This dissertation has been microfilmed exactly as received

66-10,171

ESTEPHAN, Joseph Ibrahim, 1934-THE INFLUENCE OF INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHER PREFERENCE FOR LEADERSHIP.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1966 Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE INFLUENCE OF INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHER PREFERENCE FOR LEADERSHIP

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

JOSEPH IBRAHIM ESTEPHAN

Norman, Oklahoma

1966

THE INFLUENCE OF INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHER PREFERENCE FOR LEADERSHIP

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the chairman of his doctoral committee and director of his investigation, Dr. Robert E. Ohm, for his continual encouragement and his able assistance and guidance in the development of this study. Furthermore, he wishes to acknowledge the valuable assistance provided by Dr. Oliver D. Johns, Dr. Omer J. Rupiper, and Dr. Funston F. Gaither throughout doctoral program.

I owe deep gratitude to my wife and two children for the extra sacrifices, understanding and love which they granted me so that I could complete this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
LIST OF	TABLES	v
Chapter		
⊥ •	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem Purpose of Study Limitations for Study Definition of Terms and Description of Instruments Sampling Procedures Data Collection Treatment and Analysis of Data Hypotheses to be Tested	2 2 2 3 4 4 5 5
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	7
III.	INSTRUMENTATION AND DESIGN	23
	Collection of Data Description of Instruments Treatment of Data Hypotheses to be Tested	23 25 33 34
IV.	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	36
v.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
	Summary	51 52 54
BIBLTOG	RAPHY	56
APPENDI	[X	60
D.	LEADERSHIP STYLES INVENTORY	61 62 66 68 75

LIST OF TABLES

Cable		Page
1.	Schema of Interpersonal Behaviors	32
2.	Ranks by Teachers from a Photograph Only, From Most to Least Like To Work With	38
3.	The Coefficient of Concordance on the two questions when ranked from photograph only, description only, and from combination of description and photograph	39
4.	Summary of \mathbf{X}_{r}^{2} values for photograph and descriptions for all questions	40
5.	Judges Choices of Leadership Styles, Most and Least Like to Work With	41
6.	Judges Choices of Leadership Styles, Most and Least Like Me	41
7.	Percentages of First Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Most Like to Work With	43
8.	Percentages of First Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Most Like Me	43
9.	Percentages of Least Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Least Like to Work With	<u>4</u> 4
10.	Percentages of Least Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Least Like Me	<i>1</i> , <i>1</i> ,
11.	FIRO-B Acceptance-Rejection Scores for the Six Interpersonal Needs of FIRO-B	46
12.	FIRO-B	47
13.	Scores of FIRO-4 of Various Occupation Groups	48

THE INFLUENCE OF INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHER PREFERENCE FOR LEADERSHIP

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For any school administrator to function successfully, he should perceive fundamental educational and administration problems in terms of their relationship to and their significance for a rapidly changing and potentially improving society. He should understand the significance and implications for the educational program of the basic principles underlying the important administrative processes and provide leadership in assuring that they are utilized constructively. He should understand people individually and as functioning members of dynamic groups whose potentiality and contributions can and should be improved through education. Since the educational enterprise is one which deals with people, certain skills in leadership are of utmost importance. Among the most important are the interpersonal relationships that exist between the administrator and the staff and between the staff and the students. In short, the successful administrator must be a highly competent person who believes in democracy, in the potentialities inherent in people, and in the significance of the educational process; a person who has the knowledge, insights, ability, and skills needed to function successfully as a recognized educational leader in helping people identify, analyze, and solve satisfactorily the problems with which they and their society are confronted.

The Problem

The problem was to determine the extent to which the interpersonal needs of teachers as measured by FIRO-B are related to teachers' preferences for a type of leadership as measured by a leadership style inventory, and by a series of five pictures representing five types of leaders.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study was to determine whether the expectations of followers of their leaders are determined by interpersonal needs. This study was developed to answer three specific questions:

- 1. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the manner of rating is done from photographs only?
- 2. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the method of rating is done from descriptions only?
- 3. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the description of each leadership style and photographs are combined?

Limitations for Study

The teacher population in this study consisted of twenty-eight faculty members of a small midwestern university. The study was restricted to the interpersonal relations factors known as inclusion, control, and affection, as measured by the FIRO-B measuring instrument. Leadership style was depicted by five photographs and by leadership style descriptions combined to form a Leadership Style Inventory. 1

Robert E. Ohm, "Leadership Style Inventory," (unpublished material, Oklahoma University, 1964).

Definition of Terms and Description of Instruments

<u>Photographs</u>: The five photographs used in the study represent five college deans. They were used to determine whether responses to a photograph influence teacher choices of leadership styles. The photographs appear in Appendix E.

Leadership Style Inventory: 2

The five descriptive paragraphs represent five leadership styles. The styles were developed from a synthesis of leader behavior research and empirical or conventional views of leadership. Each style is composed of a set of statements selected both for their representation of research based dimensions and consistency in building a generalized style.

The styles are pragmatic in that they represent both theoretical and culturally derived views. The sub-structure of statements, however, does represent research derived dimensions.

The styles are deliberately positive in character, since negative statements tend to become obvious cues for decisions when information and thought are limited. The obvious dimensions of the authoritarian laisse-faire, democratic triangle or loaded words such as autocratic, unfriendly, cold, and indecisive, have been avoided. The five types styles are: (1) Brown representing the rule following, rule bound, or role oriented leader, (2) Green representing the person oriented, non-directive approach concerned with the personality and professional

²Vernon McAllister, "A Study of Leadership Role Precepts as Viewed by Teachers, School Administrators, and School Board Members." (unpublished ED.D. Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1964)

growth of each individual, (3) Cardinal representing the charismatic leader with the traits commonly associated with the leader stereotype, (4) White representing a practical oriented and manipulative style that uses available means to get the job done, (5) Black representing a systems—goal oriented style. Names were assigned for identification purposes and have no relation to style or photograph. The five descriptions given in Appendix B.

<u>Description of FIRO-B</u>: ³ FIRO-B is a measuring instrument which stands for Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior.

FIRO-B is designed to measure the individual's behavior toward others (e) and the behavior he wants from others (w) in three areas of interpersonal interaction. This measure leads to six scores: (1) expressed inclusion behavior (eI), (2) wanted inclusion behavior (wI), (3) expressed control behavior (eC), (4) wanted control behavior (wC), (5) expressed affection behavior (eC), and (6) wanted affection behavior (wA).

Sampling Procedures

The sample in this research was drawn from a small midwestern university. It is a church related university with all of the faculty belonging to the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Using a faculty directory and numbering the names, a selection was made using the table of random numbers. The total sample of twenty-eight teachers represents one-fifth of total population.

Data Collection

Individual conferences were held with each subject in the subject's

William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Personal Behavior, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958).

office. The instruments were administered in three stages; photographs, leadership style, and combined photographs and leadership style. In each stage the subject was asked to rank the stimuli material according to from most like to work with to least like to work with, and from most like me to least like me.

The conference was terminated with the understanding that the FIRO-B would be mailed to them at a later date.

The FIRO-B was mailed to each of the twenty-eight subjects with a letter thanking the respondents for their participation in the research and with a request to respond to the instrument and return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope at their earliest convenience. All twenty-eight responded and all of the responses were complete.

Treatment and Analysis of Data

The scores received on the FIRO-B scale were analyzed to determine if definite patterns existed in interpersonal needs.

Similarly, responses to the photographs and leadership styles were treated to determine the extent to which preference patterns existed. Kendall's coefficient of concordance, Wc, was used to test the extent to which patterning existed.

The mean scores of the experimental group were compared with the mean scores of other groups on which FIRO had been used to determine the extent to which the experimental group differed on the six interpersonal needs.

Hypotheses to be Tested

Through the use of the rating devices, this study was designed to determine the extent to which the interpersonal needs of teachers as measured by FIRO-B were related to teachers' preferences for a type

of leadership as measured by leadership style inventory, and by a series of five pictures representing five types of leaders.

This study was developed to answer three specific questions:

- 1. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the manner of rating is done from photographs only?
- 2. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the method of rating is done from descriptions only?
- 3. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the description of each leadership style is accompanied by a photograph?

On the bases of these questions and assumptions the following hypotheses were made:

- 1. The extent to which raters agree on photographs is a matter of chance.
- 2. The extent to which raters agree on leadership styles is a matter of chance.
- 3. The extent to which raters agree on leadership styles and photographs when combined is a matter of chance.
- 4. The extent to which teachers have the same need pattern is a matter of chance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The study and practice of administrative leadership are experiencing a great deal of change. One area is a study of human personality and human interactions in organizations. Although administrative thought has made tremendous advances, the greatest advances still lie ahead.

There are many theories being developed that will make an impact on education and administration. Various authorities in the field have outlined different theories. Probably one of the best known theories in educational administration comes from Getzels. This theory describes administration as a social process in which behavior is conceived as a function of both the nomothetic and the idiographic dimensions of a social system. Another theory is one of motivation in which the needs, drives, and motives of individuals are considered. The Barnard theory or organizational equilibrium illustrates this type of theory.

In addition to these categories there are two theories which may portend what lies ahead in theory construction. The first is the work of Presthus in which he used the Weber bureaucratic $model^2$ and the

¹Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process," In Andrew W. Halpin (ed.), Administrative Theory in Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958), pp. 150-165.

Robert Presthur, The Organizational Society, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1962).

second is the work of Griffiths in which he employs system—theory as a model. The Presthus theory deals largely with conflict and motivation, yet it also discusses man as a rational being. It is an attempt to explain the behavior of man within an organization as a whole and uses the system theory as a model to investigate the problem of change in organizations. System theory is the result of an attempt to develop a general theory which enables the researcher to describe, explain, and predict a wide range of human behavior within organizations. It deals with conflict, motivation, and decision—making in much the same manner as does Presthus. The two theories represent the direction in which theoreticians might move in the coming years.

Paralleling this concern for developing an administrative theory has been a concern with the study of leadership. There have been numerous and intensive investigations of leadership and leader behavior.

Considering leadership as the focal point in administration, we must consider according to Pigors, ⁴ (1) the leader, (2) the situation, (3) the group as a functioning organization, and (4) the members of the group. This review of literature will attempt to interpret studies in relation to these four concepts of organization.

The Leader

Morphet, Johns and Reller defined leadership in terms of leader

³Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," in Mathew B. Miles (ed.), <u>Innovations in Education</u> (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1963).

⁴P. Pigors, <u>Leadership or Domination</u>. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1935).

Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and T. L. Reller, Educational Administration, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 86.

behavior, when the leader (1) helps the group to define tasks, goals and purposes, (2) helps the group to achieve its tasks, goals and purposes, and (3) helps to maintain the group by assisting in providing for group and individual needs.

Leadership is very highly valued in human society. In any society, human beings could be classed and divided into two groups—the leaders and the followers. Therefore, leaders must possess certain traits or qualities not possessed by followers. Some persons in each generation since the beginning of recorded history have believed that "leaders are born, not made." However, Stogdill concluded:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of interactions of variables which are in constant flux and change.

Therefore, leadership is not a matter of passive status, nor does it devolve upon a person simply because he is the possessor of some combination of traits. Rather, the leader acquires leader status through the interactions of the group in which he participates and demonstrates his capacity for assisting the group to complete its tasks.

The Situation

Leadership is defined by Pigors as the situation where one, or at most a very few personalities are placed in the environment so that his or their, "will, feeling, and insight direct and control others in the

Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership, A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, XXV (1948), p. 64.

pursuit of a cause."⁷ Leadership has often been thought of as a specific attribute of personality that is possessed by some people and not by others, or at least one with which some degree of proficiency in its usage while others achieve little or none. Gibb⁸ holds that leadership is not viewed as an attribute of personality, but rather as the quality of a role within a particular and specified social system. He further asserts that leadership is a function of both the social situation and the personality, and is therefore the result of the interaction between the two.

The Group as a Functioning Organization

Gibb has developed three principles of leadership theory.

- 1. Leadership is always relative to the situation. A group must be confronted with a common problem that is in the process of being solved through communication and interaction before any leadership can be displayed.
- 2. Leadership is always directed toward some group goal. It is the quality that comes out as the group moves about together.
- 3. The third principle is an outgrowth of the second in that leadership is a process of mutual stimulation. The leader must be a member of the group with the same objectives in mind. He can be superior to the group, but he can not differ too greatly from the followers. He

Pigors, loc. cit.

⁸Cecil A. Gibb, "The Principles and Traits of Leadership," in C. G. Browne, The Study of Leadership, (Danville: Interstate Printers, 1958), pp. 67-75.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 267-284.

must have many of the qualities of the followers.

Myers 10 made an analysis of more than two hundred studies of leadership that had been made in a period of fifty years. He concluded in summary form the following:

- No physical characteristics are significantly related to leadership.
- 2. Although leaders tend to be slightly higher in intelligence than the group of which they are members, there is no significant relationship between superior intelligence and leadership.
- 3. Knowledge applicable to the problems faced by a group contributes significantly to leadership status.

The following characteristics correlate significantly with what Myers just enumerates:

These characteristics denote qualities of an interactional nature. They are present in leadership situations much more often than are characteristics that denote status or qualities of a more individualistic nature. Some characteristics of the later kind are socio-economic background and self confidence.

The research indicates, however, that personal characteristics of leaders differ according to the situation. Leaders tend to remain leaders only in situations where the activity is similar. No single characteristic is the possession of all leaders.

The above quotes suggest that Stogdill and Myers are substantially in agreement concerning the relationship of personality traits to leadership.

Robert B. Myers, "The Development and Implications of a Conception of Leadership for Leadership Education," (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1954), pp. 105-106.

^{11 &}lt;u>Tbid.</u>, p. 107.

The Members of the Group

Hemphill¹² found that, in most studies of leadership, emphasis has been placed upon the personal characteristics of the individual designated as the leader. This is but one aspect of the problem. The social situation in which the leader functions is also important.

Sanford 13 found that the leader relations are a result of psychological factors in the follower and the leader. The follower has problems that the leader must solve. He has certain standards by which he judges the leader's effectiveness. He also has situationally determined needs to be satisfied. These needs include the achieving of the group goal. In many situations the "nice guy" is often selected as the leader, but in other situations, where there is a pressing need or a challenging goal to be achieved, he is often bypassed for someone who can assume leadership whether or not he is a "nice guy." This also applies to the leader, for just as there are many different needs to be met for the followers, there are also needs to be met for the leader. Some leaders are known to be "nice guys," but have difficulty meeting the demands when strong authority is required. In the same way, an authoritarian leader is greatly handicapped when trying to lead groups that encourage self-expression and group will.

The democratic leader seeks to evoke the maximum involvement and participation of every member in the group activities and in the determination of objectives.

¹² John K. Hemphill, <u>Situational Factors in Leadership</u>, (Ohio State University: Columbus, 1944), p. 101.

¹³Fillmore H. Sanford, "The Follower's Role in Leadership Phenomena," in Guy E. Swanson (ed.) Readings In Social Psychology, (Henry Holt and Company: New York, 1952), pp. 328-341.

He seeks to spread responsibility rather than concentrate it. He seeks to encourage and reinforce interpersonal contacts and relations throughout the group structure so as to strengthen it. He seeks to reduce intragroup tension and conflict. He seeks to avoid hierachial group structure in which special privilege and status differentials predominate.

Gibb¹⁵ further explained democratic leadership as an attempt to broaden the base of participation and to make the maximum use of the individual differences that exist. It draws creativity from the group members because it transfers power and influence to those who have the most to offer for the immediate goal. This technique is impossible in authoritarian leadership. It should be noted that the participation by all members of the group, while declared by many to be desirable is often less efficient than is directed leadership.

Authoritarian leadership is further explained by Gibb:

It is important for the use we can make of our resources and of our groups that we recognize authoritarianism and democracy as poles of a continuum, neither of which is wholly good or wholly bad, but which represents extremes of a variable "leadership technique" that should be adapted to all elements of the situation-culture, personality content, structural interrelations, syntality, and task.

Lippitt and ${\rm White}^{17}$ in an experimental study of leadership found that a group was more acceptable to an authoritarian leader if it had

¹⁴D. Kreech and R. S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems for Social Psychology. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1948), p. 425.

¹⁵ Cecil A. Gibb, "Leadership," in Gardner Lindzey (ed.), <u>Handbook</u> of Social Psychology, Vol. 11, (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954), pp. 887-917.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ronald Lippitt and Ralph White, "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Guy E. Swanson and others (eds.) Readings in Social Psychology, (New York: Holt, 1952), pp. 340-355.

experienced no other type of leadership. Those groups that had had experience with a democratic leader became frustrated and resistive when they encountered an authoritarian leader.

In the area of democratic leadership Kutner 18 concludes that the final authority in any democratic group must rest with the membership. The group in organizing itself must set the limits of authority that its leader must possess.

The leader is to represent the group within and throughout the group organization.

From the above discussion, it is clear that there is no single pattern of leadership and that a variety of types may appear within an organization.

The difficulty of scientific selection of leaders is that leadership is a group value judgment differing with each group and each circumstance. Jennings writes that:

The why of leadership appears not to reside in any personality traits considered simply, not even in a constellation of related traits, but in interpersonal contributions of which the individual becomes capable, in a specific setting eliciting such contributions from him. 19

Eaton²⁰ explained that leadership selection may never be completely refined. However, leadership tests which could separate the extreme

¹⁸Bernard Kutner, "Elements and Problems of Democratic Leader-ship," in Alvin W. Gouldner (ed.), Studies in Leadership, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 459-467.

Helen Hall Jennings, <u>Leadership and Isolation</u>, (New York: David McKay, 1943), p. 205.

Joseph W. Eaton, "Is Scientific Leadership Selection Possible?" in Alvin W. Gouldner, Studies in Leadership, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 640.

cases—those very likely to succeed or fail as leaders—would be an important scientific achievement.

Interpersonal Needs Approach

Every personality trait is influenced in some way by social interaction. Horney²¹ writes that every child works out a strategy which in the main follows one of three lines: moving toward people, which corresponds to the affection area; against them which corresponds to control area; and from them, which corresponds to the area of inclusion. These are continued and manifested on through adult life. Each of these corresponds to his social world. Although one of the three is usually predominant for each individual, there are always traces of the other two.

People whose dominant attitude is one of moving toward people are described by Horney²² as "compliant." Such a person shows a marked need for affection and approval and an especial need for a "partner" who is a friend, lover, husband or wife. He often subordinates himself to others, seeks good things for others, but not for himself. Those whose dominant characteristics is one of moving against people are above all interested in being "tough." Those who develop neither characteristic develop a neurotic detachment because they have been unable to relieve basic anxiety either by compliance or toughness.

. . . the detached person becomes panicky if he can no longer safeguard his emotional distance from others . . .

²¹ Karen Horney, Our Inner Conflicts, (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1945), pp. 40-43.

^{22&}lt;u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 74-94.

the reason his panic is so great is that he has no technique for dealing with life. . . . the detached person can neither appease nor fight, neither co operate nor dictate terms, neither love nor be ruthless. He is as defenseless as an animal that has only one means of coping with danger—that is, to escape and hide.²³

Fromm²⁴ in his book <u>Man for Himself</u>, discusses three types of interpersonal needs which he calls "interpersonal relatedness."

One type of this relatedness which he calls "withdrawal—desctructiveness" corresponds to the inclusion behavior.

Another type of relatedness is "symbiotic" which corresponds to the area of control. The main emphasis of this type is on a power relation and freedom.

The last type of relatedness which corresponds to affection is "love." This king of relation involves close ties and is personal.

Freud²⁵ emphasizes that the total personality consists of the three major systems: those he calls the erotic which correspond to the affection area; the narcissistic which correspond to the inclusion area; and the obsessional which correspond to the area of control.

Combs²⁶ describes adequate, self actualizing persons as persons as characterized by an essentially positive view of self. This is not to suggest that adequate people never have negative ways of regarding themselves.

^{23 &}lt;u>Tbid.</u>, pp. 91-92.

Erick Fromm, Man for Himself, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1947), pp. 109-110.

²⁵Sigmund Freud, "Libidinal Types," In <u>Collection Papers</u>, (London: Hogarth, 1950), Vol. 5, pp. 247-248.

Arthur W. Combs, "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, 1962 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962), p. 51.

In discussing the positive view of self Combs makes the following statement:

Having a positive view of self is much like having money in the bank. It provides a kind of security that permits the owner a freedom he could not have otherwise. With a positive view of self one can risk taking chances; it permits him to be creative, original and spontaneous. What is more, he can afford to be generous, to give of himself freely or to become personally involved in events. Feeling he is much more, he has so much more to give.

Tannenbaum and others recently expressed themselves concerning the use of interpersonal relations in the study of administration as follows:

Interpersonal effectiveness is influenced by three types of variables: personality variables, interpersonal variables, and situational variables. Much recent research has arrived at broad statistical generalizations about groups of individuals, types of relations, and varieties of situations. These generalizations represent good beginnings. However, work must rapidly proceed to the point where individual predictions can be made; that is, where it can be predicted how a specific individual with a given personality involved in a given interpersonal relation in a given situation will behave.

Parsons and Shils in developing a theory based on "need-disposition" states:

Need dispositions are tendencies to orient and act with respect to objects in certain manners and to expect certain consequences from these actions. The conjoined word "need-disposition" itself has a double connotation; on the one hand it refers to a tendency to fulfill some requirement of the organism, a tendency to accomplish this end state.

^{27&}lt;sub>Tbid</sub>.

Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massorik, <u>Leader-ship and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach</u>, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961), p. 12.

Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, "Personality as a System of Action," Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (ed.) Toward a General Theory of Action, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 114-115.

Schutz³⁰ followed a different line of thinking from those of Fromm, Freud, Parsons and Shils. A theory of interpersonal behavior was developed and built around a basic postulate that each person has three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control and affection. Each person has the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with other people in each of these three areas, where inclusion means interaction and association; control includes power; and affection includes love and refers to a close, personal relationship.

Schutz's analysis to a certain extent corresponds to Horney's three types of personal behavior.

Under Inclusion types, Schutz³¹ lists four different personalities:

- (1) The undersocial person tends to be introverted and withdrawn.

 He avoids associating with others and doesn't like or accept invitations to join others.
- (2) The oversocial person tends toward extraversion in his later interpersonal behavior. He seeks people incessantly and wants them to seek them out.
- (3) The social is comfortable with people and comfortable being alone. Unconsciously, he feels that he is a worthwhile, significant person and that life is worth living. He is fully capable of being genuinely interested in others and feels that they will include him in their activities and that they are interested in him.
 - (4) Inclusion pathology, failure to be included, means:

William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Personal Behavior, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958).

^{31 &}lt;u>Toid.</u>, pp. 25-28.

. . . anxiety over having contact with people. Unsuccessful resolution of inclusion relations lead to feelings of exclusion, of alienation from people, of being different and unacceptable, and usually to the necessity of creating a phantasy world in which the nonincluded person is accepted. Inclusion, because it is posited to be the first area of interpersonal relations to be dealt with by the infant, has strong narcissistic elements and other close similarities to the description by psychoanalysts of the interpersonal characteristics in the oral stage. Hence a pathological difficulty in the inclusion area leads to the most regressed kind of behavior, that concerned with belonging to people, being a significant individual.

Under the Control types Schutz 33 includes:

- (1) The abdicrat, who is described as a person who tends toward submission and abdication of power and responsibility in his interpersonal behavior. Characteristically, he gravitates toward the subordinate position where he will not have to take responsibility for making decisions, and where someone else takes charge.
- (2) The autocrat is a person whose interpersonal behavior often tends toward the dominating. Characteristically, he tries to dominate people and strongly desires a power hierarchy with himself at the top.
- (3) The domocrat is the person who has successfully resolved his relations with others in the control area in childhood, and power and control present no problem. He feels comfortable giving or not giving orders and taking or not taking orders, as is appropriate to the situation.
- (4) Control pathology, is one in which the person who does not accept control of any kind develops pathologically into a psychopathic personality. He has not been adequately trained to learn the rules of behavior for respecting the rights and privileges of others.

³²<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 28.

^{33 &}lt;u>Thid.</u>, pp. 28-30.

The affection types according to Schutz³⁴ are:

- (1) The underpersonal type tends to avoid close personal ties with others. He characteristically maintains his dyadic relations on a superficial, distant level and is most comfortable when others do the same to him. Consciously he wishes to maintain this emotional distance, and frequently expresses a desire not to get "emotionally involved"; unconsciously he seeks a satisfactory affectional relation.
- (2) The overpersonal type attempts to become extremely close to others. He definitely wants others to treat him in a very close, personal way.
- (3) The personal type is represented by the person who successfully resolved his affectional relations with others in childhood, and
 for him close emotional relations with other persons present no problems.
 He is comfortable in such a personal relation, and he can also relate
 comfortably in a situation requiring emotional distance.
- (4) Affection pathology, represented by the person who desires affection in a special way.

Leadership Styles in Relation to Interpersonal Needs

Leadership styles have been investigated to a limited extent.

Bechtold in his study found out that the (1) age of teachers does affect their FIRO-B score; (2) the years of teaching experience affect

^{34 &}lt;u>Tbid.</u>, pp. 30-32.

³⁵Lawrence A. Bechtold, "Administrative Typologies and the Relationship to Interpersonal Behavior of Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, University of Oklahoma, 1965), p. 85.

the interpersonal needs of teachers as measured by FIRO-B; (3) teachers score high on the inclusion expressed need and relatively low on the inclusion wanted need; (4) teachers score high on the need control expressed and high on the control wanted need; (5) teachers score relatively low on affection expressed and high on affection wanted; (6) the administrative typology designating the instructional leader was preferred in the large number of simulated situations; (7) the administrative typology classified as the operational mediator was least preferred and (8) teachers indicated a desire for the need control wanted and preferred that typology, the instructional leader, that denotes behavior against people.

According to Getzel and Guba³⁶ the nomothetic-idiographic-transactional formulation can be used to describe the styles of leadership.

Nomothetic leadership may be defined as institution oriented, rulefollowing, policy following behavior. The idiographic leader uses the
person oriented, non-directive approach concerned with the personality
and professional growth of each individual. The transactional type of
leader represents the practical orientation and manipulative style that
uses available means to get the job done. Rules are applied when
necessary, but are changed or interpreted to fit the situation when
appropriate. Control is exerted through deliberately designed group
structure and knowledge of the informal as well as the formal structure
of the organization. The fourth type is the charismatic leader. This
type attempts to be consistent with follower responses to charisma in

³⁶ J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, IXV, (Winter, 1957).

that follower dependency is a part of the general description. The last type of leadership according to ${\rm Bion}^{37}$ and expanded by Thelen 38 demonstrates the upward communication and acceptance considered to be important in foreman effectiveness.

The above discussion indicates that every individual has basic interpersonal needs which lead him to behave in a certain way for the purpose of establishing a satisfactory relation with others. For instance, if an individual's early training is oriented toward rule following, directly or indirectly this type of individual will interact with others according to his frame of reference. In making choices or decisions, each person favors the type of leadership style that satisfies his basic interpersonal need.

This brief review of the related research points up the need for wider research especially in the area of the interpersonal behavior and leadership.

More specifically, there is a need for the investigation of interpersonal needs and preferences for leadership styles. The results of investigating the relation of needs to preferences for a type of leader should contribute to leadership theory and administrative practice.

W. R. Bion, Experiences With Groups, (London: Tavistock Institute, 1951, 1961).

³⁸ H. D. Thelen, The Dynamics of Groups at Work, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954).

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION AND DESIGN

Collection of Data

The questions of the study suggested that a sample appropriate for testing the hypotheses should be relatively homogenous in terms of needs, i.e., the sample should be significantly weighted in the direction of at least one of the needs as measured by FIRO-B. Consequently, the members of a small, midwestern university with a strong religious orientation were selected. It was expected that such a sample would have a need pattern that could differentiate the group from others on which FIRO-B data was available.

Permission to interview the faculty members of the university was granted by the Dean of the university. Using a faculty directory, all full time faculty were numbered and every fifth faculty member was selected for interview, providing a total sample of twenty-eight subjects.

The sample selected was composed of nineteen males and nine females ranging in age from a low of thirty years to a high of fifty years. All of the sample were members of the supporting church denomination. Both faculty and students were required to attend chapel once a week. Sixteen members of the sample had Master's degrees or above and twelve had earned doctorates.

The final sample represented the full range of disciplines in the

university at the graduate as well as undergraduate level.

The individual conference and mailed questionnaire procedures were used to collect the data. The individual conferences were held with each subject in the subject's office. The instruments were administered in three stages: photographs, leadership style, and combined photographs and leadership style. In each stage the subject was asked to rank the stimuli material according to the following format:

"If you were a teacher rank the following ____ in order of preference from most like to work with to least like to work with."

Most 1

2

3

4

Least 5

"If you were to become an administrator, rank the from most like me to least like me."

Most 1

2

3

4

Least 5

The conference was terminated with the understanding that the FIRO-B instrument would be mailed to them at a later date.

The FIRO-B instrument was mailed to each of the twenty-eight subjects with a letter thanking the respondents for their participation in the research and with requests to respond to the instrument and return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope at their earliest convenience.

All twenty-eight responded and all of the responses were complete.

The photographs and leadership styles were ranked from most to least preferred in a scale of one to five. The most preferred was

given a score of one and the least preferred a score of five. FIRO-B scores are Guttman Scales ranging from zero to nine for each of the six interpersonal needs. A score of zero is a rejection of the need and score of nine is high acceptance of the need. The raw scores are given in Appendix D.

Description of Instruments

The photographs were selected to represent five academic college deans. Although McAllister in a previous study using these same pictures found that pictures had no significant influence on choices of leadership styles when styles and pictures were combined, the pictures were used in this study to attempt to replicate the findings. The use of the pictures as an instrument is based on the assumption that visual cues influence preferences for types of leaders regardless of descriptive styles. The reliability of the use of photographs has not been tested extensively, therefore, the findings may be influenced and to a certain extent biased.

The Leadership Style Inventory describes five leadership Styles as follows:

1. Brown represents the rule following, rule bound, or role criented leader. Leadership is exerted through emphasis on policies, rules and roles. Decisions are made with reference to the appropriate policy or rule. When a situation is not covered by existing regulations, interpretation leading to decisions are made in terms of the welfare of the organization as if the interpretations were a logical extension of existing structure. Rules may be reinterpreted if their application to

¹ McAllister, op. cit.

a particular situation seems to favor the individual over the organization.

- 2. Green represents the person oriented, non-directive approach concerned with the personality and professional growth of each individual. Rules are loosely defined and each individual is expected to create the major part of the role he sees for himself in the organization with whatever support his dependency may require. Green sees the role creation process as one that requires considerable individual freedom and autonomy within a bare minimum of rules that are open to change. Decision making is generally distributed among the members and groups in the organization and leadership is exerted through developing the leadership potential of the staff.
- 3. Cardinal represents the charismatic leader with the traits commonly associated with the leader stereotype. He is tall, impressive, decisive, has a high energy level, gets things moving, inspires his subordinates, is seldom "wrong", is busy, and has a personal magnetism that evokes loyalty and affection. Though he protests publicly about the need and desirability for decentralization, his leadership tends to centralize decision making, power, and control of resources.
- 4. White represents a practical orientation and manipulative style that uses available means to get the job done. Rules are applied when necessary but are changed or interpreted to fit the situation when appropriate. Control is exerted through deliberately designed group structure and knowledge of the informal as well as formal structure of the organization. Indigenous or informal leadership is used whenever possible. Decisions are made in light of the demands of the situation,

sometimes favoring the organization, sometimes the individual, sometimes left to the group, and sometimes made ahead of group action when dead-lines need to be met. Leadership is exerted through a thorough know-ledge of group structure and individual needs directed to achieve the goals of the organization.

5. Black represents a goal oriented style of leadership. Individuals and groups operate in their areas of competency. Decision making is done in terms of the sub-systems affected by the decision and is evaluated in terms of the objectives to be achieved. Individuals are held to goal directed performance and goals as well as rules are changed as the results of performance are considered in individual conference and group discussion. Leadership is located or delegated in accord with the competencies required by the situation. Decisions are made after consultation with superiors, peers subordinates, specialists, and others that may be affected by the decision.

In referring to the leadership styles, it is appropriate to label Brown as the nomothetic leader; Green as the idiographic leader; Cardinal as the charismatic leader; White as the transactional leader; and Black as the goal oriented leader.

The styles were developed from a synthesis of leader behavior research and empirical or conventional views of leadership. Each style is composed of a set of statements selected both for their representation of research based dimensions and consistency in building a generalized style. The reliability and validity have not been established.

Since no general, comprehensive theory of leadership has as yet been formulated, the five styles are pragmatic in that they represent

both theoretical and culturally derived views. The sub-structure of statements, however, does represent research derived dimensions.

The styles are deliberately positive in character, since negative statements tend to become obvious cues for decisions when information and thought are limited. The obvious dimensions of the authoritarian, laizze-faire, democratic triangle or loaded words such as autocratic, unfriendly, cold, indecisive, etc., have been avoided. The forced choice among positive elements taps ethical dilemmas in leadership which has provided significant distributions across styles.

Sentences that delineate a style are taken from subsets describing one or more dimensions of leader behavior identified by current research.

Since warm, friendly behavior is positively valued in contrast to cold, aloof behavior, each of the styles has some warmth and friendliness, ruling out some of the obvious negative dimensions currently in use such as authoritarian, etc., which normally provide the "right" choice cues for respondents.

Behaviors taken from Getzel's and Guba's nomothetic-idiographic-transactional formulation are a part of the styles of Brown, White, and Green. Brown exhibits a nomothetic orientation, Green an idiographic orientation, and White a transactional orientation. Since the transactional dimension is admittedly loose and difficult to bound, some liberty has been taken in developing White's style.

The Initiating-Structure-In Action and Consideration dimensions

²W. J. Getzels, and G. E. Guba, "Social Behavior and The Administrative Process," <u>The School Review</u>, IXV, (Winter, 1957).

of leader behavior, as defined by Halpin³ are not as readily assigned to distinct styles. Several of the sentences describing Brown are taken directly from the Initiating Structure dimension of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The sentences describing the Consideration dimension of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire are either of the friendly or negative type. Consequently this dimension is not identifiable as unique to a single style. However, since friendly or considerate behavior is also a part of Brown's style, it most nearly represents the high initiation and consideration leader behavior quadrant proposed by Halpin as characterizing the most effective or ideal leader. In turn Green represents the low initiating structure, high consideration type in Halpin's quadrant scheme.

The non-directive approach to group leadership proposed by Rogers and extended by Gordon is evident in Green's style. In developing this style, an effort was made to keep away from behaviors which could be interpreted as laizze-faire, sloppy, or withdrawn and used as negative choice cues.

The trait theory of leadership is pushed to the charisma level in Cardinal's style. It attempts to be consistent with follower responses to charisma in that follower dependency is a part of the general description.

³A. W. Halpin, <u>The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents</u>. Studies in Educational Administration, Monograph No. 6, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959.

⁴C. R. Rogers, <u>Client Centered Therapy</u>. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951).

⁵T. Gordon, <u>Group Centered Leadership</u>. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1955).

The manipulative issue inherent in a leader's understanding of and skill in group processes and use of organizational structure to achieve organizational goals is suggested in White's style. The question of the meaning, purpose and function of "good human relations" can be raised in relation to White's orientation.

The work orientation of the Work-Emotionality dimension of group process developed by Bion⁶ and expanded by Thelen⁷ is reflected in Black's style. In addition, Black demonstrates the upward communication and acceptance considered to be important in foreman effectiveness and the systems check behavior which makes certain that the decision will be accepted and carried out before the decision is made.

The second instrument used was FIRO-B which stands for Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior.

FIRO-B is designed to measure the individual's behavior toward others (e) and the behavior he wants from others (w) in three areas of interpersonal interaction. This measure leads to six scores: (1) expressed inclusion behavior (eI), (2) wanted affection behavior (wI), (3) expressed control behavior (eC), (4) wanted control behavior (wE), (5) expressed affection behavior (eC), and (6) wanted affection behavior (wA).

<u>Interpersonal Need</u> is defined as one that may be met only through the attainment of a satisfactory relationship with other people.

⁶W. R. Bion, Experiences With Groups. London: Tavistock Institute, 1951.

⁷D. C. Pelz, "Influence: A Key To Effective Leadership," <u>Study of Leadership</u>, (eds.) C. C. Browne and T. S. Cohn, Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1958.

The three areas of interpersonal need which are basic to personality structure and behavior are called inclusion, control, and affection.

Schutz⁸ defines the three interpersonal needs as such:

The interpersonal need for inclusion is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to interaction and association.

The interpersonal need for control is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to control and power.

The interpersonal need for affection is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with others with respect to love and affection.

Schutz 9 further defines "satisfactory relation" for the three interpersonal needs as follows:

A satisfactory relation for inclusion includes: (1) A psychologically comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from originating or initiating interaction with all people to not initiating interaction with anyone, and (2) A psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always initiating interaction with the self to never initiating interaction with the self.

A satisfactory relation for control includes: (1) A psychologically

William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Personal Behavior, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1953), pp. 18-20.

^{9&}lt;u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 18-20.

comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from controlling all the behavior of other people to not controlling any behavior of others and (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always being controlled by them to never being controlled by them.

A satisfactory relation for affection includes: (1) A psychologically comfortable relation with others somewhere on a dimension ranging from initiating close, personal relations with everyone to originating close, personal relation with no one, and (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them on a dimension ranging from always originating close, personal relations toward the self, to never originating close, personal relations toward the self.

Individual behavior is measured by behavior toward others and behavior wanted from others. The former is known as expressed behavior and the latter is known as wanted behavior. Table one is a scheme of the theoretical framework.

TABLE 1¹⁰
Schema of Interpersonal Behaviors

Dimension	Expressed Behavior	Wanted Behavior
Inclusion	I initiate interaction with people.	I want to be included.
Control	I control people.	I want people to control me.
Affection	I act close and personal toward people.	I want people to get close and personal with me.

^{10 &}lt;u>Tbid.</u>, p. 59.

Treatment of Data

The scores received on the FIRO-B scale were analyzed to determine if definite patterns existed in interpersonal needs.

Similarly, response to the photographs and leadership styles were treated to determine the extent to which preference patterns existed. Kendall's coefficient of concordance, Wc, was used to test the extent to which patterning existed.

The mean scores of the experimental group were compared with the mean scores of other groups on which FIRO-B had been used to determine the extent to which the experimental group differed on the six interpersonal needs.

Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to measure the degree of agreement among teachers rating the five college deans on a scale ranging from most to least preferred. The most preferred was given a rank of one and the least preferred a rank of five.

This measure of agreement simply tells whether or not there is agreement among the raters who rated the five college deans.

If Wc represents the coefficient of concordance then according to Kendall's

Wc= Sum of squares between columns -
$$\frac{1}{m}$$
Total sum of squares + $\frac{2}{m}$

where m is the number of judges and sum of squares between columns:

¹¹ Allen Edwards, Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Science (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1954), pp. 402-412.

Total sum of squares is:

$$Total + \frac{M(N^3 - N)}{12} + \frac{2}{M}$$

$$\chi_{r}^{2}$$
 = Test of significance for Wc

$$\chi_r^2 = (n-1)$$
 (Sum of squares between columns)
$$\frac{(n^3 - n)}{12}$$

where n is the number of subjects to be ranked.

Hypotheses to be Tested

Through the use of the rating devices, this study was designed to determine the extent to which the interpersonal needs of teachers as measured by FIRO-B were related to teachers' preferences for a type of leadership as measured by leadership style inventory, and by a series of five pictures representing five types of leaders.

This study was developed to answer three specific questions:

- 1. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the manner of rating is done from photographs only?
- 2. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the method of rating is done from descriptions only?
- 3. Do teachers having the same interpersonal needs choose the same leadership style when the description of each leadership style is accompanied by a photograph?

On the bases of these questions and assumptions the following hypotheses were made:

1. The extent to which raters agree on photographs is a matter

of chance.

- 2. The extent to which raters agree on leadership styles is a matter of chance.
- 3. The extent to which raters agree on leadership styles and photographs when combined is a matter of chance.
- 4. The extent to which teachers have the same need pattern is a matter of chance.

CHAPTER IV

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an analysis and interpretation of the data and comparisons of the results of the several treatments with the results of previous studies. The descriptions of treatments of data and results are organized around the presentation of data tables.

Table 2 is the raw data recorded for photographs and the question which asked the respondents to rank the photographs from most to least preferred is described in detail.

Tables 3 and 4 are summaries of the treatment of data for the two questions for the photographs, the leadership styles and the combination of styles.

Tables 5 and 6 are the rankings of photographs and leadership styles with the number of first, second, third, fourth and last choices shown.

Tables 7 and 8 are the percentages of first choices for each style for the two questions.

Tables 9 and 10 are the percentages of last choices for each style for the two questions.

Table 11 is the raw data recorded for the FIRO-B instrument which is followed by the description of the Wc treatment.

Table 12 is a summary of FIRO-B scores of the college faculty comprising the study group.

Table 13 is a summary of FIRO-4 scores of previous studies of different groups as reported by Schutz.

Description and interpretation of the data follow:

As a test of the first hypothesis, there is no significant agreement among raters when photographs only are rated, the data in table 2 were treated, using the formula:

Wc= Sum of squares between columns
$$-\frac{1}{m}$$

Total sum of squares $+\frac{2}{m}$

$$\frac{(53)^2 + (94)^2 + (92)^2 + (87)^2 + (94)^2}{28} \qquad \frac{(28)(5)(6)^2}{4} \qquad \frac{1}{28}$$

$$\tilde{W}c=$$

 $\frac{28 (5^3 - 5)}{12} + \frac{2}{28}$

<u>28(120)</u> + <u>2</u>

Wc=

WC=

$$\frac{36514}{28}$$
 $\frac{1260}{28}$ $\frac{1}{28}$

28

Ranks by Teachers From a Photograph Only-From Most to Least Like to Work With

	Brown	Black	Cardinal	Green	White
Teacher l	3	2	5	4	1
Teacher 2	1	4	3	2	5
Teacher 3	ī	2	<u>4</u>	3	5
Teacher 4	1	5	4	3	2
leacher 5	3	1	2	$\mathcal{L}_{\underline{r}}$	5
Teacher 6	3	5	2	4	1
Teacher 7	2	4	1	5	3
Teacher 8	ī	2	5	1	3
Teacher 9	2	4	5	1	3
Teacher 10	ĺ	3	<u>4</u>	2	5
Teacher ll	1	2	5	3	4
Teacher 12	2	5	1	4	3
Teacher 13	2	5	4	1	3
Teacher 14	ĺ	5	2	3	4
Teacher 15	3	1	4	2	5
Teacher 16	1	5	2	4	3
Teacher 17	2	4	1	3	5
Teacher 18	3	2	4	5	1
Teacher 19	ĺ	4	5	2	3
Teacher 20	ī	5	2	3	4
Teacher 21	2	ī	4	3	5
Teacher 22	1	3	5	2	4
Teacher 23	3	4	1	5	2
Teacher 24	ĺ	3	2	4	5
Teacher 25	3	2	5	i	4
Teacher 26	5	$\frac{2}{4}$	1	2	3
Teacher 27	1	3	4	5	2
Teacher 28	2	4	5	3	1
Totals	53	94	92	87	94

Wc = .335 χ_r^2 = 37.61 Sig. at .001

df. (n-1) = (5-1) = 4

Wc= .335

In order to test Wc, the χ_r^2 was used:

= (n-1) (Sum of squares between columns)

$$(n^3 - n)/12$$

Substituting in formula with the data for the 28 judges, we get:

$$\chi_{\rm r}^2 = (5-1)(94.035)$$

$$\frac{(5^3 - 5)}{12}$$

= 37.614

Then entering the table of χ^2_r with n-l= 4 degrees of freedom, we see that the obtained value of χ^2_r of 37.61 would occur less than one time of the thousand indicating that the agreement among raters on photographs is not a matter of chance.

Data from the second question, "most like me to least like me" on photographs only was treated, using the same procedure, as were the data from styles only and a combination of styles and photograph. The results are reported in tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 3

The Coefficient of Concordance on the two Questions when Ranked from Photograph Only, Description Only, and from Combination of Description and Photograph.

Question	Photograph	Description	Description and Photograph
1	•335	•271	•173
2	.116	.148	-1 48

TABLE 4 Summary of $\boldsymbol{\chi}^2$ Values for Photographs and Descriptions

uestion	Photograph	Description	Description and Photograph
1	37.61***	20.15***	19.21***
2	13.07*	15.68**	16.58**

The observed values found in Tables 3 and 4 indicate that the coefficient of concordance and in the first question from photograph only was significantly higher than any other observed values. By inspection it can be inferred that the significance is related to Brown being chosen first thirteen times out of possible twenty eight. The judges when rating the subjects from description and from description and photograph were in somewhat less agreement than when they rated the five college deans from photograph only. However, \mathbf{x}_{r}^{2} values in all ratings were significant at or above the .02 level. This test of significance indicates that the coefficient of concordance representing agreement among raters was not a matter of chance. Raters were in agreement in the type of style they most prefer to work with and see as most like them.

The nomothetic style of Brown was preferred by a significant number of raters and the charismatic style of Cardinal was rejected by a significant number of raters.

In order to determine what styles were most preferred and least preferred, the photographs, styles and combination were ranked according to choices as shown in tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 5

Judges Choices of Leadership Styles, Most and Least Like to Work With

Name	Photograph				Style			e de desemble	Style and Photograph						
	1	2	3 —	4	5	1	2		4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Brown	13	7	7	0	1	8	7	8	2	3	12	7	6	2	1
White	4	3	9	Ý.	8	3	2	4	9	10	4	l	4	7	12
Green	2	6	9	7	4	7	8	5	6	2	4	9	8	6	1
Black	3	6	4	8	7	7	7	7	7	0	5	9	7	5	2
Cardinal	5	6	1	9	7	3	4	4	<u>/</u> }	13	3	2	3	8	12

TABLE 6

Judges Choices of Leadership Styles, Most and Least Like Me

Name	Photograph					Style				Style and Photograph					
	1	2	3	4	5	1		3		5	1	2	3	4	5
Brown	9	7	7	2	1	11	5	7	5	0	11	6	5	5	1
White	2	3	8	7	8	3	4	6	8	7	3	4	6	6	9
Green	9	4	7	4	4	9	7	4	6	2	7	13	1	5	2
Black	4	9	3	8	4	Ĺ	8	6	8	2	6	4	10	4	4
Cardinal	4	4	5	8	7	2	4	5	1	16	2	1	5	8	12

Tables 5 and 6 which are tables of ranks from the group on the first and second question rating the subjects in three different methods described earlier.

Nomothetic style represented by Brown was ranked first in the first question thirteen times from photograph only, eight times from description only, and twelve times from the combination of description and photograph. In the second question, (Table 6) Brown was ranked first nine times from photograph only, eleven times from description only, and eleven from description and photograph combined. Tables 5 and 6 further indicate that Brown received more first place rankings than any other leader in this study. These two tables, further indicate that Brown in the first question received last rank of one time from photograph only, three times from description only, and one time from the combination of description and photograph. In the second question, Brown was chosen last once from photograph only, received no last rankings from description only, and chosen last once from the combination of description and photograph.

Similarly, an inspection of Tables 5 and 6 indicates that the charismatic style represented by Cardinal and the style of White were least preferred to work with and be like.

Ranking by percentages in Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 in conjunction with the significant Wc scores indicates that the raters most preferred Brown as a dean, as a leadership style, and in combination, both as someone with whom they most prefer to work with and be like. Similarly, Cardinal and White were the least preferred as persons with whom to work and be like. Over all, the charismatic style represented by Cardinal is the least preferred, except on the question "most like me" in which he has a middle ranking. Therefore, the teachers comprising the sample can be said to prefer a rule oriented type of leader.

On the other hand, Cardinal's leadership style has been called the charismatic type of leadership with the traits commonly associated with the leader stereotype. His leadership tends to centralize decision making, power, and control of resources. Therefore, the study sample can be said to least or negatively prefer the charismatic type of leadership.

Tables 7 and 8 show the ranking data in percentages.

TABLE 7

Percentages of First Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Most Like to Work With

Name	Photograph	Description	Description and Photograph
own	47.0%	32.5%	32.5%
ite	14.4%	10.3%	10.3%
een	10.3%	21.6%	21.6%
ack	10.3%	25 • 3%	25.3%
rdinal	18.0%	10.3%	10.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 8

Percentages of First Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Most Like Me

Name	Photograph	Description	Description and Photograph
Brown	32.1%	35.6%	35.6%
White -	7.0%	10.3%	10.3%
Green	32.1%	29.4%	29.4%
Black	14.4%	10.1%	10.3%
Cardinal	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 9

Percentages of Least Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Least Like to Work With

Name	Photograph	Description	Description and Photograph
Brown	3.5%	10.3%	10.3%
White	28.5%	40.0%	40.0%
Green	14.5%	7.0%	7.0%
Black	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cardinal	28.5%	42.7%	42.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 10

Percentages of Least Rankings from Photograph, Description and Description and Photograph, Least Like Me

			niguja i gunga dama (). Araminin finamining (dinak artistamininfinaming termi da, anak arami (). Aramining (dinak termi) dinak aramining (dinak dama) (dinak dama)
Name	Photograph	Description	Description and Photograph
Brown	3.5%	0.0%	3.5%
White	28.5%	32.2%	32.2%
Green	25.0%	10.3%	10.3%
Black	14.5%	3.5%	0.0%
Cardinal	28.5%	54.0%	54.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

To measure the degree of agreement among teachers' interpersonal relationship behavior on the FIRO-B instrument, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used.

Scores on FIRO-B ranging from 0 to 9 on six scores: (1) expressed inclusion; (2) expressed control; (3) expressed affection; (4) wanted inclusion; (5) wanted control; and (6) wanted affection. Accepting implies high score, and rejecting implies a low score.

This measure of agreement simply tells whether or not there is agreement among teachers in their interpersonal needs.

From the data of FIRD-B in Table 11, substitution can be made into the formula found in chapter three of the study.

$$\frac{(129)^2 + (109)^2 + (74)^2 + (80)^2 + (145)^2 + (45)^2 - (28)(6)(7)^2}{28} - \frac{1}{28}$$

WC=

$$\frac{28 (6^3 - 6)}{12} \div \frac{2}{28}$$

$$= \underbrace{(16641) + (11881) + (5476) + (6400) + (20449) + (2025)}_{28} - \underbrace{(8232)}_{4} - \underbrace{1}_{28}$$

WC=

Wc=

$$\frac{187.39}{490.07} = .382$$

In order to test significance of Wc, the X r was used:

$$\chi_r^2 = (n-1)$$
 (Sum of squares between columns)
 $(n^3 - n)/12$

Substituting in formula with the data for the 28 judges, we get:

$$\chi_{r}^{2} = (6 - 1) (187.39)$$

$$\frac{(6^{3} - 6)}{12}$$

$$= \frac{937.05}{17.5}$$

$$2 = 53.54$$

Table 11 is the raw data recorded for the FIRO-B instrument.

TABLE 11

Acceptance-Rejection Scores for the Six Interpersonal Needs of FIRO-B

		7				
Teacher	EI	EC	ΞA	WI	WC	AW
1	Ĩ	6	4	7	9	3
2	5	9	1	0	9	2
3 4	7	5	2	9	8	3
A_{k}^{0}	3	2	2	1	7	
5 6	ε	Ą	2	7	G	1 2
5	7	Ć	2	7	6	О
7	5	رة الله الم	**	1	6	2
8	5 3 5	4	2	O	G	
9	5	2	3	7	õ	3
10	7	5	4	7	5	3
11	3	5 4	1	0	5	2
12	8	8	4	9	5	0
13	6	G	1	8	5	3
14	4	3	2	1	5	0
15		2	5	1	5	0332030222
16	1 2	1	3	0	5	2
17	5		2	2	5	2
18	5	<u>4</u> 4	3	1	5	0
19	7	4	4	0	5	2
20	8	8	2	9	4	2
21	5	5	2	2	4	
22	4	1	3	0	4	2
23	5	3	4	2	4	1 2 3
24	6	6	2	0	3	0
25	3	4	3	Ö	3	0
26	ĺ	2	3	Ö	3	Ö
27	2	Ô	3	Õ	3	2
28	2	4	1	Ö	2	1
Total	129	109	74	30	143	45
Means	4.60	3.90	2.64	2.36	5.11	1.44

df = 5 $\chi_{r}^{2} = 53.54$

Sig.= .001

Then entering the table of \mathbf{x}^2 with n-1=5 degrees of freedom, it can be observed that the obtained value of \mathbf{x}^2 of 52.54 would occur less than .001 per cent of the time. Therefore, it can be said that there is agreement among the group in regard to their interpersonal needs. The major agreement is on the interpersonal need known as wanted control in which the mean score is 5.11 as it is shown in Table 11. This agreement indicates the need for a high amount of control toward people. The interpersonal need known as expressed inclusion was also high, with a mean score of 4.60.

Table 11 further indicates that the experimental group was significantly low on the need for expressed and wanted affection. The mean scores were 2.86 and 1.44 respectively. It can be said therefore, that there is need pattern characteristic of the study sample. It is possible then to compare this pattern characterizing the study group with other groups on which the FIRO instrument was used.

Table 12 is a summary of FIRO-B scores of the college faculty comprising the study group.

Table 13 is a summary of FIRO-4 scores of previous studies of different groups as reported by Schutz. No prediction was made for Inclusion in Table 13, since it did not seem relevant in its FIRO-4 form.

TABLE 12 of FIRO-B

		Expressed	Wanted				
	Inclusion	Control	Affection	Inclusion	Control	Affection	
Teachers	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	

William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1958), p. 73.

TABLE 13 Scores on FIRO-4 of Various Occupation Groups

	Affection	Expressed Control	Wanted Control
Officers	Low	High	High
Supervisors	High	High	High
Teachers	High	Low	Low
Nurses	High	Low	Low

FIRO-4 instrument was administered to several different occupational groups and the results explored to detect differences. Several groups were used and their mean scores on each scale divided at the median for all occupational groups. Hence each group scored high or low on each FIRO-4 scale. The following occupational groups were used for this exploration:

- 1. Air Force Senior Officers (N= 864), a group of Colonels and Lieutenants at a command training school.
- 2. Industrial Supervisors (N= 39), a group of male (except one) foremen (aged 26-55) in a large Detroit automotive plant.
- 3. Public School Administrators (N= 40), a group of relatively progressive administrators from one county in Maryland. They were of both sexes and about 30-45 years old.
- 4. Student Nurses (N= 60), a group of young (17-20), female, recent high school graduates, just beginning nursing training at a large Boston hospital.

By inspection, Table 12 indicates that teachers of the study were significantly high on control expressed and wanted, and low on affection expressed and wanted.

Table 13 indicates that officers of Schutz's research rated low on affection, and high on control expressed and wanted. Similarly, the sample group rated low on affection and high on control expressed and wanted. Therefore, the study sample was most like the military officer group.

When the study group is compared with the teacher's group in Schutz's study, a group most like the study group in most characteristics, the groups were opposite in their need patterns. The study group was high on control expressed and wanted and low on affection expressed and wanted, while the teacher's group was low on control expressed and wanted and high on affection expressed and wanted. One possible explanation for the contrasting need patterns is that the study group has a very strict religious orientation. They follow prescribed rules and standards of the Old Testament of the Bible such as the Ten Commandments. They also follow health rules, such as abstaining from smoking, drinking tea, coffee or any alcoholic beverages. This orientation may account for the high control, low affection need pattern of the group.

At this point, one of the major questions of the study can be examined: Is there a relationship between interpersonal needs and preferences for leadership styles? Since it has been shown that the study group has a significant preference for the nomothetic or rule oriented leadership style and has a need pattern characterized by high expressed and wanted control and low expressed and wanted affection, it can be said that interpersonal need patterns are related to preference for a leadership style. This preference, for the study group, is logical in that high expressed and wanted control could be predicted to relate to a preference for rule oriented leadership or a rule oriented

form of control.

On the other hand, the interpersonal need known as affection is the lowest of the needs expressed and wanted.

This relation of a low need for affection, both expressed and wanted, to a negative preference for the charismatic style of leader—ship is logically explained. It can be argued that followers of charismatic leaders tend to have a high need for affection and to express affection. Charismatic leaders satisfy both these needs. Therefore, the study group, being low on affection expressed and wanted, rejects the charismatic leadership style.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the preferences for a leadership style was influenced by interpersonal needs. A sample of twenty-eight teachers was drawn from a small midwestern university using the table of random numbers. The total sample of twenty-eight teachers represents one-fifth of total population.

Two instruments were given to each teacher. The Leadership Style Inventory Instrument was administered in three stages; photographs, leadership style, and combined photographs and leadership style. The second instrument, the FIRO-3, was mailed to each of the twenty-eight subjects. All twenty-eight were completed and returned.

Scores received on the FIRO-B scale were treated to determine if definite patterns existed in interpersonal needs. Similarly, responses to the photographs and leadership styles were treated to determine the extent to which preference patterns existed. Kendall's coefficient of concordance, Wc, was used to test the extent to which patterning existed. In addition mean scores of the experimental group were compared with the mean scores of other groups on which FIRO had been used to determine the extent to which the experimental group differed on the six interpersonal needs.

This study was developed to answer the following questions:

- 1. Do interpersonal needs influence teachers' preferences for leadership styles?
- 2. To what extent does the inclusion of a photograph influence teacher preferences for and judgments about leadership styles?
- 3. How does the pattern of interpersonal needs of the experimental group compare with the need patterns of other groups?
- 4. Is there any logical relation between specific style and specific needs?

Data were gathered and the following hypotheses were tested:

- 1. The extent to which raters agree on photographs only is a matter of chance.
- 2. The extent to which raters agree on leadership style only is a matter of chance.
- 3. The extent to which raters agree on leadership styles and photographs combined is a matter of chance.
- 4. The extent to which teachers have interpersonal needs pattern is a matter of chance.

Conclusions

The underlying purpose of the study was to explore the area of interpersonal needs of teachers and to determine whether these needs would affect their preference of leadership styles.

The data secured in this study support the following conclusions:

1. Teachers who rated the five college deans from photograph were in agreement on the one they most preferred. When photographs were combined with styles, no appreciable changes in preferences occured. Consequently, it can be concluded that descriptive style preferences were stronger than preferences for photographs.

2. The teachers in the study were significantly high on control expressed and wanted, and low on affection expressed and wanted. When compared with groups in previous studies, the study group was most similar to military officers who were also low on affection and high on control expressed and wanted.

When the study group was compared with a teacher's group in a previous study, a group most like the study group in most characteristics, the groups were opposite in their need patterns. The study group was high on control expressed and wanted and low on affection expressed and wanted, while the teacher's group was low on control expressed and wanted and high on affection expressed and wanted. One possible explanation for the contrasting need patterns is that the study group has a very strict religious orientation. They follow prescribed rules and standards of the Old Testament of the Bible such as the Ten Commandments. They also follow health rules, such as abstaining from smoking, drinking tea, coffee or any alcoholic beverages. This orientation may account for the high control, low affection needs pattern of the group.

Since it has been shown that the study group has a significant preference for the nomothetic or rule oriented leadership style and has a need pattern characterized by high expressed and wanted control and low expressed and wanted affection, it can be said that interpersonal need patterns are related to preference for a leadership style. This preference, for the study group, is logical in that high expressed and wanted control could be predicted to relate to a preference for rule oriented leadership or rule oriented form of control.

3. The leadership style classified as charismatic leadership was least preferred by almost two thirds of the experimental group. Since

the interpersonal need known as affection is the lowest of the needs expressed and wanted by the study group.

This relation of a low need for affection, both expressed and wanted, to a negative preference for the charismatic style of leadership is logically explained. It can be argued that the rejection of the charismatic style is related to low need for affection and to express affection. To state this in positive form, the charismatic leader satisfies both the need for wanted and expressed affection. Thus, there may be two types of follower dependency; one based on a high need for control and related to nomothetic leadership and the other based on a high need for affection and related to charismatic leadership.

The reliability of the use of photographs has not been tested extensively, therefore, the findings may be influenced and to a certain extent biased.

The reliability and validity of the Leadership Styles have not been established.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of the study suggest the following recommendations:

- 1. FIRO-B, as a measuring instrument, is useful in determining the interpersonal needs of people. Since this study was on a limited sample, it is recommended that a similar study be conducted with a sample composed of teachers from all grade levels and from different subject areas.
- 2. That a study be made comparing administrator needs and leadership styles with the needs and ratings of their teachers.
- 3. The findings of this study are based on views of faculty

belonging to a small, midwestern church related university with a strong religious orientation. It is recommended that similar studies be made on other religious groups from different religious organizations such as Catholic or other protestant churches to determine whether there is a characteristic need pattern based on a general religious orientation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bechtold, Lawrence A. "Administrative Typologies and the Relation—ship to Interpersonal Behavior of Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, University of Oklahoma, 1965), p. 85.
- Bion, W. R. Experiences With Groups, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954).
- Combs, Arthur W. "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality,"

 Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, 1962 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962), p. 51.
- Eaton, Joseph W. "Is Scientific Leadership Selection Possible?"

 In Alvin W. Gouldner, Studies in Leadership, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 640.
- Edwards, Allen. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Science (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1954), pp. 402-412.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Libidinal Types," In Collection Papers, (London: Hogarth, 1950), Vol. 5, pp. 247-248.
- Fromm, Erick. Man for Himself, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1947), pp. 109-110.
- Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process," In Andrew W. Halpin (ed.), Administrative Theory in Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958), pp. 150-165.
- Getzels, J. W. and Guba, Z. G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, IXV, (Winter, 1957).
- Gibb, Cecil A. "The Principles and Traits of Leadership," in C. G. Browne, The Study of Leadership, (Danville: Interstate Printers, 1958), pp. 67-75.
- Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership," in Gardner Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 11, (Cambridge: Addison, Wesley, 1954), pp. 887-917.
- Gordon, T. Group Centered Leadership, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1955).
- Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," in Mathew B. Miles (ed.), <u>Innovations in Education</u> (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1963).

- Halpin, A. W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Studies in Educational Administration, Monograph No. 6, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959.
- Hemphill, John K. Situational Factors in Leadership, (Ohio State University: Columbus, 1944), p. 101.
- Horney, Karen, Our Inner Conflicts, (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1945), pp. 40-43.
- Jennings, Helen Hall. <u>Leadership and Isolation</u>, (New York: David McKay, 1943), p. 205.
- Kreech, D. and Crutchfield, R. S. Theory and Problems for Social Psychology. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1948), p. 426.
- Kutner, Bernard. "Elements and Problems of Democratic Leadership," in Alvin W. Gouldner (ed.), Studies in Leadership, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 459-467.
- Lippitt, Ronald, and White, Ralph. "An Experimental Study of Leader-ship and Group Life," in Guy E. Swanson and others (eds.),

 Readings in Social Psychology, (New York: Holt, 1952), pp.

 340-355.
- McAllister, Vernon, "A Study of Leadership Role Precepts as Viewed by Teachers, School Administrators, and School Board Members," (unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1964).
- Morphet, Edgar L., Johns, Roe L., and Reller, T. L. Educational Administration, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 86.
- Myers, Robert. "The Development and Implications of Conception of Leadership for Leadership Education," (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1954), pp. 105-106.
- Ohm, R. E., "Leadership Style Inventory," (unpublished material, University of Oklahoma, 1964).
- Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward A. "Personality as a System of Action," Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds.) <u>Toward a General Theory of Action</u>, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 114-115.
- Pelz, D. C. "Influence: A Key To Effective Leadership," Study of Leadership, (eds.) C. C. Browne and T. S. Cohn, Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1958.
- Pigors, P. <u>Leadership or Domination</u>. (New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1935).

- Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962).
- Rogers, C. R. Client Centered Therapy. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951).
- Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership, A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, XXV (1948), p. 64.
- Schutz, William C. FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Personal Behavior, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958).
- Sanford, Fillmore H. "The Follower's Role in Leadership Phenomena," in Guy E. Swanson (ed.) Readings In Social Psychology, (Henry Holt and Company: New York, 1952), pp. 328-341.
- Tannenbaum, Robert, Weschler, Irving R. and Massorik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961), p. 12.
- Thelen, H. D. The Dynamics of Groups at Work, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954).

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO TEACHERS

: : --

July 1, 1964

Dear Mr.

I greatly appreciate your help and cooperation in answering the first part of my questionnaire for my Ph.D. dissertation.

The enclosed questionnaire constitutes the second part of my data collection. I believe that I told you about it while I was with you.

I greatly appreciate your help in answering the questionnaire.

The questionnaire is called "FIRO-B" which stands for "Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior."

The primary purposes for the FIRO-B are (1) to measure how an individual acts in interpersonal situations, and (2) to determine the interaction between people.

Since I will be comparing this second questionnaire with the first one, it is, of course, quite important to me that you complete it and send it to me. For your convenience, therefore, I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you again for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Estephan

APPENDIX B

LEADERSHIP STYLES INVENTORY

Leadership Style Inventory

1. Brown is tall, clean cut, friendly and energetic. He does little things that make it pleasant to be a member of the faculty. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.

He is conscientious and efficient and goes to all the meetings he feels the school's public relations require. He schedules work to be done and maintains definite standards of performance. He knows exactly the type of school he wants and lets his faculty know.

Teachers know where they stand with Brown; he tells them. Staff meetings are short and to the point with a minimum of time-wasting discussion.

The teachers' manual; developed by Brown in consultation with his teachers spells out the rules and regulations in detail. Brown knows the manual and school policies so well that he is never at a loss in dealing with the problems and questions that arise. Deadlines are met and teachers are called to task when necessary with appropriate consultation and explanation. Though invariably pleasant and considerate, the staff is comfortable, with the reasonable distance Brown seems to maintain between himself and the staff.

11. White is well groomed, likeable, cordial, and full of enthusiasm. Faculty members find it easy to talk over their problems with him. He has formed strong friendships with some members of the staff.

White is a student of group process and conducts faculty meetings so as to ensure group consensus. Agendas are compiled by an appointed committee that works closely with White. Any proposal for action brought up from the floor is generally referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and recommendation so that White has a chance to provide the guidance needed.

Major problems are discussed with influential constituents and/or staff members prior to their consideration by the staff or community groups. Timing and strategy play an important part in the formal consideration process. White manages to get support for most of his proposals and decisions prior to formal action, or, if a decision has been made, he is able to get formal backing of the actions taken.

White believes that, as a dean, he has more responsibility than other staff members in determining what is to be done. His knowledge of the informal organization enables him to guide the staff into doing things that are necessary even though some individuals may be in fundamental disagreement with him.

111. Green is slender, well dressed, smokes a pipe and has a warm and ready smile for everyone. His office is always open and he is always

ready and willing to consult on any matter. People get the feeling that he really listens to what they are saying and find themselves telling more than they might have originally intended. His responses are generally in the form of questions or comments that help the individual to clarify his thinking.

Green avoids giving value judgments or directive statements since he believes that staff and students should be given as much freedom as possible within a framework of necessary rules and expectations in order to create their own roles in the organization. He sees his job as creating an environment in which teachers can teach in the best way they know how.

Staff meetings are open discussions in which everyone participates freely. The agenda may be ignored in order to get at what Green feels are the real problems of the staff or school. Faculty meetings are seen as a way of developing insights and gaining understandings that will guide teachers in their work.

Green expresses a firm commitment to self-realization as an important aim of administration. He leaves his staff alone unless they come to him seeking help. He encourages them to grow professionally, primarily be giving them increased responsibility and encouraging them to take leadership in their areas of competence.

IV. Black is quiet, unassuming, and open with an implicit strength that induces liking and respect.

Black spends much of his time in planning and evaluation sessions with groups and individuals that have accepted responsibility for the development of some part of the school program or solution to a school problem. Teachers know where they stand with Black and he knows where he stands with them. They tell each other as they evaluate their work in conferences and meetings.

Black works well as either a leader or member of the group as the occasion demands. Despite the fact that group leadership and community representation is shared among the faculty, Black is seen as having influence with his superiors and with important groups in the community.

Black sees his role as one of developing, chrifying, or reaffirming purposes and objectives. Important decisions are checked with relevant individuals and groups in order to get as much information as possible on alternatives and the consequences of the decision before formal action is taken.

When conflicts arise, Black tries to resolve them by reference to the aims and philosophy of the school. He tries to get both sides of the issue and persuade those concerned to arrive at a consensus on the course of action to take. When necessary, Black will make the decision. He will, however, evaluate the consequences of his unilateral decisions with the staff.

V. Cardinal is tall and has a personal magnetism that produces instant liking, trust, and respect in the people he meets and with whom he works. Teachers come to him with their problems despite the fact that he is sometimes so busy that he is not always available to give the help they have come to expect from him. He initiates many of the innovations and improvements in the school program through his ability to take decisive and vigorous action based on planning that sets and clarifies the role expectations of those involved.

Faculty meetings are generally satisfying because his personality and ideas almost always produce group agreement on the plans and actions he has suggested. The faculty have come to depend on him and he sees his job as being worthy both of the trust of the faculty and confidence of his superiors. His superiors rate him as a dynamic and decisive leader in control of his organization. Few problems or conflicts get past him. Consequently, he does much more informing of his superiors than he does consulting. He belongs to a number of the important community organizations. He is often in demand as a speaker for community events and club meetings.

Though he would like to have other members of the staff take some decision making responsibility and has tried to decentralize some of the administrative activity, the staff has come to feel that he has the most information and is in the best position to determine what needs to be done. Consequently, they resist efforts to involve them in administration, preferring rather, to concentrate on their teaching.

APPENDIX C

FIRO-B INSTRUMENT

				NAME		********	************
GROU	P	•	- 67		1	С	٨
DATE	***************************************		The		-		i i
	FEMALE	i		_	c		
					₩		
√.:Е					· " L		
. ;	Please place number of th	e answer that	t best applies to you i	in the box at the le	eft of the stat	ement. I	Please be as
] 1.	I try to be with people.						•
–	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	` 5. rai	cly	6. never
2.	I let other people decide				_	_	•
7 ,	1. usually I join social groups.	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rai	cly	6. never
	i. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rai	elv	6. never
4.	I try to have close relation			i. occasionary	, sai	ciy	O. Hever
· · ·	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rai	cly	6. never
5.	I tend to join social organ	nizations whe	n I have an opportun			•	
_	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rai	ciy	6. never
6.	I let other people strongly		2		<u> </u>		_
¬ "	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rai	cly	6. never
/.	I try to be included in inf 1. usually	ormal social a 2. often		A*10			
	I try to have close, person		3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rai	ely	6. never
0.	1. usually	2. often	ips with people. 3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. ra	elv	6. never
9.	I try to include other per			4. Occasionally	J. 14	ciy	o. neva
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. re:	rely	6. never
] 10.	I let other people control		•				,
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. oecasionally	5. ra:	ely	6. never
11.	I try to have people arou			•		-	
—]	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. ra	rely	6. never
12.	I try to get close and per	-	-	4 • •-	_		
7 12	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. ra	rely	6. never
13·	When people are doing to 1. usually	inings togetne 2. often	er I tend to join them 3. sometimes	1. 4. occasionally	ς	ral u	6
14.	I am easily led by people		s. sometimes	To Occasionally	5. ra	cıy	6. never
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. ra	rely	6. never
15.	I try to avoid being alon			ii oodaasi		····	0. 110,00
_	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. ra	rely	6. never
16.	I try to participate in gro	up activities.		·		•	
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. ra	rely	6. never
		PLEAS	E BE AS HONEST AS	YOU CAN			
17.	I try to be friendly to pe	ople.		•			
	1. most	2. many	3. some	4. a few	5. on	e or two	6. nobody
-	people	people	people	people	P	eople .	•
18.	I let other people decide						
	1. most people	2. many	3. some	4. a few		e or two	6. nobody
10	people My personal relations wi	people th people are	people	people	. Р	cople	
^{17.}	l. most	an people are	3. some	'4. a few	5 An	e or two	6. nobody
	people	people	people	people		copic	0. 1000Q)
20.	I let other people take ch			· · .	•	•	
	1. most	2. many	3. some	4. a few	5. on	e or two	6. nobody
	people	people	people	people	p	cople	•
21.	I try to have close relation					•	
	l. most people	2. many	3. some	4. a few		e or two	6. nobody
72	Peopleng	people ly influence r	people	people	, P	cople	
^{**}	1. most	2. many	ny actions, 3. some	4. a few	·	e or two	6. nobody
	people	people	people	people		e or two copie	u. modody

•

23. I try to get close and personal with people. 1 most 2 many 3 some 4 a few people					-67a-			•
24. I let other people control my actions. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people pe	23.							c - 1. 1.
24. I let other people control my actions. 1. most 2. many 3. some people 25. I act cool and distant with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people people people people people people people people 26. I am easily led by people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people people people people people people people people people 27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peopl			-	•				o' nononà
1. most 2. many 3. some people	74	-	· -		people	pcopic	people	
people pe	Z4.			_	eome	4 a few	5 one or two	6 minute
25. I act cool and distant with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some people	•				=			O. Investy
1. most 2. many 3. some people	75	-	•		Forbit	Prof.	F F	
26. I am easily led by people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 28. I like people to invite me to things. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to act close and personal with me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to act close and personal with me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to invite me to to people people 29. I like people to act close and personal with me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to act close toward me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to act close toward me. 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to include me in their activities. 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to include me in their activities. 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 29. I like people to include me in their activities. 3. like people to include me in their activities. 3. some 4. a few people 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.	L., 20.		-		some	4. a few	5. one or two	6. nobody
26. I am easily led by people. 1. most 2. many 3. some people pe				•		people		•
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop	26.	-	•	•	-			
27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some people				many 3.	some	4. a fcw	5. one or two	6. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop		·	people .	people	people	people	people	•
28. I like people to invite me to things. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peo	27.	I try to have	close, personal i	relationships wit	h people.		_	
28. I like people to invite me to things. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peo								6. nobody
i. most 2. many 3. some people		F	people	people	people	people	people	
people people people people people people 29. I like people to act close and personal with me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peopl	28.	I like people	to invite me to	things.				
29. I like people to act close and personal with me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people		i. n	nost 2.	many 3.	some			6. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop	LJ	. р	cople	people	people	people-	people	
people pe	29.	I like people			ic.			
30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people				•				6. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop		-	-		-	people	peopie	
people people people people people people 31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 32. I like people to act close toward me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people people people people people people people people people 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peo	30.	•	• •					
31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people				•				b. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop	721	-	•		= =	people	people	
people people people people people people 32. I like people to act close toward me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people people people people people people people people 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people people people people people people people people people 34. I like people to include me in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peo	31.					4 a few	5 one or two	6 nobody
32. I like people to act close toward me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peo				•				o. moody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop	32	-	· -		F F		F	
people people people people people people 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people 34. I like people to include me in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people people people people people people people 35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people				_	some	4. a few	5. one or two	6. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop				•	•			,
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few people peop	33.	I try to take	charge of things	when I am wit	h people.		•	
34. I like people to include me in their activities. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people						4. a few	5. one or two	6. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people people people people people 5. one or two 6. nobody people peopl		P	people	people	people	people	people	•
people people people people people 35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people people people 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people people people 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.	34.	I like people	to include me i	n their activities.				
35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody 7. people 7. people 8. Try to have other people do things the way I want them done. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 7. one or two 6. nobody 7. people 8. people 9. people				•				6. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people people people people 5. one or two 6. nobody people 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people people people people 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.		_	•			people	people	
people people people people people 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people people people people 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.	35.	I like people						
36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. 1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.				•				6. nobody
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody people people people people 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.		-	· -			people	people	
people people people people people people 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.	30·	· ·		•		A a fam.	5	6 nobodu
37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.				•				o. Hobbidy
	27	•				people	pp	
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody			-	•		4. a few	5. one or two	6. nobody
people people people people people				•				o. noocey
38. I like people to act friendly toward me.	38.	-	•		• •	- •	• • •	
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody	٠٠٠ لـــا			_	some	4. a few	5. one or two	6. nobody
people people people people people								•
39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.	_ 39.	. I like people	to invite me to	participate in the	eir activities.			
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody				•				6. nobody
people people people people people	٠				people	people	people	
40. I like people to act distant toward me.	40.	. I like people			•		_	
1. most 2. many 3. some 4. a few 5. one or two 6. nobody	-			•	-	_	• • • • • • • •	6. nobody
people people people people people		<u> </u>	beobre	beobie .	people	peopic	реоріе	

PLEASE REMEMBER TO BE AS HONEST AS YOU CAN

41. I try	to be the dominant	person when I	am with people.			
	1. usually		3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
42. I lik	te people to invite m				•	
	l. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
43. I lik	e people to act close	toward me.				
	l. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
44. I tr	y to have other peopl	e do things I v	vant done.			
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
45. I lik	te people to invite m	e to join their a	activities.			
	I. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
46. I lik	e people to act cool :	and dista <mark>nt tow</mark>	ard me.			
	I. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
47. I tr	y to influence strongl					
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
48. I lik	e people to include r	ne in their activ	vities.			
	I. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
49. I lil	ce people to act close	and personal	with me.			
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
50. I tr	y to take charge of th	ings when I'm	with people.			
 1	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarcly	6. never
51. I lil	ce people to invite m	e to participate	in their activities.			
	1. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
52. I lil	ce people to act dista	nt toward me.				•
	1. usually	•	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rarely	6. never
53. I tr	y to have other peopl	e do things the	way I want them do	ne.	•	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rerely	6. never
54. I ta	ke charge of things v				•	•
	l. usually	2. often	3. sometimes	4. occasionally	5. rerely	6. never

APPENDIX D

TABLES OF FIRST AND LAST RANKINGS OF TEACHERS

TABLE 1

Ranks by Teachers from a Photograph, Most to Least Like to Work With

	Brown	Black	Cardinal	Green	White	
Teacher 1	3	2	5	ά	1	
Teacher 2	1	4	3	2	5	
Teacher 3	1	2	4	3	5	
Teacher 4	1	5	<u> </u>	3	2	
Teacher 5	3	1	2	4	5	
Teacher 6	3	5	2	4	1	
Teacher 7	2	4	1	5	3	
Teacher 8	1	2	5	4	3	
Teacher 9	2	4	5	1	3	
Teacher 10	1	3	4	2	5	
Teacher 11	1	2	5	3	4	
Teacher 12	2	5	1	4	3	
Teacher 13	2	5	4	1	3	
Teacher 14	l	5	2	3	4	
Teacher 15	3	1	₹.	2	5	
Teacher 16	1	5	2	Ą	3	
Teacher 17	2	4	1	3	5	
Teacher 18	3	2	4	5	1	
Teacher 19	1	4	5	2	3	
Teacher 20	1	5	2	3	Ą.	
Teacher 21	2	1	4	3	5	
Teacher 22	1	3	5	2	4	
Teacher 23	3	ζī	1	5	2	
Teacher 24	1	3	2	4	5	
Teacher 25	3	2	5	1	4	
Teacher 26	5	4	1	2	3	
Teacher 27	1	3	4	5	2	
Teacher 28	2	4	5	3	1	
Totals	53	94	92	87	94	

Wc= .335 $\chi_r^2 = 37.61$ Sig. at .001

TABLE 2

Ranks by Teachers from a Photograph, Only, Most to Least Like Me

	Brown	Black	Cardinal	Green	White
Teacher 1	3	2	5	4	1
Teacher 2	l	4	3	2	5
Teacher 3	1	2	4	3	5
Teacher 4	2	4	1	5	3
Teacher 5	1	3	2	4	5
Teacher 6	1	3	4	5	2
Teacher 7	2	<u>4</u>	1	5	3
Teacher 8	2	1	5	3	4
Teacher 9	2	4	5	1	3
Teacher 10	2	3	4	1	5
Teacher ll	1	2	<u>4</u>	5	3
Teacher 12	2	5	1	4	3
Teacher 13	3	4	2	1	5
Teacher 14	2	1	3	5	4
Teacher 15	4	2	3	1	5
Teacher 16	3	5	2	1	4
Teacher 17	2	4	1	3	5
Teacher 18	2	1	5	3	4
Teacher 19	1	Ą	5	2	3
Teacher 20	3	5	2	1	₹_
Teacher 21	3	1	<i>4</i> <u>.</u>	2	5
Teacher 22	3	2	5	1	Δ
Teacher 23	1	4	3	5	2
Teacher 24	1	2	5	3	<u>4</u>
Teacher 25	1	2	5	Ţ	3
Teacher 26	Ą	5	3	1	2
Teacher 27	3	2	4	5	1
Teacher 28	5	2	Ϋ́	1	3
Totals	61	83	95	Sl	100

df. (n-1) = (5-1) = 4

 $\chi_{\rm r}^2$ = 13.07 Sig. at .01

TABLE 3

Ranks by Teachers from Description Only, Most to Least Like to Work With

·	Brown	Black	Cardinal	Green	White
Teacher l	3	2	5	4	1
Teacher 2	5	3	2	4	1
Teacher 3	l	4	2	3	5
Teacher 4	2	3	5	l	4
Teacher 5	3	1	4	2	5
Teacher 6	3	1	2	₫.	5
Teacher 7	3	2	5	1	4
Teacher 8	4	1	5	2	3
Teacher 9	3	4	5	1	2
Teacher 10	1	3	ά	2	5
Teacher 11	3	1	5	2	4
Teacher 12	2	1	3	4	5
Teacher 13	1	2	5	3	4
Teacher 14	1	4	3	2	5
Teacher 15	5	2	3	1	4
Teacher 16	5	3	<u>4</u> .	1	2
Teacher 17	4	1	2	3	5
Teacher 18	2	4	1	3	5
Teacher 19	1	4	5	2	3
Teacher 20	2	4	1	5	3
Teacher 21	2	1	5	4	3
Teacher 22	1	3	5	2	4
Teacher 23	3	4	5	2	1
Teacher 24	1	2	Ą	3	5
Teacher 25	1	4	3	2	5
Teacher 26	2	4	1	3	5
Teacher 27	1	2	3	5	4
Teacher 28	2	3	5	1	4
Totals	67	73	102	72	106

$$\chi_{\rm r}^2$$
 = 20.15 Sig. at .001

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} TABLE 4 \\ \hline Ranks by Teachers from Description Only, Most to Least Like Me \\ \end{tabular}$

	Brown	Black	Cardinal	Green	White
			-		
Teacher l	3	2	5	4	l
Teacher 2	1	4	2	3	5
Teacher 3	1	4	2	3	5
Teacher 4	1	3	5	4	2
Teacher 5	2	4	3	5	1
Teacher 6	2	4	1	5	3
Teacher 7	3	2	5	1	4
Teacher 8	4	2	5	1	3
Teacher 9	3	4	5	1	2
Teacher 10	l	3	<u>4</u>	2	5
Teacher 11	3	1	4	2	5
Teacher 12	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher 13	2	1	5	3	4
Teacher 14	1	4	3	2	5
TeaCher 15	4	2	5	1	3
Teacher 16	4	2	5	1	3
Teacher 17	4	1	3	2	5
Teacher 18	2	3	5	ı	<u>4</u>
Teacher 19	1	4	5	2	3
Teacher 20	2	5	1	3	4
Teacher 21	3	Ą	5	2	1
Teacher 22	3	2	5	1	4
Teacher 23	3	4	5	1	2
Teacher 24	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher 25	3	2	1	5	4
Teacher 26	4	3	1	2	5
Teacher 27	1	3	2	<u>.</u>	5
Teacher 28	1	3	5	4	2
Totals	64	80	104	73	99

$$\chi_{\rm r}^2$$
 = 16.53 Sig. at .01

TABLE 5

Ranks by Teachers from Photograph and Description, Most to Least Like to Work With

	Brown	Black	Cardinal	Green	White
Teacher 1	3	2	5	4	1
Teacher 2	5	3	2	4	1
Teacher 3	1	4	2	3	_ 5
Teacher 4	2	3	5	1	4
Teacher 5	3	1	4	2	5
Teacher 6	3	1	2	<u>Ž</u>	5
Teacher 7	3	2	5	ĺ	4
Teacher 8	<u> 4</u>	l	5	2	3
Teacher 9	3	4	5	1	2
Teacher 10	1.	3	4	2	5
Teacher 11	3	1	5	2	4
Teacher 12	2	1	3	<u>4</u>	5
Teacher 13	1	2	5	3	<u> </u>
Teacher 14	1	4	3	2	5
Teacher 15	5	2	3	1	4.
Teacher 16	5	3	4	1	2
Teacher 17	4].	1	2	3	5
Teacher 18	2	4	1	3	5
Teacher 19	. 1	4	5	2	3
Teacher 20	2	<u>4</u>	1	5	3
Teacher 21	2	1	5	4	3
Teacher 22	1	3	5	2	4
Teacher 23	3	4	5	2	1
Teacher 24	1	2 -	4	3	5
Teacher 25	1	4	3	2	5
Teacher 26	2	4	1	3	5
Teacher 27	1	2	3	5	4
Teacher 28	2	3	5	1	4
Totals	67	73	102	72	106

$$\chi_{r}^{2} = 19.21 \text{ Sig. at .001}$$

TABLE 6

Ranks by Teachers from Photograph and Description, Most to Least Like Me

	Brown	Black	Cardinal	Green	White
Teacher l	3	2	5	4	1
Teacher 2	1	₹.	2	3	5
Teacher 3	1	4	2	3	5
Teacher 4	1	3	5	4	2
Teacher 5	2	4	3	5	1
Teacher 6	2	4	1	5	3
Teacher 7	3	2	5	1	4
Teacher 8	4	2	5	1	3
Teacher 9	3	<u>4</u>	5	1	2
Teacher 10	1	3	4	2	5
Teacher ll	3	1	5	2	4
Teacher 12	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher 13	2	1	5	3	4
Teacher 14	1	4	3	2	5
Teacher 15	4	2	5	1	3
Teacher 16	ć <u>i</u>	2	5	1	3
Teacher 17	4	1	3	2	5
Teacher 18	2	3	5	l	4
Teacher 19	1	4	5	2	3
Teacher 20	2	5	1	3	4
Teacher 21	3	Ą	5	2	<u>1</u>
Teacher 22	3	2	5	1	4
Teacher 23	3	4	5	1	2
Teacher 24	1	2	3	<u>L</u>	5
Teacher 25	3	2	1	5	4
Teacher 26	4	3	1	2	5
Teacher 27	1	3	5	4	2
Teacher 28	1	3	5	4	2
Totals	64	80	104	73	99

$$\chi_{\rm r}^2$$
 = 16.58 Sig. at .01

APPENDIX E

PHOTOGRAPHS OF DEANS



Mr. Black



Mr. Cardinal



Mr. Brown



Mr. White



Mr. Green

		·	