

1973

A study of interpersonal relationships in school administration

David William Teigland
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Teigland, David William, "A study of interpersonal relationships in school administration " (1973). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 4979.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/4979>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-25,259

TEIGLAND, David William, 1932-
A STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. [Page 86, previously
copyrighted material not microfilmed at
request of author. Available for consultation
at Iowa State University Library.]

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1973
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

A study of interpersonal relationships
in school administration

by

David William Teigland

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Area

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	3
Hypotheses	5
Need for the Study	6
Definition of Terms	7
Sources of Data	8
Delimitations of the Study	9
Organization of the Study	9
Summary	10
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
The Role of the Administrator as Related to Leadership	11
Styles of leadership	12
Situational leadership	13
The group dynamics approach	15
The behavior of effective leaders	16
The purpose of leadership	17
Interaction	24
Selection Techniques	26
The FIRO-B Instrument	30
Summary	35
CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	37
Collection of Data	38
Analysis of the Data	38
Analysis of FIRO-B Scores	40

	Page
Inclusion behavior	40
Control behavior	41
Affection behavior	42
Interpretation of the FIRO-B Scores	43
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS	46
Examination of the Data	46
Interpretation of the Findings	62
Control wanted	62
Control expressed	62
Inclusion wanted	63
Inclusion expressed	63
Affection wanted	64
Affection expressed	64
Summary	68
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
Summary	70
Purpose	70
Procedure	70
Results	71
Limitations	75
Discussion	77
Conclusions	80
Recommendations for Further Study	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	82
APPENDIX A. FIRO-B SURVEY INSTRUMENT	85
APPENDIX B. LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS	87
APPENDIX C. SECOND LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS	88
APPENDIX D. LETTER TO GRADUATE STUDENTS OUTSIDE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION	89

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. The classification of interpersonal behaviors	34
Table 2. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of large school superintendents	47
Table 3. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of graduate students in educational administration with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration	49
Table 4. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of graduate students in the field of educational administration	51
Table 5. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration	52
Table 6. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of large school superintendents with those of graduate students in the field of educational administration	53
Table 7. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of large school superintendents with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration	56
Table 8. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of all school superintendents collectively with those of graduate students in the field of educational administration	57

	Page
Table 9. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of all school superintendents collectively with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration	59
Table 10. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of all school superintendents collectively with those of all graduate students collectively	60
Table 11. Summary table of significant differences found in the study	61
Table 12. Summary of significant differences by groups	65

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Strong leadership is needed in every organization whose intent is to be effective and worthwhile. The nation's public schools are no exception. If they are to provide the type of educational programs which are appropriate and challenging for all students and which develop each individual to his fullest potential, effective leadership is of utmost importance. Without it, the entire educational program may drift into obsolescence and not fulfill its primary obligation, i.e., to educate each student to the extent of his capabilities.

One way to increase the probability of providing strong positive leadership for the public schools is through the process of selection. If the right persons are prepared to be administrators of the schools, the right kind of leadership will prevail, and it is more likely that the job is going to get done. As in most other organizations, school procedures are changing and new concepts are constantly being developed, which require very alert and imaginative types of leadership. Individualized programs of instruction are being developed; open space classrooms are being constructed; flexibility in scheduling classes is becoming common, and more use of multimedia is evident.

These are only a few examples of what is meant by new procedures and concepts in the field of education. With all

of this and more, it is necessary to provide the type of leadership which best fosters and promotes new programs and innovations so as to add to the effectiveness of educational endeavors. It would be desirable to have the very best school administrators recruited into the profession and trained for optimum goal achievement.

One method through which potentially successful administrators may be identified is through refined selection techniques. It would be advantageous to have a test or other measuring device which could be administered to differentiate between potentially good and poor administrative candidates. As one study points out, self-choice is still the primary method of vocational election throughout the nation as a whole. The main admission requirement in programs for preparation as an educational administrator is that the person be present--sometimes candidates have even been accepted sight unseen.

Logically it would seem that this is probably not the best way to select the future leaders of public schools. It was this writer's desire to get the selection procedure into a better perspective by attempting to identify a selection technique to better measure whether or not a person possesses the behavioral characteristics which are needed to help foster success as an educational administrator.

The Problem

It has long been recognized that certain school superintendents are considered to be successful by the manner in which they administer their schools. It was the purpose of this study to determine which behavioral patterns, if any, are needed in order for an individual to achieve success (see operational definition of successful superintendent on page 8) in the field of school administration. This suggested an investigation of the interpersonal profiles of successful school superintendents to attempt to ascertain if they possessed some or any common characteristics or behavioral patterns.

This study sought to answer the following questions concerning behavioral patterns related to superintendents' success:

1. What are the interpersonal behavior patterns of successful school superintendents in the Midwest?
2. Are the interpersonal behavior patterns of successful school superintendents different when categorized as to the size of the school they administer (the large school being classified as having an enrollment greater than 5000 students and the small school as having an enrollment of less than 500 students)?
3. Are the interpersonal behavior patterns of successful school superintendents different when compared with graduate

students who are just preparing themselves to serve in the field of educational administration?

4. Are the interpersonal behavior patterns of successful school superintendents different when compared with graduate students working in areas outside the field of educational administration?

One way to identify a successful school superintendent is by the number of years he has served a particular school district. For the purposes of this study, the writer chose to include school superintendents with a minimum of five consecutive years in their present superintendency. With the pressures being exerted by society upon today's educational scene, it is very unlikely that any superintendent would be able to survive in a position in the same school for a period of five years or longer if he were not doing at least a relatively good job. The supply of educational administrators is plentiful and the competition is keen because these positions pay well. Superintendents are expected to perform at a level commensurate with what they are paid, and they are held accountable for the successful operation of their schools. The people in the community are not prone to accept anything less over any extensive period of time. There is abundant evidence to support this contention, particularly in the last five to ten years.

Hypotheses

The FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS ORIENTATION-BEHAVIOR instrument (FIRO-B) measures interpersonal relationships, yielding scores in six different areas:

1. Control wanted
2. Control expressed
3. Inclusion wanted
4. Inclusion expressed
5. Affection wanted
6. Affection expressed

The null hypotheses as related to these six categories state that there are no significant differences between the groups of school superintendents and graduate students when they are categorized and compared in the following ways:

- (a) Small school superintendents and large school superintendents.
- (b) Graduate students in the field of educational administration and graduate students outside the field of educational administration.
- (c) Small school superintendents and graduate students in the field of educational administration.
- (d) Small school superintendents and graduate students outside the field of educational administration.
- (e) Large school superintendents and graduate students in the field of educational administration.

- (f) Large school superintendents and graduate students outside the field of educational administration.
- (g) All school superintendents collectively and graduate students in the field of educational administration.
- (h) All school superintendents collectively and graduate students outside the field of educational administration.
- (i) All school superintendents collectively and all graduate students collectively.

Need for the Study

It is evident that any technique which might be used by graduate schools preparing educational administrators to predict the potential of success for prospective administrators will be well received. It is this writer's opinion that there is a need to identify those persons desiring to enter the field of school administration who also possess the qualities and potential needed to achieve success in their chosen profession.

Many times, it is very difficult to make a proper decision as to whether an individual should make an effort to seek graduate preparation in the field of educational administration, or whether it would be wiser to pursue some other endeavor. If a person is well qualified and has the potential to succeed in the field of administration, he should make every effort to improve himself and advance to positions of a

supervisory nature. By the same token, however, if a person is not qualified to enter or advance in this field, he should be made aware of that as well. Good teachers, for example, do not necessarily make good administrators. This is where help is needed to enable a person to make the right choice in decisions which affect his future. There is obviously a need for a "predictor of success" so that an individual will be able to measure his capabilities objectively and thereby help himself to realize whether or not he possesses the potential needed to achieve success in a chosen field.

Definition of Terms

The following are operational definitions as used in this study:

1. Superintendent: the chief school administrator of a local public district organized to serve students enrolled in kindergarten through grade twelve.
2. Large school superintendent: the chief school administrator in a school with an enrollment of 5000 or more students with an upper range of 62,000.
3. Small school superintendent: the chief school administrator in a school with an enrollment of less than 500 students.
4. Graduate student in the field of school administration: a teacher or college student who is working toward an advanced degree in educational

administration.

5. Other graduate students: college students who are working toward an advanced degree in some field other than educational administration.
6. FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relationships Orientation-Behavior): an instrument designed to measure the behavior patterns of people in interpersonal situations.
7. Expressed behavior: the behavior an individual expresses toward others.
8. Wanted behavior: the behavior an individual wants others to express toward him.
9. Successful superintendent: a superintendent in either a large school or a small school who has held that position for a minimum of five years. No other criteria for success are expressed or implied.

Sources of Data

All of the data used in this study dealing with school superintendents and graduate students were taken from the evaluative instrument FIRO-B, a test designed to measure a person's behavioral characteristics in different interpersonal situations. Data published by the education departments of selected midwestern states were used to identify the large and small districts used in this investigation.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was limited to sixty randomly selected school superintendents in the midwestern states of Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, Missouri, and Nebraska and sixty graduate students at Iowa State University. The superintendents involved were from thirty large school systems (six from each state) with enrollments of 5000 or more students and from thirty small school systems (six from each state) with enrollments of less than 500 students. The superintendents were selected on the basis of the respective sizes of their schools, and they all had held their present positions for a minimum of five years.

The two graduate student groups involved in the study were comprised of thirty students from within the field of educational administration in the College of Education at Iowa State University, and thirty students working toward advanced degrees outside the College of Education.

Organization of the Study

The report of the study was organized into five chapters. The first chapter includes the statement of the problem, the need for the study, hypotheses, definitions, sources of data, delimitations of the study, and organization of the study. The second chapter contains a review of the related literature. Chapter three explains the procedures used in the study. Chapter four contains the findings, and chapter five contains the summary, conclusions,

and recommendations.

Summary

Strong leadership is needed within the public school system as in any other organization if it is to be effective and worthwhile. One way to increase the possibility of providing more effective leadership is through the process of selection. Until now, self-selection is the primary method by which students move into educational administration preparation programs. It was the purpose of this study to seek an approach to improved selection techniques whereby it could be determined whether or not a person possesses the characteristics needed in order to improve the likelihood of becoming a successful school administrator.

Hypotheses were formulated to compare behavioral characteristics of large and small school superintendents, who had been in their respective positions for five or more years with those of graduate students in and outside the field of educational administration. By so doing, it was the intent of the study to determine which behavioral characteristics are needed in order to become successful educational administrators and thereby establish a screening device which could be used in advising graduate students who are endeavoring to enter the field of school administration.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Many studies have been made in connection with the different types of leadership roles which are exemplified by practicing educational administrators. For the purpose of this review of related literature, the material was categorized into four separate groups:

1. The Role of the Administrator as Related to Leadership
2. Interaction
3. Selection Techniques
4. The FIRO-B Instrument

The Role of the Administrator
as Related to Leadership

Role is defined by Buxton (4) as a composite picture of the function that a particular person fills in his department or institution. He maintains that roles need to be established and that there is evidently much specialization of roles by certain staff members in division of labor and responsibility.

Much of the related research indicates that people tend to identify with a certain type of role within society as a whole. Kelly (16, p. 97) defined this role in terms of his theory of personal constructs as ". . . a psychological process based upon the role-player's construction of aspects of the construction systems of those which he attempts to join

in a social enterprise . . ." A role is an ongoing pattern of behavior that follows from a person's understanding of how others who are associating with him in his task think. In other words, a role is a position that one can assume even before he is told exactly what is expected of him.

Most administrators recognize that providing leadership is a major dimension of their role. This aspect of administration is emphasized in much of the educational literature which they read and at the various meetings which they attend. But what constitutes leadership, and what does the administrator do in his leadership role? (11, p. 295)

Styles of leadership

One theory which has been particularly influential in the field of education conceives of leadership as being expressed in three forms: democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire (17).

Democratic. The style of leadership which is termed "democratic" is represented by a leader whose primary role is assisting a group to reach its goals. The democratic leader helps the group to achieve its objectives by giving information, suggesting alternative courses of action, and trying to stimulate self-direction on the part of all its members. In his relationship with the group, the democratic leader offers both praise and criticism. He tries to influence the group but does not attempt to dominate its thinking or behavior. The group that functions under democratic leadership decides its own objectives and policies on the basis of group discussion and decision.

Autocratic. Under authoritarian leadership, on the other hand, the behavior and thinking of the group are dominated by the leader. He does this by determining the roles of its members and setting the goals toward which the entire group will work. Group involvement and influence in decision-making are minimized or severely restricted under authoritarian leadership. The leader decides which topics, issues, or problems the group will consider, and he makes the final decision in all policy matters. The central characteristic of authoritarian leadership is the tendency of the leader to give orders. His goal is to control the thinking and behavior of the members of the group, so that the purposes which he believes are important can be accomplished.

Laissez-faire. Laissez-faire leadership is a third style which is used by some leaders. Based on this concept of leadership, the leader's role is very limited. He does not offer to assist the group in any way to achieve its goals, unless requested. He makes no attempt to evaluate or regulate the members of the group or their progress toward achieving their objectives. Under laissez-faire leadership the group members are given complete freedom to decide what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. The laissez-faire leader's behavior is premised on the belief that the members of the group have the ability to solve their own problems and to determine their own goals, and the attempts by the leader to influence or to guide their thinking would only restrict their effectiveness (11, pp. 295-296).

One of the major criticisms of the latter is that when carried to an extreme, anarchy may be the resultant.

Situational leadership

The most important variable which should determine the leader's behavior is the nature of the situation in which he finds himself according to another major theory of leadership. This school of thought rejects the premise that one style of

leadership is preferable to another or that there exists a set of personal qualities which every leader must possess. Gorton says the proponents of situational leadership abide by the assumption that the style of leadership used by an individual should be related to the situation, and different situations call for different kinds of personal qualities and behavior on the part of the leader (11, pp. 296-297).

The empirical evidence is not extensive, but there is considerable observational experience to support the situational theory of leadership. For example, persons who are appointed or elected as leaders in one situation may not be chosen again when circumstances change. Individuals who are successful in leading a group in a given situation may not be successful with a different group or at another time.

Gorton states that situational leadership and its importance can easily be observed in educational administration. The person chosen for any administrative position is usually selected primarily on the basis of his possession of certain personal qualities and a style of leadership which meet the requirements of the situation in which he will be working. School boards look for superintendents who can solve and work with the particular types of problems which are present in their own school district. They will seek someone who possesses the unique personal qualities and leadership style for their particular situation (11, p 297).

The administrator's adaptability and flexibility play key roles in the situational theory of leadership according to Gorton. This theory maintains that no particular style of leadership is appropriate for every occasion. Emphasizing the changing nature of situations, this theory underscores the need for the administrator to recognize the implications of changing circumstances and to judge accurately the type of leadership required. Since education in the 1970's is in a period of change, the situational concept of leadership appears to offer a desirable perspective to the student of educational administration (11, p. 298).

The group dynamics approach

Gorton feels that the "group dynamics theory of leadership" has produced the premise that leadership should vary according to the needs of the group with which the administrator is associated (6, pp. 492-499). This theory of leadership states that the needs of the group should define the nature of the situation in which the leader's behavior will be evaluated (11, p. 298).

Gorton further states that although it is true that the administrator works with different groups who may vary in their specific needs, researchers from the group dynamics field have revealed that most groups possess two basic needs of which every leader should be cognizant: group achievement and group maintenance (6, pp. 496-499).

Gorton says it is the contention of group dynamics theorists that groups initially organize on the basis of a common interest or concern. Later in the group, however, a new need develops. The members of the group desire their activities and interpersonal relationships to be enjoyable as well. The administrator's goal in the area of group maintenance is to develop and to sustain positive interpersonal relations and an esprit de corps among the members, so that everyone will work cooperatively and diligently toward the achievement of group objectives. Gorton contends that the primary value of the group dynamics theory of leadership to the administrator is the fact that it suggests the importance of understanding the achievement and maintenance needs of any group with whom he hopes to exercise leadership (11, pp. 298-300).

The behavior of effective leaders

Yet another approach to leadership examines the phenomenon in terms of the behavior of effective leaders (11, p.300).

In studies conducted by Halpin, the behavior of aircraft commanders and school superintendents was examined and two sets of behavior were found to be associated with effective leadership (12, pp. 86-130). The first, "initiating structure," refers to a leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of

Gorton says it is the contention of group dynamics theorists that groups initially organize on the basis of a common interest or concern. Later in the group, however, a new need develops. The members of the group desire their activities and interpersonal relationships to be enjoyable as well. The administrator's goal in the area of group maintenance is to develop and to sustain positive interpersonal relations and an esprit de corps among the members, so that everyone will work cooperatively and diligently toward the achievement of group objectives. Gorton contends that the primary value of the group dynamics theory of leadership to the administrator is the fact that it suggests the importance of understanding the achievement and maintenance needs of any group with whom he hopes to exercise leadership (11, pp. 298-300).

The behavior of effective leaders

Yet another approach to leadership examines the phenomenon in terms of the behavior of effective leaders (11, p.300).

In studies conducted by Halpin, the behavior of aircraft commanders and school superintendents was examined and two sets of behavior were found to be associated with effective leadership (12, pp. 86-130). The first, "initiating structure," refers to a leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of

procedure. The leader who assumes this leadership role will attempt to define the behavior he expects from each member of the organization, and he will emphasize the importance of "getting the job done" (11, p. 300).

The second leadership variable identified was a factor which was termed "consideration." Consideration involves the expression of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth between the leader and the group. The administrator who assumes this leadership role will attempt to develop a positive and satisfying relationship between himself and his followers, and he will try to promote a spirit of cooperation among the different members of the group (11, p. 300).

The purpose of leadership

An additional contribution to the literature on leadership, and one which is held to have significant implications for the educational administrator, was developed by Lipham (18, pp. 49-141). Lipham makes an important distinction between the administrator and the leader. He defines the administrator as "the individual who utilizes existing structures or procedures to achieve an organizational goal or objective." He goes on to say that "the administrator is concerned primarily with maintaining rather than changing established structures, procedures, or goals" (18, p. 122). Thus the administrator, according to Lipham, must be viewed as a stabilizing force (11, p. 301).

In contrast, the "leader" as defined by Lipham, "is concerned with initiating changes in established structures, procedures, or goals; he is a disrupter of the existing state of affairs." Leadership, to Lipham, is "the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing organizational goals and objectives" (11, p. 301).

It is acknowledged by Lipham that the administrator who adopts the role of leader will be unable to spend all of his time on leadership. He must also devote some time to the administering of his school. There is considerable doubt whether an organization can successfully maintain itself if the administrator spends all or most of his time in initiating new procedures or goals (11, pp. 301-302).

The significance of Lipham's approach to leadership lies in his emphasis on initiating change. The administrator who performs all of the various tasks that are required in order to administer his school or school district, such as scheduling, staffing, supervising, or budgeting, may be functioning as an administrator, but in terms of Lipham's definition, is not performing as an educational leader (11, p. 302).

Research had not been notably successful in determining the personal qualities which a leader should possess (32, pp. 35-71). However, the extent to which an administrator will exercise leadership behavior will depend on his perception of the problems faced by his school or school district, his

vision as an educator, his need to function as a leader, and the degree to which he is willing to assume an element of risk. Education today is in need of improvements and if changes are to be made, there will be a certain amount of risk involved. Whether a leader feels that this risk is worth taking is something which has to be determined individually. Certainly if education is to advance, intelligent leadership is necessary and changes must be made. It is important to the educational profession to produce leaders who can foster and promote the type of educational programs that are needed in today's society.

Many studies have attempted to relate personality with the particular type of role a person plays in life. Murphy (23) used the concept of role in his theory of personality describing it as a more or less fixed way of behaving forced on an individual by his culture and emphasizing the importance of role interaction.

The field of education and the people working in it, especially the faculty, have accounted for a considerable amount of research. In this area, generated by the many questions that pertain to individual performances, evaluations of performances have often been interwoven with an assessment of personality. Many and various methods have been employed, measures which stem from one or more of the theories of personality, or in many cases, from none at all. Ratings range all

the way from simple value judgments to elaborate questionnaires and intricate statistical procedures which isolate a range of pertinent parameters.

Basically, it would appear that personality ratings per se are not adequate in predicting success or failure in the field of school administration. There seems to be more and more emphasis being placed on types of interaction between people and how this effects leadership capabilities. Some would suggest what is needed most of all is a good deal of common sense and understanding of people when it comes to "getting the job done." Any research which will enhance this aspect of leadership and its relative role will be well received.

Sachs (27, p. 206) has said, "In an administrative view, there is no spontaneity so striking as the effort of members to do what the organization forbids." Whether this holds true for school administrators is a matter of opinion. It is an interesting thought, however, and it might well be responsible for some of the changes which do occur within the field of educational administration. No person can successfully practice a vocation without a good deal of ethical insight (knowledge of what the job entails) and, if this is done conscientiously, it is certain to produce change. From such perception comes the growing belief of the worthwhileness of the task. The doctor needs to be proud of his service, the

attorney of his, the engineer of his, and the teacher and administrator of theirs. Developing this ethical and professional insight may well be the most important and difficult task the professional person undertakes. It is imperative that persons who can perform this task are brought into school administration.

In a study of school administration by Sachs (27, p. xi). in 1966, it was indicated that there is one characteristic among leaders that seems to distinguish them. They are more often than not "angry" men. They are men who find the status quo unacceptable and set out in some way to do something about it. Sachs goes on to explain the curiosity that many educational leaders confuse expediency with success. Somehow they have arrived at the idea that whatever "works" represents sound leadership. He states further that we should not lose sight of the fact that "enhancement of the individual, whoever he may be, is the goal of good education, and indeed of society." We should not let "efficiency" in administration or in any other given aspect of education interfere with this goal.

Sachs (27, p. x) also intends that administrators, in succumbing to the desire for efficiency, "have done much to harm the discipline." He states further that care should be taken so as not to confuse "good education" with "efficient administration."

Studies have been concerned with school superintendents which have attempted to identify the attributes which contribute to the success of the individual. Halpin (12, p. 66) in his study of leadership qualities, had only limited success in predicting the effectiveness of a group of superintendents. Other studies in this area have run into the same difficulty. Further research is needed in an attempt to pinpoint the theories and approaches needed for effective administration within an organization.

Clearly, the theory of leadership is complex. This often makes it difficult to put into practice. According to Sachs there are some of the areas needing research:

1. Nature and quality of interaction: What kinds of interaction might be conducive to heightening morals, developing ego strength and personal satisfactions of members of the group? What tends to reduce same?
2. An Analysis of the Ability to Diagnose Problems: Basic research is necessary to discover and understand the kind and degree of sophistication and diagnostic ability that administrators may hold. Such diagnostic ability would apply to understanding of curriculum, teacher selection, pupil personnel, teacher evaluation, etc. Indeed, the degree of diagnostic ability is in direct ratio to the ability to perform adequately as an administrator.
3. Areas of Communication. Obviously, until the administrator has established the insights concerning the types and kinds of interaction he establishes, he is not very sophisticated. Furthermore, unless he has some realization of his skill in diagnosis, he is not too effective. But, unless he is able to communicate this insight and diagnosis to others so that they can

implement many of the things he has perceived, he has not performed adequately as an administrator. Thus, much research is needed in the area of communication as well as in the area of social interaction (27, p. 260).

There is agreement among social scientists that leadership is an important element in administrative behavior that encompasses both the personal and organizational dimensions of the institution. Beal, in 1962, wrote: "It is probable that without leadership no group can produce worthwhile action in the direction of its goals" (2, p. 31). Other authors have also agreed on this point, and the research has been plentiful.

The "why" of leadership, according to Sachs (27, p. 261), appears not to reside in any personality trait considered singly, not even a constellation of related traits, but in the interpersonal contribution of which the individual becomes capable in a specific setting eliciting such contribution from him. It becomes one responsibility of the administrator to sensitize himself as much as possible to the group or individual with whom he is communicating. Sachs goes on to say that paramount in the clinical approach to public relations is the development and acceptance of individuality. If the school administrator knows that in an organization there are both institutional and personal dimensions and that some conditions require emphasis on one, and different conditions require emphasis on the other, he may be one step ahead. Sachs

concludes by saying that without some framework, the superintendent is simply victim of all the forces about him and he has no integrity of his own.

Interaction

A profession has been defined by Sachs (27, p. 206) as, "A vocation or occupation requiring advanced training in some liberal art or science, and usually involving mental rather than manual work such as teaching, engineering, law, or theology; a body of persons in a particular calling or occupation." If there is one characteristic that is unique to a profession--a characteristic that grants a large degree of autonomy to the profession and at the same time an awesome responsibility--it is the quality of diagnostic wisdom. Diagnostic wisdom involves obtaining all the facts available and putting them together in integrated form. As Dewey (7, p. 125) put it, "there is one characteristic of all scientific operations which is necessary to note. They are such as disclose relationships." This lends credence to studies which take a close look at the relationships between and among people and attempt to determine the effects of these relationships.

Harry Stack Sullivan (33) emphasized a theory of interpersonal relationships as an interaction between personality development and culture. Sullivan and Mead (20) seem in agreement concerning the development of a self-concept through

the interaction of other persons considered significant by the self. The "significant others" are persons who most intimately provide rewards and punishments for the self.

Until Murray (24) proposed his individual need/environmental press concept, little attention was paid to the interactional effects of people as they function and relate to others in a particular situation. The concepts of projection and observer roles had appeared earlier, but the integration of situational and personal determinants in predicting performance had not been previously emphasized.

In a 1967 study of social interaction within schools, Miner (22, p. 37) discovered that school administrators are strikingly homogeneous insofar as the managerial variables are concerned. In fact, school districts themselves tend to be homogeneous according to size and with regard to social motivation. In larger consolidated districts, social interaction with authority figures is clearly valued by those in positions of authority themselves. The overall trend of the comparisons suggests that school administrators are neither particularly conforming nor particularly deviant.

Much of the recent research in the field of school administration has concentrated on the importance of both the environmental setting as well as the personal performance of the administrator in determining the effectiveness of the school administrator. Shartle (30) suggests that the following

should be considered:

1. Individual behavior acts of the administrator.
2. Organizational behavior, which includes events occurring within the organization.
3. Interaction of the individual, the organization, and environmental events.

It appears that in most recent studies concerned with effective leadership, the emphasis has switched from the importance of certain personality traits to the importance of the behavior of the individual. Gibb (10, p. 74) denounced the personal trait approach to the study of leadership by stating "Leadership is a source of mutual stimulation, a social interactional phenomenon." More studies are needed to determine the exact amount of importance that these behavioral characteristics in a social setting do command.

Selection Techniques

John Dewey (7, p. 125) in The Quest for Certainty, stated, "When an administrator does his job well, he establishes autonomy, not only for the professional but for the profession." This is why it is extremely important for the profession as a whole to select and provide school administrators of only the very best caliber. What each administrator does reflects upon the entire profession, and if only the most capable persons are allowed to enter the field of educational

administration, the entire profession will benefit. Hence, any tool, any measuring device which will produce an improved screening technique for prospective candidates will be welcomed. A professional person commits himself to learning his profession as a life-long task. This takes a very special type of person and one who should be selected with extreme care if he is to grow to the benefit of both himself and his profession in the years ahead.

In 1964, Thomas (34, p. 26) in a study concerned with school administration, pointed out,

"A soft spot in our program is the almost disdainful avoidance of the human side of school administration, except for the frequent exhortations and pronouncements on the virtues of being democratic. The melancholy fact is, then, that we haven't been going out after the best prospective administrators, and we don't do much to screen the ones that come to us."

It appears presently as if it is strictly up to the individual whether or not he or she should attempt to enter and work for advancement in the field of educational administration. There is really no set criterion by which to guide persons making these important decisions. It is evident that there is an urgent need for more useful screening devices and selection procedures in order to be assured that well-qualified persons are entering the profession of educational administration.

Much early recruitment begins with or through early contact with insightful and empathetic teachers in the school.

This is why it is important to have top quality teachers in school. The first of the agencies indirectly influencing the formal training of the teacher and administrator is the college. This is why exposure to top quality college professors and screening techniques are so important in directing possible administrative candidates. Administrators should be knowledgeable as teachers. They should be able to speak and write clearly. Value commitments are also important and should be considered in screening administrators. More and more boards of education are looking with favor on administrative people with the Ph.D. or the Ed.D. degree, so beginning candidates should possess the necessary potential to proceed with their studies and obtain the advanced degree.

Sachs (27, p. 239) lists the following as being used presently for screening administrators: "B" average, interviews, achievement tests, personality inventory, two to five years of successful teaching, and recommendations from the school district or peers. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Rorschach test have also been used by some universities. Personality factors arising from the environment are difficult to measure scientifically. It may well be that at present, as far as screening is concerned, investigation is still superficial. Sachs suggests that certain tools in the behavioral sciences may be an aid in the selection of the school administrator. More research is

needed with regard to other qualifications needed in order to be able to predict a certain degree of success in the school administration profession.

One large industrial complex uses basic groups of eight or nine persons engaged in problem-solving, the results of which must be taken into consideration when new personnel is being selected. Schutz (28) analyzes the possible perceptions operative in group interaction. The complexities suggest more than superficial selection. Some of the suggested methods for screening are: Seminars of 15 to 20 with participants graded on verbal and written skills and/or internship programs where a person can actually work in a given profession for a period of time. Another aspect of the training program should include the study of theories and premises underlying democratic leadership in America.

Schutz also discusses various perceptual factors in personality as related to leadership.

"To summarize, difficulties with initiating interaction range from being uncomfortable when not associating with people (can't stand to be alone--the oversocial) to not being comfortable initiating interaction (can't stand being with people--the under social). Difficulties controlling others range from not feeling comfortable controlling the behavior of anyone (can't tell anyone what to do--abdicator) to not feeling comfortable when unable to control everyone (always have to be in charge--autocrat). Difficulties with originating close personal relationships range from being uncomfortable when unable to establish sufficiently close, personal relations (can't get close enough--the overpersonal) to

being uncomfortable when getting too close and personal with someone--the underpersonal." (28, p. 32).

This theory of certain behavioral patterns being associated with leadership characteristics deserves a thorough investigation.

Schutz has done the job of investigating this theory of interpersonal relationships and has developed an instrument which has been used with considerable success. It is with this in mind that this writer is making a further attempt to utilize what has already been concluded in research and apply the same to be used in the screening process which is used in the selection of prospective administrative candidates. A description of this evaluative instrument follows (35).

The FIRO-B Instrument

A theory based upon the fundamental interpersonal relationships of people has been developed which is tied closely to this investigation. It is concerned with the behavior of people and how they react with each other. It does not include the behavior of an individual alone, nor does it consider the feelings, attitudes, or values of people. It is a theory that can be applied to the study of behavior of people such as that of educational administrators as they are actually engaged in the process of administration.

An important part of this theory is that behavior is relatively stable and does not change to any great degree over

a period of time. This is related to this writer's theory that the graduate student's behavior should be much the same as the practicing administrator if he is to be successful at a later date in his chosen profession.

The development of an instrument which measures how a person acts in interpersonal situations has been accomplished. It is not only convenient to have this instrument, but of greater significance is the fact that the theory states that behavior will be much the same in all similar situations. Thus, scores from the test might enable one to predict how a particular graduate student will behave at a later date in the actual practice of school administration.

Schutz has developed a theory, called the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation, which is presented in his book, F.I.R.O., A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior (28). In the development of the theory, Schutz utilizes the work of Freud, Fromm, Horney, Bion, and others. It is based on the premise that each individual has three interpersonal need areas: inclusion, control, and affection, which are sufficient for the prediction and explanation of interpersonal behavior. Each of the three need areas is defined in terms of one's perception of other people, of the reactions desired from other people, and of one's self-concept. Each need area is also defined at both the behavioral and feeling levels, but the interest for this study is

limited to the behavioral aspect.

The need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people is defined behaviorally as the "interpersonal need." The behavioral definition for the need for inclusion is with respect to interaction and association; the need for control is with respect to control and power; while love and affection are in the affection area. Schutz (29, p. 20) states that these needs demand the organism to establish a kind of equilibrium in the three different areas, between the self and other people, in order to be anxiety-free.

Different types of behavior are a result of the drive to satisfy these needs. Inclusion behavior deals with one's desire to have attention, prominence, and fame with identity, commitment, and participation. The person who joins clubs and organizations would be filling a strong need in this area as contrasted with the person who prefers to use his leisure time hunting or fishing by himself. Some people make themselves prominent by talking a great deal. Those who communicate very little except in a small circle of close friends, have stronger needs in the affection area. Inclusion behavior is unlike affection in that it does not involve strong emotional attachments to individual persons. It is unlike control in that the preoccupation is with prominence, not dominance (28, p. 20).

The decision-making process between people comprises

what is known as control behavior. Terms connoting positive control include authority, power, dominance, and influence. Terms such as follower and submissive denote control behavior. The instrument designed to measure the interpersonal behavior just described is called FIRO-B. It contains six scales designed to measure expressed inclusion behavior, wanted control behavior, expressed affection behavior, and wanted affection behavior. Each of these scales was developed through the use of the Guttman scaling technique by giving it to 150 subjects who were mostly college students. The results were then cross validated with about 1500 students from Harvard and nearby colleges. The average reproducibility score for the FIRO-B scales was .94 and the mean stability coefficient was .76. The test was also proven to have a high degree of concurrent validity.

The classification of the interpersonal behaviors as measured by the FIRO-B are outlined in Table 1 (see p. 34).

Several persons have reviewed the FIRO-B theory and their remarks are of interest to this particular study.

Douglas (8) states that the validation data for FIRO-B look promising and the test itself is interesting. "It deserves to be used and evaluated by other researchers in the area." He goes on to say that Schutz deserves credit for trying to derive a theory of interpersonal behavior that is based on the hypothetical-deductive philosophy. F.I.R.O.,

A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior is an unusual book, quite different from other texts on personality theory, and one which experimentally-oriented psychologists interested in interpersonal relationships may find especially challenging.

Table 1. The classification of interpersonal behaviors

	Expressed Behavior	Wanted Behavior
Inclusion	I make efforts to include other people in my activities and to get them to include me in theirs. I try to belong, to join social groups, to be with people as much as possible.	I want other people to include me in their activities and to invite me to belong, even if I do not make an effort to be included.
Control	I try to exert control and influence over things. I take charge of things and tell other people what to do.	I want others to control and influence me. I want other people to tell me what to do.
Affection	I make efforts to become close to people. I express friendly and affectionate feelings and try to be personal and intimate.	I want others to express friendly and affectionate feelings toward me and to try to become close to me.

A somewhat different view is taken by Borko (3), who feels that FIRO-B lays all psychology on the bed of theory and forces a fit. He does accept the intention of Schutz as completely unique. He states that the validation data are

promising and the test is interesting. It deserves use. The test of the theory will be based on the quantity of research which it stimulates.

Ryan (26, i) remarks that when he first began using the FIRO-B as a clinical psychologist, he had his doubts about its value. Now, however, he is not only convinced that it measures significant variables, but also that it does so very well. The more he has used it, the more impressed he has become with the FIRO-B, both as a clinical and research tool.

Ackerman (1, p. 360) states that FIRO-B aspires toward a theory of behavior that will render itself to experimental verification. The understanding is "precarious," but the methodology is "interesting."

Most of the reviewers regard the FIRO-B theory as one which deserves further use and investigation. They do point out some areas of weakness, but generally the test itself is regarded as having positive value.

Summary

Much has been researched and written about the field of educational administration. Many theories have been stated in reference to identifying the successful school administrator with most studies centering around a certain amount of speculation as to why a person had been considered successful or unsuccessful in an administrative position.

Many writers agree that administrators play a certain role in society which helps them identify with the position they hold. Many also agree that certain leadership qualities or characteristics are deemed necessary in order for an administrator to be considered a success. Some of the characteristics are rather nebulous, however, and very few of the descriptions or biographical sketches which have been developed are 100 percent accurate or found to be present in all successful administrators.

There also seems to be agreement that the studies which have gone on before have been beneficial, but many which have dealt with personality characteristics have failed to pin-point exactly what type of person is needed to do the job. There have been indications which lead to the theory that perhaps certain behavioral characteristics are more important than personality per se and deserve more attention than they have received in the past. It is with this idea in mind that this writer has attempted to pursue an investigation which hopefully might shed more light on the particular behavioral characteristics needed to achieve success in the field of school administration.

CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The sample for this investigation was drawn in the spring of 1972 from among practicing school superintendents in the midwest and from among graduate students in and outside of the field of educational administration at Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa. Each of these two groups was divided as follows:

Group I: Superintendents

- (a) Thirty public school superintendents from large schools--with enrollments of 5000 students or more.
- (b) Thirty public school superintendents from small schools--with enrollments of less than 500 students.

Group II: Graduate Students

- (a) Thirty graduate students studying in the field of school administration.
- (b) Thirty graduate students studying in a field other than school administration.

Once these groups were established, it was determined the subjects to be included in the study would be selected by a random sampling technique used in connection with the lists provided by the education departments of the various states and with the help of selected graduate students within the College of Education and within the Student Senate at Iowa

State University. The superintendents were selected at random from the state directories with the only stipulation that of compliance with the school size agreed upon, and that they had served in their present positions for a period of at least five years.

Collection of Data

All of the data used in this study were taken from the results of the survey instrument FIRO-B (see Appendix A), an instrument designed specifically to measure the behavior of people in interpersonal situations. The survey was conducted by mail with the school superintendents and with the graduate students in the Student Senate at Iowa State University. The survey was administered as a group in the case of the students within the College of Education at Iowa State. The response in all cases was excellent. Follow-up letters were used in the few cases where the survey instruments were not returned and 100 percent results were achieved.

Analysis of the Data

The raw data relevant to this study were placed on code sheets after the hand scoring of the FIRO-B instrument had been completed. IBM cards were then punched and verified. The Computer (360/40) at the Iowa State Computation Center was used to analyze all the data.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences by Hull

and Nic (14) was used as the computer program in the treatment of the data and testing of hypotheses. This treatment yields "t scores" of the pooled variety for determining whether or not significant differences exist between the various categories. This "Student-t distribution" provides criteria for small-sample tests concerning differences between two means. To use these criteria, it is necessary to assume that the two samples come from populations which can be approximated closely with normal distributions and which have equal variances. Specifically, the test of the small hypothesis $u_1 = u_2$ is based upon the statistic

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum (x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2 + \sum (x_2 - \bar{x}_2)^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

where $\sum (x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2$ is the sum of the squared deviations from the mean for the first sample while $\sum (x_2 - \bar{x}_2)^2$ is the sum of the squared deviations from the mean of the second sample (9, pp. 255-256).

Since this study involved four different groups, it was necessary to compare all of the different categories within each of the groups in an effort to test for significant differences which might exist between any of the four groupings.

This writer elected to test at three levels of significance: the .01 level, the .05 level, and the .10 level. Recent research has made more use of the .10 level of significant difference, and it was felt that if a particular pattern was discovered in this study, it would be easier to trace by the use of all three levels of testing. A summary table could then be constructed and a close examination made possible for the review and study of any areas or categories where significant differences at any of the three levels tend to cluster and form patterns.

Analysis of FIRO-B Scores

In order to gain a better understanding of the analysis of FIRO-B scores, descriptions of the interpersonal needs of an individual in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection are explained by Schutz (29, pp. 21-33).

Inclusion behavior

Inclusion behavior is that behavior directed toward one's general social orientation. It refers to association between people. Some terms that explain this association in a positive manner are: associate, mingle, communicate, belong, member, join. Terms that are negative in the inclusion area are: introvert, isolate, outsider, lonely, withdrawn, ignored.

This need to be included makes itself known by talking

a lot. Usually they are not as interested in power or dominance as they are in prominence. The desire to belong to a fraternal organization is not necessarily a liking for the members or a desire for power; it is often for its prestige value. It is the hope that people will pay attention to him, know who he is and be able to distinguish him from others that causes a person to join groups. He must be known as a specific person with a particular identity, for if he is not known, he cannot be attended to or have interest paid to him.

Therefore, inclusion has to do with interacting with people, with attention, acknowledgment, prominence, status, identity, and anticipation as attendant aspects. It does not involve strong emotional attachments to individuals and the preoccupation is with prominence, not dominance.

Control behavior

Control behavior is that which refers to the decision-making process between people. Terms showing positive control are: power, authority, dominance, influence, ruler, officer, and leader. Terms that show negative control are: rebellion, followers, submissive, and henpecked. The desire for power, authority and control are others, and over one's future is known as the need for control. At the other extreme is the need to be controlled, to have responsibility taken away. A more subtle form is the term "influential."

This is the person who controls others through the power he has to influence their behavior. The acquisition of money or political power is a direct method of obtaining control over other persons. This can often involve coercion rather than other methods of influence like persuasion and example.

Prominence is not required for control as it is for inclusion. The concept of the "power behind the throne" is an example of a role that would fill a high control need and low inclusion need.

Affection behavior

Affection behavior describes close personal emotional feelings between two people. While inclusion and control can occur between groups of individuals, affection can occur only between pairs of people at any one time. Terms that refer to affection that are positive are: like, personal, love, and friendship. Terms which show negative affection are: dislike, cool, distant, and hate.

Affection behavior involves, in addition to emotional attachment, the confiding of anxieties, wishes, and feelings. In groups, affection behavior is characterized by friendship and differentiation between members. A common way for avoiding a close tie with any one member of the group is to be equally friendly with all of them; therefore, popularity may not be affection at all, but rather inclusion (35).

Interpretation of the FIRO-B Scores

The following suggestions for the interpretation of the FIRO-B are taken from the Clinical Interpretation of the FIRO-B by Leo Robert Ryan (26) and listed here for the reader's review.

1. Note the dominant high and low points in the profile.

Scores on the FIRO-B range from 0 to 9. The closer the score is to the extremes of the range, the more applicable are the following general behavioral descriptions for high and low scores in each area.

a. Inclusion.

As indicated earlier, inclusion refers to one's general social orientation. Thus, a low expressed score means that the person is uncomfortable around people and will tend to move away from them; high expressed score suggests that the person is comfortable in social settings and will tend to move toward people.

A low wanted inclusion score means that the person is selective about with whom he associates, while a high wanted score means that he has a strong need to belong and to be accepted.

b. Control.

The score on this dimension pertains to leadership behavior. A low expressed score means that the person avoids making decisions and taking on responsibility; a high expressed score indicates that he can and does take on the responsibilities involved in a leadership role.

A low wanted control score suggests that the person does not want others to control him, to make decisions for him; a high wanted score for males is reflective of dependency needs: they may merely be a measure of "tolerance" rather than dependency. This is the

only score that requires a differential interpretation for females.

c. Affection.

This dimension, unlike inclusion concerns itself with the need for deep relationships rather than superficial ones. Thus, a low expressed score describes a person who is cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate relationships; a high expressed score suggests that the person can readily become emotionally involved, establishing intimate relationships with others.

A low wanted affection score indicates that the person is very selective about with whom he forms deep relationships, while a high wanted affection score describes a person who wants others to initiate close, intimate relationships with him.

2. Note the exact position of the score within the 0-9 range.

The intensity of the score modifies the strength and applicability of the descriptions given above. For example, 0 - 1 are extremely low scores; the behavior described above will have a compulsive quality.

2-3 are low scores; the behavior mentioned for low scores will be noticeably characteristic of the person.

4-5 are borderline scores; although not extreme, the person may reveal a tendency toward the behavior described for high and low scorers.

6-7 are high scores; the behavior will be noticeably characteristic of the person.

8-9 are extremely high scores; the behavior will have a compulsive quality to it.

3. Consider the general orientation WITHIN each area.

The person's orientation within each area (inclusion, control, affection) is revealed by the interaction of his expressed and wanted behavior.

If the scores are of similar intensity, the probability is that the person behaves in ways which are compatible with his needs. The greater the discrepancy between the two scores, the greater the probability of conflict and/or frustration.

4. Note the interaction AMONG the three areas. Although each of the six scores obtained provides valuable information, no score should be interpreted in isolation. The way in which a person orients himself in one area may help or hinder the interpersonal stance he assumes in other areas.

It is also important to remember that the three areas are in reverse order with respect to their ability to modify other areas. The orientation assumed by the person in the affection area, for example, is more important than that assumed in the control area. And the control area, in turn, is more important than the inclusion area.

(26, pp. 4-5)

With these three areas in mind and in consideration of their intended meaning, it is now possible to evaluate and interpret the findings as they are related to the various groups which were investigated in this particular study.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

The findings of this study are based on the results obtained by administering the FIRO-B to thirty large school superintendents, thirty small school superintendents, thirty graduate students in the field of educational administration, and thirty graduate students outside the field of educational administration at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. Frequency distributions, means, standard deviations, and "t" scores are used in table form to describe the superintendents and graduate students being studied. The "pooled t" test was used to test hypotheses and statistically evaluate the findings.

Examination of the Data

The following tables present the data which were revealed when the FIRO-B was administered to each of the four groups--the large school superintendents, the small school superintendents, the graduate students in the field of educational administration, and the graduate students outside the field of educational administration. Each of the groups was compared with the other in the areas of control wanted, control expressed, inclusion wanted, inclusion expressed, affection wanted, and affection expressed. Significant differences are indicated at three levels--.10, .05, and .01--and are noted in table form as well as in the discussion which

follows.

Table 2. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of large school superintendents

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.50	1.57	-0.92
Small School Superintendents	30	4.90	1.79	
Control Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	2.60	3.21	-0.08
Small School Superintendents	30	2.67	3.10	
Inclusion Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.80	2.44	1.75*
Small School Superintendents	30	3.73	2.29	
Inclusion Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.13	2.16	0.78
Small School Superintendents	30	3.73	1.78	
Affection Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	3.30	2.14	-1.21
Small School Superintendents	30	3.97	2.13	
Affection Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	5.07	2.18	1.22
Small School Superintendents	30	4.37	2.25	

*Indicates significance at .10 level.

In comparing the interpersonal relationships of the small school superintendents with those of the large school

superintendents as found in Table 2, there is no significant difference in the areas of control wanted, control expressed, inclusion expressed, affection wanted, or affection expressed.

However, there was a significant difference between the two groups of superintendents at the .10 level of significance in the area of inclusion wanted. This would indicate that the large school superintendents have a greater desire to be invited to join and be included in a group than do their counterparts in smaller school systems. Admittedly, this is not a high level of significance but when viewed along with other behavioral differences, insights are gained into the nature of those who seek and/or succeed in different types of positions.

There were more numerous significant differences discovered when comparing the interpersonal relationships of graduate students in the field of school administration with graduate students outside the field as is shown in Table 3 (next page).

In the category of control wanted, it was revealed that graduate students in the field of educational administration are more willing to accept control from other people than the graduate students outside the field. This noted difference was at the .05 level.

Another category which reveals a highly significant difference, at the .01 level, was in affection wanted. The

Table 3. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of graduate students in educational administration with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.30	1.97	2.51**
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.03	1.94	
Control Expressed:				
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	3.76	0.83
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.03	3.42	
Inclusion Wanted:				
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.23	2.73	1.37
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.27	2.75	
Inclusion Expressed:				
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	1.90	1.27
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.17	1.97	
Affection Wanted:				
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	4.63	2.62	2.93***
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	2.97	1.69	
Affection Expressed:				
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.63	2.61	2.32**
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.10	2.51	

** Indicates significance at .05 level.

*** Indicates significance at .01 level.

graduate students outside the field of educational administration show much less desire to have people give them affection than do the graduate students in the field of educational administration.

The other category showing significant difference at the .05 level of significant difference was in the area of affection expressed. The graduate students outside the field of educational administration again show less need for expressing affection toward others than do their counterparts within the field.

When comparing the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of graduate students in the field of educational administration there were two categories in which significant differences existed at the .05 level, as shown in Table 4 (see next page).

The first was in the category of inclusion wanted. The small school superintendents show less desire to be included in the group than do the graduate students in the field of educational administration.

The second area of significant difference was in the category of affection expressed. Again, the small school superintendents tended to show less need for expressing affection than did the graduate students in the field of educational administration.

Table 4. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of graduate students in the field of education administration

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
Small School Superintendents	30	4.90	1.79	-0.82
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.30	1.97	
Control Expressed:				
Small School Superintendents	30	3.67	3.10	-1.27
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	3.76	
Inclusion Wanted:				
Small School Superintendents	30	3.73	2.29	-2.31**
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.23	2.73	
Inclusion Expressed:				
Small School Superintendents	30	3.73	1.78	-0.14
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	1.90	
Affection Wanted:				
Small School Superintendents	30	3.97	2.13	-1.08
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	4.63	2.63	
Affection Expressed:				
Small School Superintendents	30	4.37	2.25	-2.01**
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.63	2.61	

** Indicates significance at .05 level.

Table 5. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
Small School Superintendents	30	4.90	1.79	1.80*
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.03	1.94	
Control Expressed:				
Small School Superintendents	30	2.67	3.10	-0.44
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.03	3.42	
Inclusion Wanted:				
Small School Superintendents	30	3.73	2.29	-0.82
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.27	2.75	
Inclusion Expressed:				
Small School Superintendents	30	3.73	1.78	1.17
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.17	1.97	
Affection Wanted:				
Small School Superintendents	30	3.97	2.13	2.02**
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	2.97	1.69	
Affection Expressed:				
Small School Superintendents	30	4.37	2.25	0.43
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.10	2.51	

*Indicates significance of .10 level.

**Indicates significance at .05 level.

In Table 5, when comparing the interpersonal relationships of small school superintendents with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration, there were two areas where significant differences were noted--one at the .10 level, and the other at the .05 level of significance.

The small school superintendents show a greater reluctance to make decisions and control the behavior of others than do the graduate students outside the field of educational administration. This was indicated at the .10 level of significance.

The graduate students outside the field of educational administration show a less desire for wanting affection than do the small school superintendents. This was evident at the .05 level of significance.

All other categories in this comparison show no significant differences between the two groups.

Table 6 compares the interpersonal relationships of large school superintendents with graduate students in the field of educational administration. One area (control wanted) reveals a significant difference at the .10 level, while another area (affection wanted) shows significance at the .05 level.

The graduate students in the field of educational administration exhibit more willingness to be placed

Table 6. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of large school superintendents with those of graduate students in the field of educational administration

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.50	1.57	-1.74*
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.30	1.97	
Control Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	2.60	3.21	-1.33
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	3.76	
Inclusion Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.80	2.44	-0.65
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.23	2.73	
Inclusion Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.13	2.16	0.63
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	1.90	
Affection Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	3.30	2.14	-2.16**
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	4.63	2.62	
Affection Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	5.07	2.18	-0.91
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.63	2.61	

* Indicates significance at .10 level.

** Indicates significance at .05 level.

under the control of others than do the large school superintendents as measured at the .10 level of significance. At the same time, the graduate students in educational administration have a greater desire to have affection shown toward them than do the large school superintendents as was indicated at the .05 level of significance.

Only in the area of "inclusion expressed" was a significant difference noted when comparing the interpersonal relationships of large school superintendents with those of the graduate students outside the field of educational administration as indicated in Table 7 (see next page). In this particular category, the graduate students show less desire to be included in a group than do the large school superintendents. This was indicated at the .10 level of significant difference.

There were no other significant differences noted in the other areas when comparing the interpersonal relationships of these two groups.

The comparison between all school superintendents collectively and graduate students in the field of educational administration in Table 8 shows that three categories (inclusion wanted, affection wanted, and affection expressed) have significant differences at the .10 level (see page 57).

The graduate students in educational administration show a greater need for inclusion than do the school

Table 7. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of large school superintendents with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.50	1.57	1.02
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.03	1.94	
Control Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	2.60	3.21	-0.51
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.03	3.42	
Inclusion Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.80	2.44	0.79
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.27	2.75	
Inclusion Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	4.13	2.16	1.81*
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.17	1.97	
Affection Wanted:				
Large School Superintendents	30	3.30	2.14	0.67
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	20	2.97	1.69	
Affection Expressed:				
Large School Superintendents	30	5.07	2.18	1.59
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.10	2.51	

* Indicates significance at .10 level.

Table 8. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of all school superintendents collectively with those of graduate students in the field of educational administration

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.70	1.68	-1.51
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.30	1.97	
Control Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	2.63	3.13	-1.56
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	3.76	
Inclusion Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.27	2.41	-1.72*
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.23	2.73	
Inclusion Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	3.93	1.97	0.31
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	3.80	1.90	
Affection Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	3.63	2.14	-1.94*
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	4.63	2.62	
Affection Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.72	2.23	-1.74*
Grad. Students in Ed. Adm.	30	5.63	2.61	

*Indicates significance at .10 level.

superintendents collectively. The graduate students in educational administration, additionally, have more need to express affection to others than do the school superintendents collectively. The graduate students in the field also indicate a greater desire to have affection shown toward them than do the school superintendents collectively.

There were two categories indicating significant differences at the .10 level in Table 9 (next page) when comparing the interpersonal relationships of all school superintendents collectively with those of the graduate students outside the field of educational administration. One was in the area of "control wanted" where the superintendents show less desire to take control and make decisions than do the graduate students outside the field of educational administration.

The other area of significant difference at the .10 level was in the category of "inclusion expressed." Here, the school superintendents show a greater desire to belong to a group than do the graduate students outside the field of educational administration.

No significant differences were noted in any of the other areas in this comparison.

There were no significant differences in any of the categories as revealed in Table 10 when comparing the interpersonal relationships of all superintendents collectively with those of all graduate students collectively (see page 60).

Table 9. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of all school superintendents collectively with those of graduate students outside the field of educational administration

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.70	2.68	1.68*
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.03	1.94	
Control Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	2.63	3.13	-0.55
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.03	3.42	
Inclusion Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.27	2.41	0.55
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.27	2.75	
Inclusion Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	3.93	1.97	1.74*
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	3.17	1.97	
Affection Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	3.63	2.14	1.49
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	2.97	1.69	
Affection Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.72	2.23	1.19
Grad. Students outside Ed. Adm.	30	4.10	2.51	

*Indicates significance at .10 level.

Table 10. A comparison of the interpersonal relationships of all school superintendents collectively with those of all graduate students collectively

	N	MEAN	SD	t
Control Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.70	1.68	0.10
All Graduate Students	60	4.67	2.04	
Control Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	2.63	3.13	-1.27
All Graduate Students	60	3.42	3.59	
Inclusion Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.27	2.41	-1.02
All Graduate Students	60	4.75	2.76	
Inclusion Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	3.93	1.97	1.26
All Graduate Students	60	3.48	1.94	
Affection Wanted:				
All School Superintendents	60	3.63	2.14	-0.41
All Graduate Students	60	3.80	2.34	
Affection Expressed:				
All School Superintendents	60	4.72	2.23	-0.34
All Graduate Students	60	4.87	2.63	

Table 11. Summary table of significant differences found in the study

GROUPS IN WHICH INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS WERE COMPARED	Control Wanted	Control Expressed	Inclusion Wanted	Inclusion Expressed	Affection Wanted	Affection Expressed
Large School ^a and Small School Superintendents			*			
Grad. Students ^a in and Grad. students outside of Educational Administration	**				***	**
Small School Superintendents and Grad. Students in Ed. Adm. ^a			**			**
Small School Superintendents ^a and Grad. Students outside of Ed. Adm.	*				**	
Large School Superintendents and Grad. Students in Ed. Adm. ^a	*				**	
Large School Superintendents ^a and Grad. Students outside of Ed. Adm.				*		
All School Superintendents and Grad. Students in Ed. Adm. ^a			*		*	*
All School Superintendents ^a and Grad. Students outside of Ed. Adm.	*			*		
All School Superintendents and all Grad. Students		N	O	N	E	

* Indicates significance at .10 level.

** Indicates significance at .05 level.

*** Indicates significance at .01 level.

^aIndicates which group has higher score (greater desire).

Interpretation of the Findings

Control wanted

In examining Table 11, which summarizes the results of the study, it was determined that four different comparisons show significant differences (one at the .05 level and three at the .10 level) in the area of "control wanted." When comparing graduate students in educational administration with those outside the field, it was discovered (at the .05 level) that the latter group wants less control placed on it than the former group is willing to accept. Likewise, the small school superintendents favored more control placed on them by others than did the graduate students outside the field of educational administration. In the case of large school superintendents, however, it was determined that they were willing to accept less control from others than did the graduate students in educational administration with whom they were compared. When comparing all school superintendents collectively with graduate students outside educational administration, it was determined the former accepted more control from others than the latter.

Control expressed

None of the comparisons in the category of "control expressed" show any significant differences between any of the groups.

Inclusion wanted

In the area of "inclusion wanted" there were three different comparisons with significant differences (two at the .10 level and one at the .05 level). The first was noted when large and small school superintendents were compared. The large school superintendents show a greater desire to be included and invited to join a group than do the small school superintendents. The second significant difference (at the .05 level) was noted when comparing small school superintendents with graduate students in educational administration. Here the small school superintendents show less desire to be included in a group than do the graduate students in educational administration. The third area of significant differences shows that all school superintendents collectively also have less desire to be included in the group than do graduate students in the field of educational administration.

Inclusion expressed

In the area of "inclusion expressed" there were only two comparisons showing significant differences (both at the .10 level). The large school superintendents show more tendency to join groups than do the graduate students outside the field of educational administration. Likewise, all school superintendents collectively have more desire to belong to groups than do graduate students outside of educational administration.

Affection wanted

There were four comparisons showing significant differences in the area of "affection wanted," (one at the .01 level, two at the .05 level, and one at the .10 level). A highly significant difference (at the .01 level) was noted when comparing graduate students in the field of educational administration with the graduate students outside the field. The graduate students in other fields show much less desire to have people act close and friendly toward them than do their counterparts within the field of educational administration. Similarly, the graduate students outside the field of educational administration have less desire (determined at the .05 level) to have others act close and friendly toward them than do the small school superintendents. The larger school superintendents, however, have less desire (as indicated at the .05 level) to have people act close and friendly toward them than do the graduate students in the field of educational administration. All school superintendents collectively, also show a less desire (as indicated at the .10 level) to have people act close and friendly toward them than do the graduate students in educational administration.

Affection expressed

The final comparisons were made in the area of "affection expressed." Here there were three different categories which show significant differences (two at the .05 level and one at

the .10 level). This shows that graduate students in the field of educational administration try more (as indicated at the .05 level) to have close relationships with other persons than do the graduate students outside educational administration. The small school superintendents tend to have fewer close personal relationships with other people (as indicated at the .05 level) than do the graduate students in educational administration. And finally, the same holds true for all school superintendents collectively who show less desire (as indicated at the .10 level) to be close to other people than do the graduate students in educational administration.

Table 12. Summary of significant differences by groups

<p>1. Large School Superintendents</p> <p>(Generally greater desire to control others and be included in groups.)</p>	<p>(a) Have a greater desire to be included in groups than small school superintendents.</p> <p>(b) Have less desire to be controlled by others than the graduate students in educational administration.</p> <p>(c) Have less desire for affection from others than the graduate students in educational administration.</p> <p>(d) Have a greater desire to join groups than do the graduate students outside of educational administration.</p>
<p>2. Small School Superintendents</p>	<p>(a) Have less desire to be included in groups than large school superintendents.</p>

Table 12. (Continued)

<p>(Generally less desire to be included in groups and for affection than large school superintendents or graduate students in educational administration)</p>	<p>(b) Have less desire to be included in groups than graduate students in educational administration.</p> <p>(c) Have less desire to show affection toward others than graduate students in educational administration.</p> <p>(d) Are willing to accept more control from others than are the graduate students outside educational administration.</p> <p>(e) Have a greater desire for affection from others than the graduate students outside educational administration.</p>
<hr/>	
<p>3. Graduate students in educational administration</p>	<p>(a) Are willing to accept more control from others than are graduate students outside educational administration.</p> <p>(b) Want more affection shown to them than do the graduate students outside administration.</p> <p>(c) Want to express more affection toward others than do the graduate students outside educational administration.</p> <p>(d) Have greater desire to be included in a group than do the small school superintendents.</p> <p>(e) Have a greater desire to express affection toward others than do the small school superintendents.</p> <p>(f) Are willing to accept more control from others than the large school superintendents.</p> <p>(g) Want more affection shown to them than do the large school superintendents.</p>
<p>(Generally have more desire for inclusion and affection than other groups)</p>	

Table 12. (Continued)

	(h) Have a greater desire to be included in a group than do school superintendents collectively.
	(i) Want more affection from others than do school superintendents collectively.
	(j) Have a greater desire to express affection toward others than do school superintendents collectively.

4. Graduate students outside educational administration	(a) Are less willing to accept control from others than are the graduate students in educational administration.
	(b) Have less desire for affection from others than graduate students in educational administration.
	(c) Have less desire to show affection toward others than graduate students in educational administration.
(Generally have less desire for inclusion and affection than other groups)	(d) Are less willing to accept control from others than are the small school superintendents.
	(e) Have less desire for affection from others than the small school superintendents.
	(f) Have less desire to express affection than large school superintendents.
	(g) Are less willing to accept control from others than are school superintendents collectively.
	(h) Have less desire to be included in a group than all school superintendents collectively.

Table 12. (Continued)

5. All school superintendents collectively	(a) Have less desire to be included in a group than graduate students in educational administration.
(Generally have less desire for inclusion and affection than do graduate students in educational administration)	(b) Have less desire for affection from others than graduate students in educational administration.
	(c) Have less desire to show affection toward others than do the graduate students in educational administration.
	(d) Have more desire to express affection than the graduate students outside educational administration.
6. All graduate students collectively	(a) No significant differences when compared with all school superintendents collectively.

It was noted in the study that, with only one exception, there was at least one area of significant difference in each of the group comparisons as measured at the .10, .05, and .01 level. When comparing all school superintendents collectively with all graduate students collectively, there was no significant difference in any of the six categories which were tested.

Summary

The following statements or generalizations can be employed as a result of the findings in this particular study:

1. Large school superintendents generally have a greater

desire to be included in groups than do small school superintendents. They also are less willing to be controlled by others and have less need for affection than graduate students in educational administration.

2. Small school superintendents generally have less desire to be included in groups and less desire for affection than large school superintendents or graduate students in educational administration.

3. Graduate students in educational administration generally have more desire for inclusion and affection than other groups.

4. Graduate students outside educational administration generally have less desire for inclusion and affection than other groups.

5. All school superintendents viewed as a single group generally have less desire for inclusion and affection than do the graduate students in educational administration.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the interpersonal relationships of large and small school superintendents and of graduate students in and outside the field of educational administration and to determine whether or not there were significant differences in the behavioral characteristics of each of the groups.

Procedure

The data concerning the interpersonal relationships of each of these groups were obtained by administering the FIRO-B survey instrument to thirty large school superintendents, thirty small school superintendents, thirty graduate students in the field of educational administration, and thirty graduate students outside the field of educational administration. The superintendents in the survey were selected by random sampling from five midwestern states with the stipulation that each must have served as the superintendent in his school district for no less than five years. The graduate students were selected from students within the College of Education and from within the Student Senate at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

When the scores of all these individuals were received,

the data were statistically treated to determine if there were significant differences between the groups in the areas of control wanted, control expressed; inclusion wanted, inclusion expressed; affection wanted, affection expressed. The "pooled t" test was used to determine significant differences between the means of each of the four groups in the six categories measuring the interpersonal relationships. The scores were analyzed in relation to the null hypotheses that there would be no significant differences between any of the groups or combinations of groups.

Results

The findings concerning these hypotheses are as follows:

1. There are no significant differences between large and small school superintendents in relationship to control wanted, control expressed, inclusion expressed, affection wanted, or affection expressed.

2. There is a significant difference between large and small school superintendents in relationship to inclusion wanted. The small school superintendents indicate less desire to be included in a group than do the large school superintendents.

3. There is no significant difference between graduate students in and graduate students outside the field of educational administration in relationship to control expressed, inclusion wanted, and inclusion expressed.

3. There is no significant difference between graduate students in and graduate students outside the field of educational administration in relationship to control expressed, inclusion wanted, and inclusion expressed.

4. There are significant differences between graduate students in and outside the field of educational administration in relationship to control wanted, affection wanted, and affection expressed. The graduate students in educational administration indicate more willingness to accept control from others than do graduate students outside the field of educational administration. The graduate students outside of educational administration indicate less desire for affection from others than do the graduate students in educational administration. Likewise, graduate students in other fields show a less desire to show affection toward others than do the graduate students in the field of educational administration.

5. There is no significant difference between small school superintendents and graduate students in educational administration in relationship to control wanted, control expressed, inclusion expressed and affection wanted.

6. There are significant differences between small school superintendents and graduate students in educational administration in relationship to inclusion wanted and affection expressed. The small school superintendents show less desire to

be included in a group than do the graduate students in educational administration. They also show less need for expressing affection than do the graduate students in educational administration.

7. There are no significant differences between small school superintendents and graduate students outside educational administration in relationship to control expressed, inclusion wanted, inclusion expressed, and affection expressed.

8. There are significant differences between small school superintendents and graduate students outside of educational administration in relationship to control wanted and affection wanted. The small school superintendents are more willing to be controlled by others than the graduate students outside of educational administration. The graduate students outside the field of educational administration show less desire for wanting affection from others than do the small school superintendents.

9. There are no significant differences between large school superintendents and graduate students in educational administration in relationship to control expressed, inclusion wanted, inclusion expressed, or in affection expressed.

10. There are significant differences between large school superintendents and graduate students in educational administration in relationship to control wanted and affection

wanted. The large school superintendents indicate less desire to have others control them than do the graduate students in educational administration. The large school superintendents also show less desire to have affection shown toward them than do the graduate students in educational administration.

11. There are no significant differences between large school superintendents and graduate students outside of educational administration in relationship to control wanted, control expressed, inclusion wanted, affection wanted, and affection expressed.

12. There is a significant difference between large school superintendents and graduate students outside educational administration in relationship to inclusion expressed. The graduate students outside the field show a less desire to be included in a group than do the large school superintendents.

13. There are no significant differences between all school superintendents collectively and graduate students in educational administration in relationship to control wanted, control expressed, and inclusion expressed.

14. There are significant differences between all school superintendents collectively and graduate students in educational administration in relationship to inclusion wanted, affection wanted, and affection expressed. The school

superintendents indicate less need for being included in a group, expressing affection toward others, and for wanting affection from others than do the graduate students in the field of educational administration.

15. There are no significant differences between all school superintendents collectively and the graduate students outside the field of educational administration in relationship to control expressed, inclusion wanted, or affection expressed.

16. There are significant differences between all school superintendents and graduate students outside educational administration in relationship to control wanted and inclusion expressed. The school superintendents are more willing to have control placed on them by others and have more desire to be included in groups than do the graduate students outside the field of educational administration.

17. There are no significant differences between all school superintendents collectively and all graduate students collectively in relationship to control wanted, control expressed, inclusion wanted, inclusion expressed, affection wanted, and affection expressed.

Limitations

This study was limited to sixty practicing school superintendents from five midwestern states and to sixty graduate students at Iowa State University. The sixty school

superintendents were composed of thirty large school superintendents (enrollments of 5000 or more) and thirty small school superintendents (enrollments of less than 500) who had served as the superintendent of their school districts for a minimum of five years.

The sixty graduate students were composed of thirty students studying in the College of Education and thirty students outside the field of educational administration at Iowa State University.

All of the data tested in this study were gathered from the FIRO-B survey instrument and are confined to six behavioral characteristics: control wanted, control expressed, inclusion wanted, inclusion expressed, affection wanted, affection expressed. No other behavioral characteristics were considered in the study.

The "pooled t" test was applied to this data to determine whether or not significant differences existed between any of the groups. There was no effort made to establish cause and effect relationship.

The conclusions of this investigation are limited to those groups tested in the study, and no attempt is made to generalize concerning all school superintendents and graduate students.

Discussion

In reviewing the results of the study, it is apparent that certain inferences can be made concerning the significant differences which were found when comparing the various groups of superintendents and graduate students.

The first of these concerns the large school superintendents as related to "inclusion wanted." It appears that this group has a greater desire to be included in a group than do the superintendents from the small schools. This could be due to the fact that as the large school superintendent has advanced professionally, he has very likely met with previous success in other smaller school systems, and with a gregarious type of nature, has established satisfactory relationships with the various community groups. He, perhaps, realized the importance of belonging to groups and of becoming accepted by people in the community. This would point out the importance of being involved and included in community affairs.

The small school superintendents show less desire to be included in groups than do the graduate students in educational administration. They also seem to have less need for expressing affection. This may seem contrary to what would generally be expected, but it may be tied closely to the role which the small school superintendent is expected to play in the community. If he is successful, he is respected as a

leader and his decisions in many matters carry much weight. In many cases, people do not consider him an average member of the community and are, therefore, reluctant to invite close relationships with him. He, in turn, may not feel that he is accepted as an equal, and consequently is not apt to express as much affection toward others or join in their groups as much as he would with fellow school administrators.

Additionally, the small school superintendents show less evidence of wanting to control the actions of others than do the graduate students outside the field of educational administration. Naturally, superintendents are placed in leadership roles, and if they are successful, they will carry out these roles in an excellent fashion. However, it is quite likely there are many times when this leadership is thrust upon the superintendent and he is expected to "take hold" and "run the show." If it is not directly related to school affairs, he may well be a little reluctant to assume this type of control. Furthermore, due to his background and previous training, he may fully realize the importance of group involvement and the democratic process and thereby be hesitant to dictate to or forcefully control the behavior of others.

All school superintendents collectively show they are willing to have more control placed on them by others than are the graduate students outside of educational administration. This could be explained by the fact that as school

superintendents, they have grown accustomed to the idea of controls from school boards, the state department, federal regulations, etc. The superintendent's job itself means that he must work for and keep the public pleased. This places him under very definite guidelines and controls which he must recognize if he is to succeed.

When comparing the graduate students in educational administration with those outside the field, it was discovered that those outside had a greater desire to control others than did those in educational administration. Likewise, the graduates outside educational administration show less desire to show affection toward others than do the graduate students in the field. This could mean the graduate students in educational administration have already become more sensitive to the needs of others and are working to serve their profession in the best manner possible, whereas the general population may tend to think more independently and is less concerned with the dynamics of groups, etc.

The graduate students in educational administration tend to be much like the small school superintendents in that they show less evidence of wanting to control the actions of others. This may be related to the fact that, as teachers and principals, these individuals perhaps pattern their behavior after that leadership to which they are exposed. If superintendents act in a certain manner and find success, those who

come from the ranks of their schools are very likely to adopt a very similar philosophy and operate in much the same manner. In a larger school, the teachers and principals are farther removed from the superintendent, and, as a result, they may not be as inclined to pattern themselves in like fashion.

It takes a certain type of person to succeed in the position of school superintendent. This study points out some of the significant differences which may be worthy of consideration when a person is trying to decide whether or not he should enter the field of educational administration.

Overall, it would appear that the small school superintendents tend to be more independent and less concerned with personal relationships than their counterparts in the larger schools. Also, the graduate students outside educational administration appear to be more independent in that they desire less affection expressed toward them and they express less affection toward others than do the graduate students in educational administration.

In addition, the large school superintendents and the graduate students outside the field of educational administration appear to want more control over others than do the graduate students in the field of educational administration.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are formulated with the use of the data which have been presented in this study:

1. Large school superintendents generally have a greater desire to be included in groups than do small school superintendents. They also are less willing to be controlled by others and have less need for affection than graduate students in educational administration.

2. Small school superintendents have less desire to be included in groups and less desire for affection than large school superintendents or graduate students in educational administration.

3. Graduate students in educational administration generally have more desire for inclusion and affection than other groups.

4. Graduate students outside of educational administration have less desire for inclusion and affection than other groups.

5. All school superintendents viewed as a single group generally have less desire for inclusion and affection than do the graduate students in educational administration.

It was noted in the study that there are significant differences among the behavioral characteristics of the individual groups, but when the school superintendents collectively are compared with the graduate students collectively,

no significant differences are found.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations are made as a result of the outcome of the study:

1. Inasmuch as there are significant differences noted between the groups of superintendents and graduate students, it would be helpful if further investigations could be made to further identify and clarify the behavioral characteristics as they apply to the role of the educational administrator.

2. A longitudinal type study is recommended whereby the FIRO-B could be administered to the graduate students presently enrolled in educational administration and a follow-up study made after a period of five years to determine which individuals have met with success and which have not.

3. A similar study involving other administrators such as principals, assistant superintendents, curriculum directors, etc., could be made to see if there is any amount of similarity between the behavioral characteristics of all educational administrators in general. This might identify those who might be likely persons to specialize and could be of help in advising students into career choices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ackerman, N. W. Review of W. C. Schutz. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy* 10: 360. 1960.
2. Beal, George M., Bohlan, Joe M. and Randabaugh, J. Neal. *Leadership and dynamic group action*. Ames: Iowa State University Press. 1962.
3. Borko, H. Review of W. C. Schutz. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20: 210-211. 1950.
4. Buxton, Claude E. *College teaching: a psychologist's view*. New York, N.Y.: Harcourt Brace and Co. 1956.
5. Campbell, Ronald F. *The changing role of the superintendent*. Unpublished mimeographed paper presented at the University of Kansas. Chicago, Ill.: College of Education, University of Chicago. 1967.
6. Cartwright, Darwin and Zander, Alvin. *Leadership and Group Performance: Introduction to Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company. 1950.
7. Dewey, John. *The Quest for Certainty*. New York: Capricorn Books. 1950.
8. Douglas, Jack D. Book Review of Schutz, William C. *FIRO: A Three-dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior*. New York: Rinehart and Company. 1958.
9. Freund, John E. *Modern elementary statistics*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1967.
10. Gibb, Cecil A. *The principals and traits of leadership. The Study of Leadership*. Edited by B. G. Brown and Thomas S. Cohn. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Publishers and Printers. 1958.
11. Gorton, Richard A. *Conflict, Controversy, and Crisis in School Administration and Supervision: issues, cases and concepts for the '70s*. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown. 1972.
12. Halpin, Andrew S. *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York, N.Y.: The Macmillan Company. 1968.

13. Hempill, John K., Griffiths, Daniel E. and Frederiksen, Norman. Administrative performance and personality. New York, N.Y.: Teachers College Press, Columbia University. 1962.
14. Hull, C. Hadlai and Nic, Norman. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Update Manual. Chicago, Ill.: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. 1972.
15. James, William. Principles of Psychology. New York, N.Y.: Henry Holt and Company. 1890.
16. Kelly, G. A. The psychology of personal constructs. New York, N.Y.: Norton. 1955.
17. Lewin, Kurt, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph K. White. Patterns in Experimentally Created "Social Climates." Journal of Social Psychology 10: 271-299. 1939.
18. Lipham, James M. Leadership in Administration. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1964.
19. Marshall, Stuart A. Leadership and sensitivity training. Journal of Education 153: 3-57. 1970.
20. Mead, George H. Language and development of self. New York, N.Y.: Henry Holt and Company. 1947.
21. Miller, Daniel R. The study of social relationships: situation, identity, and social interaction. Psychology: A study of a science 5: 639-726. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1963.
22. Miner, John B. The school administrator and organizational character. Eugene, Center for the Advanced Study of Education Administration, University of Oregon. 1967.
23. Murphy, G. Personality - A biosocial approach to origins and structures. New York, N.Y.: Harper. 1967.
24. Murray H. A. Explorations in personality. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press. 1938.
25. Rogers, Carl R. Some observations on the organization of personality. American Psychologist 2: 358-368. 1947.

26. Ryan, Leo Robert. Clinical Interpretation of the FIRO-B. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. 1971.
27. Sachs, Benjamin M. Educational administration, a behavioral approach. Part two: Practical applications. New York, N.Y.: Harper. 1968.
28. Schutz, William C. FIRO-B, A Three-dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. New York, N.Y.: Rinehart and Co. 1958.
29. Schutz, William C. The Interpersonal Underworld. Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, Inc. 1968.
30. Shartle, Carroll L. A theoretical framework for the study of behavior in organizations. Andrew W. Halpin, ed. Administrative Theory in Education. Pp. 73-88. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers. 1958.
31. Snygg, Donald, and Combs, Arthur W. Individual behavior. New York, N.Y.: Harper. 1949.
32. Stodgill, Ralph M. Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. Journal of Psychology 29: 35-71. 1948.
33. Sullivan, Harry Stack. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York, N.Y.: Norton. 1953.
34. Thomas, Michael, P. Strategies in the preparation of school administrators. Albuquerque, New Mexico: The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. 1964.
35. Witt, Henry W. An interpersonal profile of area school instructors. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Ames, Iowa, Library, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1971.

APPENDIX A.

FIRO-B SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PLEASE NOTE:

Page 86, "FIRO-B", copyright 1967 by Consulting Psychologists Press, not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at Iowa State University Library.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

APPENDIX B .

LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

Maxwell, Iowa
March 30, 1972

Dear Sir:

I am writing to request your participation in a dissertation study I am completing at Iowa State University. It will entail making your responses to the items on the enclosed FIRO-B Survey instrument. This will take no more than 10 or 15 minutes to complete. It is not necessary to put your name on the survey.

I am attempting to determine whether school superintendents have a definite response pattern which would be characteristic of the administrators in the profession. If so, this may prove to be helpful in the identification of graduate students who may be successful in their careers at a future date.

Please return the completed FIRO-B Survey form in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study. It is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

David W. Teigland
Superintendent
Maxwell Community School
Maxwell, Iowa 50161

APPENDIX C.

SECOND LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

Maxwell, Iowa
April 30, 1972

Dear Sir:

About three weeks ago I mailed out a survey instrument for use in research for my dissertation study at Iowa State University. I have had a 79% return on this FIRO-B questionnaire, but I do need 100% if my study is going to be valid.

If this FIRO-B is still laying on your desk, would you please take ten minutes to complete the form and return it to me? I would appreciate it greatly and I can assure you that your responses will be kept strictly anonymous. My main purpose in this study is to compare large and small school superintendent's responses with those of current graduate students. I hope that I will be able to contribute something to the area of prediction of success in the area of school administration for these beginning graduate students.

Thanks again for your cooperation in this study. If you should happen to need another copy of the FIRO-B, I will be happy to mail one to you.

Sincerely,

David W. Teigland
Superintendent
Maxwell Community School
Maxwell, Iowa 50161

APPENDIX D .

LETTER TO GRADUATE STUDENTS
OUTSIDE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Maxwell, Iowa
May 13, 1972

Dear Sir:

I am writing to request your participation in a dissertation study I am completing at Iowa State University. It will entail making your responses to the items on the enclosed FIRO-B Survey instrument. This will take no more than 10 or 15 minutes to complete. It is not necessary to put your name on the survey as all participants will remain anonymous.

Please return the completed form in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study. It is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

David W. Teigland
Superintendent
Maxwell School
Maxwell, Iowa 50161