cards. Section VI provided six status scores which were also entered on the roster and then transferred to IBM cards as items 75 through 80.

Scoring the Criteria

The responses made by teachers to the 134 criteria in Section II through V were transferred to IBM score sheets. Each item was provided a 5-point scale. The responses at the extremes received two black marks on the IBM score sheets. Other responses received only one black mark. This arrangement enabled us to correctly score the data. This procedure is fully described in the IBM manual.² The items in each section were placed and scored on the IBM score sheet as follows:

<u>Section</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>No. of Items</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Numbers</u>
II	Concepts	10	+ 20	1 - 10
III	Organization	6	+ 12	16 - 21
IV	Principals	75	+ 150	31 - 105
V	Teachers	43	+ 86	106 - 148

After all teachers' responses were transferred to IBM score sheets, they were machine scored. If a teacher's evaluation agreed with the criteria, the perfect total score would have been a positive 268; if in

¹
International Business Machines

²
Manual of Instruction for the IBM Test Scoring Machine, p. 12.

total disagreement, the score would have been a negative 268. Each score sheet was scored twice, once for the democratic items and once for the non-democratic items, then combined for a total score. A school's democracy scores would appear as follows:

School Code 76

<u>Teacher Code</u>	<u>Sections</u>				<u>Total</u>
	II	III	IV	V	
6	6	6	115	37	164
5	2	4	106	48	160
2	9	-1	118	38	164
Total	17	9	339	123	488
Average	6	3	113	41	163
IBM Card Items	#70	#71	#72	#73	#74

The average total democracy score for School 76 is 163. The average scores for each section and for each teacher are depicted. Teacher #2 responded negatively to statements in Section III as the -1 indicates. The average score for Section III is 3. The scores for each school were treated in like manner.

A sample distribution was taken in order to assign code numbers in order to transfer scores to IBM cards. The total democracy score was transferred as IBM Card Item 74. Other sections were assigned to the IBM card as indicated above. The average democracy scores for each school as well as individual teacher democracy scores were transferred to IBM cards. Thus, an IBM card contained descriptive data for each school. On another IBM card, data for each individual teacher was recorded.

How Democratic Are the High Schools?

A distribution of scores made on the criteria as evaluated by individual teachers and averaged for each school are shown in Table X. The mean score of individual teachers is 122.3, or 72.8 per cent of a perfect score; the mean for the averages for each school is 116.5, or 71.7 per cent of the perfect score. There were ten schools and eighty teachers scoring above 200. This score is above 87 per cent of the perfect. Twelve schools and seventy-seven teachers scored negatively. These non-democratic tendencies were shown in 5.9 per cent of the schools and by 12.4 per cent of the teachers.

TABLE X

DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON FORM 5A AS AVERAGED FOR SCHOOLS AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS

Code	Total Democracy Score	School Average		Teachers' Scores	
		f	%	f	%
9	200 or more	10	4.9	80	12.9
8	180 - 199	16	7.8	49	7.9
7	160 - 179	21	10.2	75	12.1
6	140 - 159	24	11.7	70	11.3
5	120 - 139	27	13.2	62	10.0
4	100 - 119	32	15.6	53	8.6
3	80 - 99	25	12.2	42	6.8
2	60 - 79	19	9.2	38	6.2
1	0 - 59	19	9.3	73	11.8
0	Less than 0	12	5.9	77	12.4
Total		205	100.0	619	100.0
Mean Score		116.5		122.3	
Standard Deviation		49.2		60.4	
Mean Difference		5.8 [#]			

[#] Not significant; Perfect Score, 268; Range from -268 to 268

A mean score of 134 would indicate an average score of one on each of the 134 statements. A score of one provides evaluations such as "tend

to agree," "fairly much," "fairly often," and "usually". In other words, the high schools of Ohio are "fairly" democratic in terms of these criteria but not "definitely" so as the mean score of 116.5 reveals.

Scores for each section of the criteria show about the same distribution as the total democracy score does. Table XI presents the scores made on the extent to which teachers agree with certain fundamental democratic concepts. The mean score is 8.3 for teachers, or 70.5 per cent of perfect; and 8.2 for schools, or 70.7 per cent of perfect.

TABLE XI

DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION II OF FORM 5A
CONCERNING FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS AS AVERAGED FOR
SCHOOLS AND AS INDICATED FOR INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS

Code	Scores on Funda- mental Concepts	School Average		Teachers' Scores	
		f	%	f	%
9	16 or more	3	1.5	30	4.8
8	14 - 15	3	1.5	40	6.5
7	12 - 13	17	8.3	64	10.3
6	10 - 11	39	19.0	88	14.2
5	8 - 9	49	23.9	106	17.1
4	6 - 7	43	20.9	95	15.4
3	4 - 5	33	16.1	89	14.4
2	2 - 3	12	5.9	55	8.9
1	0 - 1	4	1.9	29	4.7
0	Negative Scores	2	1.0	23	3.7
Totals		205	100.0	619	100.0
Mean Scores		8.2		8.3	
Standard Deviations		3.2		4.5	
Mean Difference		.1#			

Not significant; Perfect Score, 20; Range from -20 to 20

Table XII, concerning Organization, indicates a mean score of 3.2, or 63.3 per cent of a perfect score. Seventeen, or 8.3 per cent of the schools, received negative scores. Ninety-eight, or 15.8 per cent of the teachers, gave their schools negative scores.

TABLE XII

DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION III OF FORM 5A
CONCERNING THE ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS AS AVERAGED
FOR EACH SCHOOL AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS

Code	Scores on Organization	School Average		Teachers' Scores	
		f	%	f	%
9	8 or more	15	7.3	81	13.1
8	6 - 7.9	19	9.3	87	14.1
7	5 - 5.9	18	8.8	54	8.7
6	4 - 4.9	23	11.2	52	8.4
5	3 - 3.9	37	18.1	52	8.4
4	2 - 2.9	21	10.2	51	8.3
3	1 - 1.9	22	10.7	54	8.7
2	0 - .9	33	16.1	90	14.5
1	-.9 - 0	13	6.3	52	8.4
0	-1.9 to -1.0	4	2.0	46	7.4
Total Scores		205	100.0	619	100.0
Mean Scores		3.2		3.2	
Standard Deviation		2.4		2.9	
Mean Difference			0		

Perfect Score, 12; Range is from -12 to 12

Table XIII presents scores of the section concerning the Principal.

The table indicates that 106 teachers gave democracy scores to their principals of 120 or more. Sixteen principals averaged 120 or more. This is 90 per cent of a perfect score. On the other hand, eleven principals averaged less than zero or on the non-democratic side. The mean or average teacher scored her principal 71.3, or 73.8 per cent of perfect, while the principals averaged 71.6, or 73.9 per cent of perfect.

TABLE XIII

DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION IV OF FORM 5A
CONCERNING THE PRINCIPAL AS AVERAGED FOR EACH
SCHOOL AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS

Code	Scores for the	School Averages		Teachers' Scores	
	Principal	f	%	f	%
9	120 or more	16	7.8	106	17.1
8	100 - 119	39	19.0	123	19.9
7	80 - 99	40	19.5	97	15.7
6	60 - 79	43	21.0	70	11.3
5	40 - 59	27	13.2	57	9.2
4	20 - 39	20	9.8	58	9.3
3	0 - 19	9	4.4	43	6.9
2	-19 - 0	3	1.5	24	3.9
1	-39 - -20	4	1.9	22	3.6
0	Less than -39	4	1.9	19	3.1
Totals		205	100.0	619	100.0
Mean Scores		71.6		71.3	
Standard Deviations		40.0		49.7	
Mean Difference		.3 [#]			

[#] Not significant; Perfect Score, 150; Range is from -150 to 150

Table XIV presents teachers' scores on factors related to the staff as a group. The mean score by teachers is 33.1, or 69.2 per cent of perfect; by schools the average is 32.2, or 68.7 per cent of perfect. A comparison of the average scores for principals and teachers reveals that factors concerning principals received a higher average rating than those applying to teachers. Principals earned 73.9 per cent of the total democracy score while teachers received only 68.7 per cent. This is evidence that teachers think of the conditions pertaining to principals as being more democratic than the conditions that teachers have.

TABLE XIV

DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE ON SECTION V OF FORM 5A
CONCERNING THE TEACHING STAFF AS AVERAGED FOR
EACH SCHOOL AND AS INDICATED BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS

Code	Scores for the Teaching Staff	School Averages		Teachers' Scores	
		f	%	f	%
9	70 or more	3	1.5	34	5.5
8	60 - 69	10	4.9	59	9.6
7	50 - 59	21	10.2	74	12.0
6	40 - 49	35	17.1	91	14.7
5	30 - 39	43	20.9	81	13.1
4	20 - 29	42	20.5	88	14.2
3	10 - 19	30	14.6	73	11.8
2	0 - 9	10	4.9	55	8.9
1	-19 0	10	4.9	45	7.3
0	Less than -19	1	.5	18	2.9
Totals		205	100.0	618	100.0
Mean Scores		32.2		33.1	
Standard Deviations		18.0		25.7	
Mean Difference		.9 ^H			

[#] Not significant; Perfect Score, 86; Range is from - 86 to 86

Basic Information Concerning Teachers

In Section I of Form 5A teachers recorded basic information about themselves. Items I through II were coded and transferred to IBM cards occupying positions 59 through 69 in a C-deck of IBM cards. This information was sorted in three ways to provide first an over-all picture of all teachers; secondly, to give information concerning those teachers who rated their schools highest; and thirdly, to show data concerning those teachers who gave the lowest scores.

There were 616 teachers in most cases providing information. Seventy-eight teachers giving highest democracy scores of 200 or more, and seventy-five teachers giving lowest scores of less than zero as shown

previously in Table IX, page 86, are used for comparisons in Tables XV through XXV.

Significance of the Data

In order to test these data the significance of the difference between two means is used. First, the standard error of the difference between two means (standard deviation of the theoretical distribution of differences between mean samples) were obtained by the following formula:

$$\sigma_d = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{N_2}}$$

σ_1 = standard deviation of first sample

σ_2 = standard deviation of the second sample

N_1 = number of items in first sample

N_2 = number of items in second sample

Secondly, the standard error of the difference was compared with the actual difference. If the actual difference were three times the standard error, then the difference between the means is considered highly significant because the probability of occurrence by chance is .0027; if the ratio is 2.5 times, the probability is .0124; if the ratio is 2.0 times, the probability is .0455. Fisher¹ considers the .01 level as significant and the .05 level as very significant.

¹ J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods, p. 62.

The difference between two proportions as represented by per cents in some tables is listed by the formula:

$$\sigma_d = \sqrt{pq \left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right)}$$

p = the total percentage of occurrence; $q = 1 - p$

N_1 = number in first sample

N_2 = number in second sample

The ratio of the standard error of the difference to the actual difference as in the case of two means determines the critical ratio which in turn establishes the level of probability of occurrence by chance.

For example, a critical ratio of 2 has a .05 probability of occurrence by chance while a CR of 3 is at the .01 level of probability.

In each table that follows, the level of probability of occurrence by chance is indicated.

Table XV shows that 52.6 per cent of the respondents were male. A greater proportion, 61.3 per cent, of those rating principals non-democratic were men. The opposite is true for those respondents rating principals as most democratic. Of the latter, 62.8 per cent were women. Women significantly see more democracy in their schools than men.

In Table XVI the average age of those teachers rating principals most democratic is 46.9 years, the oldest among those presented. It has generally been assumed that older teachers are non-democratic. These data indicate that older teachers see more democracy. The average age of all respondents is 44.0 years.

TABLE XV

SEX OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THAT OF TEACHERS
GIVING SCHOOLS LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Teachers' Sex	All	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%	Difference
Female	291	47.3	29	38.7	49	62.8	24.1%**
Male	325	52.6	46	61.3	29	37.2	24.1%**
Totals	616	99.9	75	100.0	78	100.0	

** Probability of occurrence by chance is .0027

TABLE XVI

AGE OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THAT OF TEACHERS SCORING
SCHOOLS WITH THE LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Teachers' Ages	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
65 or more	9	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.3
60 - 64	34	5.6	5	6.7	3	3.8
55 - 59	72	11.9	8	10.7	13	16.7
50 - 54	81	14.7	9	12.0	15	19.2
45 - 49	47	7.8	14	18.7	16	20.5
40 - 44	132	21.8	16	21.3	14	17.9
35 - 39	108	17.9	4	5.3	4	5.1
30 - 34	61	8.4	5	6.7	8	10.3
25 - 29	47	7.8	12	16.0	2	2.6
Less than 25	16	2.6	1	1.3	2	2.6
Totals	615	100.0	75	100.0	78	100.0
Means	44.0		44.3		46.9	
Standard Deviation	10.7		11.0		9.7	
Difference of Means					1.3#	

Probability of occurrence by chance is .1096

The marital status of respondents is shown in Table XVII. Of those answering these inquiries, 58.2 per cent were married.

TABLE XVII

MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHERS COMPARING ALL TEACHERS WITH THAT
OF TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Marital Status	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
Divorced	15	2.4	0	0	2	2.6
Widow (er)	17	2.8	2	2.8	5	6.4
Married	358	58.2	50	67.5**	33	42.3
Single	224	36.6	22	29.7	38	.7**
Totals	614	100.0	74	100.0	78	100.0

**Probability of the difference in percentages between lowest and highest democracy of occurring by chance is less than .01.

A greater percentage, 67.5 per cent, of those rating schools lowest in democracy were married. Single teachers were more inclined to give the schools a higher democracy rating.

The average teacher giving lowest democracy scores has more dependents than other teachers. This is shown in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

THE NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH
TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Number of Dependents	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
9	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	2	.3	0	0	0	0
6	6	1.0	1	1.3	0	0
5	31	5.0	2	2.7	5	6.4
4	72	11.7	10	13.3	6	7.7
3	81	13.2	12	16.0	8	10.3
2	84	13.7	13	17.3	6	7.7
1	146	23.7	14	18.7	21	26.9
0	193	31.4	23	30.7	32	41.0
Totals	615	100.0	75	100.0	78	100.0
Means	1.7		1.76		1.35	
Standard Deviation	1.00		1.58		1.57	
Difference of Means					.41*	

* Probability of occurrence by chance is .0278

Table XIX presents the years of teaching experience of teachers. The average teacher has taught 21.4 years; the average teacher scoring schools lowest has taught 20.0; the average teacher scoring schools highest has taught 22.8 years. Again this bears out the observation that teachers who see the most democracy in schools are slightly older and more experienced.

TABLE XIX

THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THAT OF TEACHERS GIVING HIGHEST AND LOWEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Years of Teaching Experience	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
45 or more	3	.5	0	0	1	1.3
40 - 44	11	1.8	2	2.7	3	3.8
35 - 39	43	7.0	5	6.8	5	6.4
30 - 34	74	12.1	10	13.5	10	12.8
25 - 29	113	18.4	10	13.5	18	23.1
20 - 24	111	18.1	14	18.9	12	15.4
15 - 19	85	13.8	10	13.5	11	14.1
10 - 14	66	10.7	8	10.8	4	5.1
5 - 9	49	8.0	8	10.8	9	11.6
Less than 5	59	9.6	7	9.5	5	6.4
Totals	614	100.0	74	100.0	78	100.0
Means	21.4		20.0		22.8	
Standard Deviation	10.6		10.8		10.3	
Mean Difference				2.8 [#]		

[#] Probability of occurrence by chance is .1096.

Table XX shows that the average teacher giving the highest democracy score has spent 13.7 years in her present school. This is slightly less than the mean of 13.8 years for all schools.

TABLE XX

THE NUMBER OF YEARS ALL TEACHERS HAVE SPENT IN THE
PRESENT HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH THE YEARS SPENT BY
TEACHERS GIVING HIGHEST AND LOWEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Years in Present School	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
45 or more	1	.2	0	0	1	1.3
40 - 44	2	.3	0	0	0	0
35 - 39	6	1.0	2	2.7	2	2.6
30 - 34	29	4.7	4	5.4	2	2.6
25 - 29	49	8.0	7	9.5	5	6.4
20 - 24	106	17.3	13	17.6	13	16.7
15 - 19	66	10.7	7	9.5	9	11.5
10 - 14	82	13.4	11	14.9	10	12.8
5 - 9	120	19.5	18	24.3	15	19.2
-5	153	24.9	12	16.1	21	26.9
Totals	614	100.0	74	100.0	78	100.0
Means	13.8		15.0		13.7	
Standard Deviation	9.8		9.8		10.3	
Mean Difference	1.5 [#]					

[#] Probability of occurrence by chance is .48.

Table XXI gives the subjects taught by teachers in all schools as compared with those teachers giving highest and lowest democracy scores.

The table reveals that a greater proportion of teachers in social studies, industrial arts, mathematics, and commercial subject fields gave lower democracy ratings to schools than others. A greater proportion of teachers in the art, music, science, and foreign languages fields gave higher ratings. Twenty-three per cent of the teachers giving low scores were mathematics teachers as compared to 13.8 per cent of the total who taught this subject. Only 11.5 per cent of those giving high democratic ratings were mathematics teachers.

TABLE XXI

SUBJECTS TAUGHT BY ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH SUBJECTS TAUGHT
BY TEACHERS GIVING SCHOOLS LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Subjects	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
H.P.E. & Other	85	13.8	7	9.5	9	11.5
Social Studies	70	11.4	10	13.5	8	10.2
Industrial Arts	49	7.9	8	10.8	2	2.6*
Art	17	2.8	2	2.7	5	6.4
Music	27	4.4	3	4.1	5	6.5
Science	72	11.7	6	8.1	11	14.1
Mathematics	85	13.8	17	23.0	9	11.5**
Foreign Language	27	4.4	0	0	6	7.7***
English	127	20.7	12	16.2	16	20.5
Commercial	56	9.1	9	12.1	7	9.0
Totals	615	100.0	74	100.0	78	100.0

*Probability of occurrence by chance is .0455

**Probability of occurrence by chance is .0051

***Probability of occurrence by chance is .0164

Table XXII exhibits little difference among the teachers in the number of semester hours of college training. The average number of semester hours of college training for all teachers is shown as 152.5; for teachers giving lowest democracy scores, 153.4; and for teachers giving highest democracy scores, 152.2

Data concerning the degrees held by respondents are shown in Table XXIII. Of the teachers responding, 44.6 per cent have Master's degrees. Over half, 54.6 per cent of those giving low ratings to their schools, had Master's degrees or better while a lesser proportion, 43.5 per cent of those giving high ratings, had their Master's degrees or more.

TABLE XXII

THE NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS OF COLLEGE TRAINING
WHICH ALL TEACHERS HAVE HAD COMPARED WITH THE HOURS
OF TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Semester Hours of Training	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
165 or more	163	26.5	25	33.3	22	28.2
160 - 164	73	11.9	8	10.7	10	12.7
155 - 159	67	10.8	9	12.0	6	7.7
150 - 154	75	12.2	4	5.4	7	9.0
145 - 149	64	10.4	8	10.7	8	10.3
140 - 144	41	6.6	6	8.0	6	7.7
135 - 139	38	6.2	3	4.0	6	7.7
130 - 134	48	7.7	4	5.4	9	11.5
125 - 129	33	5.4	6	8.0	2	2.6
Less than 125	14	2.3	2	2.5	2	2.6
Totals	616	100.0	75	100.0	78	100.0
Mean Scores	152.5		153.4		152.2	
Standard Deviation	13.5		14.2		14.0	
Mean Difference	1.2 [#]					

[#]Probability of occurrence by chance is .50

TABLE XXIII

DEGREES OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF
TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Degrees	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
Ph. D.	1	.2	1		0	
Ed. D.	10	1.6	3		1	
Master's	275	44.6	37	54.6	33	43.5
B.S. in Ed.	139	22.6	18		20	
B.S.	59	9.6	5		7	
A.B.	112	18.2	9		13	
None	16	2.6	1		4	
Other	2	.6	1		0	
				45.4		56.5*
Totals	614	100.0	75	100.0	78	100.0

*Probability of occurrence by chance is .2713

A greater proportion of teachers having no degrees gave higher democracy ratings to their schools than others. This seems to indicate that those with higher degrees are either more critical and see less democracy or teach in schools that are less democratic.

Table XXIV shows that the average among all teachers received his college training in the 1925-1929 period. Of those teachers giving their schools low evaluation in terms of the democratic criteria, 21.4 per cent received their college training since 1940, while only 10.3 per cent of those giving high ratings went to college during the same period.

A slightly lesser proportion, 15.4 per cent, of those providing highest democracy ratings received their college training prior to 1920. The table will show that 41.4 per cent of the teachers giving lowest ratings received training since 1929, while 34.7 per cent of the teachers giving highest ratings received training since 1929.

The number of leadership positions held on school committees or in local education associations by teachers is shown in Table XXV. The average teacher in each category held at least two leadership positions.

TABLE XXIV

THE COLLEGE TRAINING PERIODS OF ALL TEACHERS COMPARED WITH
THOSE OF TEACHERS GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES

Training Period	All Schools	%	Cumulative %	Lowest Democracy	%	Cumulative %	Highest Democracy	%	Cumulative %
1945-1949	45	7.2		7	9.4		2	2.6*	
1940-1944	40	6.3		9	12.0		6	7.7*	
1935-1939	69	11.3		6	8.0		11	14.1	
1930-1934	94	15.3		9	12.0		8	10.3	
			40.1			41.4**			34.7
1925-1929	136	22.2		18	23.8		23	29.4	
1920-1924	119	19.3		12	16.0		16	20.5	
1915-1919	65	10.6		7	9.4		7	9.0	
Before 1915	48	7.8		7	9.4		5	6.4	
			59.9			58.6			65.3
Totals	616	100.0	100.0	75	100.0	100.0	78	100.0	100.0
Means	1929			1929			1928		
Standard Dev.	9.5			10.4			8.5		
Mean Difference						1 year#			

*Probability of occurrence by chance is .6455

**Probability of occurrence by chance is .3681

#Probability of occurrence by chance is .50

TABLE XXV

THE NUMBER OF LEADERSHIP POSITIONS HELD BY ALL TEACHERS
COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF POSITIONS OF THOSE TEACHERS
GIVING LOWEST AND HIGHEST DEMOCRACY SCORES.

Number	All Schools	%	Lowest Democracy	%	Highest Democracy	%
9	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	.8	2	2.7	0	0
7	11	1.8	2	2.7	1	1.3
6	20	3.2	4	5.4	2	2.5
5	23	3.7	1	1.3	7	9.0
4	52	8.5	6	8.0	4	5.0
3	88	14.3	10	13.4	12	15.4
2	142	23.1	17	22.6	19	24.4
1	154	25.0	18	23.9	15	19.3
0	121	19.6	15	20.0	18	23.1
Totals	616	100.0	75	100.0	78	100.0
Means	2.2		2.1		2.0	
Standard Deviation	1.6		2.0		1.7	
Mean Difference					.17 [#]	

[#]Probability of occurrence by chance is +.50

There is little difference among the three classifications.

Item Analysis

After the Form 5A, Sections II through V had been scored, a graphic item analysis¹ was made, i.e., the responses to each part of the scale accompanying each of the 134 criteria were counted. Since the democracy scores were available, the 622 usable inquiries were divided into democratic and non-democratic categories in terms of Section II of Form 5A.

A sample distribution was made. The mean score on Section II was 8. Score sheets were divided into two piles -- those with minus 8 and plus 8

¹
IBM- Manual of Instruction, loc. cit., pp. 15-18.

scores. Alternate 8's were placed in each of the two piles. There were 328 minus 8's and 294 plus 8's.

Each of these groups was divided into three more categories on the basis of the adequacy score made on Form 3 for each principal and recorded as Item 47 on the IBM card. High adequacy was indicated by a low code score of 0 and 1; median adequacy, 2 and 3; and low adequacy by a 4 or more. The resultant six piles were as follows:

<u>Adequacy Classification</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Minus 8's, Number with Low Democracy Scores</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Plus 8's, Number with High Democracy Scores</u>
High	1	114	4	104
Median	2	99	5	100
Low	3	<u>115</u>	6	<u>90</u>
Total		328		294

Each of the six groups was scored five times to obtain the following:

1. To get the number marking the first response.
2. To get the number marking both the first and second responses.
3. To get the number marking the third response.
4. To get the number marking both fourth and fifth responses.
5. To get the number marking the fifth response.

The percentage of respondents marking a given response was then figured. Then data became available for each of the 134 criteria as shown for Item I in Section II of Form 5A.

Item 1 - All normal individuals have potential abilities
to solve their common problems cooperatively.

Group	Democracy Score	Adequacy Score	Percentage of Teachers Marking Response					Score
			1	2	3	4	5	
1	High	High	32.6	97.1	2.9	0	0	130.0
2	High	Median	37.0	98.0	2.0	0	0	135.0
3	High	Low	38.8	93.3	4.5	2.2	2.2	129.0
4	Low	High	7.0	77.7	13.5	8.8	3.5	72.4
5	Low	Median	14.1	74.7	16.3	9.0	1.0	78.8
6	Low	Low	12.1	74.8	20.9	4.3	.9	82.0
Total			27.8	84.6	10.7	4.7	1.1	107.0

The sum of the percentages for responses 2, 3, and 4 equals 100 per cent. If teachers had agreed with the judges they would have marked only response Number 1. This would have meant that teachers in an ideal democratically administered school would "strongly agree" with the statement.

It is interesting to note that the percentages for response Number 3 increases from Group 1 through Group 6. Of the 622 teachers, 84.6 per cent "tend to agree" and/or "strongly agree". The 84.6 per cent contains the 27.8 per cent for "strongly agree". Where schools received high adequacy scores, the teachers appear to be in stronger agreement with the democratic criteria. Compare Group 1 with Group 4. A similar analysis was made of each of 134 criteria.

In order to facilitate the study of these criteria, each item was scored similar to the original scoring of the completed Form 5A, sections II, III, IV, and V except on the basis of 100. The responses were weighted 2, 1, 0, -1, -2 respectively for democratic items and -2, -1, 0, 1, 2 for non-democratic ones. Since response 2 contains the distributions for both 1 and 2, and response 4 contains both 4 and 5, it is only necessary to add 1 and 2 or 4 and 5 to get the weighted scores

for the item. Thus, the total percentages for Item 1 in the Table appear for responses 1 through 5 as 27.8, 84.6, 10.7, 4.7, and 1.1. Therefore, apply the weights to Item 1. Keep in mind that when two responses on one end of the scale are positive the two on the other end will be negative and vice versa. Add 27.8 and 84.6 to get 112.4. Add 4.7 and 1.1 to get 5.8. Subtract 5.8 from 112.4 to get the weighted score of 106.6 or 107 as a whole number. Each item was scored this way. The scores for 134 criteria together with responses in percentage appear in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXVI

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

II. The Extent to Which High School Teachers Agree with Certain Fundamental Concepts of Democracy

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	
	1.	All normal individuals have the potential abilities to solve their common problems cooperatively.
107		Strongly Agree <u>27.8</u> Tend to** Agree <u>84.6</u> In Be- tween <u>10.7</u> Tend to*** Disagree <u>4.7</u> Strongly Disagree <u>1.1</u>
	* 2.	Leadership ability is a gift that only a few possess.
-67		Strongly Agree <u>20.4</u> Tend to** Agree <u>64.8</u> In Be- tween <u>19.6</u> Tend to*** Disagree <u>15.6</u> Strongly Disagree <u>2.4</u>
	* 3.	Participation in the administration of the school is an imposition upon teachers.
62		Strongly Agree <u>3.4</u> Tend to Agree <u>17.2</u> In Be- tween <u>23.0</u> Tend to Disagree <u>59.8</u> Strongly Disagree <u>22.3</u>
	4.	Learning takes place in the process of doing.
144		Strongly Agree <u>53.7</u> Tend to Agree <u>92.3</u> In Be- tween <u>6.1</u> Tend to Disagree <u>1.6</u> Strongly Disagree <u>.5</u>
	5.	No man or limited group of men is capable or good enough to

* Non-democratic

** Includes percentage for first response

*** Includes percentage for fifth response

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO TEACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>				
		control others without their consent.				
		Strongly	Tend to	In Be-	Tend to	Strongly
107		Agree <u>40.0</u>	Agree <u>77.5</u>	tween <u>13.8</u>	Disagree <u>8.7</u>	Disagree <u>1.8</u>
		6. Most teachers are capable of managing themselves in group behavior.				
		Strongly	Tend to	In Be-	Tend to	Strongly
137		Agree <u>48.7</u>	Agree <u>90.5</u>	tween <u>7.2</u>	Disagree <u>2.3</u>	Disagree <u>.2</u>
		7. Educational opportunities equal for all youth are necessary.				
		Strongly	Tend to	In Be-	Tend to	Strongly
122		Agree <u>48.4</u>	Agree <u>82.2</u>	tween <u>9.9</u>	Disagree <u>7.9</u>	Disagree <u>1.3</u>
		* 8. Cooperative endeavor requires moral qualities beyond the great majority of teachers.				
		Strongly	Tend to	In Be-	Tend to	Strongly
77		Agree <u>4.3</u>	Agree <u>16.1</u>	tween <u>15.7</u>	Disagree <u>68.2</u>	Disagree <u>28.8</u>
		* 9. It is impossible to participate intelligently out of one's field of teaching.				
		Strongly	Tend to	In Be-	Tend to	Strongly
87		Agree <u>3.2</u>	Agree <u>12.7</u>	tween <u>16.4</u>	Disagree <u>70.9</u>	Disagree <u>31.8</u>
		*10. Leadership is confined to the thinking of a few capable individuals.				
		Strongly	Tend to	In Be-	Tend to	Strongly
8		Agree <u>6.6</u>	Agree <u>38.4</u>	tween <u>20.3</u>	Disagree <u>41.3</u>	Disagree <u>11.9</u>

III. How high schools are organized

		1. A professional relations committee promotes the in-service growth of teachers.				
		Fairly	Occa-	Once in	Very	
-40		Often <u>9.3</u>	often <u>29.7</u>	sionally <u>25.3</u>	a while <u>45.0</u>	seldom <u>33.8</u>
		2. The arrangement of the school organization aids the cooperative efforts of the group.				
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at
49		deal <u>22.2</u>	much <u>49.0</u>	degree <u>31.5</u>	little <u>19.5</u>	all <u>3.2</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>				
		* 3. Teachers dominate their students.				
		Occa- Once Very				
16		Always <u>1.8</u>	Often <u>27.8</u>	sionally <u>40.0</u>	a while <u>32.2</u>	seldom <u>13.7</u>
		4. Cooperation arises in the group from a mutual understanding of the common aims.				
		Occa-				
79		Always <u>15.6</u>	Often <u>69.6</u>	sionally <u>25.3</u>	Seldom <u>5.1</u>	Never <u>.8</u>
		5. The "right" atmosphere exists in the school.				
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very				
97		Often <u>31.8</u>	often <u>77.8</u>	sionally <u>13.0</u>	a while <u>9.2</u>	seldom <u>3.4</u>
		6. The organization is cemented together by mutual loyalties.				
		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at				
59		deal <u>19.3</u>	much <u>55.8</u>	degree <u>30.2</u>	little <u>14.0</u>	all <u>2.4</u>
IV. <u>How the principals in high schools operate</u>						
		1. He tries to present all sides of a question to the faculty when necessary.				
		Occa-				
99		Always <u>38.6</u>	Often <u>70.7</u>	sionally <u>20.3</u>	Seldom <u>9.0</u>	Never <u>1.3</u>
		* 2. He "rides" teachers who make mistakes.				
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very				
127		Often <u>3.5</u>	often <u>10.3</u>	sionally <u>13.3</u>	a while <u>76.4</u>	seldom <u>65.1</u>
		3. He helps others accomplish their common purposes.				
		Occa-				
88		Always <u>24.3</u>	Often <u>70.4</u>	sionally <u>22.2</u>	Seldom <u>7.4</u>	Never <u>.3</u>
		* 4. He treats teachers like cogs in a machine.				
		Fairly Occa- Once in				
94		Often <u>10.1</u>	often <u>18.6</u>	sionally <u>13.2</u>	a while <u>68.2</u>	seldom <u>54.3</u>
		5. He generates the power of leadership in others in the school.				
		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at				
44		deal <u>20.6</u>	much <u>48.4</u>	degree <u>29.4</u>	little <u>22.2</u>	all <u>3.1</u>
		6. He helps the faculty cement itself into a cooperative working whole.				
		Occa-				
52		Always <u>17.5</u>	Often <u>56.6</u>	sionally <u>24.1</u>	Seldom <u>19.3</u>	Never <u>3.2</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
		7. He keeps an open mind while the facts are being assembled.
		Occa-
95		Always <u>34.6</u> Often <u>71.7</u> sionally <u>18.5</u> Seldom <u>9.8</u> Never <u>1.3</u>
		8. He welcomes differing points of view.
		To some
84		Always <u>31.5</u> Usually <u>65.1</u> extent <u>23.8</u> Seldom <u>11.1</u> Never <u>1.9</u>
		* 9. He keeps the school apart from the community.
		Defi- To some
103		nitely <u>.6</u> Usually <u>5.5</u> degree <u>21.3</u> Seldom <u>73.2</u> Never <u>35.9</u>
		*10. He avoids group discussion of common problems.
		Occa-
74		Always <u>2.9</u> Often <u>18.0</u> sionally <u>16.4</u> Seldom <u>65.6</u> Never <u>29.0</u>
		11. He makes it possible for the students to participate in the administration of the school.
		Defi- To some Very Not at
47		nitely <u>26.7</u> Usually <u>41.3</u> degree <u>41.2</u> little <u>17.5</u> all <u>3.9</u>
		12. He is thoughtful and considerate of his associates.
		Occa-
118		Always <u>44.7</u> Often <u>80.2</u> sionally <u>14.7</u> Seldom <u>5.1</u> Never <u>.8</u>
		13. He listens to what others on the staff have to say.
		Occa-
117		Always <u>46.0</u> Often <u>76.7</u> sionally <u>18.3</u> Seldom <u>5.0</u> Never <u>.5</u>
		*14. He criticizes teachers before other members of the staff.
		Fairly Occa-
124		Often <u>3.1</u> often <u>6.6</u> sionally <u>11.9</u> Seldom <u>81.5</u> Never <u>52.6</u>
		*15. He plans the school program without the help of the teachers.
		Occa-
13		Always <u>8.8</u> Often <u>30.0</u> sionally <u>23.5</u> Seldom <u>46.5</u> Never <u>4.8</u>
		16. He stresses the importance of high morale among the teachers.
		Occa-
76		Always <u>36.8</u> Often <u>62.4</u> sionally <u>19.6</u> Seldom <u>18.0</u> Never <u>5.3</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
		*17. He selects the textbooks for the teachers use.
		Occa-
154		Always <u>.2</u> Often <u>1.8</u> sionally <u>6.6</u> Seldom <u>91.6</u> Never <u>64.8</u>
		*18. He dominates the other members of the staff for personal reasons.
		Defi- To some Very Not at
128		nately <u>2.3</u> Usually <u>5.0</u> extent <u>12.4</u> little <u>82.6</u> all <u>55.3</u>
		19. He sets a good example of cooperative behavior.
		Occa-
100		Always <u>40.5</u> Often <u>70.6</u> sionally <u>18.9</u> Seldom <u>10.5</u> Never <u>.8</u>
		20. He encourages the free play of human intelligence.
		Occa-
103		Always <u>38.7</u> Often <u>75.1</u> sionally <u>15.4</u> Seldom <u>9.5</u> Never <u>1.1</u>
		*21. He remains aloof from the rest of the staff.
		Defi- To some Not very Not at
105		nately <u>3.1</u> Usually <u>7.2</u> degree <u>21.4</u> much <u>71.4</u> all <u>43.6</u>
		22. He holds informal conferences with teachers and pupils.
		Fairly Occa- Once in
81		Often <u>37.1</u> often <u>63.3</u> sionally <u>23.2</u> a while <u>13.5</u> Seldom <u>5.6</u>
		23. He acts in terms of "we-ness" instead of "I-ness".
		Occa-
102		Always <u>38.1</u> Often <u>74.9</u> sionally <u>15.1</u> Seldom <u>10.0</u> Never <u>1.1</u>
		*24. He discourages teachers from occupying positions of leadership.
		Defi- To some Not at
143		nately <u>1.4</u> Usually <u>4.2</u> extent <u>9.1</u> Seldom <u>86.7</u> all <u>63.3</u>
		25. He shows appreciation for any contribution to the common program.
		Occa-
108		Always <u>46.5</u> Often <u>73.5</u> sionally <u>16.0</u> Seldom <u>10.5</u> Never <u>1.3</u>
		26. He admits error readily and willingly.
		Occa-
66		Always <u>27.5</u> Often <u>58.5</u> sionally <u>24.8</u> Seldom <u>16.7</u> Never <u>3.7</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>				
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very				
		Often often sionally a while seldom				
104	*27. He brooks no questioning.	Often <u>3.7</u>	often <u>10.5</u>	sionally <u>21.0</u>	a while <u>68.5</u>	seldom <u>49.5</u>
		Occa-				
45	*28. He acts as a boss.	Always <u>7.1</u>	Often <u>20.1</u>	sionally <u>25.9</u>	Seldom <u>54.0</u>	Never <u>17.8</u>
		Occa-				
89	29. He refers problems to special committees for study and report.	Often <u>43.1</u>	often <u>68.5</u>	sionally <u>14.9</u>	a while <u>16.6</u>	Seldom <u>6.3</u>
		Fairly Occa- Once in				
		Often often sionally a while Seldom				
135	*30. He prepares the courses of study for the teachers.	Always <u>4.5</u>	Often <u>7.4</u>	sionally <u>6.3</u>	Seldom <u>86.3</u>	Never <u>65.4</u>
		Occa-				
126	31. He is easy to work with.	Always <u>51.1</u>	Often <u>81.5</u>	sionally <u>14.3</u>	Seldom <u>4.2</u>	Never <u>1.3</u>
		Occa-				
148	*32. He plays one teacher against the other.	Often <u>1.4</u>	often <u>4.3</u>	sionally <u>21.3</u>	a while <u>74.4</u>	seldom <u>80.5</u>
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very				
		Often often sionally a while seldom				
134	33. He expects the school to achieve as much as possible for each individual.	Always <u>65.9</u>	Often <u>88.1</u>	sionally <u>8.4</u>	Seldom <u>3.5</u>	Never <u>.2</u>
		Occa-				
99	*34. He changes teacher assignments without consulting them.	Often <u>5.5</u>	often <u>14.6</u>	sionally <u>16.4</u>	a while <u>69.0</u>	Seldom <u>55.5</u>
		Occa- Once in				
		Often often sionally a while Seldom				
71	35. He makes the teachers feel secure during the process of rapid change.	Always <u>29.1</u>	Often <u>61.4</u>	sionally <u>22.7</u>	Seldom <u>15.9</u>	Never <u>4.0</u>
		Occa-				
148	*36. He lords it over the other members of the staff.	Often <u>2.4</u>	often <u>6.4</u>	sionally <u>6.8</u>	a while <u>86.8</u>	seldom <u>76.0</u>
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very				

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
	37.	He trusts the other members of the staff.
120		A great deal <u>49.4</u> Fairly much <u>77.3</u> To some degree <u>17.2</u> Comparatively little <u>5.5</u> Not at all <u>.5</u>
	*38.	He forces the teachers into line.
89		Occa- Always <u>1.0</u> Often <u>10.5</u> sionally <u>26.6</u> Seldom <u>62.9</u> Never <u>27.5</u>
	39.	He participates in discussions on the level with the rest of the faculty.
108		Fairly Often <u>48.7</u> often <u>73.2</u> sionally <u>15.7</u> Once in a while <u>11.1</u> Very seldom <u>6.3</u>
	40.	He supports parents' organizations as a vital link between the home and the school.
106		A great deal <u>52.6</u> Fairly much <u>71.9</u> To some degree <u>15.4</u> Comparatively little <u>12.7</u> Not at all <u>5.6</u>
	*41.	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
38		Fairly Often <u>10.0</u> often <u>23.5</u> Occa- sionally <u>24.1</u> Once in a while <u>47.4</u> Seldom <u>27.8</u>
	42.	He develops in others the power for initiating action.
44		A great deal <u>19.0</u> Fairly much <u>48.7</u> To some degree <u>30.4</u> Comparatively little <u>20.9</u> Not at all <u>3.1</u>
	*43.	He hesitates to commend teachers for their contributions.
86		Occa- Always <u>4.0</u> Often <u>15.4</u> sionally <u>16.1</u> Seldom <u>68.5</u> Never <u>36.8</u>
	44.	He respects all youth regardless of their social or economic standing.
143		Occa- Always <u>63.3</u> Often <u>36.5</u> sionally <u>9.0</u> Seldom <u>4.5</u> Never <u>1.1</u>
	*45.	He hesitates to delegate authority to others on the staff.
83		To some Not at Always <u>3.1</u> Usually <u>12.2</u> extent <u>22.4</u> Seldom <u>65.4</u> all <u>32.5</u>
	46.	He furnishes leadership in developing the curriculum.
64		Fairly Often <u>32.8</u> often <u>62.1</u> Occa- sionally <u>18.1</u> Once in a while <u>19.8</u> seldom <u>11.3</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>				
	47.	He furnishes guiding suggestions for the cooperative planning of the faculty.				
		Occa-				
58		Always <u>18.5</u>	Often <u>57.2</u>	sionally <u>26.6</u>	Seldom <u>16.2</u>	Never <u>1.4</u>
	*48.	He focuses attention upon himself.				
		Defi-	To some	Very	Not at	
85		nitely <u>3.9</u>	Usually <u>10.9</u>	extent <u>18.5</u>	little <u>70.6</u>	all <u>29.3</u>
	49.	He sympathetically counsels teachers and pupils with their personal problems.				
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very				
46		Often <u>30.5</u>	often <u>60.1</u>	sionally <u>3.6</u>	a while <u>36.3</u>	seldom <u>8.4</u>
	50.	He invites others to participate in activities which affect them.				
		Occa- Once in Very				
70		Always <u>23.2</u>	Often <u>65.0</u>	sionally <u>21.3</u>	a while <u>13.7</u>	seldom <u>5.0</u>
	*51.	He rules the roost.				
		Occa-				
60		Always <u>8.5</u>	Often <u>19.5</u>	sionally <u>19.7</u>	Seldom <u>60.8</u>	Never <u>26.8</u>
	52.	He places the welfare of youth above all else.				
		Occa-				
117		Always <u>44.2</u>	Often <u>79.4</u>	sionally <u>15.5</u>	Seldom <u>5.1</u>	Never <u>.8</u>
	*53.	He rules with an iron hand.				
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at
84		deal <u>4.0</u>	much <u>12.7</u>	degree <u>18.5</u>	little <u>68.8</u>	all <u>31.8</u>
	*54.	He looks at leadership as a one way process.				
		A great	Fairly	To some	Comparatively	Not at
68		deal <u>5.5</u>	much <u>14.6</u>	degree <u>25.6</u>	little <u>59.8</u>	all <u>28.0</u>
	*55.	He draws a line between himself and others on the staff.				
		Defi-	To a large	To some	Not at	
97		nitely <u>2.7</u>	degree <u>8.7</u>	extent <u>20.9</u>	Seldom <u>70.4</u>	all <u>37.6</u>
	56.	He stimulates self-direction in others.				
		Occa-				
54		Always <u>16.6</u>	Often <u>56.3</u>	sionally <u>27.1</u>	Seldom <u>16.6</u>	Never <u>1.9</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
		*57. He is austere and aloof from the other members of the staff.
		Occa-
126		Always <u>1.0</u> Often <u>6.9</u> sionally <u>12.7</u> Seldom <u>80.4</u> Never <u>54.7</u>
		*58. He discourages the teachers from pursuing their individual aims.
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very
145		Often <u>1.8</u> often <u>5.5</u> sionally <u>9.0</u> a while <u>85.5</u> seldom <u>68.2</u>
		59. He develops in others the power of carrying responsibilities.
		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at
72		deal <u>30.1</u> much <u>57.7</u> degree <u>26.4</u> little <u>15.9</u> all <u>1.3</u>
		*60. He relies upon pressure to get things done.
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very
96		Often <u>3.4</u> often <u>14.0</u> sionally <u>16.9</u> a while <u>69.1</u> seldom <u>44.4</u>
		61. He is patient with those who differ with him.
		Occa-
68		Always <u>23.0</u> Often <u>63.3</u> sionally <u>21.9</u> Seldom <u>14.8</u> Never <u>3.1</u>
		*62. He breaks rules he wouldn't permit others to break.
		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at
123		deal <u>2.6</u> much <u>5.6</u> degree <u>11.3</u> little <u>83.1</u> all <u>51.3</u>
		63. He displays skill in the use of cooperative techniques.
		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at
50		deal <u>23.5</u> much <u>53.1</u> degree <u>27.4</u> little <u>19.5</u> all <u>6.8</u>
		64. He is well acquainted with his community and its problems.
		A great Fairly Comparatively Not at
129		deal <u>49.4</u> much <u>83.1</u> degree <u>13.0</u> little <u>3.9</u> all <u>.2</u>
		65. He carries into action the program developed by the faculty.
		Fairly Occa- Once in Very
75		Often <u>32.6</u> often <u>66.1</u> sionally <u>50.1</u> a while <u>16.2</u> seldom <u>7.9</u>
		*66. He blames the same members of the staff when things go wrong.
		Occa-
116		Always <u>1.3</u> Often <u>4.5</u> sionally <u>17.5</u> Seldom <u>78.0</u> Never <u>45.2</u>
		67. He is friendly and approachable with the teachers and pupils.
		Occa-
133		Always <u>56.6</u> Often <u>83.4</u> sionally <u>21.9</u> Seldom <u>5.3</u> Never <u>.8</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
	68.	He treats the teachers and the pupils with impartiality.
105		Occa- Always <u>42.6</u> Often <u>75.6</u> sionally <u>13.9</u> Seldom <u>10.5</u> Never <u>2.9</u>
	*69.	He places his personal welfare ahead of the rest of the staff.
105		Defi- To some nitely <u>3.5</u> Often <u>9.3</u> extent <u>15.6</u> Seldom <u>75.1</u> Never <u>45.7</u>
	*70.	He pits one teacher against another.
153		Fairly Occa- Once in Not at Often <u>2.1</u> much <u>4.7</u> sionally <u>5.3</u> a while <u>90.0</u> all <u>72.2</u>
	71.	He frees others to plan and act cooperatively.
55		Fairly Occa- Once in Very Often <u>25.9</u> often <u>55.3</u> sionally <u>24.4</u> a while <u>20.3</u> seldom <u>6.9</u>
	*72.	He feels above the others on the staff.
114		Defi- To some Not very Not at nitely <u>3.4</u> Usually <u>7.2</u> extent <u>14.8</u> much <u>78.0</u> all <u>49.7</u>
	73.	He serves the human needs of the group.
66		Very Fairly To some well <u>31.5</u> well <u>61.1</u> Acceptably <u>18.5</u> extent <u>20.4</u> Poorly <u>6.6</u>
	74.	He develops in others the power for planning their own actions.
63		A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at deal <u>34.4</u> much <u>52.1</u> degree <u>28.1</u> little <u>19.8</u> all <u>2.4</u>
	*75.	He disregards the feelings of teachers in making decisions.
80		Fairly Occa- Once in Very Often <u>6.1</u> often <u>16.7</u> sionally <u>79.5</u> a while <u>4.0</u> seldom <u>54.8</u>

V. The Part Teachers Play in the Administration of the School

	1.	Teachers assume responsibility for their freedom of action.
97		A great Fairly To wom3 Comparatively Not at deal <u>29.4</u> much <u>73.3</u> degree <u>21.1</u> little <u>5.6</u> all <u>.6</u>
	2.	Teachers help promote group enterprises.
93		A great Fairly Comparatively Not at deal <u>33.0</u> much <u>67.5</u> degree <u>25.4</u> little <u>7.1</u> all <u>.6</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
		3. Teachers discuss problems with the principal.
103		Fairly Often <u>38.3</u> Occa- sionally <u>23.0</u> Seldom <u>6.1</u> Never <u>.3</u> often <u>70.9</u>
		*4. Teachers are interrupted to take care of the principal's wishes.
87		Fairly Often <u>5.8</u> Occa- sionally <u>20.9</u> Once in a while <u>65.1</u> Seldom <u>41.2</u> often <u>14.0</u>
		5. Teachers help induct new staff members into the faculty.
36		Occa- Not at Always <u>21.2</u> Often <u>49.2</u> sionally <u>25.7</u> Seldom <u>25.1</u> all <u>9.8</u>
		6. Teachers share in cooperative projects among themselves.
54		Fairly Often <u>20.6</u> Occa- sionally <u>32.2</u> Seldom <u>15.9</u> Not at all <u>2.4</u> often <u>51.9</u>
		7. Teachers help evaluate their own professional growth.
4		A great deal <u>10.5</u> Fairly much <u>32.1</u> To some degree <u>37.2</u> Comparatively little <u>30.7</u> Not at all <u>8.2</u>
		8. Teachers clarify faculty issues thru faculty forums.
-12		Fairly Often <u>14.0</u> Occa- sionally <u>24.0</u> Once in a while <u>39.5</u> Seldom <u>22.5</u> often <u>36.5</u>
		9. Teachers have a feeling of self-respect in the school.
116		Defi- nitely <u>43.7</u> To Some Degree <u>18.2</u> Seldom <u>3.7</u> Not at all <u>.5</u> Usually <u>78.1</u>
		10. Teachers acquaint themselves with the community as it relates to the school.
73		A great deal <u>19.1</u> Fairly much <u>62.1</u> To some degree <u>30.0</u> Comparatively little <u>7.9</u> Not at all <u>.2</u>
		11. Teachers improve themselves thru professional meetings.
68		A great deal <u>21.5</u> Fairly much <u>59.8</u> To some degree <u>29.4</u> Comparatively little <u>10.8</u> Not at all <u>1.3</u>
		12. Teachers value the expert advice and service rendered by the principal.
56		A great deal <u>21.5</u> Fairly much <u>52.9</u> To some degree <u>30.9</u> Comparatively Little <u>16.2</u> Not at all <u>1.6</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
	13.	Teachers help interpret the school to the public through an organized public relations program.
-2		A great deal <u>12.1</u> Fairly much <u>32.5</u> To some degree <u>31.6</u> Comparatively little <u>35.9</u> Not at all <u>10.6</u>
	14.	Teachers meet to discuss matters of vital common concern.
52		Fairly Often <u>17.8</u> Fairly often <u>48.9</u> Occasionally <u>38.2</u> Seldom <u>12.9</u> Never <u>2.1</u>
	15.	Teachers help organize the curriculum.
39		A great deal <u>22.2</u> Fairly much <u>46.3</u> To some degree <u>30.1</u> Comparatively little <u>23.6</u> Not at all <u>5.5</u>
	*16.	Teachers are propelled by aims of the principal.
-27		Fairly Often <u>8.4</u> Fairly often <u>54.7</u> Occasionally <u>18.3</u> Once in a while <u>27.0</u> Seldom <u>9.4</u>
	17.	The minority has the opportunity to express itself.
111		Occa- Always <u>55.6</u> Often <u>67.0</u> Occasionally <u>21.9</u> Seldom <u>11.1</u> Never <u>1.0</u>
	18.	Teachers are free to suggest policies for the improvement of the school.
118		Occa- Always <u>52.9</u> Often <u>74.9</u> Occasionally <u>16.9</u> Seldom <u>8.2</u> Never <u>1.3</u>
	19.	Teachers accept responsibility for the results of cooperatively developed policies.
84		Definitely <u>22.7</u> Usually <u>67.7</u> To some degree <u>26.5</u> Very little <u>5.8</u> Not at all <u>.8</u>
	20.	Teachers accept the responsibility to help formulate policies.
74		Definitely <u>24.8</u> Usually <u>61.9</u> To some extent <u>27.3</u> Very little <u>10.8</u> Not at all <u>1.3</u>
	21.	Teachers feel secure in the school.
111		Definitely <u>36.2</u> Usually <u>88.2</u> To some extent <u>12.7</u> Very little <u>5.1</u> Not at all <u>1.0</u>
	22.	Teachers help select textbooks.
140		Fairly Often <u>65.8</u> Fairly often <u>79.6</u> Occasionally <u>16.4</u> Seldom <u>4.0</u> Never <u>1.3</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>				
62	23. Teachers critically evaluate progress toward their objectives. A great deal 15.1 Fairly much 57.6 To some degree 31.9 Comparatively little 10.5 Not at all .3				
104	24. Teachers are free to discuss controversial issues among themselves and in the classroom. A great deal 40.0 Fairly much 71.7 To some degree 22.0 Comparatively little 6.3 Not at all 1.6				
65	25. Teachers assume responsibility for the welfare of others in the group. Definitely 17.8 Usually 56.8 To some degree 35.0 Seldom 8.2 Not at all 1.1				
117	*26. Teachers feel ill-at-ease in the principal's presence. Definitely 2.1 Usually 5.9 To some extent 12.9 Seldom 81.2 Not at all 45.3				
92	27. Teachers help establish the standards of conduct for the school. Often 34.9 Fairly often 69.3 Occasionally 21.1 Seldom 9.6 Not at all 2.4				
102	*28. Teachers are considered incompetent to develop policies. Definitely 1.8 Usually 7.9 To some degree 20.6 Seldom 71.5 Not at all 40.4				
181	*29. Teachers insist that the principal outline their work for them. Often .6 Fairly often 1.1 Occasionally 3.9 Once in a while 95.0 Seldom 87.9				
88	30. Teachers share common purposes with the principal. Often 32.8 Fairly often 69.0 Occasionally 20.4a Once in a while 10.6 Seldom 3.1				
85	31. Teachers keep themselves professionally informed. Definitely 20.6 Usually 70.9 To some degree 22.3 Not too much 6.8 Not at all .2				

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
	32.	Teachers share with the principal in determining their conditions of work.
46		Definitely <u>16.7</u> Usually <u>52.3</u> To some degree <u>27.7</u> Not too much <u>20.0</u> Not at all <u>3.1</u>
	33.	Teachers are free to initiate action toward common goals.
92		Definitely <u>35.4</u> Usually <u>67.5</u> To some degree <u>22.2</u> Not too much <u>10.3</u> Not at all <u>1.0</u>
	34.	Teachers help select their supplies and equipment.
127		Occasionally <u>46.9</u> Often <u>34.1</u> Occasionally <u>12.2</u> Seldom <u>3.7</u> Never <u>.2</u>
	35.	Teachers exercise authority in proportion to their responsibility.
93		Occasionally <u>29.6</u> Often <u>73.8</u> Occasionally <u>16.9</u> Seldom <u>9.3</u> Never <u>1.3</u>
	36.	Teachers help the principal thru an advisory group.
25		Fairly Often <u>24.9</u> Fairly Often <u>48.9</u> Occasionally <u>19.6</u> Once in a while <u>31.5</u> Seldom <u>17.5</u>
	37.	Teachers cooperate in their research upon common problems.
29		Frequently <u>15.1</u> Frequently <u>57.7</u> Occasionally <u>30.9</u> Seldom <u>11.4</u> Never <u>1.3</u>
	38.	Teachers are free to experiment with different methods of teaching.
130		Occasionally <u>47.9</u> Often <u>34.7</u> Occasionally <u>12.9</u> Seldom <u>2.4</u> Never <u>.2</u>
	39.	Teachers create opportunities for the personality development of their students.
92		Definitely <u>25.7</u> Usually <u>69.5</u> To some degree <u>27.3</u> Seldom <u>3.2</u> Not at all <u>.3</u>
	40.	Teachers help plan the supervisory program.
-1		A great deal <u>7.1</u> Fairly much <u>23.6</u> To some degree <u>51.0</u> Comparatively little <u>25.4</u> Not at all <u>16.2</u>

TABLE XXVI (cont.)

THE SCORES ON EACH ITEM AND THE PERCENTAGES OF 622 TEACHERS
RESPONDING TO EACH PORTION OF EACH SCALE FOR EACH OF 134
CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADER-GROUP BEHAVIOR

<u>Score</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Democratic Criteria</u>
	41.	Teachers help construct the salary schedule.
15		A great deal <u>18.2</u> Fairly much <u>39.1</u> To some degree <u>32.9</u> Comparatively little <u>28.0</u> Not at all <u>14.0</u>
	42.	Teachers' decisions carry weight.
74		Fairly Often <u>22.3</u> Fairly often <u>60.9</u> Occasionally <u>30.3</u> Seldom <u>8.8</u> Never <u>.5</u>
	43.	Teachers share their experiences with one another.
90		Often <u>27.2</u> Fairly often <u>71.1</u> Occasionally <u>23.3</u> Once in a while <u>5.6</u> Seldom <u>1.4</u>

Criteria Most Characteristic and Least Characteristic of Schools

Those criteria selected from the 134 democratic criteria as most characteristic and least characteristic of Ohio high schools appear in two tables. Table XXVI was studied to find those criteria scoring highest. Those criteria were placed in Table XXVII. Twenty-five criteria with highest scores were selected as best characterizing the high schools of the State of Ohio. The criteria are arranged in the table according to the sections of the Form 5A. Keep in mind that a perfect score would be 200 since the weighted extremes are scored 2 and since one response could receive 100 per cent.

The twenty-four criteria least characteristic of Ohio high schools are shown in Table XXVIII. Respondents did not mark the scale extremes of these criteria to any great extent -- average, about 25 per cent; however, the responses 2 and 4, which also contain responses 1 and 5 respec-

tively, average 80 per cent or more of the total. Ranks 4, 13, and 18 are exceptions to this.

Table XXVII reveals that teachers believe in learning as a process of doing (Section II). They feel able to manage themselves in groups (Section II).

Close examination of the criteria in the table shows that principals are friendly, approachable, easy to work with, and trusting of their staffs. They do not dominate, lord it over, or remain aloof from their faculties. They are one of the group. Principals do not prepare courses of study or select textbooks for teachers. By implication, teachers participate in these activities.

TABLE XXVII

DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS

Form 5A
Section II

<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Fundamental Concepts</u>				
4	144	1	Learning takes place in the process of doing.				
			Strongly agree	Tend to agree	In between	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
			<u>53.7</u>	<u>92.3</u>	<u>6.1</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>.5</u>
6	137	2	Most teachers are capable of managing themselves in group behavior.				
			Strongly agree	Tend to disagree	In between	Tend to agree	Strongly disagree
			<u>48.7</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>90.5</u>	<u>.2</u>
7	122	3	Educational opportunities equal for all youth are necessary.				
			Strongly agree	Tend to agree	In between	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
			<u>48.4</u>	<u>82.2</u>	<u>9.9</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>1.3</u>

TABLE XXVII (cont.)

DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS

<u>Section III</u>			<u>Organization</u>	
			(None)	
<u>Section IV</u>			<u>The Principal</u>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>		
17	154	1	He selects the textbooks for teachers' use.	
			Occa-	
			Always <u>.2</u>	Often <u>1.8</u> sionally <u>6.6</u> Seldom <u>91.6</u> Never <u>64.8</u>
70	153	2	He pits one teacher against another.	
			Fairly Occa- Once in Not at	
			Often <u>2.1</u> much <u>4.7</u> sionally <u>5.3</u> a while <u>90.0</u> all <u>72.2</u>	
33	150	3	He expects the school to achieve as much as possible for each individual.	
			Occa- Once in Not at	
			Always <u>65.9</u> Often <u>88.1</u> sionally <u>8.3</u> a while <u>3.5</u> all <u>.2</u>	
32	148	4	He plays one teacher against the other.	
			Fairly Occa- Once in Very	
			Often <u>1.4</u> often <u>4.3</u> sionally <u>21.3</u> a while <u>74.4</u> seldom <u>80.5</u>	
36	148	4	He lords it over the other members of the staff.	
			Fairly Occa- Once in Very	
			Often <u>2.4</u> often <u>6.4</u> sionally <u>6.8</u> a while <u>86.8</u> seldom <u>76.0</u>	
58	145	6	He discourages the teachers from pursuing their individual aims.	
			Fairly Occa- Once in Very	
			Often <u>1.8</u> often <u>5.5</u> sionally <u>9.0</u> a while <u>85.5</u> seldom <u>68.2</u>	
24	143	7	He discourages teachers from occupying positions of leadership.	
			Defi- To some Not at	
			nately <u>1.4</u> Usually <u>4.2</u> extent <u>9.1</u> Seldom <u>86.7</u> all <u>63.3</u>	
44	143	7	He respects all youth regardless of social or economic standing.	
			Occa-	
			Always <u>63.3</u> Often <u>86.5</u> sionally <u>9.0</u> Seldom <u>4.5</u> Never <u>1.1</u>	

TABLE XXVII (cont.)

DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS

The Principal (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>	
30	135	9	He prepares the courses of study for the teachers. Occa- Always <u>4.5</u> Often <u>7.4</u> sionally <u>6.3</u> Seldom <u>86.3</u> Never <u>65.4</u>
67	133	10	He is friendly and approachable with teachers and pupils. Occa- Always <u>56.6</u> Often <u>83.4</u> sionally <u>21.9</u> Seldom <u>5.3</u> Never <u>.8</u>
64	129	11	He is well acquainted with his community and its problems. A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at deal <u>49.4</u> much <u>83.1</u> degree <u>13.0</u> little ____ all <u>.2</u>
18	128	12	He dominates the other members of the staff for personal reasons. Defi- To some Very Not at nitely <u>2.3</u> Usually <u>5.0</u> extent <u>12.4</u> little <u>82.6</u> all <u>55.3</u>
2	127	13	He "rides" teachers who make mistakes. Fairly Occa- Once in Very Often <u>3.5</u> often <u>10.3</u> sionally <u>13.3</u> a while <u>76.4</u> seldom <u>65.1</u>
31	126	14	He is easy to work with. Occa- Always <u>51.1</u> Often <u>81.5</u> sionally <u>14.3</u> Seldom <u>4.2</u> Never <u>1.3</u>
57	126	14	He is austere and aloof from the other members of the staff. Occa- Always <u>1.0</u> Often <u>6.9</u> sionally <u>12.7</u> Seldom <u>80.4</u> Never <u>54.7</u>
62	123	16	He breaks rules he wouldn't permit others to break. A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at deal <u>2.6</u> much <u>5.6</u> degree <u>11.3</u> little <u>83.1</u> all <u>51.3</u>
14	121	17	He criticizes teachers before other members of the staff. Fairly Occa- Once in a Very Often <u>3.1</u> often <u>6.6</u> sionally <u>17.9</u> while <u>81.5</u> seldom <u>52.6</u>
37	120	18	He trusts the other members of the staff. A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at deal <u>49.4</u> much <u>77.3</u> degree <u>17.2</u> little <u>5.5</u> all <u>.5</u>

TABLE XXVII (cont.)

DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS

<u>Section V</u>		<u>The Teachers</u>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>	
29	181	1	Teachers insist that the principal outline their work for them. Occa- Once in Often <u>.6</u> often <u>1.1</u> sionally <u>3.9</u> a while <u>95.0</u> Seldom <u>87.9</u>
22	140	2	Teachers help select textbooks. Fairly Occa- Often <u>65.8</u> often <u>79.6</u> sionally <u>16.4</u> Seldom <u>4.0</u> Never <u>1.3</u>
38	130	4	Teachers are free to experiment with different methods of teaching. Occa- Always <u>47.9</u> Often <u>84.7</u> sionally <u>12.9</u> Seldom <u>2.4</u> Never <u>.2</u>
34	127	4	Teachers help select their supplies and equipment. Occa- Always <u>46.9</u> Often <u>84.1</u> sionally <u>12.2</u> Seldom <u>3.7</u> Never <u>.2</u>

Teachers are free to experiment with various methods of teaching.

They help select textbooks and supplies.

On the other hand, Table XXVII indicates that teachers believe leadership to be a gift of a few and 38.4 per cent "tend to agree" leadership is confined to the thinking of a few capable individuals. Of the 134 criteria, Item 2 of Section II received the lowest negative score of -67. In this regard, teachers tend to be non-democratic in their thinking.

Three of the six original organization statements are found in Table XXVIII. Teachers indicate that schools are only partially organized to aid the cooperative efforts of the group. About half the teachers dominate their students "to some degree" while the other half of the teachers do so "fairly much" and sometimes "a great deal".

Although the principals do not discourage teachers from pursuing their individual aims and occupying positions of leadership, as found among the criteria most characteristic of high schools, Table XXVIII reveals that principals do not, on the whole, develop in others the power of initiating action (Item 42, Section II) or generate the power of leadership (Item 5, Section IV). Although most characteristically principals are far from being domineering, Table XXVII shows that they do speak in a manner not to be questioned (Item 41, Section IV) "occasionally" if not "fairly often". Although a majority of principals seldom act as bosses, almost as many "occasionally" or "often" do (Item 28, Section IV).

Even though it is most characteristic to describe the principal as a personable fellow and to say that teachers are free to experiment and do have a say in the selection of textbooks and supplies, Table XXVII reveals that not quite half of the schools are arranged to aid cooperative endeavor (Item 3, Section III), that the principal seldom calls upon teachers to help plan the school program, and that faculty forums, organized public relations, evaluation of professional growth, construction of salary schedules, and reliance upon advisory groups exist only "to some degree". About one out of six of the schools report that such procedures seldom, if at all, exist in their schools. Only one-fourth of the teachers (Item 2, Section IV) indicate that student participation in the administration of the school is definitely possible.

In comparing the criteria in the two tables, the personal qualities of the principals are most characteristically democratic but the organi-

national techniques to aid the cooperative endeavors of all persons in the schools appear to be missing. Teachers do not think of themselves as leaders but depend upon a few capable leaders.

TABLE XXVIII

CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS

Section IIFundamental ConceptsItem Score Rank

2	-67	1	Leadership ability is a gift that only few possess. Strongly Tend to In be- Tend to Strongly agree agree tween disagree disagree <u>20.4</u> <u>64.8</u> <u>19.6</u> <u>15.6</u> <u>2.4</u>				
10	8	2	Leadership is confined to the thinking of a few capable individuals. Strongly Tend to In be- Tend to Strongly agree agree tween disagree disagree <u>6.6</u> <u>38.4</u> <u>20.3</u> <u>41.3</u> <u>11.9</u>				

Section IIIOrganization

1	-40	1	A professional relations committee promotes in-service growth of teachers. Fairly Occa- Once in Very Often <u>9.3</u> often <u>29.7</u> sionally <u>25.3</u> a while <u>45.0</u> seldom <u>33.8</u>				
2	49	2	The arrangement of the school organization aids the co-operative efforts of the group. A great Fairly To some Comparatively Not at deal <u>22.2</u> much <u>49.0</u> degree <u>31.5</u> little all <u>3.2</u>				
3	16	3	Teachers dominate their students. Occa- Once in Very Always <u>1.8</u> Often <u>27.8</u> sionally <u>40.0</u> a while <u>32.2</u> seldom <u>13.7</u>				

Section IVThe Principal

15	13	1	He plans the school program without the help of the teachers. Occa- Always <u>8.8</u> Often <u>20.0</u> sionally <u>23.5</u> Seldom <u>46.5</u> Never <u>4.8</u>				
----	----	---	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE XXVIII (cont.)

CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS

The Principal (cont.)Item Score Rank

41	37	2	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned. Fairly Often 10.0 often 28.5 Occasionally 24.1 a while 47.4 Seldom 27.8
5	44	3	He develops in others the power for initiating action. A great deal 19.0 Fairly much 48.7 To some degree 30.4 Comparatively little 20.9 Not at all 3.1
28	45	5	He acts as a boss. Always 7.1 Often 20.1 Occasionally 25.9 Seldom 54.0 Never 17.8
49	46	6	He sympathetically counsels teachers and pupils with their personal problems. Often 20.5 often 60.1 Occasionally 3.6 a while 36.3 seldom 8.4
11	47	7	He makes it possible for the students to participate in the administration of the school. Definitely 26.7 Usually 41.3 Very little 17.5 Not at all 3.9
63	50	8	He displays skill in the use of cooperative techniques. A great deal 23.5 Fairly much 53.1 To some degree 27.4 Comparatively little 19.5 Not at all 6.8

Section VThe Teachers

16	-26	1	Teachers are propelled by the aims of the principal. Fairly Often 8.4 often 54.7 Occasionally 18.3 a while 27.0 Seldom 9.4
8	-12	2	Teachers clarify issues through faculty forums. Fairly Often 14.0 often 36.5 Occasionally 24.0 a while 39.5 Seldom 22.5
13	-2	3	Teachers help interpret the school to the public through an organized public relations program. A great deal 12.1 Fairly much 32.5 To some degree 31.6 Comparatively little 35.9 Not at all 10.6

TABLE XXVIII (cont.)

CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS

			<u>The Teachers (cont.)</u>				
<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>					
40	-1	4	Teachers help plan the supervisory program.				
			A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
			<u>7.1</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>25.4</u>	<u>16.2</u>
7	4	5	Teachers help evaluate their own professional growth.				
			A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
			<u>10.5</u>	<u>32.1</u>	<u>37.2</u>	<u>30.7</u>	<u>8.2</u>
41	18	6	Teachers help construct the salary schedule.				
			A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
			<u>18.2</u>	<u>39.1</u>	<u>32.9</u>	<u>28.0</u>	<u>14.0</u>
36	25	7	Teachers help the principal through advisory groups.				
			Occa- Often		Once in sionally		Not at all
			<u>24.9</u>	<u>48.9</u>	<u>19.6</u>	<u>31.5</u>	<u>17.5</u>
37	29	8	Teachers cooperate in their research upon common problems.				
			Fre- Always		Occa- sionally		Not at all
			<u>15.1</u>	<u>57.7</u>	<u>30.9</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>1.3</u>
5	36	9	Teachers help induct new staff members into the faculty.				
			Always		Often		Not at all
			<u>21.2</u>	<u>49.2</u>	<u>25.7</u>	<u>25.1</u>	<u>9.8</u>
15	39	10	Teachers help organize the curriculum.				
			A great deal	Fairly much	To some degree	Comparatively little	Not at all
			<u>22.2</u>	<u>46.3</u>	<u>30.1</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>5.6</u>
32	46	11	Teachers share with the principal in determining their conditions of work.				
			Defi- nitely		To some degree		Not at all
			<u>16.7</u>	<u>52.3</u>	<u>27.7</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>

The items most characteristic of schools were scored according to four of six categories mentioned on page 105. The data appear in Table XXIX. In the table the average score of 153 in the high democracy and high adequacy column is the highest average score shown. Other average scores decrease with adequacy. The average score of 132 is given in

the column for low democracy and low adequacy scores. It is evident that as democracy and adequacy scores decrease so do the weighted item scores.

TABLE XXIX

SCORES ON THE DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO CITY
HIGH SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Sections of Form 5A	Criteria Most Characteristic of Schools	Scores in the Average School	High Democracy		Low Democracy	
			High Adequacy Score	Low Adequacy Score	High Adequacy Score	Low Adequacy Score
II	4	144	170	165	119	131
	6	137	160	167	110	124
	7	122	150	156	110	119
III	None					
IV	2	127	144	130	108	114
	14	121	135	120	124	112
	17	154	179	177	133	169
	18	128	107	156	136	120
	24	143	163	144	119	139
	30	135	157	150	142	129
	31	126	138	133	134	108
	32	148	175	164	162	156
	33	150	153	153	147	129
	36	148	165	160	159	146
	37	120	141	137	107	109
	44	143	156	140	146	134
	57	126	136	135	127	130
	58	145	169	151	148	137
	62	123	146	120	121	113
	64	129	152	135	117	119
	67	133	149	128	138	121
	70	153	172	155	155	150
V	22	140	155	160	133	155
	29	181	187	185	168	183
	34	127	132	140	127	123
	38	130	142	130	121	113
Averages		137	153	147	133	132

The scores on criteria least characteristic of schools are presented in Table XXX. The average score for these criteria is quite low in comparison to the average score for the most characteristic criteria.

TABLE XXX

SCORES ON THE DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTERISTIC OF OHIO CITY
HIGH SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Sections Form 5A	Criteria Least Characteristic of Schools	Scores in the Average School	High	Low	High	Low
			Adequacy Score	Adequacy Score	Adequacy Score	Adequacy Score
II	2	-67	-34	-39	-95	-100
	10	8	41	68	24	23
III	1	-40	-3	-30	-14	-67
	2	4	97	42	51	25
	3	-11	28	23	-9	7
IV	5	44	74	38	59	13
	11	47	74	37	57	15
	15	13	38	29	28	4
	28	45	55	60	40	42
	41	37	33	52	23	34
	42	44	63	58	61	-6
	49	46	100	52	79	66
	63	50	80	49	65	24
V	5	36	68	40	33	19
	7	4	22	11	4	-5
	8	-12	7	-14	2	-43
	13	-2	33	-1	-9	-21
	15	39	63	54	42	16
	16	-26	12	-4	-21	6
	32	46	69	49	38	38
	36	25	75	38	26	-30
	37	29	80	73	54	44
	40	-1	-8	-20	1	-37
	41	15	33	28	-2	-6
Averages		15	46	29	22	2

In the table the highest average is 46 in the high democracy and adequacy column, and only 2 in the low democracy and low adequacy column. Again it is evident that as adequacy decreases so does the score on democracy. It is also evident that a slight positive democracy score exists even for those schools showing low adequacy as well as low democracy. The average score, a positive 2 in the last column, supports this observation.

Democracy and Adequacy

Table XXXI shows the range of percentages of respondents agreeing with the criteria in each pair of extreme responses combined. The per cent of agreement decreased from 70.7 per cent to 60.9 per cent under high democracy and from high adequacy to low adequacy. Under low democracy the decrease is from 60.6 per cent to 55.1 per cent. It is evident that when democracy is held constant in either high or low categories the percentage of agreement with the criteria decreases with adequacy.

TABLE XXII

THE PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS AGREEING WITH THE CRITERIA
USING THE TWO EXTREME RESPONSES AS THE UNIT OF MEASURE AND
COMPARING HIGH AND LOW DEMOCRACY WITH HIGH AND LOW ADEQUACY

Sections of Form 5A	*Item	Schools with High Democracy Scores			Average	Schools with Low Democracy Scores		
		High	Median	Low		High	Median	Low
		A d e q u a c y				A d e q u a c y		
II	1	97.1	98.0	93.3	84.6	77.1	74.7	74.8
	6	91.3	98.0	97.8	90.5	86.8	86.8	84.3
III	1	41.3	54.0	35.6	29.7	35.1	25.2	19.1
	6	63.5	58.0	64.4	55.8	51.8	54.5	45.2
IV	1	81.7	71.0	65.6	70.7	70.2	72.7	63.5
	6	73.0	55.0	55.6	56.6	57.0	54.5	45.2
	11	53.8	44.0	41.1	41.3	44.7	35.3	29.6
	16	74.0	55.0	65.6	62.4	66.7	53.5	59.1
	21	76.0	69.0	76.7	71.4	67.5	72.7	67.8
	26	65.4	63.0	52.2	58.5	60.5	60.6	50.0
	31	84.6	75.0	82.2	81.5	86.0	86.8	74.8
	36	90.4	80.4	87.8	86.8	90.4	88.8	83.5
	41	48.1	52.0	50.0	47.4	43.0	47.4	45.2
	46	76.0	64.0	54.4	62.1	64.9	61.6	51.3
	51	83.7	63.0	64.4	60.8	55.3	63.6	55.7
	56	66.3	58.3	58.9	56.3	57.0	54.5	44.3
	61	73.1	65.0	52.2	63.3	58.8	72.7	56.5
	66	86.5	75.0	77.0	78.0	74.6	73.7	73.0
	71	64.4	54.4	55.5	55.3	59.6	57.5	39.1
V	1	78.8	78.0	77.0	73.3	67.5	71.7	66.1
	6	56.7	60.0	58.9	51.9	43.0	47.4	47.0
	11	67.3	64.0	68.9	59.8	57.0	60.5	58.3
	16	26.9	24.0	30.8	27.0	22.8	27.2	30.4
	21	85.6	75.0	80.0	82.2	80.7	77.7	72.2
	26	89.4	75.0	85.6	81.2	78.9	77.7	79.1
	31	76.9	84.0	80.0	70.9	60.5	63.6	61.7
	36	62.5	55.0	53.3	48.9	45.6	49.4	29.6
	41	45.2	46.0	42.2	39.1	36.0	38.3	27.8
Averages		70.7	64.6	60.9	62.4	60.6	60.7	55.1

*A sample from the 134 criteria taking every sixth item.

In the foregoing chapter, the criteria for evaluating democracy and the adequacy of principals were applied to schools in general. In the next chapter the criteria will be applied to factors related to the job of the principal.

CHAPTER V

THE RESPONSIBILITIES, ADEQUACY, DEMOCRACY, AND STATUS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Introduction

The job analyses of the activities of the principal as presented in this chapter include a time study in terms of contact with people, individual effort, and administrative functions. Analyses of his adequacy, status, and democratic attitudes also are shown.

To obtain the above data, principals were asked to participate in the study after superintendents had given permission. A form was designed upon which could be recorded the necessary information. It was submitted to principals who had indicated a willingness to participate in the study.

Upon receipt, the data were coded and arranged for tabulation on IBM equipment.

Invitations to Principals

Since this study was a part of other related researches, invitations were sent in two groups. In all, 88 city superintendents indicated a willingness to participate in the study and to provide data. In these cities are 243 high schools.

In Group I the invitations shown in Figure 10 were then sent to 213 high school principals to get their cooperation and to get permission to contact a sample of their teachers. One hundred and seventy replied favorably. Three said no. After a follow-up, the total was

Figure 10

The Invitation Sent to 243 Ohio City High School Principals
to Participate in This Leadership Research

November 16, 1949

Dear High School Principal:

The Bureau of Educational Research of The Ohio State University cordially invites you to participate in a state-wide leadership study involving all the high schools in Ohio cities. Your superintendent has already accepted a similar invitation to take part in this study which is one of a number in a ten-year research program, three years of which is being devoted specifically to educational research.

The purpose of this study is to determine the conditions under which the high school principals of the State of Ohio operate. All data will be treated in a strictly confidential manner. Names of schools and of persons are in no way used for comparative purposes. The findings will be added to the total picture with the hope of providing information leading to an improved program of training of the nation's future leaders.

I realize of course that you have many demands upon your time, but I am also aware of the great need for basic research of this kind, especially in the field of educational leadership. Therefore, I hope you will accept this invitation to cooperate in this study yourself and that you will also be willing for us to invite about ten per cent of your teachers to participate.

Each of the selected teachers will be asked to check a list of 150 items concerning leadership situations. Your superintendent is providing an evaluation of fifteen statements about the functions of leadership. We would like for you to furnish some basic information relating to yourself and your school and to send us a directory of your teachers. These materials are designed to take the minimum effort to gain the maximum of results.

An addressed post card is enclosed for your convenience in replying to this invitation. Check it in the appropriate place and place it in the return mail no later than December 1st.

Thanking you in advance for your willingness to cooperate in what we believe is a very important study, I am

Very cordially yours,

T. C. Holy
Director

brought to 192 who indicated a willingness to participate. Six said no.

In Group II, twenty-five out of thirty schools replied favorably making a grand total of 217 who replied favorably to the invitations. This is 75.5 per cent of the 274 city high schools in the State of Ohio not including night schools.

The Inquiry to Principals

The inquiry shown in Figure 11 and referred to in this study as Form 3 was designed. It is divided into six sections to obtain necessary data:

<u>Section</u>	<u>Type of Data</u>
I	Total time spent by the principal in professional effort
II	An analysis of time spent in contact with people
III	An analysis of time spent in individual effort
IV	Proportion of time spent on major functions
V	Basic information concerning the principal and his school
VI	Status information

Sections I-IV, inclusive, were adapted in this study from a research in naval leadership¹ in order to interchange comparisons between the two. Section V was designed to provide basic data through pertinent to the study. Section VI was developed by another member of

¹

C. L. Shartle et al, Naval Leadership, pp. 76-78.

the staff¹ and included because of its relatedness.

The inquiry referred to as Form 3 was sent to 192 city high school principals in Group I and later to 25 in Group II. Returns were as follows according to sections completed by respondents:

<u>Section</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
I	Professional Effort	192	70.0
II	Contact with People	188	68.6
III	Individual Effort	188	68.6
IV	Major Functions	187	68.2
V	Basic Information	182	66.4
VI	Status	191	69.7
	<u>Total possible</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Coding

When inquiries of one hundred or more had been returned, a frequency distribution was made for each part of the data. Code numbers from 0 through 9 were assigned to cover the range in order to fit IBM cards. In certain tables, code numbers are shown together with the interval and the frequency distribution established from sorting on IBM equipment.

In general, the data were examined in three ways: (1) for all schools, (2) for a selected sample of the 21 least adequate and the 21 most adequate principals, and (3) for a selected sample of the 41 least democratic and the 45 most democratic schools.

Basic Information Concerning Principals and Schools

The information in this section is furnished by 182 Ohio city high school principals and compared with a sample of 21 least adequate and

¹Melvin Seeman and Richard T. Morris, A Status Factor Approach to Leadership, pp. 86-101.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

HOWARD L. BEVIS, *President*

COLUMBUS 10

133

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Figure 11

Inquiry Sent to Ohio City High School Principals

Form 3

Dear High School Principal:

I am most appreciative of your acceptance of the invitation to participate in one of Ohio State's leadership studies. Your responsibilities are outlined as follows and should take but a short time to complete:

- I. Analyze percentage-wise the time you spend in professional effort.
- II. Analyze the time you spend in contact with persons as individuals or in groups.
- III. Analyze the time you spend in individual effort.
- IV. Analyze the time you spend performing the major administrative responsibilities required.
- V. Check certain basic data concerning yourself and the school.

When you have checked each of these on succeeding pages and return to the Bureau of Educational Research in the envelope provided. BE SURE TO ENCLOSE ALSO A DIRECTORY OF YOUR TEACHERS.

Thank you for your cooperation. Return to the Bureau by January 15th.

Yours truly,

T. C. Holy,
Director

I. An analysis of the total time spent by you in professional effort:

(	%)	1.	What per cent of your total professional time do you spend in <u>contact with people</u> , e.g., pupils, parent, teachers, and other?
(	%)	2.	What per cent of your professional time do you spend in <u>individual effort</u> , e.g., making reports, reading, computation, etc?
(	%)		<u>Total Time</u>

II. An analysis of the time spent in contact with people:

The purpose of this analysis is to determine the relative proportion of time spent in getting things done with people. Please account below for 100% of your time spent with people. In the space before each item please write the approximate percentage of time spent in the activity described.

- (%) 1. Attending staff conferences with yourself or someone else acting as the chairman.
- (%) 2. Consulting with high authorities, such as your superintendent, state department officials, board members.
- (%) 3. Consulting with your associates on the same staff level such as other principals, supervisors, and specialists.
- (%) 4. Consulting with assistants and other subordinates.
- (%) 5. Consulting with outside persons, such as parents, business men, clergymen, and civic leaders.
- (%) 6. Interviewing personnel in conferences, as applicants with problems.
- (%) 7. Making speeches within the school or school system.
- (%) 8. Making speeches to outside groups, such as churches, service organizations, welfare groups, and civic affairs.
- (%) 9. Attending meetings of outside groups such as those mentioned in (8) above.
- (%) 10. Interviewing students in conferences, committees, discipline, and general control.
- (%) 11. Teaching, such as regular classroom instruction.
- (%) 12. Other _____

100% of the total time spent in contact with people.

III. An analysis of the time spent in individual effort:

Of the time you spend in individual effort what percentage of that time is spent in the activity described below? Please write the approximate percentage of the time spent in the activity in the space provided before each activity.

Please account for 100% of your time spent in individual effort.

- (%) 1. Observation of the work of pupils, teachers, and custodians.
- (%) 2. Reading and answering the mail.
- (%) 3. Examining reports, including those prepared by others.
- (%) 4. Preparing and the writing of reports.
- (%) 5. Reading professional materials.
- (%) 6. Writing for publication.
- (%) 7. Reflection upon plans and procedures.
- (%) 8. Mathematical computation.
- (%) 9. Preparing charts, tables, diagrams.
- (%) 10. Use of examination forms, charts, instruments, machines.
- (%) 11. Travel in connection with professional work.
- (%) 12. Other _____

100% of the total time spent in individual effort.

IV. An analysis of the proportion of your time spent in performing the major functions of a high school principal:

Please disregard any other analyses in this inquiry and now consider your entire range of administrative responsibilities from day to day. Attempt to account as accurately as possible for the relative percentage of time devoted to the various administrative and technical functions.

Before each item please write the approximate percentage of the total time spent in the function described.

- (%) 1. Inspection (Observation of the school in order to determine condition)
- (%) 2. Research (Gathering and the preparation of data)
- (%) 3. Planning (Short term and long range planning)
- (%) 4. Preparing procedures (Outlining methods for operation plans)
- (%) 5. Coordination (Integration of activities for purposes of efficiency, economy and control of the school)
- (%) 6. Evaluation (Evaluation of reports, information, correspondence, decisions, school progress, results of the educational program.
- (%) 7. Interpretation (Clarifying and explaining to those concerned)
- (%) 8. Supervision (Seeing that the work gets done)
- (%) 9. Personnel (Selection of teachers, in-service training, faculty meetings, motivation)
- (%) 10. Pupil personnel (Attendance, scheduling, counseling, discipline)
- (%) 11. Public relations (Interpreting or selling the educational program to the public)
- (%) 12. Professional performance (Teaching, operating equipment)
- (%) 13. Professional consultation (Helping workshops, meeting architects.
- (%) 14. Materials and supplies (Requisitioning, inventorying, issuing)
- (%) 15. Other _____

100% of the total time spent in the performance of the major functions of a high school principal.

V. Basic information about you and the high school:

Please place a check mark in the appropriate place when answering the question.

1. What is the grade organization of the high school?
7-12 _____ 9-12 _____ 7-9 _____ 10-12 _____ 3-3 _____
2. How many pupils are enrolled in the high school?
Less than 500 _____ 501-1000 _____ 1001-1500 _____ More than 1500 _____
3. How many teachers are on your staff?
Less than 20 _____ 21-30 _____ 31-40 _____ 41-50 _____ 51-60 _____
61-70 _____ More than 70 _____
4. How many men are on your teaching staff?
Less than 10 _____ 11-20 _____ 21-30 _____ 31-40 _____ 41-50 _____
More than 50 _____
5. What is the approximate age of the youngest teacher? _____
The oldest? _____
6. What is the average age of your teaching staff? _____
7. How many years has the average teacher taught in the high school?
Less than 10 _____ 10-20 _____ 21-30 _____ More than 30 _____
8. From what economic level do the majority of pupils come? Check at the appropriate on the scale. The number 1 represents the lowest income group and 9 represents the highest income group.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
lower			middle			upper		
9. From what population group does the largest majority of the pupils come?
Farm _____ Rural village _____ Urban _____ City _____
10. How did you become the principal of this high school?
From within this school _____ From within this city _____
From outside _____
11. As compared to the average member of your staff are you:
Older _____ Younger _____ Taller _____ Shorter _____
12. Which of the following degrees do you hold:
None _____ A.B. _____ B.S. _____ B.S. in Ed. _____ Masters _____
PhD _____ EdD _____ Other _____
13. What branch of the Armed Services have you served?
None _____ Army _____ Navy _____ Marines _____ Air Corps _____ Other _____

THANKS!

DON'T FORGET TO SEND ALONG

A DIRECTORY

The following questions deal with the community relations of school people.
Directions: Please check at one of the marked-off points along the scale to indicate your answer. For most of the questions there are seven points along the scale. You may check at one of the four described alternatives or in between them. Some of the questions may seem difficult to answer, but make your best guess about them.
(Please check at the marks, not in the spaces.)

1. How would you characterize the job of school superintendent in your community at the present time with respect to the following:

a. the general prestige of the office of superintendent

b. the degree of influence the superintendent has in general community affairs:

c. the social position the superintendency carries in the community:

d. the economic position in the community the superintendency affords:

2. If a national survey were made on the prestige of occupations, which occupation in each of the following pairs would rate higher in prestige? (Circle the number of the occupation with the higher prestige in each pair. Use a check mark to indicate how much higher, Circle both numbers if they are equal in prestige.)

- 1. school superintendent 2. county judge
- 3. minister 4. public school teacher
- 5. manager--small store 6. school superintendent
- 7. public school teacher 8. accountant
- 9. clerk in a store 10. school superintendent
- 11. public school teacher 12. small factory owner
- 13. school superintendent 14. electrician
- 15. college professor 16. public school teacher
- 17. school superintendent 18. physician

A great deal higher	A good bit higher	Slightly higher

3. Which space would you check along the following scale to indicate your social position in your community (check the appropriate space)?

4. Considering total income from all sources and present assets, where along the following scale would you place yourself in your community?

4. Considering total income from all sources and present assets, where along the following scale would you place yourself in your community?

Relatively high economically Somewhat above average Somewhat below average Relatively low economically

5. How would you describe the residential area in which you live?

Among the better areas in the community Somewhat above average Somewhat below average Among the poorer areas in the community

6. If you were asked to use one of these six names for your social class, which would you say you belonged in (check the appropriate space):

Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower
Upper Upper Middle Middle Lower Lower
Class Class Class Class Class Class

7. This is a continuation of the ratings on national prestige occupations. If a national survey were made, which occupation in each of the following pairs would rate higher in prestige? (Circle the number of the occupation with the higher prestige in each pair. Use a check mark to indicate how much higher. Circle both numbers if they are equal in prestige.

1. public school teacher	2. physician
3. college professor	4. school superintendent
5. public school teacher	6. electrician
7. school superintendent	3. small factory owner
9. clerk in a store	10. public school teacher
11. school superintendent	12. accountant
13. manager of a small store	14. public school teacher
15. minister	16. school superintendent
17. public school teacher	18. county judge

A great deal higher	Considerably higher	Slightly higher

8. How would you characterize the job of public school teacher in your community at the present time, with respect to the following:

- a. the general prestige of the position:

Very high in prestige Fairly high Moderately low Quite low in prestige

- b. the degree of influence teachers have in community affairs:

Very high degree of influence Fairly high Moderately low Quite low degree of influence

c. the social position of teachers in the community:

Very high Fairly high Moderately low Quite low
position

d. the economic position of teachers in the community:

Very high Fairly high Moderately low Quite low
position

9. From the economic standpoint, what per cent of income earners in the community would you estimate is doing better than the average teacher? _____%

10. Where would you check along the following scale to indicate the social position of the superintendent in your community (check the appropriate space).

High Middle Low

11. How would you characterize the residential area in which the superintendent lives?

Among the bet- Somewhat above Somewhat below Among the
ter areas in the average average poorer
community areas

12. From the economic standpoint what per cent of income earners in the community would you estimate is doing better than the superintendent? _____%

13. If you were asked to use one of these six names to designate the social class of the superintendent, which would you say he belonged in (check the appropriate space):

Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower
Upper Upper Middle Middle Lower Lower
Class Class Class Class Class Class

14. Considering total income and present assets, where would you estimate the superintendent places along the following scale?

Relatively Somewhat above Somewhat below Relatively
high average average low
economically economically

The following statements are concerned with your attitudes and opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. You are simply expressing your own opinion on each statement. Please circle the appropriate letter.

146

- "A" means you definitely or strongly agree
"a" means you agree somewhat or tend to agree
"?" means you are undecided or in between
"d" means you disagree somewhat or tend to disagree
"D" means you definitely or strongly disagree

1. Those who have a larger investment in an enterprise ought to have greater power in determining policy.	A a ? d D
2. In America, there are too many people in the lower social and economic brackets.	A a ? d D
3. Differences in prestige among the various occupations should be reduced.	A a ? d D
4. Social clubs which restrict membership on a racial basis ought to be considered as being against American principals.	A a ? d D
5. People of about the same social or economic position ought to pretty much mingle with their own kind.	A a ? d D
6. For men to do their best there must be the possibility of earning a higher reward than the next fellow.	A a ? d D
7. The army system of keeping the officers and enlisted men pretty distinct was not a bad thing during the war.	A a ? d D
8. It would avoid awkwardness and embarrassment if people who are qualified to use certain titles (e.g. an M.D. or Ph.D.) would do so regularly.	A a ? d D
9. In most organizations the by-passing of lines of authority ought not to be permitted.	A a ? d D
10. The incomes of most people are a fair measure of their contribution to human welfare.	A a ? d D
11. Differences in rank within an organization should be kept clearly before the members to increase their incentive to do good work and rise within the organization.	A a ? d D
12. It is unwise to try to run a business on a completely democratic basis where all members have an equal voice in the making of decisions.	A a ? d D
13. High social or economic position in America are a pretty good sign of an individual's superior ability or efforts.	A a ? d D
14. It is better to set a high ranking position as one's goal and fall short of it than to set a moderately low one and achieve it.	A a ? d D
15. Differences in rank among people are o.k. since they are chiefly the result of the way individuals have made use of the opportunity open to them.	A a ? d D
16. We ought to encourage competition between individuals since this is one of the most important ways in which progress is made.	A a ? d D
17. We should not be too concerned if there are many people in low positions in our society since most of them do not want the responsibility of higher positions.	A a ? d D
18. If all the money in the United States were equally distributed among all the population, sooner or later it would be back in just about the same hands it is now due to the superior ability of some individuals.	A a ? d D

The following are factual questions about important aspects of American life. You are asked to circle the appropriate letter to indicate your answer.

147

"T" means that you are pretty sure the statement is true

"t" means that you guess the statement is true

"?" means that you have no idea about the truth of the statement

"f" means that you guess the statement is false

"F" means that you are pretty sure the statement is false

Some of the following questions may seem difficult. You are not expected to know the exact answer on many of the items. But your general experience and knowledge will enable you to make a "best guess." Please answer every item.

1. In general, in the U. S., people tend not to associate with those who have a lower social standing than they do.	T t ? f F
2. The amount of understanding between those in the higher social and economic brackets and those in the lower brackets is diminishing in this country.	T t ? f F
3. People in the U. S. make definite social distinctions based upon income and occupation.	T t ? f F
4. It is more difficult now than it ever was before in the U. S. to move out of the lowest social and economic positions.	T t ? f F
5. There are no social classes in the United States.	T t ? f F
6. In the U. S., distinctions made on the basis of race or religion are being eliminated to a large degree.	T t ? f F
7. The amount of contact individuals in the higher social and economic brackets have with those in the lower brackets in the U. S. is very small.	T t ? f F
8. Most people in the U. S. are able to classify others in their own community as to their social standing.	T t ? f F
9. In the U. S. there is very little real understanding between individuals in different racial or religious groups.	T t ? f F
10. There is less and less room at the top of the social and economic structure as time goes on.	T t ? f F
11. In this country it is impossible to tell by appearance alone what general social and economic position a person has.	T t ? f F
12. Most people in the U. S. pick their friends and associates from among those who have the same social standing as they have.	T t ? f F
13. In our society the possibility of moving from one social or economic level to a higher level has decreased a great deal.	T t ? f F
14. The concentration of wealth in the upper brackets in the U. S. is increasing.	T t ? f F
15. Upon fairly short acquaintance it is pretty easy to tell the social level of an individual.	T t ? f F
16. Taken as a whole, in the U. S. there is much less opportunity for movement up through the ranks of large organizations to top positions than there used to be.	T t ? f F
17. Political attitudes in this country are largely determined by the social and economic position of the individual.	T t ? f F

21 most adequate principals as well as with 41 least democratic and 45 most democratic principals.

Nine tables are used to report the data. Frequency distribution, standard deviations, means, and mean difference are provided. The data are tested for the significance of the difference between means and for the difference between percentages according to procedures indicated earlier on pages 93-94.

The organization of Ohio city high schools is shown in Table XXXII.

TABLE XXXII

THE ORGANIZATION OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Organization	Schools		Adequate Schools				Democratic Schools			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
8-12	1	.5	0	0	0		1	2.5	0	0
3- 3	2	1.1	0	0	2	9.5	0	0	1	2.2
10-12	28	15.4	4	19.0	6	28.7	6	14.6	6	13.3
7- 9	56	30.7	6	28.7	4	19.0	14	34.1	16	35.6
9-12	55	30.3	7	33.3	5	23.8	11	26.8	13	28.9
7-12	40	22.0	4	19.0	4	19.0	9	22.0	9	20.0
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0

Note: Differences are not significant in this table.

The largest single group among all schools is junior high school with 30.7 per cent; the traditional 9-12 organization has the second largest percentage of 30.3. There are no significant differences among the selected samples of adequate or democratic schools.

In Table XXXIII are found the enrollments of Ohio city high schools sampled in this study. The average school has 854 pupils enrolled. Those showing lowest adequacy and lowest democracy are smaller although the mean differences are not significant. A close examination

of the table will reveal that 24.4 per cent of the schools having lowest democracy as compared with 40.0 per cent of the schools showing highest democracy are above 1,000 pupils in size. The probability of this difference occurring by chance is .1336.

TABLE XXXIII

THE ENROLLMENTS OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Enrollment	All		Adequacy				Democracy			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1500 +	14	7.7	0	0	0	0	2	4.9#	4	8.9#
1001 - 1500	48	26.4	5	23.8	7	33.3	8	19.5#	14	31.1#
501 - 1000	82	45.1	10	47.6	11	52.4	17	41.6	19	42.2
Less than 500	38	20.8	6	28.6	3	14.3	14	34.1	8	17.8
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0
Mean	854		726		845		726		906	

Note: Mean differences in this table are not significant.

The probability of the differences between the percentages in the lowest and highest democracy columns of occurring by chance is .1336.

The number of teachers in the sample of Ohio city high schools is depicted in Table XXXIV. Over half the schools have fewer than 40 teachers; however, it is significant to note that a proportionately larger number of the schools with more than 40 teachers made higher democracy scores and higher adequacy scores. The data in this table amplifies the observations in the foregoing table and points to the conclusion that both democracy and adequacy increases with the size of the school. It is generally assumed that the opposite is true.

TABLE XXXIV

THE NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Number of Teachers	All Schools		Adequacy				Democracy			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
70+	11	6.0	0	0	0	0	1	2.4*	4	8.9*
61-70	10	5.5	1	4.8	2	9.5	2	4.9*	2	4.4*
51-60	23	12.6	2	9.5	3	14.4	2	4.9*	8	17.8*
41-50	26	13.7	0	0	6	28.6	4	9.8*	10	22.2*
31-40	38	20.9	6	28.6**	4	19.0**	7	17.1	8	17.8
21-30	44	24.3	8	38.1**	4	19.0**	16	38.9	5	11.1
Less than 21	31	17.0	4	19.0**	2	9.5**	9	22.0	3	17.8
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0
S.D.	18.6		13.3		14.4		15.0		21.7	
Mean	41.4		30.7		35.5		31.1		38.1	
Mean Difference				4.8##				7.0#		

Probability of occurrence by chance is .0719.

Probability of occurrence by chance is .2713.

* Probability of the percentage differences between the lowest democracy and highest democracy columns occurrence by chance is .0027.

** Probability of occurrence by chance is .05.

In Table XXXV is reported the number of men on the faculties of Ohio city high schools. The average number of men is 17.3, or about 40 per cent of the average faculty of 41.4 shown in the previous table. Those schools with highest democracy scores have more men than the average school and more than those schools with lowest democracy evaluations; however, the mean difference of 2.6 men is not significant.

TABLE XXXV

THE NUMBER OF MEN ON THE FACULTIES OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Number of Men	All Schools		Adequacy				Democracy			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
50+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41-50	6	3.3	2	9.5	0	0	2	4.9#	2	4.4#
31-40	15	8.3	1	4.8	3	14.3	2	4.9#	4	8.9#
21-30	43	23.6	4	19.0	6	28.6	6	14.6#	12	26.7#
11-20	69	37.9	8	38.1	7	33.3	17	41.5	15	33.3
Less than 10	49	26.9	6	28.6	5	23.8	14	34.1	12	26.7
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0
Mean	17.3		17.8		18.3		15.5		18.1	
S.D.	10.4		12.0		10.0		10.6		10.9	
Mean Difference			.5				2.6##			

The probability of the occurrence by chance of the difference between the percentages in the lowest and highest democracy columns is .1096.

The probability of occurrence by chance is .2713.

Table XXXVI exhibits the age range of teachers reported by principals. The average age of 44.2 reported by principals is only .2 years more than the average reported by the teachers themselves in Table XVI. The average age of teachers does not appear to be significantly greater in either of the democracy categories; however, principals with the younger faculties received the lowest adequacy scores; 23.8 per cent of this group were under 40.

The ages of principals compared with faculties are shown in Table XXXVII. A greater proportion, 76.2 per cent, of the principals who reported themselves as older than their staffs received lowest adequacy scores, as compared to 47.6 per cent of the principals who received highest adequacy scores. Although a slightly greater proportion of the older principals received highest democracy scores the

difference is not significant.

TABLE XXXVI

THE AGES OF TEACHERS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Age of Teachers	All Schools		Adequacy				Democracy			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
53+	2	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
52-3	9	4.9	0	0	2	9.5	0	0	4	8.9
50-1	17	9.3	1	4.8	3	14.3	5	12.2	6	13.3
48-9	9	4.9	0	0	2	9.5	4	9.8	1	2.2
46-7	25	13.8	0	4.8	3	14.3	3	7.3	5	11.1
44-5	31	17.1	7	33.3	4	19.0	8	19.5	6	13.3
42-3	18	9.9	4	19.0	2	9.5	2	4.9	6	13.3
40-1	36	19.8	3	14.3	5	23.9	11	26.8	8	17.8
38-9	14	7.7	2	9.5	0	0	2	4.9	4	8.9
-38	21	11.5	3	14.3	0	0	6	14.6	5	11.1
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0
Mean	44.2		42.7		46.1		43.6		44.4	
S.D.	4.7		3.5		4.0		4.5		5.0	
Mean Difference			3.4*				.8			

*Very significant at the .511 per cent level of probability.

TABLE XXXVII

AGES OF PRINCIPALS COMPARED WITH FACULTIES IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Age	All Schools		Adequacy				Democracy			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Older	124	68.1	16	76.2*	10	47.6*	28	68.3	35	77.8
Average	11	6.1	1	4.8	0	0	3	7.3	2	4.4
Younger	47	25.8	4	19.0**	11	52.4**	10	24.4	8	17.8
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0

*Difference between the percentages in the highest and lowest adequacy columns is significant at the .05 level of probability.

**Difference between the percentages in the highest and lowest adequacy columns is significant at the .02 level.

Since Table XXXVI shows that principals with the younger faculties received lowest adequacy scores and since Table XXXVII shows that principals, who reported themselves older than their faculties were given lowest adequacy scores, the conclusion can be drawn that older principals with young faculties are least adequate. The age gap between leader and group becomes important.

As expected a larger number, 90.2 per cent, of the principals report Master's degrees in Table XXXVIII. No significant differences appear among the categories reported.

TABLE XXXVIII

DEGREES HELD BY PRINCIPALS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Degrees	All Schools		Adequacy				Democracy			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Ed. D.	1	.5	0	0	1	4.8	0	0	0	0
Ph.D.	5	2.7	0	0	0	0	1	2.4	1	2.2
M. A.	164	90.2	19	90.5	19	90.5	37	90.3	39	86.7
B. S. in Ed.	9	4.9	1	4.8	0	0	1	2.4	4	8.9
B. S.	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.2
A. B.	2	1.2	1	4.8	1	4.8	2	4.9	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N	182	100.0	21	100.1	21	100.1	41	100.0	45	100.0

Note: Differences are not significant in this table.

In general, military men are expected to be less democratic than others due to military training. Table XXXIX reveals that about half of principals receiving highest democracy scores had spent time in armed service; however, almost two out of three of the principals in schools receiving lowest democracy scores had no service. A greater proportion, or 71.4 per cent, of those principals scoring high on adequacy had no

service. This tends to refute the assumption that military men are considered efficient. A more refined analysis of this problem might prove significantly otherwise.

TABLE XXXIX

ARMED SERVICE OF PRINCIPALS IN OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Armed Service	All Schools		Adequacy				Democracy			
			Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
None	111	61.0	12	57.1	15	71.4	27	65.9	23	51.1
Service	64	35.2	6	28.6	6	28.6	11	26.8#	19	42.2#
Other	7	3.8	3	14.3	0	0	3	7.3	3	6.7
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0

The probability of occurrence by chance of the differences between the percentages in the lowest and highest democracy columns is .2713.

Table XL indicates the economic level of the localities in which Ohio city high schools are situated. The classification is patterned after Warner's¹. The average high school is in a middle class community. Twenty-four high schools are reported in lower class communities while sixteen are reported in upper class areas. Although there are no significant differences among the categories, 7.8 per cent more of the highest democracy schools are in the lower class areas than the lowest democracy schools.

1

W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, Martin B. Loeb, Who Shall Be Educated? 190 pp.

TABLE XL

ECONOMIC LEVEL OF OHIO CITY HIGH SCHOOL LOCALITIES

Economic Level	All Schools		Adequacy				Democracy			
	f	%	Lowest		Highest		Lowest		Highest	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Upper-Upper 9	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper 8 - 8.9	3	1.6	0	0	1	4.8	0	0	1	2.2
Lower-Upper 7 - 7.9	12	6.6	1	4.8	1	4.8	4	9.7	3	6.7
Upper-Middle 6 - 6.9	36	2.0	4	19.0	5	23.8	9	22.0	10	22.2
Middle 5 - 5.9	59	32.4	6	28.6	8	38.1	15	36.6	12	26.7
Lower-Middle 4 - 4.9	47	25.8	7	33.3	4	19.0	8	19.5	10	22.2
Upper-Lower 3 - 3.9	17	9.3	2	9.5	2	9.5	2	4.9	7	15.6
Lower 2 - 2.9	5	2.7	1	4.8	0	0	2	4.9	1	2.2
Lower-Lower 1 - 1.9	2	1.1	0	0	0	0	1	2.4	1	2.2
N	182	100.0	21	100.0	21	100.0	41	100.0	45	100.0
Mean	5.3		5.1		5.4		5.4		5.2	
S. D.	1.3		1.2		1.2		1.3		1.4	
Mean Difference	.3				.2					

Time Analyses

In Sections I, II, and III of Form 3, principals indicated their estimates of time spent performing various administrative responsibilities. Table XLI gives the frequency distribution of principals in terms of the time they spend in contact with people. The average principal spends 72.5 per cent of his time in contact with people. The other 27.5 per cent of his time he spends in individual effort.

TABLE XLI

THE PER CENT OF TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS IN CONTACT WITH PEOPLE
AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Per Cent of Time Spent in Contact with People	In All Schools	Adequacy of Leadership		Democracy in Schools	
			Lowest	Highest	Lowest	Highest
9	90 plus	17	1	0	1	8
8	85-89	15	0	0	3	3
7	80-84	37	1	4	4	8
6	75-79	42	5	6	12	7
5	70-74	24	4	4	8	5
4	65-69	8	0	1	3	2
3	60-64	25	3	6	7	3
2	55-59	2	0	0	1	0
1	50-54	10	3	1	2	5
0	Less than 50	12	3	0	3	3
Totals		192	20	22	44	44
Means		72.5	67.0#	71.8#	71.4##	74.9##
Standard Deviation		12.3	13.0	8.4	11.1	14.2

Probability of the mean difference occurring by chance is .16.

Probability of the mean difference occurring by chance is .19.

The principals in schools having the highest democracy scores spend 74.9 per cent of their time in contact with people. This is slightly more time than the average principal spends. Eight principals in highest democracy schools spend 90 per cent of their time with

people. The least democratic and the least adequate principals spend less time with people and more time in individual effort.

An analysis of the time principals spend with people reveals that the greatest amount of time, 29.8 per cent, is spent by the average principal with students in conference, in committees, and upon matters of discipline and general control. The second greatest portion, or 17.6 per cent, of time is spent with assistants and subordinates. These amounts of time spent by principals in contact with people are shown in Table XLII.

The per cent of time which principals spend in various types of individual effort are presented in Table XLIII. The average principal spends almost a third, 35.0 per cent, of the time that he spends on individual effort observing pupils, teachers, and custodians. Correspondence, planning, and reading takes about another third of the time spent in individual effort.

TABLE XLII
PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY THE AVERAGE PRINCIPAL
IN CONTACT WITH PEOPLE

No.	Types of Contacts with People	Mean %
1.	Attending staff conferences with the principal or someone else as the chairman	7.8
2.	Consulting with high authorities, such as the superintendent, state superintendent, etc.	5.3
3.	Consulting with associates on the same staff level such as other principals, supervisors	6.1
4.	Consulting with assistants and subordinates	17.6
5.	Consulting with outside persons, such as parents, businessmen, clergymen, etc.	9.1
6.	Interviewing personnel in conferences as applicants with problems, etc.	7.1
7.	Making speeches within the school or school system	3.8
8.	Making speeches to outside groups, such as churches, service organizations, etc.	3.0
9.	Attending meetings of outside groups, such as churches, service organizations, etc.	6.8
10.	Interviewing students in conferences, committees, discipline, and general control	29.8
11.	Teaching, such as classroom instruction	3.6
Total		100.0

TABLE XLIII

MEAN PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS
IN VARIOUS TYPES OF INDIVIDUAL EFFORT

No.	Types of Individual Effort	Mean %
1.	Observation of the work of pupils, teachers, and custodians	35.0
2.	Reading and answering mail	9.6
3.	Examining reports, including those prepared by others	7.4
4.	Preparing and writing reports	7.6
5.	Reading professional materials	9.5
6.	Writing for publication	1.7
7.	Reflection on plans and procedures	11.0
8.	Mathematical computation	6.0
9.	Preparing charts, tables and diagrams	4.1
10.	Using examination forms, charts, instruments	4.1
11.	Travel in connection with professional work	4.0
Total		100.0

Table XLIV depicts the percentages of time spent on each administrative function by principals among all schools. By close examination the table reveals that almost half the principal's time is spent on pupil personnel (16.1 per cent), supervision (14.1 per cent), planning (9.2 per cent), and coordination activities (8.1 per cent).

Table XLV shows the mean per cents of time spent by principals on fourteen administrative functions comparing all schools with those of high and low economic level, high and low enrollment, and with those of varying types of organization. In general, the pattern for all

TABLE XLIV

PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY THE AVERAGE PRINCIPAL PERFORMING
FOURTEEN ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS ESTABLISHED AS CRITERIA
FOR EVALUATING THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

No.	Administrative Function	Mean %
1.	Inspection, such as the observation of the school to determine conditions	7.1
2.	Research by gathering data and preparing the same	5.0
3.	Short and long term planning	9.2
4.	Preparing procedures by outlining methods for operation	6.2
5.	Coordination by integrating activities for purposes of efficiency, economy, etc.	8.1
6.	Evaluation of reports, information, correspondence, decisions, school progress	7.2
7.	Interpretation by clarifying and explaining to those concerned	4.1
8.	Supervision to see that the work gets done	14.1
9.	Personnel through selection of teachers in-service training, faculty meetings, etc.	6.4
10.	Pupil personnel through checking attendance, scheduling, counseling, and discipline	16.1
11.	Public relations by interpreting or "selling" the educational program to the public	7.1
12.	Professional performance through teaching and operating equipment	3.1
13.	Professional consultation through helping with workshops, institutes, etc.	3.1
14.	Materials and supplies through requisitioning inventorying, and distributing	3.2
Total		100.0

TABLE XIV

THE MEAN PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT BY OHIO HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN PERFORMING
VARIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT CLASSIFICATIONS IN SCHOOLS

No.	Administrative Functions	All Schools	Economic Levels		School Enrollment		School Organization			
			High	Low	1000+	-500	7-12	9-12	7-9	10-12
1.	Inspection	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.3	6.4	8.0	7.1	7.3	4.7
2.	Research	5.0	5.1	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.5	5.3	4.5	4.1
3.	Planning	9.2	8.4	8.9	10.4	7.4	8.0	8.3	9.4	8.3
4.	Procedure	6.2	6.2	6.7	7.9	5.7	7.0	7.1	6.7	6.4
5.	Coordination	8.1	8.0	8.3	9.1	8.5	9.4	8.0	7.7	9.5
6.	Evaluation	7.2	7.0	7.8	8.2	7.8	8.4	7.3	7.2	8.7
7.	Interpretation	4.1	5.1	5.6	6.1	4.9	5.3	5.1	5.2	4.8
8.	Supervision	14.1	16.3	13.3	14.8	14.2	14.4	12.5	15.6	16.8
9.	Personnel	6.4	7.1	5.9	7.4	6.0	5.7	6.3	6.7	7.6
10.	Pupil Contact	16.1	14.1	15.2	13.0	16.8	13.5	12.6	15.1	13.4
11.	Public Relations	7.1	7.2	6.1	6.9	5.7	6.3	6.2	5.7	6.3
12.	Professional	3.1	2.1	4.2	3.1	4.8	3.4	3.6	3.1	2.3
13.	Consultation	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.6	3.4	2.7	3.5	2.5	3.4
14.	Material	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.7
Total Per cents		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Schools		137	51	69	60	37	43	53	54	28

schools prevails for each function except for planning and supervision. The principals in the senior high schools and in the high schools located in areas of high economic conditions report a greater amount of time, 16.8 per cent and 16.3 per cent respectively, spent on supervision. The average for all schools is 14.1 per cent.

When the percentages of time spent by principals on various functions for all schools are related to adequacy and democracy, Table XLVI shows that principals and schools scoring high on adequacy and democracy also spend more time, 17.2 per cent and 16.3 per cent respectively, on supervision. They also spend less time controlling pupils, 14.7 per cent and 14.4 per cent respectively. Otherwise, the patterns of time spent on various functions appear equal.

TABLE XLVI

THE MEAN PER CENTS OF TIME SPENT ON FOURTEEN ADMINISTRATIVE
FUNCTIONS BY PRINCIPALS OF ALL SCHOOLS RELATED
TO ADEQUACY AND DEMOCRACY

No.	Administrative Functions	All Schools	Adequacy		Democracy	
			Lowest	Highest	Lowest	Highest
1.	Inspection	7.1	7.4	3.2	7.2	6.8
2.	Research	5.0	6.4	4.7	4.1	5.3
3.	Planning	9.2	8.4	8.9	9.1	10.2
4.	Procedure	6.2	6.5	7.7	7.1	6.6
5.	Coordination	8.1	7.4	8.3	9.2	7.7
6.	Evaluation	7.2	8.0	8.7	7.2	8.1
7.	Interpretation	4.1	4.5	5.4	4.1	4.7
8.	Supervision	14.1	11.6	17.2	14.0	16.3
9.	Personnel	6.4	6.6	7.1	6.0	4.8
10.	Pupil Contact	16.1	18.5	14.7	17.5	14.4
11.	Public Relation	7.1	6.4	6.1	5.1	5.9
12.	Professional	3.1	2.3	2.3	3.2	3.2
13.	Consultation	3.1	2.5	2.4	3.1	2.7
14.	Material	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.3
Total Per Cents		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Schools		187	21	21	43	44

Status as Seen by Principals

The relationships of individuals in an organization or the status pattern should provide clues to the nature of the organization. In a line-and-staff organization status is clearly defined. In the committee arrangement patterns are not as discernible. The former is non-democratic; the latter is democratic. Therefore, a hypothesis should be tested herewith: that as persons recognize or as an organization exhibits clear-cut status relationships then the democracy diminishes.

The status instrument shown as a part of Form 3 was designed by Seeman¹ to provide eight scores:

(1) Status Attitude (See page 146): The aim was to sample the principal's preferences in a broad range of status involved situations. The items included in the instrument asked the respondent to say "yes" or "no" to the following kinds of preference statements regarding status:

- (a) the amount of status difference in society should be maintained or increased,
- (b) status differences should be kept clearly visible and operative,
- (c) differences in status are right and reasonable,
- (d) competition for status is a good thing,
- (e) differential status should have its prerogative.

(2) Status Perception (See page 147): This instrument was designed to determine the extent to which the principal maximized or minimized

¹ Melvin Seeman, op. cit., pp. 10-12.

status differences in American society. A high score indicates wide preference in matters of status. The items were intended to give no direct clue regarding the principals' attitude. The perception items asked:

- (a) Are the status differences among people of the United States large or small?
- (b) Are these differences increasing or decreasing?
- (c) Are these differences clear and/or right?

A high score indicates a perception of large status differences.

Three more scores were determined from the seen status position of (3) superintendents, (4) principals, and (5) teachers. These were determined from several composite status position scores based upon four areas: economic, prestige, social, and influence status.

Scores (6) (7) (8) were determined from the differences in status among superintendents, principals, and teachers.

Tables XLVII through LIV will show the relationships of these status factors to adequacy of leadership and democracy of schools by examining mean differences. Correlations will be left to the next chapter.

Table XLVII provides the distribution of schools according to the status attitude scores of principals. The mean score for all schools was 57.7 and about the same for schools in the "adequacy" columns; however, the scores for "most democratic" schools are 56.6 which is significantly lower than the mean score in the "least democratic" column and lower than the score for all schools. This indicates that principals in "least democratic" schools are looking for status dif-

ferences in society. Logic would seem to dictate this to be true.

Democratic leaders should be less interested in status.

TABLE XLVII

STATUS ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED
TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Attitude Score Intervals	All Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
			Least	Most	Least	Most
9	85 plus	0	0	0	0	0
8	80-84	1	0	0	0	0
7	75-89	6	4	0	0	0
6	70-74	7	2	2	2	1
5	65-69	22	6	6	2	5
4	60-64	36	12	5	4	3
3	55-69	50	8	15	5	3
2	50-54	32	8	6	7	4
1	45-49	22	2	8	1	3
0	-45	15	2	3	0	2
Number of Schools		191	44	45	21	21
Mean Scores		57.7	60.7**	56.6**	58.7	57.5
Standard Deviation		8.6	9.0	7.5	6.9	8.9

** The mean difference between these columns are at the .016 level of significance.

Status perception scores of principals are shown in Table XLVIII.

They are almost identical for all categories. This indicates that the perception of status in American life is about the same for all principals.

TABLE XLVIII

STATUS PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS
RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Perception of Principals	In All Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
			Least	Most	Least	Most
9	57 plus	47	14	10	4	5
8	54-56	25	6	6	1	3
7	51-53	31	6	8	6	3
6	48-50	21	3	6	5	1
5	45-47	26	4	7	1	3
4	42-43	9	2	2	0	1
3	39-41	11	2	4	1	0
2	36-38	12	4	2	0	2
1	33-35	7	3	0	2	3
0	-33	2	0	0	1	0
Number of Schools		191	44	45	21	21
Mean Scores		50.3	50.5	50.8	49.5	48.9
Standard Deviation		7.3	8.1	6.3	7.3	8.4

Note: Probability of mean differences occurrence by chance
is more than .50.

Principals see superintendents in fairly high status positions. Table XLIX reveals that all the means are about the same. This shows that all principals, regardless of classification, see the superintendent at about the same level. Almost 72 per cent of the principals place the superintendent in the "fairly high" or "very high" status positions.

TABLE XLIX

SUPERINTENDENTS' STATUS AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS
AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Description	Status Score	In All Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
				Least	Most	Least	Most
9	Very High	110+	13	3	3	3	0
8	High	105-109	25	5	5	3	3
7	Fairly	100-104	28	4	10	2	3
6		95-99	40	13	11	4	9
5	High	90-94	32	6	9	1	2
4	Average	85-89	27	4	5	2	2
3	or	80-84	11	3	1	2	1
2	Above	75-79	13	4	1	3	1
1	Below	70-74	6	2	0	0	0
0	Average	-70	2	0	0	0	0
Number of Schools			191	44	45	21	21
Means			94.8	94.5#	97.8#	96.1	96.5
Standard Deviation			10.5	10.1	9.3	11.9	7.6

The probability of the mean differences in the "Democracy" columns occurrence by chance is .1096.

Table L shows that principals see themselves "fairly high" in status. Sixty-three per cent of the principals, as compared to 72 per cent of the superintendents, are placed in the "fairly" to "very high" status classification. Eighteen, or 41 per cent, of the least democratic principals, and 15, or 62 per cent, of the least adequate principals gave themselves "slightly above average" or "lower status". Low status is not significantly related to low adequacy and low democracy.

TABLE L

PRINCIPALS' OWN STATUS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED
TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Description	Status Score	Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
				Least	Most	Least	Most
9	High or Very High	23 plus	52	14	13	6	3
8	Fairly High	22-22.9	13	1	3	0	2
7		21-21.9	10	3	2	0	1
6		20-20.9	28	4	7	1	6
5		19-19.9	18	4	7	1	2
4	Above	18-18.9	14	4	3	0	2
3	Average	17-17.9	14	4	2	2	1
2	Average	16-16.9	15	5	4	5	1
1		15-15.9	12	1	2	1	0
0	Low	-15	15	4	2	5	4
Number of Schools			191	44	45	21	21
Means			19.9	19.9	19.9	18.4#	19.4#
Standard Deviation			3.0	3.1	2.7	3.4	3.0

The probability of the mean differences in the "Adequacy" columns occurrence by chance is .3173.

Table LI presents the distribution of scores concerning teacher status. A mean score of 52.3 is shown for all schools. This places teachers "moderately low" in status. This is not significantly different from other classifications. Sixty-one principals, or 32 per cent of those in all schools, place teachers in average status positions. For schools with most democracy, 18, or 40 per cent of the teachers are given "average" or "above" in status.

TABLE LI

TEACHER STATUS AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS IN ALL SCHOOLS
AND AS RELATED TO ADEQUACY AND DEMOCRACY

Code	Status Description	Status Score Interval	Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
				Least	Most	Least	Most
9	Average	57 plus	61	15	18	5	7
8	Moderately	54-56	29	7	10	5	2
7		51-53	28	7	3	3	3
6	Low	48-50	27	3	7	2	6
5		45-47	25	8	4	3	2
4	Status	42-44	9	3	3	1	0
3		39-41	6	1	0	2	1
2	Low	36-38	2	0	0	0	0
1		33-35	3	0	0	0	0
0	Status	-33	1	0	0	0	0
Number of Schools			191	44	45	21	21
Means			52.3	53.6	53.0	51.9	52.9
Standard Deviation			6.0	5.4	4.9	5.8	5.1

Note: Probability of the mean differences occurrence by chance is more than .50.

The difference in status among superintendents, principals, and teachers are presented in the next three tables. Table LII reveals that superintendents are considered a half-rank above teachers. "Least adequate" principals consider the difference a little greater. Superintendents are seen to be in the "fairly" to "very high" status positions. Teachers are seen in the "low" to "moderately low" classifications. Superintendents with most democratic schools have significantly more status position than superintendents with least democratic schools.

TABLE LII

SUPERINTENDENT AND TEACHER STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN
BY PRINCIPALS AND AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY

Code	Status Differences	All Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
			Least	Most	Least	Most
9	4.0-4.9	0	0	0	0	0
8	3.5-3.9	0	0	0	0	0
7	3.0-3.4	4	1	1	3	0
6	2.5-2.9	7	2	1	0	1
5	2.0-2.4	28	7	4	3	3
4	1.5-1.9	52	11	12	9	4
3	1.0-1.4	62	12	19	3	12
2	.5- .9	22	7	5	3	0
1	0 - .4	13	4	2	0	1
0	Less than 0	3	0	1	0	0
Number of Schools		191	44	45	21	21
Means		1.5	1.0*	1.4*	1.8 [#]	1.5 [#]
Standard Deviation		.7	.6	.6	.7	.5

* The mean difference in the "Democracy" columns is very significant at the .0019 level of probability.

[#] The probability of the mean difference in the "Adequacy" column occurrence by chance is .1336.

Table LIII indicates that the status difference between the principal and the superintendent is only .4 of a rank. A superintendent's status is "very high" compared to the principal's "fairly high" status; however, "least adequate" principals consider their status 1.1 ranks lower than the superintendent. For sixty-one, or 32 per cent of the principals, a negative difference exists. This means that they consider their status higher than that of the superintendent.

TABLE LIII

SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPAL STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN
BY PRINCIPALS AND AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY

Code	Status Differences	All Schools	Democ racy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
			Least	Most	Least	Most
9	3.5 plus	0	0	0	0	0
8	3.0-3.4	0	0	0	0	0
7	2.5-2.9	5	0	0	1	3
6	2.0-2.4	8	5	1	6	0
5	1.5-1.9	17	3	4	2	1
4	1.0-1.4	21	2	5	3	2
3	.5- .9	42	11	12	1	6
2	0 - .4	37	6	12	4	2
1	-.5- 0	31	11	4	0	6
0	Less than -.5	30	6	7	4	1
Number of Schools		191	44	45	21	21
Means		.4	.5	.5	1.1#	.7#
Standard Deviation		.9	.9	.8	1.2	1.1

The probability of the mean difference occurrence by chance in the "Adequacy" column is .3373.

The average status difference between the principals and teachers shown in Table LIV is about one rank. Among the "least adequate" principals the difference is slightly less. Insofar as principals see status, there seem to be no significant differences among the samples shown in Table LIV. Superintendents are about half a rank above principals, and the teachers are a whole rank below.

TABLE LIV

TEACHER-PRINCIPAL STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY PRINCIPALS
IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN
SCHOOLS AND THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Differences	All Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
			Least	Most	Least	Most
9	3.5 plus	0	0	0	0	0
8	3.0-3.4	1	0	1	0	0
7	2.5-2.9	7	1	3	1	0
6	2.0-2.4	21	6	5	1	1
5	1.5-1.9	40	11	6	2	8
4	1.0-1.4	34	6	6	3	1
3	.5- .9	34	7	10	4	3
2	0 - .4	28	9	5	8	4
1	-.5- 0	13	3	5	0	2
0	Less than -.5	13	1	4	2	2
Number of Schools		191	44	45	21	21
Means		1.1	1.1	1.0	.8	.9
Standard Deviation		.92	.85	1.05	.89	.92

Note: Probability of the mean differences occurrence by chance is more than .50.

Status from the Teacher's Standpoint

Section V of Form 5A provides the data for this series of tables.

Six scores are obtained as follows:

- (1) Superintendent: Items 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
- (2) Principal: Items 2, 3, 4, 5
- (3) Teacher: Items 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d, 7
- (4) Superintendent-Principal differences
- (5) Superintendent-Teacher differences
- (6) Principal-Teacher differences

The data in the tables present the distributions of the status scores by individual teachers, by the average of teachers' scores for each school, by a sample of "least" and "most" democratic schools and

by a sample of "least" and "most" adequate leadership. The data are tested by finding the significance of the difference between means. Correlations with other data are presented in the next chapter.

Status analyses of superintendents, principals, and teachers as seen by teachers are presented in Tables LV through LX. In Table LV the average status score of superintendents is 48.9 as seen by teachers as individuals. Superintendents have significantly higher status in "most democratic" schools as is indicated by the 49.7 compared to the 47.8 in the "least democratic" column.

TABLE LV

STATUS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AS SEEN BY TEACHERS IN ALL
SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS
AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Description	Status Scores	By Teachers	By Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
					Least	Most	Least	Most
9		60+	30	1	1	0	0	0
8	Very	56-59	64	5	2	2	0	0
7	High	54-55	45	14	2	6	1	3
6		52-53	69	22	5	7	2	2
5	High	50-51	38	26	4	8	2	6
4		48-49	79	32	5	10	3	2
3		46-47	74	39	13	7	6	3
2	Fairly	44-45	66	24	8	0	4	3
1	High	40-43	78	21	6	4	2	4
0	Average	-40	68	15	4	3	0	1
Number of Schools			611	205	50	47	20	24
Means			48.9	48.6	47.8*	49.7*	47.9#	48.5#
Standard Deviation			5.5	4.1	4.4	4.1	3.3	4.2

* The difference between the means in the "Democracy" column is very significant at the .0278 level of probability.

The mean differences between the "Adequacy" columns are beyond the .50 level.

The mean status of principals as seen by teachers is shown in Table LVI. The average score by schools of 19.5 places principals in the "above average" status position. The principals in "most democratic" schools are significantly higher in status than other principals, as the 21.1 average score indicates.

TABLE LVI

STATUS OF THE PRINCIPAL AS SEEN BY TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS
AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN THE SCHOOLS
AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Description	Status Scores	By Teachers	By Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
					Least	Most	Least	Most
9	Very High	30+	2	0	0	0	0	0
8	High	28-29	9	0	0	0	0	0
7	Fairly	26-27	18	2	0	1	0	0
6		24-25	61	9	0	7	0	1
5	High	22-23	84	17	2	7	1	1
4	Above	20-21	118	46	8	17	5	5
3	Average	18-19	115	73	14	10	7	11
2	Average	16-17	120	40	15	4	5	1
1	Below	11-15	78	18	11	1	5	5
0	Average	-11	6	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Schools			611	205	50	47	22	24
Means			20.0	19.5	18.0*	21.1*	18.2#	18.9#
Standard Deviation			3.5	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.9

* The difference in the means in the "democracy" column is very significant at the .00 level of probability.

The probability of the difference between the means in the "adequacy" column occurrence by chance is .3681.

Comparing the way principals see their own status and the status of their superintendents with the way teachers look at the status of principals and superintendents, teachers give principals and superinten-

dents lower status than the principals give themselves and the superintendents (see Tables XLVII through LIV).

Teachers give themselves above average status. This is shown by the mean score of 19.7 for the 611 teachers in Table LVII. It is highly significant to find that teachers see themselves at higher status in the "most democratic" schools as the score of 21.8 indicates when compared with "slightly lower" status in the "least democratic."

TABLE LVII

STATUS OF TEACHERS AS SEEN BY THEMSELVES IN ALL SCHOOLS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN THE SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Description	Status Scores	By Teachers	By Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
					Least	Most	Least	Most
9	Very High	30+	18	0	0	0	0	0
8		28-29	7	1	0	1	0	0
7	High	26-27	46	5	0	1	0	2
6	Fairly	24-25	105	19	3	9	1	0
5	High	22-23	63	31	4	15	2	3
4	Above Aver.	20-21	131	53	6	8	4	7
3	Average	18-19	70	51	15	9	5	4
2	Moderately	16-17	66	30	17	2	9	7
1	Low	11-15	83	8	4	0	1	1
0	Low	-11	22	7	1	2	1	0
Number			611	205	250	47	23	24
Means			19.7	19.3	18.6*	21.8*	18.6**	20.1**
Standard Deviation			4.4	3.1	3.7	3.2	2.7	3.1

* The difference between the two means in the "democracy" columns is very significant at the .00 level of probability.

** The difference between the means in the "adequacy" columns is very significant at the .01 level of probability.

Almost 40 per cent of the teachers place themselves in "fairly" to "very high" status -- 11.6 per cent in the latter.

It is highly significant to find also that in schools where leadership was rated highest by the superintendent teachers gave themselves higher status as the 20.1 mean score shows.

Principals place teachers at the "moderately low" level (see Table LI); however, teachers think of themselves as "above average."

Status differences as seen by teachers are shown in the next three tables. The status differences as seen by all teachers are .53 between the principals and superintendents; .64 between principals and teachers; and .13 between superintendents and teachers.

Table LVIII shows a difference of .41 rank between the superintendent and the principal on the average for all schools; however, it is highly significant to find only .2 rank exists in "most democratic" schools. A negative difference between superintendents and principals in nineteen "most democratic" schools, or 44.9 per cent, are seen by teachers in a higher status position than the superintendent, while only 27.3 per cent of the principals in all schools are given higher status. Sixteen per cent of the principals in least democratic schools are given higher status.

TABLE LVIII

SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPAL STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN
BY TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS AS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN
THE SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Differences	By Teachers	All Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
				Least	Most	Least	Most
9	2.0 plus	26	1	1	0	0	0
8	1.5-1.9	43	8	6	0	2	1
7	1.2-1.4	43	8	3	2	0	0
6	.9-1.1	79	17	4	2	1	2
5	.6- .8	79	36	11	7	5	5
4	.3- .5	93	45	10	9	5	9
3	0- .2	81	37	7	8	3	3
2	-.5- -.1	93	31	5	8	2	3
1	-1.0- -.4	82	18	3	11	5	1
0	Less than -1.0	22	2	0	0	0	0
Number		611	205	50	47	23	24
Means		.63	.41	.64*	.20*	.41#	.49#
Standard Deviation		4.4	3.1	2.7	3.2	2.7	3.1

* The difference between means of the "democracy" columns is highly significant at the .00 level of probability.

The probability of the occurrence by chance of the difference between means in the "adequacy" columns is more than .50.

Teachers evidently like to look up to their principals in most democratic schools because they see more of a difference in status between themselves and their principals than in the average school. The data shown in Table LIX supports these observations. The mean differences shown in the table range from .64 rank for the "all schools" to .96 for the "most democratic." It is significant to find that teachers indicate more of a difference, .96 rank, between themselves and the principals in most democratic schools, than between themselves and the principals in least democratic schools where the difference is only .61. It is also significant to discover that superintendents gave higher

adequacy ratings to principals where the status differences were less between principals and teachers. Among most adequate principals and teachers the difference is .66; among least adequate principals and teachers the difference is .91.

TABLE LIX

PRINCIPAL-TEACHER STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY TEACHERS
IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS
AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Code	Status Differences	By Teachers	All Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
				Least	Most	Least	Most
9	3.0 plus	19	0	0	0	0	0
8	2.0-2.9	61	8	2	2	0	0
7	1.5-1.9	78	16	3	7	3	1
6	1.2-1.4	53	16	2	3	1	1
5	.9-1.1	71	38	14	12	3	5
4	.6- .8	82	41	5	6	7	6
3	.3- .5	78	50	9	10	6	6
2	.0- .2	66	23	9	5	3	4
1	-1.0- 0	91	13	6	2	0	1
0	Less than -1.0	11	0	0	0	0	0
Number		610	205	50	47	23	23
Means		.64	.82	.81#	.96#	.91*	.66*
Standard Deviation		.72	.53	.60	.28	.45	.43

The difference between the means are significant at the .09 level.

* The difference between the means in the "adequacy" columns is significant at the .05 level of probability.

Table LX indicates that teachers see differences between themselves and superintendents ranging from 1.0 to 1.2 ranks. Teachers see less status difference between themselves and the superintendents who rated the principal with a higher adequacy score as the 1.0 compared to the 1.2 rank reveals; however, the difference is not significant.

These data show that teachers give higher status to principals in schools scoring high in democracy and see less difference between them-

selves and the principal in the most democratic schools.

TABLE LX

SUPERINTENDENT-TEACHER STATUS DIFFERENCES AS SEEN BY
TEACHERS IN ALL SCHOOLS AND AS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY IN
THE SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP OF PRINCIPALS

Code	Status Differences	By Teachers	By Schools	Democracy in Schools		Adequacy of Leadership	
				Least	Most	Least	Most
9	3.0 plus	34	1	1	0	0	0
8	2.0-2.9	93	10	5	1	0	1
7	1.7-1.9	62	21	7	6	4	1
6	1.4-1.6	82	28	6	4	2	1
5	1.1-1.3	80	47	11	14	8	5
4	.8-1.0	88	54	9	13	4	10
3	.5- .7	51	22	6	4	2	4
2	0- .4	70	14	4	2	2	1
1	-1.0- 0	39	8	1	3	1	1
0	Less than -1.0	7	0	0	0	0	0
Number		606	205	50	47	23	24
Means		1.3	1.2	1.3*	1.1*	1.2#	1.0#
Standard Deviation		.71	.51	.57	.49	.49	.43

* Difference between the means of the "democracy" column occurs at the .1936 level of probability.

Difference between the means of the "adequacy" column occurs at +.50 level of probability.

The foregoing chapter has compared data for all schools with samples of data from the least and most adequately led schools as well as with the least and most democratic schools.

In the next chapter correlations among descriptive data, adequacy of leadership and democracy in schools will be presented.

CHAPTER VI

DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY RELATED TO LEADERSHIP FACTORS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the relationships of democracy scores and adequacy scores to other data by means of coefficients of correlation. The other data include basic information concerning the schools and teachers, time spent on functions of leadership, the adequacy of performing functions, status as seen by principals and by teachers, and intercorrelations of the factors related to democracy.

The study by correlations was facilitated by an IBM accounting machine and the use of the process known as progressive digitizing.¹

The Data

All the data reported in previous chapters were coded and punched into three decks of IBM cards. The A-deck contained eighty items of information concerning the principal, i.e., three for coding, fourteen for basic information, fourteen for time spent on functions, sixteen for his ratings on functional adequacy, eight for status as he saw it, and twenty-five for a break down of his time spent with people and upon individual effort. There were 169 IBM cards with complete information in the A-deck. The twenty-four items concerning time spent with people and upon individual effort were left out of the B-deck and the C-deck.

¹Walter L. Deemer, Aviation Psychology Program Research Reports, Records, Analysis, and Test Procedures, No. 18, United States Army Air Forces, pp. 215-220.

The B-deck contained the averages for the first fifty-six items of the A-deck. The last twenty-four items of the A-deck were replaced by: three for coding purposes, eleven for basic information concerning the teachers for each school, five for the democracy scores made by each school, and six status scores from teacher data. The last twenty-four items also were averages of teachers' viewpoints of a school. There were 169 cards of complete data in B-deck also. A constant N was established for both the A- and B-decks because relationships among data and ease of calculation were desirable.

The C-deck contained 501 cards of complete information. The C-deck differed from the B-deck in that each card of information contained the information for an individual teacher. Although there were 622 teachers reporting data, only 501 provided complete information for correlation purposes.

The three decks contained identical information in the first fifty-six items and differed in the last twenty-four, e.g., A-deck had time analysis items, B-deck had averages of the teachers' information, and C-deck had the individual teachers' information.

The Formula for Coefficients of Correlation

In order to calculate the coefficients of correlation from the basic data provided¹ by IBM tabulation, the following formula was used:

¹

J. P. Guilford, loc. cit., p. 45.

$$r = \frac{N\sum xy - \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{N\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2} \sqrt{N\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2}}$$

r = Coefficient of correlation

Σ = Sigma, or sum

x = Variables, either total democracy score or total adequacy score

y = Basic data variables

Since variable 47, the total adequacy score for leadership, and 74, the total democracy score for schools, were correlated with 103 other variables, they became constants in the formula.

The reader should keep in mind that a constant N of 169 for schools and 501 for teachers was maintained in all correlations in order to facilitate calculations. For schools, the N of 169 represents 61.7 per cent of the city high schools in the State of Ohio. The N of 501 is 5.2 per cent of the high school teachers in the State of Ohio.

Procedure for Calculating the Coefficients of Correlation

All data were organized to fit the ten categories adaptable to IBM tabulating and sorting equipment. The IBM tabulator provided the $\sum x$'s (sum of variable x) in the first operation, $\sum x^2$ (sum of variable x squared) and $\sum xy$ (the sum of variable x multiplied by variable y) in the second operation for the calculation of the coefficients of correlation.

The tabulator recorded the information as follows for variable 47 controlled on variables 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, shown in Figure 12.

Figure 12

Arrangement of Data Recorded by IBM Tabulator
From Which Σx 's for Correlations Were Obtained

Total Democracy Variable	Interval	Concepts 70	Organization 71	Principal 72	Staff 73	Total Democracy 74
74	9	52	72	80	72	81
74	8	119	169	189	166	185
74	7	205	295	347	289	325
74	6	302	405	484	400	439
74	5	407	487	617	494	544
74	4	539	614	789	625	660
74	3	618	688	893	700	717
74	2	691	740	969	752	749
74	1	748	783	1021	790	763
74	Σx 's =	780	797	1035	803	763

The last line provides the Σx 's, i.e., the sums for variables 70, 71, 72, 73, 74 when controlled on variable 74. In the second operation, the above data were summarized to provide Σx^2 's and Σxy 's.

Σx 780 in the example for variable 70 is a sum of the cumulative totals for each interval added progressively to the next, i.e., the 52 is added to make the cumulative total of 119, and 119 is added in to make 205. As a result 52 is added nine times, 67 or (119-52) is added eight times, 86 or (205-67-52) is added seven times and so on. As a result, when the sums for each interval are added, i.e., 52, 119, 205, etc., the result is Σxy , or Σx^2 in this case.

In the second tabulation operation the data were recorded as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13

Arrangement of Data Summarized by IBM Tabulator
to Provide $\sum x^2$'s and $\sum xy$'s for Correlations

Variables	70	71	72	73	74
<u>70</u>	<u>4032*</u>	3849	4804	3801	3681
<u>71</u>	3849	<u>4743*</u>	5335	4309	4253
<u>72</u>	4804	5335	<u>6991*</u>	5410	5389
<u>73</u>	3801	4309	5410	<u>4389*</u>	4288
<u>74</u>	3681	4253	5389	4288	<u>4463*</u>

* $\sum x^2$'s, i.e., variable 70, 70 or variable 71, 71, etc.

All numbers except those with the asterisk (*) are
 $\sum xy$'s, i.e., the sums of variables 70 and 71, or
70 and 72, etc.

After arriving at these basic data, i.e., $\sum x$, $\sum x^2$, $\sum xy$, the work sheet shown in Figure 14 was set up to aid machine calculation of the coefficients of correlation. A portion of the work sheet is shown as an example:

Figure 14

A Portion of the Work Sheet from Which Basic Data
Were Taken to Calculate Coefficients of Correlation

Variable	Description	Basic Elements			Democracy Variable 74		Adequacy Variable 47	
		$\sum x$	$\sum x^2$	*NO	$\sum xy$	r	$\sum xy$	r
70	Concepts	780	4032	268.6	3681	.242	2202	-.032#
71	Organization	797	4743	408.3	4253	.553	2048	.207#
72	Principal	1035	6991	332.4	5389	.877	2736	.224#
73	Staff	803	4387	315.0	4288	.857	2105	.210#
74	Total	763	4463	414.9	4463	.999	1941	.217#

The signs were changed to avoid confusing the reader but without changing the interpretation of data.

$$* NO = \sqrt{N\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2}$$

The procedure described in this section made available data for 5,305 coefficients of correlation since there were recorded information for 103 variables; however, this research provides coefficients of correlation for the total adequacy score and total democracy score related to each of the 103 variables making a total of 206. These coefficients of correlation and their significance are described in later sections of this chapter.

The Significance of the Coefficients of Correlation

In the tables of coefficients of correlations to follow, the total democracy score for each school and the total adequacy score for each high school principal are correlated with each of the 103 characteristics of the schools. The reader should keep in mind the assumption that the amount of democracy increases in a school with the increase of score. A high score means high democracy; however, the data for adequacy were arranged so that a high score means low adequacy. Therefore, a negative adequacy coefficient would mean positive correlation. To avoid confusion, the signs on adequacy coefficients were changed so that adequacy and democracy coefficients are comparable.

The data show that coefficients of correlation are small in size, i.e., less than thirty. It is generally accepted that as the size of a coefficient of correlation approaches 1.00 the stronger the correlation becomes. Significance of the size of a coefficient is judged primarily by the probability of coefficient arising by chance. According to Guilford¹, with 167 degrees of freedom and two variables a coefficient

1

J. P. Guilford, op. cit., pp. 58-63, and p. 549.

of correlation of .151 is significant and a coefficient of .198 is considered very significant. By significant is meant that the probability of a coefficient of correlation arising from an uncorrelated population is 5 chances in 100 which is indicated by .05; by very significant is meant a probability of 1 chance in 100 shown by .01 that it could have arisen if there were no true correlation. If there are 500 degrees of freedom and two variables, a significant coefficient would be .088; a very significant r would be .115.

Since there are 169 sets of complete information for schools with two variables making 167 degrees of freedom, a coefficient of correlation of .151 is considered significant and a coefficient of .198 is considered very significant for democracy and adequacy scores. For teachers' data a coefficient of .088 is considered significant and one of .115 very significant since there are 501 cases with two variables.

The reader should also keep in mind that democracy scores were developed from evaluations by teachers and that adequacy scores came from evaluations by superintendents. Both sets of data came at separated intervals and from separate sources.

Correlations of Democracy and Adequacy with Basic Information

Table LXI presents the coefficients of correlation of democracy and adequacy as related to basic information concerning the schools in general. Democracy does not seem to be significantly related to many of the items of basic data. The relationship between adequacy and the average teacher's age produces a significant r of .197 for the schools as a whole and an r of .224 when teachers are considered individually.

This means that as the adequacy of a principal as seen by the superintendent increases so do the teachers' ages.

TABLE LXI

BASIC INFORMATION CONCERNING 169 OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS AND 501 TEACHERS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION

No.	Form	IBM		169 Schools		501 Teachers	
	3	Var.	Basic Information	Democracy	Adequacy [#]	Democracy	Adequacy [#]
2	5		School Enrollment	.072	.026	.065	.080
3	6		Number of Teachers	.126	.092	---	---
4	7		Number of Men	-.021	.004	---	---
6	10		Age of Teachers	-.014	.197**	.060	.224**
7	11		Years Teaching	.025	-.061	---	---
8	12		Economic Level	.033	.087	.001	.001

Democracy is IBM variable 74

Adequacy is IBM variable 47

** Probability of .01 of occurrence by chance

[#] Signs have been changed to make all coefficients in the table comparable.

Note: Coefficients left out could not be calculated because of the nature of reported information.

Table LXII shows coefficients of correlation relating basic information concerning teachers with democracy in schools and adequacy of leadership. Democracy scores seem to increase as the average number of leadership positions a teacher holds decrease as the r of $-.165$ shows. This can be interpreted to mean that the more experienced leaders see less democracy in the schools. An r of $.112$ for democracy related to teachers' ages indicates the tendency for the age of teachers to increase with the scores they gave. The more experienced teachers gave higher scores as the r of $.096$ for experience-democracy reveals. The $-.097$ for

training period-democracy seems to corroborate the experience and age observations. The earlier trained teachers, older and more experienced teachers tend to give the higher democracy ratings. Adequacy doesn't seem to be significantly related to any of the data, although the $-.149$ for Number 5 shows the inclination for superintendents' evaluations to decrease as the experience of the teachers increases.

TABLE LXII

BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT 501 TEACHERS IN 169 OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS
REPORTED BY TEACHERS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND
ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION

No.	Form	IBM	Basic Information	169 Schools		501 Teachers	
5A	Var.		about Teachers	Democracy	Adequacy [#]	Democracy	Adequacy [#]
1	59	Sex		----	----	----	----
2	60	Age		.065	-.089	.112*	-.008
3	61	Marital Status		----	----	----	----
4	62	Dependents		.000	-.078	.033	-.024
5	63	Teaching Experience		.062	-.149	.096*	-.033
6	64	Years in School		-.107	-.097	.023	-.024
7	65	Subjects Taught		----	----	----	----
8	66	Semester hours		-.023	.049	-.014	.026
9	67	Degrees		----	----	----	----
10	68	Training Period		-.106	.081	-.097*	.009
11	69	Leadership positions		-.165*	.019	.000	.008

* Probability of .05 of occurring by chance

[#] Signs have been changed to make all coefficients in the table comparable.

Democracy and Adequacy Related to Status Factors

The eight status factors as seen by principals and related to democracy and adequacy appear in Table LXIII. The $-.115$ principal status-democracy correlations under teachers indicates that those principals who gave themselves higher status received lower democracy scores; however, the $.122$ reveals that superintendents were inclined to give higher adequacy ratings to principals who gave themselves higher status. This may be evidence of administrative cliquishness or leadership stratification. The $-.133$ principal-attitude r shows that teachers gave lower democracy scores where principals had well-defined status attitudes, i.e., believe that status difference in society should be maintained, that differences should be visible and operative, that individuals in high and low status positions deserve to be there, that competition for status is a good thing. The $-.092$ emphasizes that superintendents gave lower adequacy scores to principals who have well-defined status preferences, and the perception r , $-.127$ shows superintendents gave low adequacy scores to principals who maximized status differences in American society.

Also in the table, the $.113$ adequacy-superintendent correlation depicts a tendency for the status given the superintendent by the principal to increase as the adequacy of the principal as seen by the superintendent increases. The principals gave high status to the superintendents when they saw themselves higher on the scale. The adequacy-principal correlation of $.122$ further supports the observation, that as the principal's status as seen by himself increases, so does his adequacy as seen by the superintendent. The $.102$ for variable 55 indicates that

as the gap between the status of principals and teachers increases so does the adequacy rating. This is further evidence of administrative cliquishness.

TABLE LXIII

STATUS FACTORS AS SEEN BY THE PRINCIPAL RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND TO ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION

Score No.	IBM Var.	Status Factors	169 Schools		501 Teachers	
			Democracy	Adequacy#	Democracy	Adequacy#
1	48	His Attitude	-.133	-.078	-.068	-.092*
2	49	His Perception	.071	-.065	.035	-.127**
3	50	Superintendent	.019	.038	.032	.113*
4	51	Teacher	.057	.022	.057	-.018
5	52	Principal	.009	.139	-.115**	.122**
6	53	Status Difference (Supt.-Teacher)	.059	-.054	.048	-.009
7	54	Status Difference (Supt.-Principal)	-.052	-.097	-.013	-.024
8	55	Status Difference (Prin.-Teacher)	-.040	.095	.042	.102*

*Probability of .05 of occurrence by chance

**Probability of .01 of occurrence by chance

#Signs changed to make coefficients comparable

Relationships between democracy, adequacy, and certain status factors as seen by teachers are provided in Table LXIV. Four status coefficients of correlation are very significantly related to democracy. Teachers apparently gave more democracy and higher status to themselves, than principals, and superintendents did. As democracy increases, teachers saw status increasing.

TABLE LXIV

STATUS FACTORS AS SEEN BY TEACHERS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS
AND TO ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION

Score	IBM Var.	Seen Status Of	169 Schools		501 Teachers	
			Democracy	Adequacy [#]	Democracy	Adequacy [#]
1	75	Superintendent	.162*	.113*	.216**	.112*
2	76	Principal	.368**	.091	.397**	.054
3	77	Teacher	.310**	-.082	.281**	.075
4	78	Status Difference (Supt.-Principal)	-.220**	.023	-.213**	.058
5	79	Status Difference (Prin.-Teacher)	.090	.005	.119**	-.001
6	80	Status Difference (Supt.-Teacher)	-.069	.003	-.057	.026

*Probability of .05 of occurrence by chance

**Probability of .01 of occurrence by chance

[#]Signs changed to make coefficients comparable

Teachers gave more status to superintendents who rated principals higher in adequacy, as the coefficients of .113 and .112 for variable 75 will show. Teachers saw more democracy in schools where they gave superintendents higher status. They assigned principals significantly high status in schools that compared favorably with the democratic criteria as the .368 and .397 reveals for variable 76. Teachers also see themselves in higher status positions when they see their school higher in terms of the criteria. The coefficients of teacher status-democracy are .310 and .281 respectively. As the status difference between the superintendent and principal increases, then teachers see less democracy as the negative coefficients -.220 and -.213 depict; however, teachers apparently want to look up to the principals because

the .119 for variable 79 shows that as the status difference widens between themselves and the principals, teachers are inclined to see more democracy.

Time Factors Related to Democracy and Adequacy

Table LXV exhibits the relationship between the amount of time a principal says he spends in contact with people and the democracy score he receives from his teachers and the adequacy score he receives from his superintendent. Although there appears to be no significant correlation the r 's are larger for the democracy scores, which indicates a tendency for democracy scores to increase with the increase in the amount of time a principal spends in contact with people. The .137 is at the .07 level of probability and reveals, that as the time principals spend with people increases, the amount of democracy assigned to the school also increases.

TABLE LXV

TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS IN CONTACT WITH PEOPLE RELATED
TO DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

No.	Form	IBM	Time Spent by	169 Schools		501 Teachers	
3	Var.		Principals	Democracy	Adequacy#	Democracy	Adequacy#
1	56		In Contact with People	.37***	-.093	.062	-.040

***At the .07 level of probability

#Sign changed so that coefficients may be comparable

In regard to the democracy-adequacy-function relationship, the coefficients of correlation are presented in Table LXVI. The most significant relationships are those having to do with supervision, pupil personnel, and teacher personnel. The superintendents and teachers

tended to rate principals higher who reported a greater amount of time spent upon supervision as the .179 and .139 show. Although the latter coefficient is at the .07 level of probability, it indicates the same direction.

TABLE LXVI

TIME SPENT BY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ON FOURTEEN
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY
IN SCHOOLS AND TO THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

No. Form 4	IBM Var.	Administrative Functions of Principals	169 Schools	
			Democracy	Adequacy#
1	19	Inspection	.015	-.108
2	20	Research	.141***	-.131***
3	21	Planning	.078	.046
4	22	Procedure	-.070	.032
5	23	Coordination	-.086	-.021
6	24	Evaluation	.092	.033
7	25	Interpretation	.054	.059
8	26	Supervision	.139***	.179*
9	27	Personnel	.184*	.067
10	28	Pupil Control	-.210**	-.207**
11	29	Public Relations	.005	-.068
12	30	Professional	-.122	.058
13	31	Consultation	-.117	.040
14	32	Material	-.029	.000

*Probability of occurrence by chance is .05

**Probability of occurrence by chance is .01

***Probability of occurrence by chance is .07

#Signs changed to make coefficients comparable

Teachers were inclined to give higher democracy scores to schools in which principals spend a greater portion of their time upon supervision. A .184 for variable 27 further supports this observation; however, principals who reported a greater portion of time with pupils, i.e., with attendance, scheduling, counseling, and discipline were given lower democracy scores by teachers and lower adequacy scores by the superintendent as the $-.210$ democracy-pupil coefficient and the $-.207$ adequacy-pupil coefficient emphasizes.

The Relationship of Adequacy to Democracy

Table LXVII exhibits the most significant coefficient of correlation in this study, the .217 for variable 47 which indicates there is a positive relationship between the democracy score given by teachers and the adequacy score provided by the superintendent. Variable 47 is the total adequacy score combining scores from the fourteen functions. The correlation between democracy and each administrative function are also shown.

A coefficient of .276 for variable 41 indicates that as the adequacy for the personnel function increases so does the democracy evaluation. Nine of the fourteen functions are significantly related to democracy. The coordination-democracy relationship of .246 is second most significant. Both of these are higher than the .217 for the total. Research (.217), Public Relations (.194), Interpretation (.181), Pupil Personnel (.179), Consultation (.167), Evaluation (.163), and Inspection (.153) appear to be significantly related to democracy also.

TABLE LXVII

THE ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
EVALUATED BY SUPERINTENDENTS RELATED TO THE DEMOCRACY
IN SCHOOLS AS SCORED BY TEACHERS

No. Form 4	IBM Var.	Administrative Functions of the High School Principal	Adequacy of Leadership Related to Democracy
1	33	Inspection	.153*
2	34	Research	.217**
3	35	Planning	.084
4	36	Procedures	.010
5	37	Coordination	.245**
6	38	Evaluation	.163*
7	39	Interpretation	.181*
8	40	Supervision	.141***
9	41	Personnel	.276**
10	42	Pupil Control	.179*
11	43	Public Relations	.194*
12	44	Professional	.123
13	45	Consultation	.167*
14	46	Material	-.025
47		Total Adequacy	.217

*Probability of occurrence by chance is .05

**Probability of occurrence by chance is .01

***Probability of occurrence by chance is .07

#Sign changes to make coefficients comparable

Only the total adequacy score, variable 47, was carried over to C-deck for correlations with what individual teachers scored schools on democracy. The coefficient .117 as shown in Table LXVIII is small but significant because of the large number of cases; however, the interpretation is somewhat different. The .117 means, that as the adequacy of the principal with whom a teacher worked became more adequate in the eyes of the superintendent, the teacher was inclined to give him and the school a significantly higher democracy score.

TABLE LXVIII

DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOLS AND ADEQUACY OF LEADERSHIP

Sec.	Phases of Democracy		169 Schools	501 Teachers
Form	IBM	Making up		
5A	Var.	the Total Score	Adequacy	Adequacy
II	70	Concepts	-.032	-.048
III	71	Organization	.207**	.131**
IV	72	Principal	.224**	.133**
V	73	Teachers	.210**	.093*
Total	74	Democracy Score	.217**	.117**

* Probability of occurrence by chance is .05

** Probability of occurrence by chance is .01

The relationship between what teachers are reported to believe (concepts) and the adequacy of a principal is weak as the -.032 and -.048 for variable 70 shows.

Reliability of the Criteria

A certain measure of reliability of the democratic criteria is shown by the intercorrelations of the various sections of Form 5A which are shown in Table LXIX.

TABLE LXIX

INTERCORRELATIONS OF THE DIFFERENT SCORES MADE ON
THE SECTIONS OF CRITERIA FOR DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

Sec. Form	Description	Variables	70	71	72	73	74
II	Concepts	70	1.00	--	--	--	--
III	Organization	71	.26	1.00	--	--	--
IV	Principal	72	.05	.57	1.00	--	--
V	Teachers	73	.18	.69	.79	1.00	--
Total	Total Democracy	74	.24	.65	.88	.86	1.00

The table shows high coefficients for all sections of the inquiry except for Section II concerning fundamental concepts; however, this coefficient is statistically significant.

CHAPTER VII

MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

In the foregoing chapters, criteria in the form of democratic leader-group behavior characteristics were established and applied to the Ohio city high schools. Data were analyzed in terms of basic information concerning the principal, the high school, and the teachers.

In this chapter, certain major conclusions will be presented in terms of the criteria as they apply to the democracy and adequacy of school organizations. Significant relationships among basic data, time studies, functional adequacy, and status of personnel will be summarized.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research has been to study the functional adequacy of high school principals in relationship to the democracy existing in the high school organizations as measured by certain democratic criteria.

To study democratic leadership, 134 criteria of democratic leader-group behavior were established. These were applied to 205 city high schools, or 74.8 per cent of those in the State of Ohio, by 622 teachers or 6.5 per cent of all the high school teachers in the State--an average of three teachers per school.

To study the adequacy of high school leadership 88, or 77.8 per cent, of the city superintendents evaluated the principals in 218 high

schools in terms of fourteen functions.

Principals in 182 high schools provided data concerning the school, teachers, superintendent, status factors, and time analyses.

The data came from three different sources--principals, superintendents, and teachers, at different times--fall, winter, and spring, respectively, of the 1949-50 school year. When data were matched for completeness, 169 principals, 501 teachers, and 83 superintendents had furnished all the necessary information.

These data were arranged to be scored, sorted, and analyzed on IBM equipment. Information was condensed to provide 131 different pieces of coded material from three decks of IBM cards--A-deck, 77; B-deck, 22; and C-deck, 22. Each of the three decks had 52 duplicate items. The criteria were scored on IBM equipment.

To accomplish the above, letters of invitation were sent to participants through the courtesy of the Bureau of Educational Research and the Personnel Research Board of The Ohio State University.

Criteria of Democratic Leadership

A list of 134 criteria for democratic leadership was established from a group of 209 presented to 30 experts in secondary education for evaluation in terms of an ideal democratically administered school. The group of 209 had been screened from among 1,179 behavior descriptions presented to 32 persons randomly selected from the field of education.

These criteria were incorporated into an inquiry and presented to teachers by which to evaluate their schools. As a result the average school received a score of 116.5, or 71.7 per cent of a perfect score,

while the average teacher scored his school 122.3, which is 72.8 per cent of perfect. These data are shown in Table LXX.

TABLE LXX
AVERAGE DEMOCRATIC CRITERIA SCORES

Form 3 Section	Criteria Classification	Schools		Teachers	
		Score	%	Score	%
II	Fundamental Concepts	8.2	70.5	8.5	70.7
III	Organization	3.2	63.3	3.2	63.3
IV	Principal Description	71.6	73.9	71.3	73.8
V	Staff Description	32.2	68.7	33.1	69.2
	Mean Score	116.5	71.7	122.3	72.8

Teachers gave themselves only 68.7 per cent and 69.2 per cent of their score while giving principals the higher percentages of 73.9 per cent and 73.8 per cent of the total possible score. This is evidence that teachers consider the characteristics of the school pertaining to themselves less democratic than those pertaining to the principal. Characteristics of organization received 63.3 per cent of the possible score, the lowest rating of all.

A qualitative analysis of the democracy scores made by schools and given by teachers are presented in Table LXXI. The averages of 116.5 and 122.3 lie in the "fairly much" interval indicating that schools are "fairly" democratic; however, this is slightly below 134 which would be the exact score for that description. Of the schools, 79.9 per cent are "fairly" democratic; 62.9 per cent of the teachers gave scores falling into this category. Twelve schools received negative scores indicating non-democratic tendencies. Seventy-seven teachers gave negative evaluations. On the other hand, 10 schools had a "great deal" of democracy. Eighty teachers considered their schools as "very "

democratic indicating that "a great deal" of democracy existed.

TABLE LXXI

DEMOCRACY SCORES MADE BY SCHOOLS AND GIVEN BY TEACHERS

Amount of Democracy	Score	Schools		Teachers	
		f	%	f	%
A Great Deal	200 - 268	0	4.9	80	12.9
Fairly Much	60 - 199	164	79.9	389	62.9
To Some Degree	0 - 59	19	9.3	73	11.8
Non-democratic	-59 - 0	12	5.9	77	12.4
N		205	100.0	619	100.0
Mean Score		116.5		122.3	

Teachers scored their schools higher on some criteria than others. Those criteria most characteristic of schools in order of their acceptance by teachers are as follows:

Fundamental Concepts

1. Learning takes place in the process of doing.
2. Most teachers are capable of managing themselves.

The Principal

1. He does not select the textbooks for teachers' use.
2. He does not pit one teacher against another.
3. He expects the school to achieve as much as possible for each individual.
4. He does not play one teacher against another.
5. He does not lord it over the other members of the staff.
6. He does not discourage teachers from pursuing their individual aims.
7. He does not discourage teachers from occupying positions of leadership.
8. He respects all youth regardless of social or economic standing.

9. He does not prepare the courses of study for the teachers.
10. He is friendly and approachable with teachers and pupils.
11. He is well acquainted with the community and its problems.
12. He does not dominate the other members of the staff for personal reasons.
13. He does not "ride" teachers who make mistakes.
14. He is easy to work with.
15. He is not austere and aloof from the other members of the staff.
16. He does not break rules he wouldn't permit others to break.
17. He does not criticize teachers before other members of the staff.
18. He trusts the other members of the staff.

The Teachers

1. Teachers do not insist that the principal outline their work for them.
2. Teachers help select textbooks.
3. Teachers are free to experiment with different methods of teaching.
4. Teachers help select their supplies and equipment.

Upon close examination of the foregoing list of descriptions most characteristic of Ohio schools leader-group behavior, it is evident that the principals are skilled in the art of human relations with teachers, pupils, and the community. Teachers are free to select materials, books, and to arrange courses, but go very little further in administrative participation.

By contrast, those descriptions least characteristic of Ohio high schools reveal that the operational techniques of democratic organization exist only to some degree. Those descriptions are interpreted in the following list:

Fundamental Concepts

1. Teachers "tend to agree" that leadership ability is a gift that only a few possess.
2. Teachers are "undecided" about whether or not leadership is confined to the thinking of a few capable individuals.

Organization

1. A professional relations committee only "once in a while" promotes in-service growth of teachers.
2. Teachers "occasionally" dominate their students.
3. The arrangement of the school organization aids the cooperative efforts of the group "to some degree".

The Principal

1. He "generally" plans the school program without the help of the teachers.
2. He "occasionally" speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
3. He generates "only a little" power of leadership in others.
4. He develops in others "only a little" power for initiating action.
5. He acts as a boss "once in a while".
6. Most principals sympathetically counsel teachers and pupils "fairly much" with their personal problems; however, quite a few only do so "once in a while".
7. He makes it possible for students to participate "to some degree" in the administration of the school.
8. He displays skill "to some degree" in the use of cooperative techniques.

The Teachers

1. Teachers are "fairly often" propelled by the aims of the principal.
2. Teachers clarify faculty issues through faculty forums "only once in a while".
3. Teachers help interpret "to some degree" the school to the public through an organized public relations program.
4. Teachers help "to some degree" with the planning of the supervisory program.
5. Teachers help "to some degree" with the evaluation of their own professional growth.
6. Teachers help "to some degree" with the evaluation of salary schedules.
7. Teachers only "occasionally" help the principal through advisory groups.
8. Teachers "occasionally", if not frequently, cooperate in their research upon common problems.
9. Teachers "occasionally" help induce new staff members into the faculty.
10. Teachers help organize the curriculum "to some degree."
11. Teachers share "to some degree" with the principal in determining their conditions of work.

It is quite evident that many cooperative techniques are only used "to some degree" in the operation of high schools.

The Functional Adequacy Criteria

Most principals are "fairly adequate" in terms of the fourteen functions contributing to the mean score of 27.6 indicated in Table LXXII for all schools. There is a significant difference between low and high democracy schools in regard to adequacy of leadership.

TABLE LXXII

THE ADEQUACY OF PRINCIPALS RELATED TO DEMOCRACY

Adequate	Score	All Schools		Low Democracy		High Democracy	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Entirely	0-14	28	12.9	6	12.7	4	8.9
Fairly	15-29	112	51.4	18	38.4	29	64.4
To Some Degree	30-52	78	35.7	23	48.9	12	26.7
N		218	100.0	47	100.0	45	100.0
Mean Adequacy Score		27.6		29.9*		25.6*	
Standard Deviation		8.5		9.5		7.9	

*A significant mean difference at the .02 level of probability

One out of eight, or 12.9 per cent of the principals, are considered "entirely adequate"; another third are rated adequate "to some degree." Least democratic schools have less adequate leadership than those schools having a high democracy rating. The reader is reminded that a high adequacy score means less adequacy; a low score means high adequacy. Of the schools scoring high in democracy, 73.3 per cent are considered "fairly" or "entirely" adequate, while only 61.1 per cent of the "low democracy" schools can be found in these classifications.

The percentages of the respondents agreeing with the criteria at various levels of adequacy are presented in Table LXXIII.

The percentages in both high and low democracy categories decrease in high democracy from 70.7 per cent to 60.9 per cent; in the low democracy from 60.6 per cent to 55.1 per cent. Here is evidence that adequacy and democratic leader-group behavior vary one with the other. The table also reveals that the average high school is 62.4 per cent democratic in terms of the democratic criteria of this study.

TABLE LXXIII

THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS AGREEING
WITH THE CRITERIA AND RELATED TO ADEQUACY

Adequacy	High Democracy Agreement	Low Democracy Agreement
High	70.7%	60.6%
Median	64.6%	60.7%
Low	60.9%	55.1%
Average	62.4%	

Further evidence that adequacy and democracy vary one with the other is presented in Table LXXIV. As adequacy decreases, democracy scores decrease from 153 to 132 for criteria "most characteristic" of schools, and from 46 to 2 for criteria "least characteristic" of schools.

TABLE LXXIV

SCORES MADE ON CRITERIA MOST CHARACTERISTIC OF SCHOOLS AS
RELATED TO SCORES MADE ON CRITERIA LEAST CHARACTERISTIC
OF SCHOOLS AND RELATED TO THE ADEQUACY OF SCHOOLS

Democracy	Adequacy	Scores on Criteria Most Characteristic	Scores on Criteria Least Characteristic
High	High	153	46
High	Low	147	29
Low	High	133	22
Low	Low	132	2
Average Democracy Score		137	15

Basic Information

Table LXXV shows that the average teacher among all schools is 44.0 years of age and has taught 21.4 years, 13.8 in the same school. She has 1.7 dependents and 152.5 semester hours, or an equivalent of 5 years of educational preparation.

TABLE LXXV
BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHERS

Basic Data	All Schools	Lowest Democracy	Highest Democracy	Level of Probability
Age of teachers	44.0	44.3	46.9	.11
Dependents of teachers	1.7	1.8	1.4	.41
Teaching experience	21.4	20.8	22.8	.11
Tenure in school	13.8	15.0	13.7	.50
Semester hours training	152.5	153.4	152.2	.50

The data in the table show that the average teacher who gave the highest democracy score was slightly older, had fewer dependents, and had greater teaching experience but had taught a shorter period in the same school. Besides the information in the table, findings of this research reveal that significantly more women give higher democracy scores than men. Significantly more married people give lower democracy scores than single persons. Industrial arts and mathematics teachers give lower democracy scores than others while foreign language teachers give higher scores.

Data in Table LXXVI show that the average school receiving a high democracy score was larger, had more teachers, had a principal older than the average of the staff, and the economic level of the area in which the school was located was in the middle class section of the city. Of the principals receiving high adequacy ratings, only 47.6 per cent are older than their faculties. In other words, superintendents were inclined to give higher ratings to younger men. On the other hand, teachers were inclined to give the school with the older principal a higher democracy score.

TABLE IXXVI

BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHERS
RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY

Basic Information	All Schools	Adequacy		Democracy	
		Low	High	Low	High
Enrollment	854	726	845	726	906
No. of teachers	41.4	30.7	35.5	31.1	38.1
No. of men	17.3	17.8	18.3	15.5	18.1
Economic level of school	5.3	5.1	5.4	5.4	5.2
Age of principal	68.1%	76.2%#	47.6%#	68.3%	77.8%

#Significant at the .02 level of probability.

Time Studies

The average principal in the most democratic school spends more (74.9 per cent) of his time in contact with people and less (25.1 per cent) of his time in individual effort than other principals. Of the time he spends in contact with people, 29.8 per cent is spent with students, 17.6 per cent with assistants and teachers, and 9.1 per cent with outside persons. Of the time spent in individual effort, 35.0 per cent is spent observing work of pupils, teachers, and custodians; 9.6 per cent reading and answering mail; and 11.0 per cent reflecting on plans and procedures.

Table LXXVII exhibits the six administrative functions upon which the average principal spends most of his time. The principal in the most democratic school spends more (16.3 per cent) of his time on Supervision and less time with Pupils (14.4 per cent) than the administrator in the least democratic school. He also spends a greater proportion of his time (10.2 per cent) planning.

TABLE LXXVII

SIX FUNCTIONS RANKED ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT IN PERFORMING THE FUNCTION IN SCHOOLS WITH THE MOST DEMOCRACY COMPARED WITH ALL SCHOOLS AND RELATED TO ADEQUACY

Democracy Rank	Function	All Schools	Adequacy		Democracy	
			Least	Most	Least	Most
1	Supervision	14.1	11.6	17.2	14.0	16.3
2	Pupils	16.1	18.5	14.7	17.5	14.4
3	Planning	9.2	8.4	8.9	9.1	10.2
4	Evaluation	7.2	8.0	8.7	7.2	8.1
5	Coordination	8.1	7.4	8.3	9.2	7.7
5	Persomel	6.4	6.6	7.1	6.0	4.8

Status Factors

Higher status is given to leadership in schools receiving high democracy scores. Table LXXVIII reveals that superintendents with most democratic schools have "high" status; those with least democratic schools have only "fairly high" status. Principals have "above average" status in the most democratic schools and only "average" status in least democratic schools. Teachers give themselves "fairly high" status and principals "above average" in the "most democratic" schools in comparison with "average" status for both in the "least democratic" schools and the "moderately low" status given to teachers in all schools by principals. In general, principals give themselves "higher" status than teachers do. On the other hand, teachers tend to give themselves higher status than the principals do.

Significantly less difference in status is seen between superintendents and teachers in "most democratic" schools; on the other hand principals see more status difference between superintendents and teachers in "most democratic" schools. Those principals who gave them-

TABLE LXXVIII

STATUS FACTORS CONCERNING SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS,
AND TEACHERS, AND RELATED TO DEMOCRACY AND ADEQUACY

Personnel	All Schools	Principals				Teachers			
		Democracy		Adequacy		Democracy		Adequacy	
		Least	Most	Least	Most	Least	Most	Least	Most
Superintendents	Fairly High	Fairly High	Fairly High	Fairly High	Fairly High	Fairly High	High	Fairly High	High
Principals	Fairly High	Fairly High	Fairly High	Average	Fairly High	Average	Above Average	Above Average	Above Average
Teachers	Moderately Low	Moderately Low	Average	Moderately Low	Moderately Low	Average	Fairly High	Average	Above Average
Difference Supt.-Princ.	.4	.5	.5	1.1	.7	.6*	.2*	.4	.5
Supt.-Teacher	1.5	1.0*	1.4*	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.0
Prin.-Teacher	1.1	1.1	1.0	.8	.9	.8	1.0	.9**	.7**

*Significant difference at the .00 level of probability

**Significant difference at the .05 level of probability

selves high status were rated high on adequacy by superintendents but low on democracy by teachers. This leads to the conclusion that as administrative cliquishness increases democracy decreases.

In general, a half rank of difference in status exists between superintendents and principals, one and a quarter ranks between superintendents and teachers, and one rank between principals and teachers.

Significant Relationships

An objective analysis of the adequacy of leadership, defined in terms of fourteen functions, evaluated by superintendents and related to democracy, defined in terms of 134 leader-group behavior descriptions and applied as criteria by teachers to their schools has been one of the major purposes of this study. That coefficient of correlation was found to be .217 which has a probability of less than .01 occurring by chance. This coefficient means that as democracy as seen by teachers increases in a school so does the adequacy of leadership as judged by superintendents.

Although the coefficient is small, it is statistically significant. Since the data correlated arose from different sources and at separated intervals, it is stronger than its size indicates at first glance because it is not contaminated through proximity factors such as time, persons, or source.

Nine of the fourteen functions in Table LXXIX from which total adequacy was determined are statistically significant.

TABLE LXXIX

FUNCTIONAL ADEQUACY RELATED TO DEMOCRACY

Functional Adequacy	Correlation with Democracy [#]
Personnel	.276**
Coordination	.245**
Research	.217**
Public Relations	.194*
Interpretation	.181*
Pupils	.179*
Consultation	.167*
Evaluation	.163*
Inspection	.153*
Total Adequacy	.217**

**Probability of occurring by chance is .01

*Probability of occurring by chance is .05

[#]Signs were changed to make coefficients comparable throughout the study

Table LXXX shows the relationship of time spent upon various functions as reported by principals to adequacy as evaluated by superintendents to be a coefficient of $-.210$, which indicates that as the time principals spend with Pupils increases the adequacy rating decreases. The time-democracy coefficient of $-.207$ indicates that as time spent with Pupils increases the democracy score tends to decrease.

TABLE LXXX

TIME SPENT BY PRINCIPALS ON FUNCTIONS
RELATED TO ADEQUACY AND DEMOCRACY

Function	Schools	
	Democracy	Adequacy [#]
Supervision	.139	.179*
Personnel	.184*	.067
Pupils	$-.210$ **	$-.207$ **

*Probability of .05 of occurring by chance

**Probability .01 of occurring by chance

[#]Signs changed to make coefficients comparable.

On the other hand, both democracy and adequacy tend to increase with the amount of time spent on Supervision and with Personnel.

Very few significant relationships exist between basic information and democracy and adequacy. Superintendents were inclined to give higher adequacy to principals with older teachers as the $-.197$ and $-.224$ previously shown in Table LXI, page 187, indicates. The $.112$ shown before in Table LXII, page 188, shows a slight tendency for older teachers to give higher democracy scores.

The highest coefficients of correlation were found to exist among status factors and democracy. The relationship between the principals' status and the democracy score was found to be $.368$ which means that a teacher who could see more democracy in the school would also assign more status to the principal. The teacher status-democracy coefficient of $.310$ indicates that as a teacher sees more status for herself she also sees more democracy in the school. Both of these coefficients are relatively strong. This is partially due to the fact that they show relationships between two sections of data provided by the same person.

Among the four sections of the inquiry concerning democracy, all the intercorrelations with the total score were significantly high; however, the sections, Concepts was lowest with $.242$. This seems to bear out the general assumption that there is not a strong relationship between what people think and what they do.

Significant Findings and Conclusion I Concerning Criteria

1. One hundred thirty-four criteria for democratic principal-staff behavior were developed.
2. Criteria were applied to 205 schools, or 74.8 per cent of

the Ohio city high schools by 622 teachers, or 6.5 per cent of all city high school teachers.

3. The average democracy score for schools on the criteria was 116.5, or 71.7 per cent of the total possible score.
4. The average teacher scores his high school 122.3, or 72.8 per cent of the total possible democracy score.
5. The average principal scores 27.5, or 60.7 per cent of the total possible adequacy score.

Conclusion I

Ohio high schools are fairly democratic, have principals who are fairly adequate in performing administrative functions and who are fairly skilled in the human relations required of cooperative endeavor.

Significant Findings and Conclusions II and III Concerning the Criteria Applied

1. Principals are more adequate in schools scoring highest in democracy.
2. Older teachers, teachers with longer teaching experience, and teachers in larger schools gave higher democracy scores.
3. Teachers of mathematics and industrial arts gave lower democracy scores than other teachers.
4. Teachers of foreign languages gave higher democracy scores.
5. Women see more democracy in schools than men; married teachers see less democracy than single teachers.
6. Older principals received lower adequacy scores; however, principals receiving highest adequacy scores had teachers older than themselves.

Conclusion II

Schools are generally lacking in organization characteristics which would encourage wider democratic participation of all personnel.

Conclusion III

Administrative efficiency increases with an increase in democratic leader-group behavior.

Significant Findings and Conclusion IV Concerning Time Studies

1. Principals in most democratic schools spend more time (74.9 per cent) in contact with people than other principals.
2. Principals in most democratic schools spend a greater portion of time (16.3 per cent) on supervision and a lesser time controlling pupils than others.
3. Principals spend half their time upon supervision, pupils, planning, and evaluation.

Conclusion IV

In democratic schools the principal and the staff of teachers spend a greater portion of time together in close working relationship.

Significant Findings and Conclusion V Concerning Status Factors

1. Teachers gave higher status to superintendents, principals, and themselves in most democratic schools.
2. Teachers saw less difference in status between themselves and superintendents in most democratic schools but more difference between themselves and principals.
3. Evidence of administrative cliquishness is revealed by the fact that democracy as seen by teachers decreases when a

principal sees himself high in status and when his adequacy as seen by the superintendent is high.

4. Principals in most democratic schools are less interested in status involved situations than others.

Conclusion V

Status increases with democracy in schools; differences decrease in democracy; democracy decreases with administrative stratification.

Implications

The evidence accumulated in this study emphasizes that democratic leader-group behavior increases administrative effectiveness. A weakness in present school operation appears to be in organization for effective participation of members of the group. On the other hand, the personal qualities of both teachers and principals are suitable for democratic organization. Therefore, the following guiding principles are suggested as a foundation upon which to build more adequate democratic schools:

1. That each group member fully realize his potential and responsibility for leadership.
2. That the fundamental concepts of democracy be understood by all group members.
3. That designated leadership at all levels avoid clique formation and isolation.
4. That shared goals be cooperatively established and clearly defined.
5. That group member roles be clearly understood in order to carry out the plans for group action.

6. That complete fluidity among group members be maintained through social, professional, and recreational means in order to facilitate communication among all members.
7. That designated leadership keep in close contact with personnel.
8. That all group members be continually aware of progress toward shared goals.
9. That designated leadership act as a catalytic agent to help all members accomplish individual and group purposes.
10. That dominance of purpose rather than of people prevail among group members.
11. That the whole is more than the sum of its parts be a fundamental axiom for group thinking.
12. That each individual feel free to develop himself to the fullest of his potential without restriction except through natural consequences detrimental to others.
13. That decision making responsibilities be clearly established.
14. That authority for action be clearly defined.

These fourteen principles imply goals, organized action to accomplish the goals, and leadership designated to help find the shortest path to the goals. It is assumed that the principal as designated leader is also the most influential member of the group in whom decision making is vested. Shared goals provide the impelling force; small groups do the work; leaders of small groups together with designated leadership check progress and direction; then initiate new action.

Since goals of education are largely concerned with curriculum, materiel, personnel, group organization will of necessity encompass these areas. An organization chart would show assignments to these specialized problems. From time to time other groups would be formed long enough to take care of specific problems of current nature. Communication of ideas would flow two ways, i.e., from group member to group or designated leader and back. Success of the group will vary in terms of effective communication to each member. Therefore, the responsibility of leadership rests in ability to influence the highest potential of individual members toward shared goals.

Recommendations

The five major conclusions point to the following recommendations :

1. That principals, teachers, parents, and pupils examine the school organization to bring about more cooperative face-to-face relationships concerning mutual problems and goals.
2. That all personnel exhibit more democratic behavior and less dominance in human relations.
3. That educators discard the notion that administrative efficiency and democratic behavior are incompatible to make a conscious effort to organize high schools for real human effectiveness.
4. That more time be spent in group endeavor rather than in isolation.
5. That the administration avoid stratification and isolation from other personnel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ayer, Fred C. "A Checking List of One Thousand Duties of School Administrators," American School Board Journal, (Eleven issues beginning February, 1929), p. 32.
- Alberty, Harold. "Administrative Leadership in the High School," Educational Leadership, Volume 5 (April, 1948), pp. 433-437.
- _____. "How May the Schools Further Democracy?" Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Volume 265, (September, 1949), pp. 17-24.
- Baker, S. Harry. "Criteria for Determination of Effective Management," National Association of Secondary School Principals, Bulletin #131, Volume 29 (May, 1945), pp. 3-12.
- Barham, Thomas G. "Democracy in School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 104 (June, 1942), pp. 15-17.
- Barnard, Chester I. Dilemmas in Leadership in the Democratic Process. Princeton, New Jersey: Stafford Little Lectures, Herbert L. Baker Foundation, 1939, 27 pp.
- Baxter, Bernice, and Cassidy, Rosalind. Group Experience the Democratic Way. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943, 218 pp.
- Beery, John R. Current Conceptions of Democracy. Contribution to Education, No. 888. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1943. (Summary in Teachers College Record, Volume 46, October, 1944), pp. 55-56.
- Bimson, Oliver H. "ABC's of Participation," School Executive, Volume 58, (July, 1939), p. 6.
- _____. Participation of School Personnel in Administration. Doctor's Thesis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1939, 325 pp.
- Bogardus, Emory S. Leaders and Leadership. New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1934, 325 pp.
- Browne, Clarence George. "An Exploration into the Use of Certain Methods for the Study of Executive Functions in Business." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1948, 200 pp.
- Burns, John H. Psychology and Leadership. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: The Command and General Staff School Press, 1934, 54 pp.

- Busch, Henry M. Leadership in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1934, 305 pp.
- Butterworth, Julian E. "Some Fundamental Conceptions," Review of Educational Research, Volume XIII, No. 4 (October, 1943), pp. 367-371.
- Cantril, H. "Experiments in Wording Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1940, Volume 4, pp. 330-332.
- Cooking, W. D. "Satisfaction from Democratic Leadership," School Executive, Volume 68 (October, 1948), p. 7.
- Curtis, S. A., McSwain, E. T., and Morrison, Nellie C. Cooperation Principles and Practices. Eleventh Yearbook of the Department of Supervision and Direction of Instruction. Washington: National Education Association, 1938, 243 pp.
- Curtis, Stuart A. "Are Administrators Autocrats?" Nation's Schools, Volume 24 (August, 1939), pp. 19-20.
- Deering, Ivah. Let's Try Thinking. Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1942, 199 pp.
- Deemer, Walter L. Aviation Psychology Program Research Reports, Records Analysis, and Test Procedures Report No. 18. United States Army Air Forces, 350 pp.
- Developing Leaders for Education. A Report of a Work Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, August 20 to 30, 1947. Endicott, New York: Edited by John E. Marshall, 85 pp.
- Dewey, John. "Democracy and Educational Administration," School and Society, Volume 45, (April 3, 1937), pp. 457-462.
- _____. Democracy and Education. New York: MacMillan, 1916, 434 pp.
- Dunkerley, Mary Dorothea. A Statistical Study of Leadership among College Women. Studies in Psychology and Psychiatry, Volume IV, Number 7, July, 1940. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1940, 65 pp.
- Educational Leadership. Eleventh Yearbook, The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Washington, D.C., January, 1933, 528 pp.
- Ferguson, Leonard W. "The Development of a Method of Appraisal for Assistant Managers," Journal Applied Psychology, Volume 31 (1947), pp. 306-311.

- Gatje, George H. "Cooperative Relationships in School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 103 (September, 1941), pp. 17-18, p. 91.
- Geer, Florence E., and Rankin, Paul T. The Principal and Supervision. Tenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, April, 1931. An Experiment in Measuring the Principal's Worth, pp. 564-570.
- Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1936, 586 pp.
- Guttman, L. "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data," American Sociology Review, Volume 9 (1944), pp. 139-150.
- Harding, L. W. "Twenty-one Varieties of Educational Leadership," Educational Leadership, Volume 6 (February, 1949), pp. 299-302.
- Hartman, George W. "Interrelations of Education and Democracy," Chapter VIII, Social Foundations of Education, Review of Educational Research, American Educational Research Association, Volume XVI, No. 1 (February, 1946), Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, pp. 81-93.
- Hassard, Charles T. "Cooperative Democratic School Administration and Supervision," American School Board Journal, Volume 103 (September, 1941), pp. 54, 82.
- Hemphill, John K. et al. Leader Behavior Description. Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1950, 97 pp.
- _____. "Situational Factors in Leadership." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Maryland, 1948, 472 pp.
- _____. Situational Factors in Leadership. Columbus: Ohio Studies in Personnel, Leadership Studies, Number 4, Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, 1949, 136 pp.
- Hertzler, J. O. "Crises and Dictatorships," American Sociological Review, Volume 5 (April, 1940), number 2, pp. 157-169.
- Hill, George O., Jr. "Leadership Guidance for Public Secondary Schools." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston University, 1946, 287 pp.
- Hill, Henry T. "Superintendent and Democratic School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 99, Number 3 (September, 1939), pp. 19-21.
- Hollingshead, Arthur D. Guidance in Democratic Living. New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1941, 260 pp.

How Democratic Is Your School? Check Lists on Democratic Practices for Secondary Schools. Federal Security Agency, Washington 25, D.C., 1949, 8 pp.

Jacobs, John E. "Democracy in School Control," Educational Administration and Supervision, Volume 27, (March, 1941), pp. 177-194.

Jacobsen, Einar W. "The Faculty Help the Principal," American School Board Journal, Volume 81 (October, 1930), pp. 135-136.

Jennings, Helen. "The Structure of Leadership Development and Sphere of Influence," Sociometry, Volume 1 (October, 1937), pp. 99-143.

_____. Sociometry of Leadership. New York: Beacon House, Sociometry Monographs, No. 14, 1947, 28 pp.

Jensen, Millin B. "Objective Differentiation between Three Groups in Education," Genetic Psychology Monographs, Volume III, No. 5 (May, 1928).

Jersild, Arthur T., and others. "I. Studies of Elementary Classes in Action. II. Pupil Participation and Aspects of Parent-Teacher Relationships," Journal of Experimental Education, Volume 10, (December, 1941), pp. 119-137.

Knauff, Edwin B. "Construction and Use of Weighted Check-List Rating Scales for Industrial Situations," Journal Applied Psychology, Volume 32 (February, 1948), pp. 63-70.

Koopman, G. Robert, Miel, Alice, and Misner, Paul J. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1943, 330 pp.

Leadership in Education. A Report of the Educational Conference and Administrators' Workshop. The Ohio State University, July 12-30, 1948, 64 pp.

Leadership at Work. Fifteenth Yearbook, The Department of Supervision and Direction of Instruction, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1943, 248 pp.

Leadership through Supervision. Yearbook, Association Supervision Curriculum Development, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1946, 163 pp.

Learning the Ways of Democracy. Washington, D.C.: The Educational Policies Commission, American Association of School Administrators, Department of the National Education Association, 1940, pp. 1-40.

Lents, Theodore F. "Democratization, Autocratization, and the Majority Point of View," Journal of Psychology, Volume 16 (1943), pp. 3-12.

- Lewin, Kurt. "Dynamics of Group Action," Educational Leadership, Volume 1 (January, 1944), pp. 195-200.
- Lewin, Kurt and Lippitt, Ronald and Escalona, Sibylle K. Studies in Topological and Vector Psychology. Studies in Child Welfare, Volume 16, No. 3, Iowa City, University of Iowa, February, 1940, 307 pp.
- Lewis, Erwin Eugene and Williams, Oscar H. Creative Management for Teachers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1932, 254 pp.
- Likert, Rensis. A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. Archives of Psychology, R. S. Woodworth, Editor, No. 140, New York, June, 1932, 35 pp.
- Lippitt, Ronald. "An Experimental Study of the Effect of Democratic and Authoritarian Group Atmosphere Upon Group and the Individual." Unpublished Master's Thesis, State University of Iowa, 1939, 300 pp.
- _____. "An Analysis of Group Reactions to Three Types of Experimentally Created Social Climates." Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, The State University of Iowa, 1940, 350 pp.
- Lund, John. Educational Leadership in Action. Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Washington 25, D.C., 1949, 15 pp.
- Manual of Instruction for the IBM Test Scoring Machine. Endicott, New York: The Department of Education, International Business Machines Corporation, Revised, 1945, 20 pp.
- Marshall, Mariann. "Democracy and Dictatorship in a Camp School," Progressive Education, Volume XVI (October, 1939), pp. 418-422.
- Matzen, John M., and Knapp, R. H. "Teacher Participation in School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 97 (October, 1938), pp. 27-28.
- McClure, Worth. "Administrative Dilemmas," American School Board Journal, Volume 103 (November, 1941), pp. 17-18.
- McFarland, Kenneth W. "Some Mistaken Notions of Democracy in School Administration," American School Board Journal, Volume 99, (October, 1939), pp. 19-22.
- McNemar, Quinn. "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," Psychological Bulletin, Volume 43, No. 4 (July, 1946), pp. 289-374.
- Miller, Ward I. Democracy in Educational Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1942, 117 pp.

Moser, Wilbur E. "Teacher Participation in School Administration: Its Nature, Extent, and Degree of Advocacy." Doctor's Dissertation, Leland Stanford University, California, 1938, 365 pp.

_____. "Democracy Put to the Vote," School Executive, Volume 58 (August, 1939), pp. 12-13.

_____. "Do Teachers Help Run the Schools?" The Nation's Schools, Volume XXIII, No. 1 (January, 1939), pp. 51-52.

_____. "Should Teachers Have a Voice in Naming Administrative Officials?" Nation's Schools, Volume 27 (February, 1941), p. 53.

Pigors, Paul J. Leadership or Domination. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1935, 354 pp.

Pistor, Frederick. "A Standardized Measure of Classroom Democracy," Journal of Educational Research, Volume 35 (November, 1941), pp. 183-192.

"The Preparation of School Administrators," The School Executive, Volume 69, No. 11, (July, 1950), pp. 43-52.

Raths, Louis E. "Leadership and Points of View," Educational Research Bulletin, Volume 19 (February 14, 1940), Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, pp. 91-98.

Ramseyer, John Alvin. "A Study of School Improvement with an Emphasis upon the Role of the Laboratory School," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1948, p. 118.

Reals, E. H. "Leadership in the High School," School Review, Volume 46 (September, 1938), pp. 530-531.

Richardson, H. M. et al. "Leadership as Related to the Bernreuter Personality Measures," Journal Social Psychology, Volume 17, (May, 1943), pp. 248-249, 266-267.

Reighley, Henry Herbert. "A Functional Analysis of the School Principals," Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1933, 540 pp.

Rorer, John Alexander. Principles of Democratic Supervision. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications. Contribution to Education, No. 858, 1942, 230 pp.

Seeman, Melvin. "Some Status Correlates of Leadership," Chapter V, Leadership in American Education, The University of Chicago Press, (1950), pp. 40-50.

Seeman, Melvin, and Morris, Richard T. A Status Factor Approach to Leadership. A Report on a Pilot Study of Four Ohio School Systems. Columbus, Ohio: The Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, 1950, 101 pp.

Sletto, Raymond Franklin. Construction of Personality Scales by the Criterion of Internal Consistency. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Sociological Press, 1937, 92 pp.

_____. "Pretesting of Questionnaires," American Sociological Review, Volume 5 (1940), pp. 193-200.

Shartle, Carroll L., Stogdill, Ralph M., and Campbell, Donald T. Naval Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, June 15, 1949, pp. 87.

_____. "Effective Leadership in Democracy," Paper read at a Symposium on Cooperation and Conflict among Living Organisms, Washington, D.C., September 13, 1948, 7 pp.

_____. Leadership Aspects of Administrative Behavior. Presidential Address, Division of Business and Industrial Psychology, American Psychological Association, September, 1950, Mimeographed 27 pp.

_____. Leadership and Executive Performance. New York: American Management Association (Reprint from Personnel, March 1949), 11 pp.

Smith, Henry Lester and Krueger, Levi McKinley. A Brief Summary of Literature on Leadership. Bloomington: Bureau of Cooperative Research, Indiana University, 1933, 80 pp.

Stogdill, Ralph M. and Shartle, C. L. "Methods for Determining Patterns of Leadership Behavior in Relation to Organization Structure and Objectives," Journal Applied Psychology, Volume 32 (June, 1948), pp. 286-291.

Strang, R. and Wollner, M. "Guidance Thru Groups," Review of Educational Research, Volume 15 (April, 1945), pp. 170-172.

Strayer, George D., Jr. "Why Not Turn to Your Staff," School Executive, Volume 58 (June 1939), p. 9.

Tead, Ordway. The Art of Leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1935, 308 pp.

Thurstone, L. L. and Chave, E. J. The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929, 96 pp.

- U. S. Office of Education, F.S.A. Living Democracy in Secondary Schools. Education and National Defense Series, Pamphlet No. 7. Prepared by A. Laura McGregor in cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1942, 32 pp.
- Wahlquist, John T. "Conflicting Views of School Administration and Supervision," Educational Administration and Supervision, Volume 27, (February, 1941), pp. 81-98.
- Wang, C. K. A. "Suggested Criteria for Writing Attitude Statements," Journal Social Psychology, Volume 3 (August, 1932), pp. 367-373.
- Warner, W. Lloyd; Havighurst, Robert J.; Loeb, Martin B. Who Shall Be Educated? New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1944, 190 pp.
- Weber, C. A. "Techniques of In-service Education Applied in North Central Secondary Schools," North Central Association Quarterly, Volume XVII, No. 2 (October, 1942), pp. 195-198.
- _____. "Reactions of Teachers to In-service Education in Their Schools," School Review, Volume LI (April, 1943), pp. 234-240.
- _____. "A Summary of the Findings of the Sub-committee on In-service Education of Secondary School Teachers," North Central Association Quarterly, Volume XVII, No. 3 (January, 1943), pp. 281-287.
- Whitehead, T. N. Leadership in a Free Society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936, 266 pp.
- Williams, Omer S. "Administrative Activities in Which Teachers Participate Democratically," American School Board Journal, Volume 105 (September, 1942), pp. 40-44.
- Wilson, Charles H. "An Evaluation of Staff Personnel Relationship." Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1949, 300 pp.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Paul Miller, was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, July 6, 1913.

I received my secondary school education in the public schools of Clinton County, Ohio, graduating at Wayne Township High School in 1931. My undergraduate training was obtained at Wilmington College, from which I received the Bachelor of Science in Education in 1936. From Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, I received the degree Master of Arts in 1941. In 1947 I became a resident enrollee of The Ohio State University and acted in the capacity of research assistant in the Bureau of Educational Research until July 1948. From July 1947 until June 1948 I completed all requirements except the dissertation for the degree Doctor of Philosophy.

I have a wife, Fay, and three children, Linda, Sherry, and Alan. My field of endeavor is education with special emphasis upon school administration.