

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

FROSCH, CAROL SNOW

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BACKGROUND PROFILES AND SELF-ASSESSED
EFFECTIVENESS OF OKLAHOMA PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL
ADMINISTRATORS BY RACE AND GENDER

The University of Oklahoma

ED.D.

1980

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1980

by

FROSCH, CAROL SNOW

All Rights Reserved

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BACKGROUND PROFILES AND SELF-ASSESSED
EFFECTIVENESS OF OKLAHOMA PUBLIC SECONDARY
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS BY RACE AND GENDER

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
CAROL SNOW FROSCH
Norman, Oklahoma
1980

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BACKGROUND PROFILES AND SELF-ASSESSED
EFFECTIVENESS OF OKLAHOMA PUBLIC SECONDARY
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS BY RACE AND GENDER

APPROVED BY

Paul B. B. B.
Charles S. Butler
David L. L.
William Carmack

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to a great number of people who contributed to this study. The guidance, inspiration, and cooperation of Dr. Robert Bibens is gratefully recognized.

The aid, time, and encouragement given by members of the doctoral committee--Dr. Charles Butler, Dr. William Carmack, Dr. Gerald Kidd, and Dr. Charlyce King--are also sincerely acknowledged. To Dr. Glenn Snider, appreciation is also expressed for his aid and encouragement during the study.

To each of the members of the panel of judges, the participants in the pilot, the respondents in the study, and the administrators in the reliability sample, sincere appreciation is earnestly expressed. I realize that without their willingness to give of time and advice, the study could not have been done.

Dr. Bill Graves can never be adequately thanked for his time and help with the statistical processing. His aid was invaluable. Also, appreciation is extended to Dr. Omer Rupiper for his technical assistance.

Finally, I wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to my mother, Mrs. Lester Snow, and to my husband, Steven, for their patience, sustenance, and moral support throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study.	4
Statement of the Problem.	5
Hypotheses to be Tested	6
Definition of Terms	8
Limitations of the Study.	9
Methodology	10
Organization of the Study	11
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
Establishment of Criteria for Ascertaining Effectiveness of Secondary Administrators	15
Rationale for Using a Self-Study Approach	30
Demographic Characteristics and Criteria for Identifying the Profile of the Administrator.	34
Rationale for Studying Secondary Administrators by Race and Gender.	37
Summary of Related Literature	39

Chapter	Page
III. METHODOLOGY.	42
Design of the Study	42
Population and Sample	42
Instrumentation	45
Data Collection Procedures.	48
Establishment of Reliability.	49
Procedure for Analysis of Data.	52
IV. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	54
Introduction.	54
Background Profiles of the Administrators as Described by the Mode	55
Presentation and Analysis of Collected Data for Demographic Factors and Test of the Hypotheses.	57
Presentation and Analysis of Collected Data for the Self-Assessment of Effectiveness and Test of the Hypothesis.	66
Summary of the Data Analyses.	72
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	75
Summary	75
Findings.	79
Conclusions	81
Recommendations	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84
APPENDIXES	95
Appendix A.	96
Appendix B.	104

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Original Sample by Race and Gender.	45
2. Final Sample by Race and Gender	50
3. Participants in Study by Race, Gender, Position, and School District Size	51
4. Demographic Factors by Race and Gender Stated by Response Frequency	58
5. Chi-square Values for Demographic Characteristics	61
6. Means for Quantifiable Demographic Factors.	65
7. Means and Number of Responses for Self-Assessment of Effectiveness Questionnaire by Race and Gender	67
8. Responses to Items on Perception about Roles Reported in Percentages	72

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BACKGROUND PROFILES AND SELF-ASSESSED
EFFECTIVENESS OF OKLAHOMA PUBLIC SECONDARY
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS BY RACE AND GENDER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

If asked for a statement about an effective secondary school administrator, the majority of the public and many school personnel would probably begin their response with "He is..." By definition, effective leaders are said to hold some characteristics in common:

They should be democratic in style; develop mutual trust, responsibility, and understanding with the participants of the organization; offer support, guidance, and assistance to the school service center personnel; maintain positive working relationships with the community; foster two-way communication; and possess knowledge of the curriculum and instruction. Among these leadership characteristics there is no mention of the leader's sex.¹

It can also be noted that the definition of an effective leader included no mention of the leader's race.

¹Barbara S. Levandowski, "Women in Educational Administration: Where Do They Stand?" NASSP Bulletin 61 (September 1977):101.

However, a government survey for the school year 1977-1978 revealed that only the District of Columbia employed women in more than twenty-five percent of all principal and assistant principal categories.¹ Further, females who attain an administrative position may have to live with stereotypes of being "unfeminine."² Or if the administrator is a minority member, he/she is too often thought not to have adequate educational training for the job.³

Popular ideas about the place or role of women and minorities are often not only unfounded, but also often contrary to reality.⁴ The current educational organization structure has appeared to be creating incongruencies by encouraging women and minorities to attain administrative credentials at institutions of higher education,⁵ but then channels these persons into "leadership roles which do not lead to administrative advancement."⁶

In writing advice for women who aspire to educational leadership, Abrams encouraged the applicant to "be a little overqualified."⁷ The

¹U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools 1977-1978 School Year (Final), by Betty J. Foster and Judi M. Carpenter (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979), p. 19.

²Jean Dresden Grambs, "Women and Administration: Confrontation or Accommodation?" Theory Into Practice 15 (October 1976):294.

³Evans H. Harris, "The Impact of Authenticity on the Black School Administrator," NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):82.

⁴Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker, "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies," Journal of NAWDAC 38 (Spring 1975):110-117.

⁵Levandowski, p. 102. ⁶Grambs, p. 295.

⁷Joan D. Abrams, "From one who made it: Advice to women on their way up in school administration," American School Board Journal 165 (July 1978):27.

issue of qualifications has been raised by those in hiring positions as a barrier for keeping women and minorities from administrative positions.¹ Forced by the government to hire a woman or minority member, the school officials may state that "they lowered standards so that the woman was eligible."²

Securing an administrative position requires a single-minded purpose and dedication that may extract more than the woman or minority person is willing or able to give. Family obligations, real or perceived, have been an argument used against hiring women for stressful or responsible positions.³

Some studies of administrators have provided revealing information about women in those positions. Way found that "the women were older, had more classroom teaching experience, and were in their previous positions longer than males."⁴ Gross and Trask, in their study of elementary principals, found that the women "were, on the average, older than the men."⁵

The choices available to women and minority members who attempt

¹Edward J. Van Meir, "Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities," Journal of NAWDAC 38 (Summer 1975):163.

²Barbra Zakrajsek, "Obtaining a Principalship," NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):96.

³Kathryn Cirincione-Coles, "The Administrator: Male or Female?" Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Winter 1975):327.

⁴Joyce Washnok Way, "A Comparison of Background Profiles, Career Expectations, and Career Aspirations of Men and Women Public School Administrators" (Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1976), p. 98.

⁵Neal Gross and Anne E. Trask, The Sex Factor And The Management of Schools (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976), p. 21.

to achieve a position in school administration often appear discouraging. Is a token position better than none?¹ If a court battle must be waged, is the cost in money and time worth it?² The frustration that is an inevitable part of applying for a position that is highly competitive must be handled by the applicant.³

If women or minority members become administrators, what, if any, statements may be made about them? Do people in these groups who attain a leadership position have common characteristics, besides possessing the necessary credentials?⁴

Purpose of the Study

Studies done in Michigan, Colorado, Pennsylvania, and nationwide discovered that differences did exist among educational leaders based on race and gender. However, the differences were in background profiles and not in leadership effectiveness.⁵

Therefore, the question arose as to the background profiles and leadership effectiveness of minority and women administrators in Oklahoma. To date, no study had been undertaken to discover those individuals who, by national standards, would be considered unique because they held

¹Zakrajsek, p. 98. ²Grambs, p. 296.

³Rosa A. Smith, "Women Administrators--Is the Price Too High?" NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):102.

⁴Abrams, p. 27.

⁵Way, p. 97; Frances Juanita Fox, "Black Women Administrators in the Denver Public Schools" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1975). pp. 127-128; Judith A. Smith, "Encouraging Women To Enter Administration," NASSP Bulletin 62 (May 1978):114-119; Gross and Trask, pp. 217-219.

secondary administrative positions. If steps are to be taken to encourage more women and minorities to become qualified and apply for secondary administrative positions within Oklahoma, it was deemed necessary to have a realistic assessment of those who had accomplished that goal.

Information needed about those individuals included determining their: age when first selected for an administrative position; current age; number of years served in administrative positions; family status; educational and experiential preparation; and size of district where they were employed. Also, information regarding the individual's professional career objectives; reason for becoming an administrator; assessment as to why he/she was hired for the administrative job; and assessment of constraints which affected his/her opportunities for selection as an administrator was considered valuable. Finally, a self-evaluation by each administrator as to his/her effectiveness for the job completed the information deemed as critical to study.

Concerned school administrators, boards of education, and teacher educators could utilize the information from the study to be better prepared to encourage women and minority members to aspire to secondary administrative positions.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine and analyze the background profiles and self-assessed effectiveness of public secondary school administrators in Oklahoma by race and gender. Specifically, this investigation involved the comparison of minority and white secondary administrators on background profiles and self-evaluation of effectiveness; the

comparison of minority and white secondary administrators by gender on background profiles and self-assessed effectiveness; and the comparison of males and females of each group on background profiles and the self-evaluation of effectiveness.

The study attempted to answer these questions:

1. What were the background profiles of public secondary school administrators in Oklahoma for 1979-1980?
2. Did the profiles differ by race?
3. Did the profiles differ by gender?
4. What were the administrators' self-assessments of their effectiveness on the job?

Hypotheses to be Tested

- H₀1: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their marital status.
- H₀2: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their parental status.
- H₀3: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their undergraduate majors.
- H₀4: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their highest educational degree attained.
- H₀5: There is no statistically significant difference among minority,

white, male, and female administrators with regard to their previous work experience in education.

H₀6: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the reason they became administrators.

H₀7: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments as to why they were hired as an administrator.

H₀8: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments of constraints which affected their opportunities for selection as an administrator.

H₀9: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their professional career objectives.

H₀10: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as a classroom teacher.

H₀11: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as administrators.

H₀12: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their current age.

H₀13: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their age

upon selection for their first administrative position.

- H₀14: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the size of the district (based on Average Daily Attendance) in which they are employed.
- H₀15: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments concerning their job effectiveness.

Definition of Terms

Administrator: The administrator was defined in this study as ". . . the head of an individual secondary school"¹ or a person who was designated as an assistant to the head of an individual secondary school.² This definition enabled the terms "principal" and "assistant principal" to be utilized synonymously with the term "administrator."

Background profile: For this study, background profile was defined as "a vivid and concisely written sketch of the personal characteristics, education, and other experiences of a person."³

Effectiveness: In this study, effectiveness was defined as the state of being "adequate to accomplish a purpose; producing the intended

¹Encyclopedia of Education, 1971 ed., s.v. "Administration, Educational: Role of Administrators," by James R. Deneen.

²Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 15.

³The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, unabridged ed. (1971), s.v. "background profile."

or expected result."¹ Evidence of effectiveness was displayed by secondary administrators who utilized identifiable leadership skills to facilitate their schools' productivity.²

Minority: For this study, minority was defined as including those persons who by self-identification indicated a racial affiliation of Black, Spanish American, American Indian, or Oriental.³

Secondary school: The definition of secondary school used in this study was limited to ". . . education planned especially for young people of ages approximately twelve to seventeen. . ."⁴ and included grades 7 through 12, or some combination of those grades.⁵

Limitations of the Study

The investigation was limited to those minority or white male or female administrators in the public secondary schools of Oklahoma for the school year 1979-1980, as identified by the Oklahoma State Department of Education.⁶ These individuals served as the population for the study.

¹Ibid., s.v. "effective."

²Thomas J. Landers and Robert S. Silverman, "It's the Principal of the Thing," NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974):45.

³U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population General Population Characteristics United States Summary, Appendix B--Definitions and Explanations of Subject Characteristics (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972):App-7.

⁴Good, p. 522. ⁵Ibid., p. 322.

⁶Oklahoma State Department of Education, Finance Division, Teacher Personnel.

Methodology

Two questionnaires were sent to all minority and to all the white female secondary administrators in Oklahoma and to a random sample of white male secondary administrators. Names and classifications of participants were obtained from the Oklahoma State Department of Education.¹ The school year 1979-1980 was used as the base year, with the information updated to January 15, 1980.

The questionnaires were developed and piloted to establish their content validity. Prior to the pilot study, a panel of educators and administrators were asked to evaluate the instrument for use as the self-assessment questionnaire. Individuals from Oklahoma were chosen who were generally acknowledged in the educational field as being knowledgeable about questionnaires and their preparation and about secondary administrators.

For the pilot study, copies of the questionnaires were given to white male secondary administrators who were taking graduate classes at the University of Oklahoma in the area of secondary education or educational administration. White males were chosen, as those participating in the pilot were precluded from also participating in the formal study.

The questionnaires consisted of two sections: 1. demographic data, which included statements covering professional objectives, reasons for becoming an administrator, and factors affecting selection and employment, in addition to personal information; and 2. a self-assessment of effectiveness. The former questionnaire utilized a checklist and short

¹Finance Division, Teacher Personnel.

answer format. The latter questionnaire presented a rating scale of the Likert-type¹ with statements based upon criteria for effectiveness of secondary leaders as found in the literature.

A cover letter explaining the nature of and reason for the study, assuring anonymity, and soliciting participation was attached to the questionnaires. A stamped, addressed return envelope was also included.

As the study was designed to elicit responses from administrators about demographic data and self-assessments relating to their jobs, descriptive statistics were utilized to process and analyze the data. Specifically, the statistical treatment included calculation of the means and frequencies and application of the "t" test or chi-square test to all quantifiable data. For those few factors that were not quantifiable, percentages were utilized in describing the responses. The .05 level of significance was used as the criterion for accepting or rejecting each of the hypotheses.

Reliability was established by having a representative sample of respondents from the formal study complete the self-assessment questionnaire approximately four weeks after they had completed the original form.

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I is the introduction, and includes the purpose of the study, statement of the

¹Claire Sellitiz, Lawrence S. Wrightsman, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, 3rd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1976), p. 578.

problem, hypotheses which were tested, definition of terms, limitations, and the methodology.

A review of related literature is contained in Chapter II.

Chapter III provides the details of the design and procedures of the study.

Chapter IV furnishes the analysis of the data.

A summary of the study, conclusions based on the data, and recommendations for further research are contained in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A rationale for studying principals was offered by Tye: ". . . the principal is the critical person in the education process . . . our schools need principals who define themselves and who are defined by others as leaders."¹ Another reason for a study of secondary school administrators was given by Thomas:

In education we have not provided equal opportunity to all those who want to become school administrators. There is no basis for continuing this practice. Leadership is possible by any person, regardless of race, sex, educational background, weight, or place of birth.²

If it is therefore acknowledged that by virtue of position, the secondary administrator is the leader of the school, then the concern becomes that of the quality of leadership exhibited. Ovard stated: "Effective leadership is related directly to the method of operation of

¹Kenneth A. Tye, "The Times They Are A Changin' for School Principals," Thrust for Education Leadership 7 (October 1977):4-5.

²M. Donald Thomas, "The Complexities of Educational Leadership," NASSP Bulletin 61 (December 1977):38.

the principal."¹ And Stogdill contended that "clusters of characteristics differentiate leaders from followers, . . . effective from ineffective leaders."²

The final rationale for a study of secondary administrators and their effectiveness was found in the following statement by Morris and Seeman:

Criteria for effectiveness may vary systematically with the individual making the evaluation: different people want different things of leadership; or with the situation: what is effective leadership in peace may not be effective leadership in war. Studies, therefore, which examine the relations among multiple criteria of effectiveness are of vital importance.³

The complex pattern of relationships which emerged in the writings on the subject necessitated reviewing the related literature under the following headings:

1. Establishment of criteria for ascertaining effectiveness of secondary administrators
2. Rationale for using a self-study approach
3. Demographic characteristics and criteria for identifying the profile of the administrator
4. Rationale for studying secondary administrators by race and gender
5. Summary of related literature

¹Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 48.

²Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership (New York: Free Press, 1974), p. 81.

³Richard T. Morris and Melvin Seeman, "The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach," in The Study of Leadership, eds. C.G. Browne and Thomas S. Cohn (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers & Publishers, 1958), p. 21.

Establishment of Criteria for Ascertaining Effectiveness
of Secondary Administrators

In order to establish criteria concerning administrator effectiveness, it is first necessary to briefly review a few of the theories from which later concepts have been developed. For without recognition of the foundation created by the past, any current attempt to develop rational criteria would fail for lack of substantiation.

Kimbrough and Nunnery provide an excellent review of general administrative theory that has applicability for educational administration.¹ Five major movements in administrative theory and their main protagonists were:

1. Scientific Management: Frederick W. Taylor, who stressed the efficient and rational use of human and material resources to achieve the goals of the organization
2. Bureaucratic Structure: Max Weber, who promulgated a hierarchical arrangement characterized by specialization and impersonality
3. Administrative Process: Henri Fayol, who defined administration in terms of its major functions
4. Human Relations or Transitional: Mary Parker Follett, who placed emphasis on the needs and relationships of the human beings within any organization
5. General Systems or Social Systems: Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba, who proposed a model for organizations that gave consideration to

¹Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration (New York: Macmillan, 1976), pp. 53-83.

goals, interactions, feedback, and alternatives.¹

Many definitions of what constitutes leadership can be found in the literature. A few are reviewed here to give an indication of the complexity of the issue. Leadership was defined as "a process or act of influencing the movements of an organized group in its effort toward goal setting and goal achievement."² Leadership was defined as "the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction."³ Or yet a third: "By leadership behavior we generally mean the particular acts in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of his group members."⁴

A distinction between leadership and administration was also made by some authors. Administration was defined as "the processes which help the organization operate its mechanisms for achieving its goals."⁵ Leadership, in contrast, was defined by Owens as "initiating changes in the organization."⁶ Griffiths said: "Administration is the process of directing and controlling life in a social organization."⁷ Katz offered yet another definition: "An administrator is one who (a) directs the

¹Ibid., pp. 53-83.

²James C. Jones, C. Jackson Salisbury, and Ralph L. Spencer, Secondary School Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 127.

³Stogdill, p. 411.

⁴Fred E. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 36.

⁵Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 127.

⁶Ibid., p. 127.

⁷Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959), p. 72.

activities of other persons and (b) undertakes the responsibility for achieving certain objectives through these efforts."¹

The above definitions--which are not at all exhaustive--illustrate the diversity of opinion that has characterized the entire concept of educational administration and leadership. The studies conducted into the aspects of leadership are legion and are described in thorough detail by Stogdill.²

And yet to build the foundation for criteria for effective leadership, it is also necessary to consider briefly at least three areas of study of leadership--traits or qualities of leaders; styles of leaders; and situational leadership.

"Prior to 1945, most of the studies of leadership were devoted primarily to the identification of the traits or qualities of leaders."³ However, studies of leader traits continued. Stogdill studied 124 leadership studies and derived a list of "personal factors associated with leadership."⁴ Lipham also studied "personal variables related to administrative effectiveness."⁵ Argyris identified "some characteristics of

¹Robert L. Katz, "Skills of an Effective Administrator," Harvard Business Review 33 (January-February 1955):34.

²Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership.

³Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 130.

⁴Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership," Journal of Psychology 25 (January 1948):63-64.

⁵James M. Lipham, "Personal Variables Related to Administrative Effectiveness," quoted in Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration As a Social Process (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 229.

successful executives."¹ Each study developed or refined lists of personal traits of persons identified as leaders. Few of the lists were in agreement--further indicating the complexity of the various aspects of leadership.

The style of the leader also came under study. Three styles of leadership were identified: democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire.² Wood, Nicholson, and Findley gave a succinct definition of autocratic leadership: ". . . authority is centered in the status leader, who in turn passes orders down the line for subordinates to follow."³ One definition of democratic leadership stated: "Respect for individuals and confidence in co-workers are the basic premises."⁴

Finally, the interaction of both the leader and the group within given situations were examined in other studies. Fiedler postulated the Contingency Model which stated:

. . . the group's performance will be contingent upon the appropriate matching of leadership style and the degree of favorableness of the group situation for the leader, that is, the degree to which the situation provides the leader with influence over his group members.⁵

A similar view was expressed by Sexton and Switzer when they stated that "there are times that an effective supervisor will use the authoritarian

¹Chris Argyris, "Some Characteristics of Successful Executives," Personnel Journal 33 (June 1953):51-54.

²Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Group Dynamics, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 18.

³Charles L. Wood, Everett W. Nicholson, and Dale G. Findley, The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1979), p. 34.

⁴Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, p. 141.

⁵Fiedler, p. 151.

style, and there are other times that they will approach students using a developmental style."¹

All of the above citings illustrate not only the complexity and diversity found concerning educational leadership, but also serve as a starting place for discovering what behaviors are associated with leadership effectiveness. Given the previous examples of diversity among many writers as to what is leadership and who is a leader, it would have been expected that wide variation in opinion would also exist as to what constitutes effective leadership. And, without doubt, variety did exist; however, there was consensus on several aspects of criteria identifying effective leadership.

Lists of administrative tasks have long been popular. Fayol postulated five elements of management: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling.² The list was expanded and refined by each person who tackled the issue. For example, Knezevich proposed: ". . . goal orienting, organizing, assembling and allocating resources, leadership, coordinating, controlling, and ceremonial functions."³ However, many of the lists of tasks performed by effective administrators or lists of their behaviors identified several areas on a remarkably consistent basis.

The single criterion of effectiveness postulated by more writers

¹Michael J. Sexton and Karen Dawn Dill Switzer, "Educational Leadership: No Longer a Potpourri," Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977):21.

²Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management, trans. Constance Storrs (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1949), pp. 43-107.

³Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 51.

and researchers than any other was the leader's ability to work well with others--the human relations function. Beck summarized this criterion well when he declared:

The most important single aspect of school administration is human relations. The successful administrator must first understand and relate well to others.¹

A study conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1977 sought to identify and analyze principals who were considered effective, as defined by their superiors and other educational leaders. Among the major conclusions of the study was the characteristic that:

These principals are people oriented . . . They seem to understand people, know how to motivate them, and know how to deal effectively with their problems. It is primarily this factor, rather than a technical expertise, that cause 'significant others' to perceive these principals as effective administrators.²

Further, in the summarization report of the NASSP study, the stress was on human relations skills as a major criterion for identifying effective principals.³

To say, however, that an administrator is effective because he/she possesses human relations skills is hardly definitive or concrete. Therefore, specific behaviors which reveal that the administrator does indeed possess human relations skills were identified by several authors.

¹William R. Beck, "The Teachers and the Principal" in Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, ed. Richard W. Saxe (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968), p. 79.

²Richard A. Gorton and Kenneth E. McIntyre, The Senior High School Principalship Vol. II: The Effective Principal (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978), pp. 2-55.

³Lloyd E. McCleary and Scott D. Thomson, The Senior High School Principalship Vol. III: The Summary Report (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), p. 21.

These behaviors included:

1. establishing a climate of mutual trust and respect¹
2. developing leadership skills and professional growth in subordinates²
3. praising staff members for accomplishments³
4. encouraging staff members' cooperation and interaction both during and outside school hours⁴

¹Arthur Blumberg, William D. Greenfield, Jr., and David Mason, "The Substance of Trust Between Teachers and Principals," NASSP Bulletin 62 (December 1978):80; Kenneth A. Erickson, "Humaneness--A Management Essential," NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):10-11; Daniel E. Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), p. 17; James R. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971), p. 148; Phil Clayton Robinson, "What Skills Are Needed by Today's School Leaders," Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977):15; Will Schutz, Leaders of Schools (LaJolla, Calif.: University Associates, 1977), p. 28; Harold B. Smith, "Descriptions of Effective and Ineffective Behavior of School Principals" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1974), p. 195; Tye, p. 6; Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell, Supervision for Better Schools, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975), p. 26.

²Charles W. Boardman, Harl R. Douglass, and Rudyard K. Bent, Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools (Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1953), p. 4; Griffiths, Human Relations, p. 246; James A. Hoeh, "Feeling Guilty for Not Being an Instructional Leader? Don't." NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973):5; Leo W. Jenkins, "The Effective Principals," American School Board Journal 121 (October 1950):18; Thomas J. Landers and Robert S. Silverman, "It's the Principal of the Thing," NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974):47; Dennis Mangers, The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 165 325, 1978), p. 55; Robinson, p. 15; William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principalship (New York: Macmillan, 1974), p. 79; Smith, p. 193; Gilbert R. Weldy, Principals What They Do And Who They Are (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), p. 39; Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950), p. 11; Wiles and Lovell, p. 28.

³Kenneth L. Fish, "The Principal As Coach," NASSP Bulletin 60 (November 1976):40; Griffiths, Human Relations, p. 247; Landers and Silverman, p. 46.

⁴Cornelio O. Abungu, The Characteristics of Successful Principals in AA High Schools of Texas (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 122 397, 1976), p. 57; Katz, p. 34; Roe and Drake, p. 13; Schutz, p. 28; Smith, p. 206; Tye, p. 6; Wiles and Lovell, p. 95.

5. supporting teachers in conflict situations¹
6. promoting staff talents and seeking to have persons on the staff who have varied socio-economic or ethnic backgrounds²

The second most often cited criterion of administrator effectiveness was communication skill. As Gregg noted: "During recent years communication has come to be recognized as a crucial component of the administrative process."³ The importance of communications was illustrated by Wood, Nicholson, and Findley when they stated:

The school principal, as the center of the communication network within a school is in a position to facilitate communication which leads to understanding and concerted effort on the part of members of the organization. Communication is considered by many writers to be the essence of the administrative process.⁴

It could be argued that to separate the communications function from the other aspects of effective behavior is an artificial distinction. The same argument might also be made for the area of human relations.

¹Erickson, p. 10; Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalsip: New Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 43; Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Revis, and James D. Logsdon, The Effective School Principal (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 510; Dwayne C. Poll, "The Interpersonal Relationships of the Principal," NASSP Bulletin 60 (November 1976):5; Ronald Eugene Prascher, "Effective and Ineffective Administrative Behavior Exhibited by High School Principals as Judged by a Selected Group of Colorado Classroom Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts International 36 (1975):2556-A; Smith, p. 198; Donald Thomas, "Who Is An Effective Principal?" NASSP Bulletin 60 (September 1974):48-52.

²Robert G. Brandt, "Administrator Attributes for Success," NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973):37; Griffiths, Human Relations, p. 247; William D. Hedges, "Being a Leader," NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973): 29; Jenkins, p. 18; Schutz, p. 40; Wiles and Lovell, p. 61.

³Russell T. Gregg, "The Administrative Process," in Administrative Behavior in Education, eds. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 294.

⁴Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, p. 67.

For as Beck noted: "Principals are urged to become sensitive to the expectations of teachers and to improve their attempts at communication."¹ And as Abungu observed: "Communication plays a major role in working with groups especially through demonstrating mutual respect for the feelings and aspirations of each group member."² However, in establishing a criterion for determining effective behavior, the major components of the administrator's role must be identified and specific behaviors noted.

The literature revealed the following administrative behaviors as evidence of communications skill:

1. providing the community and parents with information about the school and students³
2. listening to and utilizing staff suggestions⁴
3. sharing two-way communication with staff and students on both school and non-school topics⁵

¹Beck, p. 88. ²Abungu, p. 58.

³Educator's Encyclopedia, 1961 ed., s.v. "School Administrator," by Edward W. Smith, Stanley N. Krouse, and Mark M. Atkinson; Robert S. Fisk, "The Task of Educational Administration," in Administrative Behavior in Education, eds. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), pp. 211-225; Jacobson, Logsdon, and Wiegman, p. 43; Kimbrough and Nunnery, p. 185; Landers and Silverman, p. 46; John A. Ramseyer et al., Factors Affecting Educational Administration (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1955), p. 20; Smith, pp. 188, 213; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, p. 25.

⁴Abungu, p. 54; Erickson, p. 10; Fish, p. 40; Griffiths, Human Relations, p. 71; Hedges, p. 34; Walter G. Patterson, "To The Principal: Are You There?" NASSP Bulletin 61 (March 1977):104; Prascher, p. 2556-A; Thomas, pp. 48-52.

⁵Harl R. Douglass, Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools, revised ed. (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1945), p. 594; Hedges, p. 34; Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 148; Smith, p. 230; Roosevelt Washington, Jr. and Hoyt F. Watson, "Positive Teacher Morale--The Principal's Responsibility," NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):6; Wiles and Lovell, p. 29; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, p. 68.

The decision making process was viewed by many authors as a key element in the administrative role. Griffiths stated: ". . . the central process of administration . . . decision making."¹ Lipham and Hoeh declared: "The view of the principal as a decision maker is an accurate conceptualization of the role."² And Simon explained that "administrative processes are decisional processes."³

Further, effective use of the decision process has become identified with shared or cooperative decision making. As Kimbrough and Nunnery recounted: ". . . There emerged in the 1930's almost universal support among educational administration scholars for cooperative decision making."⁴ Justification for this view was offered by Gregg, who approached the issue from two sides:

It is particularly appropriate to encourage wide participation in decision making in an educational organization. Here most of the personnel have above-average ability and extensive preparation. . . .
 . . . It is an accepted principle of democracy that persons concerned and affected by plans and decisions should have opportunity to participate in formulating them.⁵

Additional justification was offered by Wiles and Lovell, who declared:

The simple process of sharing decisions is the most powerful tool a leader has. It is the key to the securing of leadership, the assumption of responsibility, the acceptance of assignments, and the development of high morale.⁶

¹Griffiths, Administrative Theory, p. 112.

²James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), p. 8.

³Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior (New York: Macmillan, 1948), p. 8.

⁴Kimbrough and Nunnery, p. 95. ⁵Gregg, pp. 278, 283.

⁶Wiles and Lovell, p. 276.

Behaviors, therefore, associated with effective decision making as identified in the literature included:

1. involving those affected by decisions in the decision process¹
2. delegating responsibilities to subordinates²
3. establishing a framework for and participating in evaluation of programs and personnel³
4. formulating short and long range plans⁴

¹Edwin H. Casburn, "Bureaucracy vs. Shared Decision Making," NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):62-68; Fenwick English, "The Ailing Principalship," in The Secondary School Principal in Action, ed. Leonard E. Kraft (USA: Wm. C. Brown, 1971), p. 47; Erickson, pp. 10-11; Anthony Fiorello, "Leadership Concepts for Principals," NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973):23; Robert Neal Gaut, "Teacher-Principal Assessment of Principal Performance in Selected Secondary Schools of Oklahoma" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969), p. 91; Gorton and McIntyre, p. 41; Gregg, p. 278; Jacobson, Logsdon, and Wiegman, p. 57; Knezevich, p. 102; Landers and Silverman, p. 46; R. Likert, The Human Organization, quoted in Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership (New York: Free Press, 1974), p. 22; McCleary and Thomson, p. 21; Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 179; Ovard, p. 43; Ramseyer et al., p. 100; Frederick M. Raubinger, Merle R. Sumption, and Richard M. Kamm, Leadership in the Secondary School (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1974), p. 59; Roe and Drake, p. 79; Smith, p. 201; Thomas, "Effective Principal," pp. 48-52; Washington and Watson, p. 6; Weldy, p. 47; Wiles and Lovell, p. 73; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, pp. 35, 42.

²Fish, p. 40; Andrew W. Halpin, "A Paradigm for Research on Administrator Behavior," in Administrative Behavior in Education, eds. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 167; Evans H. Harris, "The Impact of Authenticity on the Black School Administrator," NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):84; Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, p. 151; Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 149; Owens, p. 137; Schutz, p. 23; Tye, p. 7.

³Educator's Encyclopedia, p. 176; Fayol, p. 98; Fisk, pp. 211-225; Gregg, p. 311; Knezevich, p. 51; Mangers, pp. 54-56; Ovard, p. 34; Prascher, 2556-A; Smith, p. 211; Weldy, p. 37; Wiles, pp. 11-18; Wiles and Lovell, p. 29; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, p. 35.

⁴Abungu, p. 49; Fayol, p. 43; Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 229; Gregg, p. 273; Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, p. 142; Knezevich, p. 51; McCleary and Thomson, p. 25; Ovard, p. 30; Ramseyer et al., p. 20; Roe and Drake, p. 76; Jesse B. Sears, The Nature of the Administrative Process (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), p. 40; Simon, p. 4; Weldy, p. 59.

A fourth area identified in much of the literature centered around the promotion of innovation or the management of change. Gorman expressed this concept succinctly: ". . . If the principal is to be truly effective, he must envision the better kind of school his school may become."¹ And as Gorton and McIntyre reported in the NASSP study of effective principals: "The principals saw themselves as the 'initiators' or 'facilitators' of major changes in the school. . . ."² This was further expressed by McIntyre, who viewed "a competent school principal as a changer of the environment in which teaching takes place, to the extent that the environment needs changing in order to accomplish the goals of the school."³

As was noted earlier, Owens viewed the hallmark of leadership as emphasizing change, as contrasted with administration which stressed maintaining.⁴ And the area of change or improvement of education affects not only the organization itself, but also affects the principal. As Tye explained: "The principal can and should be the key agent for change in his school . . . the most important place for a principal to begin organizing for planned change is with himself."⁵

¹Burton W. Gorman, Secondary Education (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 84.

²Gorton and McIntyre, p. 40.

³Kenneth E. McIntyre, "What Kind of Person (If Any) Is Needed?" in The Principalship in the 1970's, ed. Kenneth E. McIntyre (Austin: Bureau of Laboratory Schools, 1971), p. 79.

⁴Owens, p. 127.

⁵Kenneth A. Tye, "The School Principal: Key Man for Change in his School," in Leadership in the Secondary School, eds. Frederick M. Raubinger, Merle R. Sumption, and Richard M. Kamm (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1974), pp. 87-88.

Among the behaviors that evidence effectiveness in the area of change or innovation as found in the literature were:

1. keeping abreast of current developments in education¹
2. promoting study of new or innovative programs²
3. facilitating change through encouragement, provision of needed resources, and evaluation techniques³

Another significant concept identified by authors in the literature was the need to provide instructional leadership and to found action on theories of administration or organization. Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops illustrated this area by saying: "If the supervisor is to operate as an effective leader, he must understand his own place and function in the organization and the requisites for strong resourceful leadership."⁴ Or as Raubinger, Sumption, and Kamm stated: "To be effective over a period of time, leadership must be based on knowledge not only of the

¹Howard J. Demeke, Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Principalship: Seven Areas of Competence (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 057 479, 1971), pp. 18-19; Gorman, p. 88; "How to Tell an Effective Principal From an Ordinary One," The Executive Educator 1 (January 1979):32; Jenkins, p. 18; Landers and Silverman, p. 46; Mangers, p. 61; McCleary and Thomson, p. 28; Weldy, pp. 38-41.

²Joe Mac Garrison, "The Leader Behavior of Oklahoma Secondary School Principals" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968), p. 10; Jacobson, Logsdon, and Wiegman, pp. 41-43; Jacobson, Revis, and Logsdon, pp. 508-510; Landers and Silverman, p. 46; Thomas, "Effective Principal," pp. 48-52; Wiles and Lovell, p. 197; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, pp. 92-93.

³Jack A. Culbertson, Paul B. Jacobson, and Theodore L. Reller, Administrative Relationships (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960), p. 378; Fenwick E. English, School Organization and Management (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1975), p. 14; Gorton and McIntyre, p. 14; Lipham and Hoeh, p. 357; Mangers, pp. 54-56; Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 153; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, p. 58.

⁴Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 145.

organization but of the larger community as well."¹ And Robinson explained that: ". . . The successful leader understands organizational procedures and the process of organizational analysis."² Halpin also noted that: "Effective administrators have invariably based their decisions on some kind of theory of administration. . . ."³

This concept was summarized by Weldy:

Good principals are acknowledged experts in the field of education and more specifically in the field of administration. They cannot be expert in every subject area, but they can and should be experts in the teaching and learning processes.⁴

Behaviors representative of effectiveness in the area of instructional leadership, administration, or organization, as identified in the literature were:

1. providing subordinates an environment conducive to achieving educational goals⁵

¹Raubinger, Sumption, and Kamm, p. 60. ²Robinson, p. 17.

³Andrew W. Halpin, "The Development of Theory in Educational Administration," in Administrative Theory In Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 11.

⁴Weldy, p. 37.

⁵Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1938; reprint ed., 1966), p. 217; Boardman, Douglass, and Bent, p. 79; John E. Corbally, Jr., T.J. Jensen, and W. Frederick Staub, Educational Administration: The Secondary School (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1961), p. 115; Educator's Encyclopedia, pp. 170-176; English, School Organization, p. 20; Fisk, p. 211; Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 345; Gregg, p. 273; John K. Hemphill, "Administration as Problem-Solving," in Administrative Theory In Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 106; Hoeh, p. 6; Knezevich, p. 9; Landers and Silverman, p. 47; McCleary and Thomson, p. 23; Gerald J. Pine and Angelo V. Boy, "Theory as a Guide to Administrative Behavior," NASSP Bulletin 63 (March 1979):34; Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 98; Bettie Burres Youngs, "Effective School Leadership Can Foster Model Relationships," Education 99 (Summer 1979):430-431.

2. cooperating or working closely with superiors and coordinates in the organizational hierarchy¹
3. striving to integrate the school with the community through public relations²

A final area identified in the literature as being crucial to the administrator's effectiveness was the managerial function. Roe and Drake defined this area as: "The administrative-managerial emphasis is characterized by placing primary responsibility upon those tasks which have to do with the smooth operation of the schools. . . ." ³ Wiles and Lovell made this statement which also illustrated the need for expertise in managerial functions:

. . . Teachers need technological support. . . .
 . . . They need specialized service in the procurement and utilization of materials and equipment.⁴

Lipham and Hoeh identified this area in their list of tasks of the principal as "financial and physical resources."⁵

Katz offered this explanation:

Technical skill implies an understanding of, and proficiency in, a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques. . . .
 . . . The administrator needs sufficient technical skill to

¹Educator's Encyclopedia, pp. 170-176; Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, p. 168; Schutz, p. 40; Smith, p. 183; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, p. 50.

²Fisk, pp. 211-225; Hoeh, p. 5; Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, pp. 179-180; McCleary and Thomson, p. 60; Jack Lee Nance, "A Study of the Leadership Role of the Superintendent and High School Principal within Selected Communities of Oklahoma" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1965), p. 118; Smith, p. 213; Tye, "Times Are Changin," pp. 5-7.

³Roe and Drake, p. 13. ⁴Wiles and Lovell, p. 196.

⁵Lipham and Hoeh, p. 10.

accomplish the mechanics of the particular job for which he is responsible. . . .¹

And Saif concluded: "Management includes records, fiscal operations, physical plant, and support services."²

Specific behaviors associated with effectiveness in this area were identified in the literature as:

1. monitoring fiscal operations and procuring and allocating resources³
2. attending to the care of physical facilities and overseeing support services⁴
3. overseeing discipline⁵
4. supervising activities⁶
5. making personnel recommendations⁷

Rationale for Using a Self-Study Approach

Justification for having administrators assess their own effectiveness was presented by numerous authors. Redfern declared:

¹Katz, pp. 34, 42.

²Philip S. Saif, A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 133 371, 1976), p. 75.

³Gregg, p. 173; Knezevich, p. 51; Ramseyer et al., p. 20; Saif, p. 75; Schutz, p. 33; Wiles and Lovell, p. 28.

⁴Demeke, p. 19; Educator's Encyclopedia, pp. 170-176; Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, p. 180; Saif, p. 75; Schutz, p. 33.

⁵Saif, p. 75; Smith, p. 226; Wiles and Lovell, p. 256.

⁶Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, p. 180; Schutz, p. 33; Wiles and Lovell, p. 256.

⁷Abungu, p. 51; Fayol, p. 97; Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, pp. 79, 82.

Self-assessment is a subtle process. It involves the capacity to weigh strengths and weaknesses; to measure accomplishments against declared goals; to admit failure as well as accept success; and to evaluate achievement in terms of one's own concept of satisfactory service rather than in terms of comparing accomplishment with that of others who are doing the same type of job in the school system.

Self-assessment is an attempt to estimate accomplishment and to identify problems that may have impeded it. Self-assessment is the starting point of a comprehensive assessment of performance effectiveness.¹

Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer offered the following explanation:

Looking at one's self as an administrator may be a difficult assignment. However, there are a number of vantage points from which views might be quite revealing. One way for the administrator to look at himself . . . would be from the standpoint of purposes. Let him ask himself whether his primary purpose is to facilitate the development of goals, policies, and programs, or whether he prefers to control, manipulate, and manage their development.²

Self-assessment was seen by some authors as a necessity for periodic review in order to better perform the position requirements. As Griffiths commented:

What is an administrator like when he has a highly developed set of human skills? First, of all, he knows himself--his strengths and weaknesses. He is aware of his own attitudes and assumptions.³

And as Mangers proposed: "To be effective, the principal needs self-understanding through an assessment of his or her own strengths and weaknesses and needs to know his or her disposition to change."⁴ McVey and Harris stated directly: "For the school administrator, the time has

¹George B. Redfern, Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How? (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 062 693, 1972), pp. 6-7.

²Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1961), p. 243.

³Griffiths, Human Relations, p. 10. ⁴Mangers, p. 62.

come for some solid self-appraisal about his leadership role in the school."¹ And as Briggs observed nearly thirty-seven years ago:

The principal should use self-evaluation when he wishes to check himself, to see to what extent he is meeting the challenges that confront him, whether he has realized their existence or not, to direct his energies to those problems that are most important and from time to time measure his growth in professional effectiveness.²

Several authors also explained the importance of self-assessment to the individual, as it could affect his/her self-confidence. As Burch and Danley observed: "We tend to perform correspondingly to what we believe are our capabilities. . . ."³ And Wiles and Lovell reported:

A supervisor must have confidence in himself. . . . When a supervisor has confidence in himself and in his ability to deal with situations, he doesn't feel the need for being constantly on guard. He can treat others as equals and believe that all are working for the good of the school. . . . In order to maintain self-confidence, it is necessary to continue to study and grow. . . . It is necessary also to study the results of one's past action and to recognize that mistakes can be learning experiences.⁴

Brandt echoed this theme: "To be effective the administrator must have a good self-concept, must be fully aware of his assets and liabilities, and must be flexible in his search for new and better ways to bring about improvement."⁵ Butera concluded that self-evaluation should be used by the principal in addition to evaluation by the superintendent and faculty

¹Marcia A. McVey and J. Jerome Harris, "School Climate: The Administrator Makes the Difference," Thrust for Education Leadership 5 (March 1976):20.

²Thomas H. Briggs, "A Self-Rating Scale for School Principals," NASSP Bulletin 27 (December 1943):49.

³Barbara G. Burch and W. Elzie Danley, Sr., "Self-Perception: An Essential in Staff Development," NASSP Bulletin 62 (April 1978):16.

⁴Wiles and Lovell, pp. 54-55.

⁵Brandt, p. 39.

to increase his/her effectiveness.¹

As to the method that might be used for the self-assessment process, a common way discussed was the questionnaire or checklist.

Walsh found in his studies:

No one method elicits a more accurate self-report than another. Subjects gave quite accurate responses to most of the informational items. . . . The results lend equal credence to research results based upon the questionnaire, interview, and personal data blank.²

Mouly expressed the advantages of the questionnaire as enabling a broad geographic coverage and providing the means for eliciting more candid replies. He named the disadvantages as including nonreturns and the ability and willingness of the respondent to understand the questions and provide the information solicited.³

Becker declared: "I consider this sort of soul-searching far more necessary and effective than the usual type of thing that goes on under the name of self-assessment, or job analysis,"⁴ when he wrote about questionnaires. Ovard⁵ and Argyris⁶ expressed the importance of the administrator's asking or being asked questions for self-examination.

Finally, Reese, in his study of fifteen public secondary schools in California involving fifteen principals and 714 teachers, concluded:

¹Thomas S. Butera, "Principal, Know Thyself!" NASSP Bulletin 60 (September 1976):84.

²Bruce W. Walsh, "Validity of Self-Report," Journal of Counseling Psychology 14 (January 1967):22; Bruce W. Walsh, "Validity of Self-Report: Another Look," Journal of Counseling Psychology 15 (March 1968):180-186.

³George J. Mouly, Educational Research (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978), pp. 189-190.

⁴Ernest J. Becker, "A Principal Rates Himself," The Clearing House 19 (October 1944):77.

⁵Ovard, p. 34. ⁶Argyris, p. 52.

Principals' perceptions of their own leader behavior did not differ significantly among large, medium, and small high schools in the areas of supportive relationships, group decision making and supervision, and high goal orientation. . . . Principals who are effective leaders can accurately assess their relations with their teaching staffs.¹

Demographic Characteristics and Criteria for
Identifying the Profile of the Administrator

In 1965, the National Association of Secondary School Principals conducted a study to describe the principalship. In 1977, they conducted another study not only to describe the principalship but also to compare the incumbents in 1977 with those in 1965. The following data described the principal in 1977 and the comparisons with 1965, where available:

Of the 1,131 respondents:

1. Males dominated the position--93 percent in 1977 compared to 90 percent in 1965
2. The bulk of the principals were between ages 40 and 49
3. Caucasians predominated with 96 percent of the total, while 3 percent were black, and all other races totaled 1 percent
4. Social studies was the most often listed undergraduate major--26 percent in 1977; while humanities led in 1965 with 29 percent
5. The 1965 study showed 48 percent had been counselors just prior to their appointment as principals; in 1977, 54 percent had served as assistant principals before becoming principals
6. In 1977, 33 percent indicated an aspiration to move to a central office

¹Richard Louis Reese, "Leadership Effectiveness of High School Principals" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1973), pp. 88-93.

position

7. Principals in private, as well as public schools were represented¹

Byrne, Hines, and McCleary remarked:

The 1965 study of principals concluded that the senior high school principalship was a male-dominated profession. The 1977 study gives evidence that it continues to be a white male dominated profession.²

Also in 1977, another study was conducted concerning principals.

The National Institute of Education surveyed 1,448 principals and found:

1. The principal had served an average of 5.8 years in his current position
2. The principal had served an average of 7.8 years as a secondary school teacher
3. Males predominated with 98.3 percent
4. Caucasians predominated with 94.2 percent; blacks constituted 3.8 percent; and all other minorities totaled to 2 percent
5. The survey involved only public secondary school principals³

Tracy described the median principal in the United States in 1970 as:

. . . Male, about 40, has had eight years experience as a classroom teacher, and is in his ninth year as the principal . . . of a secondary school with an enrollment of about 300 pupils. He entered the field of administration in his early thirties and is in the same school where he started his career as a principal. . . .

¹David R. Byrne, Susan A. Hines, and Lloyd E. McCleary, The Senior High School Principalship Vol. I: The National Survey (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978), pp. 1-7.

²Ibid., p. 18.

³U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, High School '77 A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals, by Susan Abramowitz and Ellen Tenenbaum (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978), p. 95.

As a secondary principal, his experience prior to his first principalship is likely to have been as a secondary teacher or vice-principal. His undergraduate major was probably in history or one of the social sciences, but the chances are better than even that he has been either a coach or athletic director during his teaching career.¹

The two national studies conducted within the last five years did not describe the principal much differently than did Tracy. Studies done in Oklahoma,² Texas,³ Colorado,⁴ Michigan,⁵ and California⁶ reached similar conclusions as to the profile of the administrator. Although some of the studies included other educational levels than just secondary, the results did not show any appreciable differences.

Demographic characteristics, therefore, that have been studied for secondary administrators in one or more studies have included a wide variety of factors. However, considerable consistency among the studies produced the following list: race; sex; marital status; number of children;

¹Encyclopedia of Education, 1971 ed., s.v. "Principal, Profile of," by Neal H. Tracy.

²Edward H. Seifert III, "The Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in Oklahoma" (Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976).

³Louis Harold Shaver, The Texas High School Principal: Characteristics and Views on Selected Educational Issues (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 046 077, 1970).

⁴Frances Juanita Fox, "Black Women Administrators in the Denver Public Schools" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1975).

⁵Joyce Washnok Way, "A Comparison of Background Profiles, Career Expectations and Career Aspirations of Men and Women Public School Administrators" (Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1976); Marion Kay Hannah, "A Comparison of Demographic Characteristics and Selected Role Functions of Michigan Public School Administrators," Dissertation Abstracts International 40 (1979):579-A.

⁶Thelma Barnes, "America's Forgotten Minority: Women School Administrators," NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1979):87-93.

undergraduate major; highest degree (or hours) attained; years as an administrator; age; age at first administrative appointment; perceived constraints on being selected as an administrator; perceived aids to being selected as an administrator; number of years in current position; number of years in district; number of administrative positions held; position prior to current one; position prior to first administrative appointment; size of district; career aspirations; reason for entering administration; and number of years as a classroom teacher.¹ The list is by no means intended to be exhaustive; it does, however, illustrate the range and depth of demographic characteristics which have been studied for administrators.

Rationale for Studying Secondary Administrators

by Race and Gender

Our education system must reflect the full diversity of our society; it must obtain the full benefits of the abilities of the individuals working within it regardless of their sex, race, ethnicity or social class; if it is to assist all individuals in

¹High School '77, p. 95; Earlie Bridges Anderson, "The Life-History Correlates, Work-Related Motivational Characteristics, and Role-Identification Factors of On-Site Women Administrators in Hawaiian Public Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International 38 (1977):5809-A; Barnes, p. 93; Eleanor B. Baron, "The Status of Women Senior High School Principals in the United States," Dissertation Abstracts International 37 (1977):4259-4260-A; Barbara Jean Roberts Brooks, "A Profile of Black Females in Selected Administrative Positions in the Public School System of Florida," Dissertation Abstracts International 36 (1976):6385-A; Byrne, Hines, and McCleary, pp. 1-7; Rosie N. Doughty, "The Black Woman in School Administration," Integrated Education 15 (July/August, 1977):34-35; Fox, p. 65; Flora Ida Ortiz and Janice Covell, "Women in School Administration A Case Analysis," Urban Education 13 (July 1978):213-236; Seifert, pp. 37-77; Shaver, pp. 47-53; Judith Ann Smith, "A Study of Women Who Are Certified and Employed as Principals and Assistant Principals in Pennsylvania," Dissertation Abstracts International 37 (1977):7463-A; Way, pp. 47-78.

attaining their potential and in contributing fully to our society.¹

Further, "women or members of minority groups may have unique perspectives on certain problems, perspectives that can broaden and enrich the decision-making process at every level."² Coursen continued the rationale for study by commenting: "What is true for blacks is not necessarily true for members of other racial minorities and may have nothing to do with women."³

Clement offered the following observation:

One can find no explanation for the very small number of women in high level administrative positions by looking at advanced training in terms of degrees held, number of years in the profession, and total number of women in the pool from which administrators are selected. However, the statistical information available is very meager.⁴

Therefore, studying females or other minorities who have attained an administrative position could provide insightful information about them. And using white males in the study group could furnish not only additional information but also provide a basis for comparison. Failure to differentiate among these groups could introduce bias into a study of secondary administrators.

Finally, previous studies, as reported in the literature, have reached certain conclusions with which new studies might be compared. Examples of these conclusions found in the literature were:

¹Shirley McCune, in the Foreward of Why Aren't Women Administering Our Schools? by Suzanne Howard (Arlington, Va.: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1975), p. 1.

²David Coursen, Women and Minorities in Administration (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 102 640, 1975), p. 1.

³Ibid., p. 3.

⁴Jacqueline Parker Clement, Sex Bias in School Leadership (Evanston, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates, 1975), p. 8.

1. On the average, women administrators were older than the men¹
2. Men saw lack of experience or training as constraints on being chosen as an administrator, while women saw sex as the main constraint²
3. There was no basis for preferring men over women in leadership ability³

Summary of Related Literature

The purpose for examining the principalship can be summarized by one statement from Weldy: "The principalship has been and promises to continue to be one of the critically influential positions of leadership in American education."⁴

In establishing a theoretical foundation for the criteria to identify effective behaviors of the administrator, several observations are relevant. Campbell remarked: "Ideally, effectiveness ought to be

¹Lorraine Collins, "About Those Few Females Who Scale the Heights of School Management," Integrated Education 15 (January/February 1977):19; Coursen, p. 11; Dorothy L. Johnson, "Ms. Administrators, Where Are They?" The School Administrator 29 (August 1972):19; Gretchen Niedermayer and Vickie W. Kramer, Women in Administrative Positions in Public Education (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 096 742, 1974), p. 12; Way, p. 98.

²Brooks, p. 6385-A; Fox, pp. 91-92; Wilma C. Robinson, "Secondary School Women Principals and Assistant Principals in Ohio: Characteristics and Aspirations," Dissertation Abstracts International 39 (October 1978): 1976-A; Way, p. 66.

³Barnes, p. 93; Charlene Dale, "Women Are Still Missing Persons in Administrative and Supervisory Jobs," Educational Leadership 31 (November 1973):125-126; Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker, "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies," Journal of NAWDAC 38 (Spring 1975):113; Barbara S. Levandowski, "Women in Educational Administration: Where Do They Stand?" NASSP Bulletin 61 (September 1977):101; Marvin R. McMillin, "Leadership Aspirations of Prospective Teachers--A Comparison of Men and Women," Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Winter 1975):324; Marvin Stone, "Women in Leadership Roles," U.S. News and World Report, May 21, 1979, p. 108.

⁴Weldy, p. 64.

measured in terms of an administrator's contribution to the achievement of the purposes of the organization."¹ Mangers commented: "The effectiveness of school principals in some districts is too often measured by their ability to 'keep the lid on' and serve the needs of the school district bureaucracy."² And Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer contended:

Obstacles to effective leadership in the secondary schools are the traditional atmosphere, the fear of theory, poorly defined goals and responsibilities, difficulties involved in initiating action, the various perceptions of the principal's role, doing what is popular, differences in beliefs about education, and ineffective selection of principals.³

In response to the problem of ineffective leaders and identifying skills needed to be effective, Robinson suggested:

Today's educational leader must be a multi-faceted, charismatic, level-headed and goal-directed person. . . . He/she must have a strong sense of self-direction and a personal commitment to boys and girls. Skills are needed in human relations, problem-solving, research and development, initiating and implementing change, coordinating resources, motivating and challenging faculty, and establishing and maintaining a learning climate that is both humanistic and productive.⁴

As for justifying the use of a self-study approach, the authors reviewed indicated the worth of self-assessment for evaluating one's effectiveness and pointing up areas in need of improvement. Both the person and the organization could profit from self-evaluation.⁵ And as Lipham and Hoeh expressed:

¹Roald F. Campbell, "What Peculiarities in Educational Administration Make It A Special Case?" in Administrative Theory In Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 182.

²Mangers, p. 8.

³Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, p. 147.

⁴Phil Robinson, p. 18.

⁵Wiles and Lovell, p. 280.

. . . The effective principal may be expected to exert himself energetically; to achieve and improve his performance; to strive for higher status in the profession and in society in general; to relate himself successfully to other people; to view the future with confidence, the present with understanding, and the past with satisfaction; and to adjust well to frustrations, irritations, confusions, and criticisms in pressure situations.¹

In regard to the demographic characteristics of the principalship, the nation-wide survey by the National Association of Secondary School Principals found:

The 1965 study of principals concluded that the senior high school principalship was a male-dominated profession. The 1977 study gives evidence that it continues to be a white male dominated profession.²

Therefore, determining the background profiles of administrators and investigating the impact of race and gender on the administrator can be further justified by the following statements. Dale suggested:

At a time when good and perhaps great leadership is needed in education, the pool of leadership development must be expanded to include women or we must all learn to live with the mediocrity which is certain to result from a restricted source of leadership talent.³

Clement echoed the same sentiment: "A society constantly plagued with the need for more qualified human resources increases its talent pool as soon as it views women and minority men through the same lens it uses for white males."⁴

¹Lipham and Hoeh, p. 355.

²Byrne, Hines, and McCleary, p. 18.

³Dale, p. 125. ⁴Clement, p. 29.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

This study was designed to investigate the background profiles and self-assessed effectiveness of public secondary school administrators by race and gender. The decision to study secondary administrators was made for three reasons: 1. to conduct such an analysis which, to date, had not been undertaken for these individuals in the state of Oklahoma; 2. to provide a realistic assessment of those currently holding the position in order to furnish concerned administrators, school boards, and teacher educators with the necessary information to encourage and prepare more women and minority members for administrative positions; and 3. to determine the factors, if any, that would be helpful in improving the leadership and administrative qualities and abilities of secondary administrators.

Population and Sample

Names and classifications of participants were obtained from the

Oklahoma State Department of Education.¹ The school year 1979-1980 was used as the base year, with the information updated to January 15, 1980.

The decision was made to divide the total group of secondary administrators into two subdivisions, each of which constituted a population. One population consisted of all white male secondary administrators, while the other consisted of all white female and all minority secondary administrators.

The major limit of the study was the utilization of only the secondary administrators employed as of January 15, 1980, in the public schools of Oklahoma.

A total of 1,032 secondary administrators was identified as constituting the total population of administrators. Of this number, 121 persons were identified as being white female or minority administrators and 911 persons were white males. All 121 of the white female and minority administrators and 121 of the white males comprised the sample selected for the survey.

A random sampling technique as described by Minium² was employed to obtain the 121 white males for the study. The following procedure was utilized in obtaining the names of the white males:

1. A card was prepared for each person
2. The names were ordered by county and district
3. To eliminate possible bias because of the county and district arrangement, the cards were dealt into ten stacks; each stack was shuffled

¹Finance Division, Teacher Personnel.

²Edward W. Minium, Statistical Reasoning in Psychology and Education, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), p. 243.

three times; then the stacks were shuffled together twice

4. A three-digit number was assigned to each person
5. After randomly selecting the page number, column, and row to enter a random numbers table, every sixth number was selected
6. The numbers were read horizontally from left to right, columns from top to bottom, and at the end of a column, the next column continued the count at the top. The first three digits of each number so selected were recorded in the order chosen
7. For numbers greater than the population limit and for numbers previously drawn, the number was omitted and the following sixth number was consulted. It was, therefore, a sample without replacement¹

On the first draw, 175 numbers were obtained, and the corresponding cards were pulled. A check was made to determine if any of the white males selected were serving in the same school building. Where this was the case, the first name drawn in the sample was used, and any other white males from that same school building were removed from the sample pool. This was done in an effort to expand the geographic scope of the study to include as many school districts and counties as possible. A total of sixty-six counties of a possible seventy-seven was represented in the combined samples. From a possible 621 school districts, 144 were represented in the study.

The numerical breakdown of the sample by race and gender is found in Table 1. The percentage that each group constituted in the total is also presented in Table 1.

¹Robert C. Weast, ed., Standard Mathematical Tables, 12th ed. (Cleveland, Ohio: The Chemical Rubber Co., 1964), pp. 238-243.

TABLE 1
ORIGINAL SAMPLE BY RACE AND GENDER

	Males	Females	Total
American Indian	15 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (6.2%)
Black	49 (20.2%)	9 (3.7%)	58 (24.0%)
Caucasian	121 (50.0%)	47 (19.4%)	168 (69.4%)
Spanish American	<u>1 (0.4%)</u>	<u>0 (0.0%)</u>	<u>1 (0.4%)</u>
Total	186 (76.9%)	56 (23.1%)	242 (100.0%)

Instrumentation

During this phase of the investigation, the first task was to find suitable instruments designed to furnish the demographic data needed and to allow the administrator to assess his or her effectiveness. A review of the relevant literature revealed several types of instruments in both categories, but none were deemed acceptable as addressing precisely the area of study. For example, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII was considered. But as Morsink noted: "The scores derived from the instrument do not determine the relative effectiveness of a leader since the emphasis is on how a leader behaves, not on how well he behaves."¹ Therefore, two instruments were developed to meet this need.

From the literature, eighteen demographic items and sixty-three

¹Helen M. Morsink, "Leader Behavior of Men and Women Principals," NASSP Bulletin 54 (September 1970):81.

effectiveness items were isolated. The demographic items were of a standardized nature such as race, sex, and marital status. The effectiveness items were derived from six major categories of activities described in the literature. Ten statements were assembled from each of the six general areas. An additional three items were included concerning the self-assessment of acceptance and comfort with the role of administrator, as were also found in the literature.

As Gay¹ recommended to help establish content validity, the effectiveness questionnaire was sent to a panel of ten persons. Each of the ten was chosen as having been familiar with the role of secondary administrator because of his or her current or previous position in education. Further, an effort was made to secure persons who represented the four major categories in the study, e.g., white female, white male, black male, and American Indian male. Of the ten judges, two were black males, two were white females, one was an American Indian male and five were white males. The panel members are listed in the Appendix.

The prospective judges were contacted by telephone to secure their consent to serve. The project was briefly described over the telephone; then a cover letter detailing the purpose of the study and the role of the judge was mailed with the effectiveness questionnaire. Specifically, the panel members were asked to critique the instrument on the basis of: clarity of thought, phrasing, format, and overall appropriateness of the activity to a secondary administrator. Also, they were invited to make any other comments or suggestions they might have regarding the instrument.

¹L.R. Gay, Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1976), p. 131.

Minor changes for several items were suggested by some of the judges. Several judges expressed concern at the length of the instrument and about so many items relating to educational innovations. A decision was made to shorten the questionnaire to a total of sixty items by combining or eliminating some of the items on innovations. Further, several panel members indicated the redundancy of two statements. The two were combined and simplified. One item, noted by several to be too broad as written, was rewritten as two items. Both the original and the final instruments are reproduced in the Appendix.

Following the procedures recommended by Borg and Gall¹ and Tuckman,² the questionnaires were administered to a pilot group of thirty white male administrators from graduate classes in secondary education or educational administration at the University of Oklahoma. Each of these men was currently serving as a public secondary school principal or an assistant principal. They represented eighteen different school districts.

If any of the men in the pilot had been selected to be in the study itself, their names were eliminated from those in the random sample pool of white male administrators. The list of alternates, chosen at the same time as the original sample, furnished any additional names needed for the study. For as Tuckman stated:

. . . A pilot test, which uses a group of respondents who are part of the intended test population but will not be part of the sample, attempts to determine whether questionnaire items possess the desired qualities of measurement and discriminability. . . .
. . . If all respondents reply identically to any one item,

¹Walter R. Borg and Meredith Damien Gall, Educational Research, 3rd ed. (New York: Longman, 1979), p. 70.

²Bruce W. Tuckman, Conducting Educational Research (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972), pp. 196, 199.

that item probably lacks discriminability. If you receive a preponderance of inappropriate responses to an item, examine it to see if it is ambiguous or poorly worded.¹

From the results and comments obtained through the pilot study, two typographical errors were corrected and an additional variable was coded into the statistical treatment. From the fifteen principals and fifteen assistant principals participating in the pilot, a potential differentiation in use of the response "not applicable" emerged. In the pilot, fewer principals used that choice, or used it less often, than did the assistant principals. Therefore, the dimension of position was coded into the statistical treatment of the sample data to offset a potential source of bias. No other changes were made in the instruments.

Data Collection Procedures

The instruments for the collection of the data for this study were the "Demographic Data Questionnaire" and the "Self-Assessment of Effectiveness Questionnaire." The two instruments were mailed to those persons in the sample on March 7, 1980. Applying the techniques proposed by Rummel² and Sax,³ a personalized, original cover letter was included explaining the purpose of the study and soliciting the person's participation. A copy of the cover letter is furnished in the Appendix.

To insure privacy, yet provide a vehicle for follow-up, a code

¹Ibid., p. 199.

²J. Francis Rummel, An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education (New York: Harper & Bros., 1958), p. 99.

³Gilbert Sax, Foundations of Educational Research, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979), pp. 258-259.

number was affixed to each questionnaire and also placed inside the return envelope. Because the original mail-out coincided with the spring vacations in some school districts, an additional week was allowed for the return. By March 28, 1980, 155 questionnaires, representing 64 percent of the total, had been received.

Using the follow-up technique described by Robin,¹ an additional 28 questionnaires were obtained from the original mail-out by sending a reminder on a post card to nonrespondents. A second cover letter and set of questionnaires were sent to the remainder of those not responding to either the first mail-out or the reminder. By April 21, 1980, a total of 217 questionnaires, representing 90 percent, had been received. Of this number, 207 questionnaires were usable and constituted the data source for the study. Of the ten questionnaires not deemed usable, four were returned from women, identified as administrators by the records in the State Department of Education, who indicated that they were classroom teachers. Five persons returned the questionnaires with their refusals to participate, and one questionnaire was completed in a manner so as to render it impossible to use.

The final representation by race and gender of participants in the study can be found in Table 2, shown on page 50.

Establishment of Reliability

As the effectiveness instrument was specially developed for the

¹Stanley S. Robin, "A Procedure for Securing Returns to Mail Questionnaires," Sociology and Social Research 50 (October 1965):26-27.

TABLE 2
FINAL SAMPLE BY RACE AND GENDER

	Males	Females	Total
American Indian	17 (8.2%)	0 (0.0%)	17 (8.2%)
Black	42 (20.2%)	8 (3.8%)	50 (24.1%)
Caucasian	<u>99 (47.8%)</u>	<u>41 (19.8%)</u>	<u>140 (67.7%)</u>
Total	158 (76.3%)	49 (23.7%)	207 (100.0%)

study, no reliability coefficient was available. Therefore, the following procedure was employed to compute the reliability:

1. After the questionnaires had been received, they were sorted by race, gender, school district size, and position
2. Percentages were computed for each race, for males and females, for each position, and for the six categories of school districts by size
3. A total of thirty-five persons was then selected in similar proportions as found in the total sample
4. Each of the thirty-five persons was contacted by telephone to assure his/her willingness to complete a second effectiveness questionnaire
5. The participants were mailed only the effectiveness questionnaire and a stamped, return envelope

Table 3 contains the numbers and percentages of respondents for both the formal study and the reliability sample. The four variables of race, gender, position, and school district size were utilized in selecting the participants for the reliability sample in order to provide balance.

TABLE 3
PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY BY RACE, GENDER,
POSITION, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT SIZE

	Number of Respondents in Study	Number in Reliability Sample
Males		
American Indian	17 (8.2%)	2 (5.7%)
Black	42 (20.2%)	8 (22.8%)
Caucasian	99 (47.8%)	18 (51.4%)
Females		
Black	8 (3.8%)	1 (2.8%)
Caucasian	41 (19.8%)	6 (17.1%)
Position		
Nonteaching Principal	85 (41.1%)	12 (34.3%)
Nonteaching Assistant	65 (31.4%)	11 (31.4%)
Teaching Principal	47 (22.7%)	8 (22.9%)
Teaching Assistant	10 (4.8%)	3 (8.6%)
School District Size		
Over 5,000 ADA	86 (41.5%)	14 (40.0%)
2,000 - 4,999 ADA	20 (9.7%)	4 (11.4%)
750 - 1,999 ADA	36 (17.4%)	4 (11.4%)
400 - 749 ADA	27 (13.0%)	6 (17.1%)
200 - 399 ADA	27 (13.0%)	5 (14.3%)
Less than 200 ADA	11 (5.3%)	2 (5.7%)

The reliability was determined by utilizing each respondent's first questionnaire as the X score and his/her second questionnaire as the Y score. The Pearson r, raw score method as described by Minium,¹ was then employed to arrive at the correlation coefficient for each of the thirty-five persons. The values of r ranged from .098 to .860 with a mean of .581. The figure of .581, therefore, was the average measure

¹Minium, pp. 146-149.

of reliability obtained from the sample and was imputed to represent the reliability for the effectiveness questionnaire.

Procedure for Analysis of Data

The data were processed and analyzed after 90 percent, or 217 of the questionnaires were received. The data were compiled and coded in order to test the hypotheses stated in Chapter I.

The sample data were divided into the following categories for statistical treatment: all males; all females; all whites; all minorities; white males; white females; black males; black females; and Indian males. After the frequencies or means were calculated for each racial or gender group, two statistical tests were employed to analyze the data. For all the demographic data for which frequency, and not quantitative, values existed, the chi-square test was utilized for testing hypotheses about frequency distributions.¹ Quantitative data values were treated with the "t for Testing Hypotheses about the Difference between Two Means."²

For both statistical treatments, the .05 level of confidence was selected as the criterion of significance for accepting or rejecting each hypothesis. If a statistically significant value at the .05 level was obtained, however, the .01 level of confidence was also consulted for comparison purposes.

For the three questions addressing role perceptions and permitting multiple answers, percentages were used to describe the data. No hypotheses were associated with these items, and, therefore, no other

¹Ibid., pp. 427-443. ²Ibid., p. 337.

statistical treatment, beyond reporting the percentages, was utilized.

Finally, in describing the background profile of each category of administrator, the mode, the score occurring with the greatest frequency,¹ was utilized. The mean, or average, was employed to describe those demographic characteristics which were quantifiable.

¹Ibid., p. 64.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Introduction

This investigation was designed to determine the background profiles and self-assessed effectiveness of public secondary school administrators. Further, the study was also designed to analyze the relationship of race and gender to the profiles and self-assessments.

Contained within this chapter are the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data and the testing of the hypotheses which were stated in Chapter I.

The organization of the chapter is as follows:

1. Background profiles of the administrators, as described by the mode
2. Presentation and analysis of collected data for demographic factors and tests of the hypotheses
3. Presentation and analysis of collected data for the self-assessment of effectiveness and test of the hypothesis
4. Summary of the data analyses

Background Profiles of the Administrators
as Described by the Mode

From the data obtained, it was possible to describe the background profiles of each of the five categories of administrators. Using the most frequent response, or mode, and the average, or mean, a composite of the "typical" administrator was developed. Although it is recognized that such composites do not account for the many individual differences, they can serve as a suitable introduction to the myriad of data generated by such a study as this.

The typical white male administrator was married, had two children, was a nonteaching principal employed in a district with over 5,000 Average Daily Attendance (ADA), had majored in two or more subjects as an undergraduate, and held a Master's degree plus 32 hours. He had served as a classroom teacher/coach prior to his first administrative position, and he had served as a classroom teacher just prior to his current assignment. He became an administrator to advance his career, perceived experience as the greatest aid to his employment as an administrator, and saw no constraints on his employment opportunities. His career goal was to be a superintendent. His current age was 43; he became an administrator at 32, after serving as a classroom teacher for nearly 11 years. He had been an administrator for 11 years and served in his current position for 7 years.

The white female administrator was married, had no children, was a nonteaching assistant principal in a district with 5,000 or more ADA, had majored in education or language arts as an undergraduate, and held the Master's degree plus 16 hours. She had been a classroom teacher

prior to her first administrative appointment and served in the same capacity just prior to her current position. She became an administrator to foster change in education and saw experience as the most significant aid to her employment as an administrator. She viewed her sex as the greatest constraint on her being employed as an administrator. Her career goal was to be a principal. Her current age was 38; she became an administrator at 36.5 years, after serving as a classroom teacher for 9 years. She had been an administrator just over 4 years and served in her current position for 3 years.

The black male administrator was married, had two children, was a nonteaching assistant principal in a district with 5,000 or more ADA, had majored in two or more subjects as an undergraduate, and held the Master's degree plus 32 hours. Just prior to his current position, he served as an assistant principal, and prior to becoming an administrator, he was a classroom teacher/coach. He became an administrator to advance his career, felt that his preparation was the major aid to his employment as an administrator, and perceived no constraints on his employment opportunities. His ten-year career goal was to retire. His current age was 43; he had become an administrator at age 35, after having been a classroom teacher for 11 years. He had served as an administrator for 7.5 years and held his current position for almost 5 years.

The black female administrator was married, had one or two children, was a nonteaching assistant principal in a district with 5,000 or more ADA, and had majored in education, language arts, or social sciences as an undergraduate. She held the Master's degree plus 16 hours. Prior to her current position, she was either a classroom teacher or an

assistant principal. Before her first administrative position, she was either a classroom teacher or a counselor. She became an administrator because she believed it would be a challenging job, saw her sex or experience as the main help in being employed as an administrator, and perceived nothing as a constraint on her being employed. She aspired to be a principal. Her current age was 43.5 years; she became an administrator at 40, served as a classroom teacher for 10 years, was an administrator for nearly 4 years, and had been in her present position almost 2 years.

The American Indian male administrator was married, had two children, majored in two or more subjects as an undergraduate, held the Master's degree plus 16 hours, and was a nonteaching principal in a district of 400-749 ADA. Just prior to his current position, he had been a classroom teacher/coach, an assistant principal, or had held a combination of roles. Before his first administrative position, he was a classroom teacher/coach. He became an administrator to receive a higher salary, saw experience as the major aid to his being employed as an administrator, and considered nothing as constraining his being hired. His career goal in ten years was to retire. His current age was 45; he had become an administrator at age 35. He had been a classroom teacher for 13.5 years, an administrator for 10 years, and in his current position for nearly 8 years.

Presentation and Analysis of Collected Data for
Demographic Factors and Tests of the Hypotheses

To imply that all administrators within each category fit the mode would be erroneous. Therefore, Table 4 was prepared to show the

number of persons responding to each of the demographic factors for which frequencies were used to describe the data.

TABLE 4
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS BY RACE AND GENDER
STATED BY RESPONSE FREQUENCY

	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
Marital Status					
Married	89	25	37	5	17
Single	6	7	3	0	0
Divorced	1	7	2	2	0
Widowed	3	2	0	1	0
Number of Children					
None	6	13	6	2	3
One	16	12	7	3	2
Two	49	10	15	3	6
Three	20	3	9	0	3
Four	6	3	3	0	1
More	2	0	2	0	2
Undergraduate Major					
Business	5	0	0	1	1
Education	8	10	8	2	6
Fine Arts	2	4	1	0	0
Language Arts	0	10	0	2	0
Mathematics	8	2	4	0	0
Natural Sciences	12	1	6	1	0
Physical Education	15	2	5	0	1
Social Sciences	18	4	5	2	1
Vocational	3	2	3	0	1
Other or More than One	28	6	10	0	7
Highest Degree/Hours					
Bachelor's	6	2	3	0	2
Master's	15	8	3	0	2
Ed.D. or Ph.D.	4	3	3	0	0
Master's + 16 hours	28	15	9	4	9
Master's + 32 hours	36	8	14	1	3
Master's + 60 hours	10	5	10	3	1

TABLE 4--Continued

	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
<hr/>					
Position Just Prior to Current One					
Assistant Principal	19	8	11	3	3
Classroom Teacher	22	16	9	3	2
Athletic Director/Coach	3	0	3	0	1
Counselor	3	9	7	1	1
Classroom Teacher/Coach	12	0	1	0	3
Elementary Principal	9	1	1	0	2
Junior H. Principal	6	1	2	0	0
Department Chairperson	0	1	0	0	0
High School Principal	12	0	2	0	2
Other	13	5	6	1	3
Position Before First					
Administrative One					
Athletic Director/Coach	6	0	6	0	2
Classroom Teacher/Coach	40	3	10	0	8
Counselor	9	14	9	3	1
Classroom Teacher	30	20	8	3	2
Department Chairperson	1	0	2	0	0
Coach	2	0	0	0	1
Other	11	4	7	2	3
Reasons for Becoming an					
Administrator					
Foster change	7	14	7	2	3
Higher salary	21	1	1	0	5
Prestigious position	2	2	0	0	0
Advance career	45	10	21	2	1
Expectation of Supervisor	4	1	3	0	1
Challenging job	11	12	7	3	3
Other	9	1	3	1	4
Aids to Employment					
Age	1	0	0	0	0
Race	0	0	3	0	0
Sex	1	4	0	3	0
Personality	28	3	7	0	0
Experience	36	18	14	3	7
Mobility	4	0	0	0	3
Preparation	15	10	15	2	3
Nothing	2	1	0	0	1
Other	12	5	3	0	3

TABLE 4--Continued

	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
<hr/>					
Constraints on Employment					
Age	2	2	3	0	0
Race	1	0	13	1	0
Sex	0	16	0	1	0
Personality	0	1	1	0	1
Lack of Experience	37	3	6	1	3
Family Situation	1	2	0	0	0
Lack of Preparation	7	3	1	0	0
Lack of Mobility	1	0	1	0	1
Nothing	45	13	15	5	12
Other	4	1	2	0	0
<hr/>					
Career Goal in Ten Years					
Superintendency	27	6	2	0	2
Professorship	3	3	2	2	0
Principalship	18	12	6	5	2
Central office	10	6	7	0	2
Leave education	11	4	8	1	3
Retire	24	5	14	0	7
Other	6	5	3	0	1
<hr/>					

The data illustrated where frequency differences appeared in the background profiles among the five groups. When the chi-square test was applied to each of the areas listed in the above table, statistically significant numbers at the .05 level were found for several of the demographic factors. The chi-square results were compiled and listed in Table 5, found on page 61.

It should be noted that the degrees of freedom associated with each chi-square test differed from one demographic factor to another and from one comparison group to another. The degrees of freedom ranged from 3 to 16. The values of chi-square listed in the table might seem misleading, unless the difference in the degrees of freedom is considered when reading the table.

TABLE 5
CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Between Males/ Females	Between Females	Among Males	Between Whites	Between Blacks	Between Whites/ Minorities
Position	17.2**	1.4	17.7**	18.5**	3.2	7.2
District Size	16.2**	7.0	36.4**	20.9**	1.9	21.4**
Marital Status	39.0**	2.2	6.5	20.2**	9.8*	2.3
Children	25.0**	1.9	9.5	24.4**	4.6	4.1
Undergraduate Major	55.7**	11.7	19.7	45.7**	21.9**	7.4
Degrees/Hours	5.3	5.7	14.4	5.1	5.3	5.8
Position before Current	29.5**	1.8	17.5	31.4**	2.8	6.8
Position before First Admin.	34.9**	2.1	17.9	28.0**	5.2	11.6
Reason for being Administrator	31.0**	2.7	24.1*	32.6**	3.8	5.8
Aid to being Employed	27.5**	5.5	33.9**	15.9*	18.5**	14.2
Constraint on Employment	69.4**	10.4	51.4**	55.8**	8.8	40.4**
Career Goal	17.3**	8.5	14.2	8.8	15.7*	12.5
*significant at .05 level						
**significant also at .01 level						

The relationship of the obtained values to each of the hypotheses about the demographic factors has been presented by stating each of the hypotheses and describing the results and significance of the chi-square test.

H₀1: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their marital status. Statistically significant values were obtained for three of the sets of comparisons--between males and females; between whites; and between blacks. Based on the chi-square values found, the hypothesis was rejected.

H₀2: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their parental status. For two of the comparison groups--between males and females and between whites, the chi-square test revealed statistically significant different values. The hypothesis, therefore, was rejected.

H₀3: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their undergraduate majors. That the chi-square test revealed statistically significant values on this measure was hardly surprising after a study of the frequency distribution illustrated in Table 4. It may be noted that none of the 158 males majored in language arts, while an extremely small proportion of females majored in natural sciences, mathematics, or physical education. From the results of the chi-square test, the hypothesis was rejected.

H₀4: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their highest educational degree attained. The chi-square tests performed on the data from the various groups revealed no value above the criterion level of .05. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

H₀5: There is no statistically significant difference among

minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their previous work experience in education. Two sets of items addressed the hypothesis and were considered together for the test. Chi-square tests, however, were performed for each factor. Both of the items displayed values above the criterion of significance. The hypothesis, therefore, was rejected.

H₀6: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the reason they became administrators. Chi-square test results showed three comparison groups as having obtained values above the criterion. Not only was a statistically significant value found between males and females, but also it was found among the males. The hypothesis was rejected.

H₀7: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments as to why they were hired as an administrator. Four of the six categories of comparisons showed statistically significant values on the chi-square test. More of the white males placed emphasis on personality than did any other comparison group. The hypothesis was rejected.

H₀8: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments of constraints which affected their opportunities for selection as an administrator. Although it is meaningless to declare a value greater than the criterion of significance as having some special importance, it should be noted, however, that the constraint factor's values obtained from the chi-square tests were the largest of all the tests of the factors for four of the comparison groups. The reason for

the large values can be observed in Table 4. The white females more frequently listed sex as a major constraint. The white males indicated that lack of experience was a significant factor--when they accorded any factor recognition. Based on the chi-square test values, the hypothesis was rejected.

H₀9: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their professional career objectives. Two comparison groups had values above the criterion of significance, and, therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

H₀14: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the size of the district (based on Average Daily Attendance) in which they are employed. The chi-square tests showed four of the comparison groups as having values exceeding the criterion. The hypothesis was rejected.

Although no hypothesis was proposed for testing about position, it may be noted that the chi-square test revealed statistically significant values for that demographic characteristic.

For hypotheses H₀10, H₀11, H₀12, and H₀13, the t test was performed to determine the existence of significance. As the data for these hypotheses was quantifiable, means were computed and the t test applied. The values obtained for the means were listed in Table 6.

A note must be made about the degrees of freedom associated with the t tests utilized for these analyses. As the significance of the t value is determined by the degrees of freedom, which are computed from the number of respondents, it should be kept in mind that the numbers of respondents varied for each set of comparisons.

TABLE 6
MEANS FOR QUANTIFIABLE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

Item # on Dem. Quest.	All Males	All Females	All Whites	All Minority	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
13.	11.2	9.4	10.4	11.4	10.9	9.2	10.8	10.1	13.5
14.	9.8*	3.7*	8.7	5.7	10.8*	3.7*	7.5	3.6	9.7
15.	18.6	15.2	17.4	18.6	18.5	14.9	18.2	16.6	19.4
16.	6.6*	2.8*	5.9	5.3	7.1*	3.0*	5.0	2.0	7.9
17.	43.3	39.0	41.6	43.7	43.0	38.1	43.2	43.5	45.0
18.	33.0	37.1	33.2	35.8	31.9	36.5	35.3	40.3	34.8

*shows where a significant difference was found by t test

H₀10: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as a classroom teacher. None of the results of the t tests for all seven of the comparison groups exceeded the criterion value. The hypothesis was accepted.

H₀11: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as administrators. For two of the comparison groups--all males/all females and white males/females, the t test values obtained exceeded the criterion value. The hypothesis, therefore, was rejected.

It may be noted that there was no statistically significant difference among the groups with regard to the number of years served as

professional educators. However, statistically significant differences were found when t tests were computed for the number of years served in the current position for two of the comparison groups.

H₀12: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their current age. The t tests did not produce values which exceeded the criterion. The hypothesis was accepted.

H₀13: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their age upon selection for their first administrative position. None of the t values exceeded the criterion. The hypothesis was accepted.

Presentation and Analysis of the Collected Data for
the Self-Assessment of Effectiveness and
Test of the Hypothesis

Table 7 was prepared to furnish a summary of each of the 57 items from the Self-Assessment of Effectiveness instrument. The means and number of responses were provided, as those values were crucial to each of the t tests computed. The item numbers correspond to those on the final questionnaire, which may be found in the Appendix.

H₀15: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments concerning their job effectiveness. None of the 57 items, for each of which 7 t tests were calculated, had values that exceeded the criterion of significance. Based on the results from the multiple t test results, the hypothesis was, therefore, accepted.

TABLE 7

MEANS AND NUMBER OF RESPONSES FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT OF
EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE BY RACE AND GENDER

Item #	All Males	All Females	All Whites	All Minority	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
1.	3.93 n=155	4.00 n=49	3.95 n=140	3.94 n=67	3.94 n=99	3.98 n=41	3.92 n=42	4.13 n=8	3.88 n=17
2.	4.08 n=156	4.13 n=48	4.06 n=140	4.09 n=67	4.06 n=99	4.05 n=40	4.18 n=40	4.00 n=8	3.94 n=17
3.	3.58 n=157	3.88 n=48	3.65 n=139	3.64 n=66	3.61 n=99	3.78 n=40	3.56 n=41	4.38 n=8	3.47 n=17
4.	4.21 n=158	4.16 n=49	4.06 n=140	4.49 n=67	4.02 n=99	4.15 n=41	4.62 n=42	4.25 n=8	4.29 n=17
5.	4.21 n=157	4.00 n=49	4.06 n=140	4.38 n=66	4.12 n=99	3.90 n=41	4.24 n=41	4.50 n=8	4.65 n=17
6.	3.49 n=152	3.64 n=47	3.52 n=135	3.55 n=64	3.50 n=96	3.56 n=39	3.53 n=40	4.00 n=8	3.35 n=16
7.	4.45 n=157	4.36 n=47	4.34 n=138	4.62 n=66	4.36 n=98	4.30 n=40	4.64 n=42	4.71 n=7	4.53 n=17
8.	3.76 n=158	3.78 n=49	3.70 n=140	3.90 n=67	3.67 n=99	3.78 n=41	3.90 n=42	3.75 n=8	3.94 n=17
9.	2.73 n=143	2.54 n=37	2.69 n=121	2.71 n=59	2.74 n=90	2.51 n=31	2.73 n=37	2.67 n=6	2.71 n=16
10.	3.49 n=154	3.48 n=48	3.41 n=137	3.63 n=65	3.37 n=97	3.50 n=40	3.70 n=40	3.13 n=8	3.71 n=17
11.	4.11 n=147	4.07 n=41	3.99 n=130	4.29 n=63	3.98 n=96	4.03 n=34	4.21 n=39	4.29 n=7	4.47 n=17
12.	4.15 n=158	4.21 n=48	4.11 n=140	4.26 n=66	4.09 n=99	4.17 n=41	4.19 n=42	4.43 n=7	4.35 n=17

TABLE 7--Continued

Item #	All Males	All Females	All Whites	All Minority	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
13.	3.53 n=149	3.47 n=47	3.54 n=134	3.47 n=62	3.54 n=94	3.53 n=40	3.56 n=39	3.14 n=7	3.35 n=16
14.	3.51 n=157	3.53 n=49	3.49 n=139	3.57 n=67	3.50 n=98	3.46 n=41	3.60 n=42	3.88 n=8	3.35 n=17
15.	3.65 n=148	3.44 n=45	3.41 n=131	4.00 n=62	3.41 n=93	3.42 n=38	4.38 n=39	3.57 n=7	3.24 n=16
16.	3.64 n=153	3.43 n=42	3.50 n=135	3.80 n=60	3.55 n=99	3.39 n=36	3.86 n=37	3.67 n=6	3.71 n=17
17.	3.38 n=147	3.34 n=41	3.29 n=129	3.56 n=59	3.28 n=95	3.29 n=34	3.51 n=35	2.86 n=7	3.65 n=17
18.	2.91 n=144	3.03 n=40	2.80 n=127	3.14 n=59	2.75 n=93	2.91 n=34	3.23 n=35	3.67 n=6	3.12 n=16
19.	3.27 n=147	3.36 n=36	3.11 n=124	3.64 n=59	3.07 n=94	3.23 n=30	3.73 n=37	4.00 n=6	3.29 n=16
20.	3.01 n=144	3.05 n=38	2.97 n=126	3.14 n=56	2.91 n=94	3.13 n=32	3.37 n=35	2.67 n=6	2.82 n=15
21.	3.05 n=143	3.17 n=42	3.08 n=127	3.07 n=58	3.05 n=92	3.14 n=35	3.11 n=36	3.29 n=7	2.88 n=15
22.	4.29 n=156	4.00 n=47	4.27 n=139	3.77 n=64	4.33 n=99	4.10 n=40	4.05 n=40	3.43 n=7	4.65 n=17
23.	4.02 n=158	3.98 n=48	3.97 n=139	4.09 n=67	3.97 n=99	3.98 n=40	4.10 n=42	4.00 n=8	4.12 n=17
24.	4.34 n=157	4.29 n=48	4.25 n=139	4.48 n=66	4.23 n=99	4.30 n=40	4.59 n=41	4.25 n=8	4.35 n=17
25.	4.18 n=156	4.13 n=48	4.15 n=138	4.20 n=66	4.17 n=98	4.10 n=40	4.24 n=41	4.25 n=8	4.06 n=17
26.	3.86 n=148	3.90 n=40	3.66 n=124	4.22 n=65	3.60 n=91	3.82 n=33	4.38 n=40	4.29 n=7	4.06 n=17

TABLE 7--Continued

Item #	All Males	All Females	All Whites	All Minority	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
27.	4.07 n=153	4.21 n=47	4.01 n=136	4.31 n=64	3.93 n=97	4.21 n=39	4.33 n=39	4.25 n=8	4.29 n=17
28.	4.06 n=154	4.26 n=46	4.07 n=137	4.19 n=63	4.00 n=98	4.26 n=39	4.21 n=39	4.29 n=7	4.12 n=17
29.	4.25 n=158	4.17 n=48	4.19 n=139	4.30 n=67	4.20 n=99	4.18 n=40	4.29 n=42	4.13 n=8	4.41 n=17
30.	3.53 n=153	3.74 n=42	3.53 n=133	3.66 n=62	3.50 n=98	3.63 n=35	3.71 n=38	4.29 n=7	3.29 n=17
31.	3.62 n=157	3.88 n=48	3.54 n=139	3.97 n=66	3.45 n=99	3.75 n=40	4.07 n=42	4.50 n=8	3.41 n=16
32.	3.27 n=143	3.10 n=40	3.06 n=128	3.55 n=56	3.07 n=94	3.03 n=34	3.59 n=34	3.50 n=6	3.50 n=16
33.	3.30 n=137	3.53 n=38	3.21 n=121	3.60 n=55	3.07 n=88	3.58 n=33	3.74 n=34	3.20 n=5	3.44 n=16
34.	3.39 n=141	3.53 n=40	3.30 n=128	3.63 n=54	3.23 n=94	3.50 n=34	3.48 n=33	3.67 n=6	3.93 n=15
35.	3.79 n=150	4.24 n=46	3.66 n=138	4.03 n=64	3.63 n=95	4.13 n=38	3.95 n=40	4.38 n=8	4.06 n=16
36.	3.49 n=150	3.58 n=45	3.36 n=132	3.75 n=64	3.31 n=95	3.51 n=37	3.87 n=39	3.88 n=8	3.41 n=17
37.	4.06 n=140	4.28 n=36	4.13 n=122	4.06 n=54	4.05 n=91	4.35 n=31	4.19 n=32	3.80 n=5	3.88 n=17
38.	3.53 n=143	4.05 n=41	3.46 n=125	3.71 n=59	3.43 n=90	3.54 n=35	3.69 n=39	3.67 n=6	3.53 n=15
39.	3.72 n=147	3.12 n=41	3.09 n=128	3.57 n=60	3.14 n=93	2.94 n=35	3.47 n=38	4.17 n=6	3.56 n=16
40.	3.78 n=145	3.46 n=37	3.67 n=123	3.80 n=59	3.76 n=92	3.42 n=31	3.78 n=37	3.67 n=6	3.88 n=16

TABLE 7--Continued

Item #	All Males	All Females	All Whites	All Minority	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
41.	3.99 n=153	4.06 n=48	3.95 n=136	4.12 n=65	3.94 n=96	3.98 n=40	4.10 n=40	4.50 n=8	4.00 n=17
42.	3.47 n=148	3.38 n=45	3.36 n=130	3.56 n=64	3.38 n=93	3.32 n=37	3.55 n=40	3.63 n=8	3.56 n=16
43.	4.07 n=155	4.15 n=48	4.04 n=137	4.18 n=66	4.01 n=97	4.13 n=40	4.29 n=41	4.25 n=8	3.88 n=17
44.	3.97 n=144	3.69 n=42	3.90 n=130	3.91 n=56	3.99 n=94	3.67 n=36	3.83 n=35	3.83 n=6	4.13 n=15
45.	3.23 n=142	2.87 n=38	3.14 n=124	3.18 n=56	3.22 n=92	2.91 n=32	3.26 n=34	2.67 n=6	3.19 n=16
46.	3.88 n=116	3.29 n=31	3.84 n=98	3.59 n=49	4.01 n=72	3.35 n=26	3.77 n=30	3.00 n=5	3.43 n=14
47.	3.73 n=101	3.76 n=21	3.65 n=80	3.90 n=42	3.68 n=63	3.53 n=17	4.04 n=25	4.75 n=4	3.38 n=13
48.	3.86 n=118	3.81 n=26	3.81 n=96	4.04 n=48	3.77 n=74	3.73 n=22	4.03 n=30	4.25 n=4	4.00 n=14
49.	4.24 n=154	4.33 n=40	4.16 n=129	4.45 n=65	4.10 n=96	4.30 n=33	4.46 n=41	4.29 n=7	4.47 n=17
50.	3.63 n=126	3.69 n=26	3.59 n=103	3.76 n=49	3.59 n=82	3.62 n=21	3.87 n=31	4.00 n=5	3.38 n=13
51.	3.88 n=147	3.59 n=34	3.77 n=122	3.95 n=59	3.83 n=94	3.57 n=28	4.03 n=40	3.67 n=6	3.85 n=13
52.	4.07 n=153	3.90 n=42	3.17 n=132	4.25 n=63	3.96 n=97	3.86 n=35	4.30 n=40	4.14 n=7	4.19 n=16
53.	3.86 n=151	3.33 n=42	3.72 n=130	3.92 n=61	3.85 n=95	3.37 n=35	3.80 n=40	4.40 n=5	4.06 n=16
54.	4.03 n=129	4.06 n=33	4.06 n=116	3.98 n=46	4.10 n=89	3.93 n=27	3.89 n=27	4.67 n=6	3.85 n=13

TABLE 7--Continued

Item #	All Males	All Females	All Whites	All Minority	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
55.	3.43 n=101	4.12 n=25	3.56 n=81	3.58 n=45	3.38 n=61	4.10 n=20	3.83 n=29	4.20 n=5	2.64 n=11
56.	3.25 n=89	3.63 n=16	3.13 n=68	2.85 n=47	3.07 n=55	3.38 n=13	3.67 n=24	4.67 n=3	3.20 n=10
57.	4.13 n=133	3.98 n=41	4.06 n=124	4.16 n=50	4.09 n=89	4.00 n=35	4.21 n=29	3.83 n=6	4.20 n=15

Note: The variation in n occurred as responses of 0, "Not Applicable," were not used in computing the mean for each item

The items included on the Self-Assessment of Effectiveness Questionnaire that asked for the respondent's perceptions as to role acceptance and discrimination have been summarized in Table 8. Because multiple responses were permitted, percentages were used to describe the data. No attempt was made to perform a chi-square test due to the multiple answers. It was worthy of note, however, to observe that when the black women perceived discrimination, it was more likely to be because of their sex and not of their race.

The role of evaluator was the only one of the six roles perceived by all of the five groups as an area of discomfort for them. Conversely, the role of instructional leader was listed by none of the groups as an area of perceived discomfort.

The data from Table 8, although interesting, have not been treated statistically, and, therefore, should be viewed accordingly.

TABLE 8
RESPONSES TO ITEMS ON PERCEPTION ABOUT ROLES
REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES

	White Males	White Females	Black Males	Black Females	Indian Males
Acceptance by:					
Faculty, Community, Students, Supervisor, and Non-certified staff	91%	78%	71%	75%	82%
All except one or two of the above	8%	22%	29%	25%	18%
No one	1%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Discrimination felt because of:					
Age	2%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Race	-0-	-0-	2%	-0-	-0-
Sex	-0-	12%	-0-	50%	-0-
Position	3%	-0-	10%	13%	6%
Background	-0-	-0-	2%	-0-	-0-
Two or more of the above	1%	5%	2%	-0-	-0-
No discrimination felt	94%	83%	83%	38%	94%
Discomfort with role as:					
Disciplinarian	2%	5%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Change Agent	1%	-0-	5%	-0-	-0-
Community Liaison	8%	7%	5%	-0-	6%
Evaluator	17%	10%	14%	13%	18%
Management Rep.	2%	5%	5%	-0-	-0-
Two or more of the above	6%	-0-	7%	-0-	18%
No discomfort with any of the roles	64%	73%	64%	88%	59%

Summary of the Data Analyses

From the results of the 72 chi-square tests and the 441 t tests, the following responses were made to each of the hypotheses:

- H₀1: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their marital status. Rejected.
- H₀2: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their parental status. Rejected.
- H₀3: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their undergraduate majors. Rejected.
- H₀4: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their highest educational degree attained. Accepted.
- H₀5: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their previous work experience in education. Rejected.
- H₀6: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the reason they became administrators. Rejected.
- H₀7: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments as to why they were hired as an administrator. Rejected.
- H₀8: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments of constraints which affected their opportunities for selection as an administrator. Rejected.

- H₀9: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their professional career objectives. Rejected.
- H₀10: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as a classroom teacher. Accepted.
- H₀11: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as administrators. Rejected.
- H₀12: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their current age. Accepted.
- H₀13: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their age upon selection for their first administrative position. Accepted.
- H₀14: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the size of the district (based on Average Daily Attendance) in which they are employed. Rejected.
- H₀15: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments concerning their job effectiveness. Accepted.

Statistically significant differences were found to exist among minority, white, male, and female administrators on ten demographic characteristics. No statistically significant differences were found for four demographic characteristics or the self-assessment of effectiveness.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine and analyze the background profiles and self-assessed effectiveness of public secondary school administrators in Oklahoma by race and gender. Hypotheses to be tested were:

- H₀1: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their marital status.
- H₀2: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their parental status.
- H₀3: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their undergraduate majors.
- H₀4: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their

highest educational degree attained.

- H₀5: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their previous work experience in education.
- H₀6: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the reason they became administrators.
- H₀7: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments as to why they were hired as an administrator.
- H₀8: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments of constraints which affected their opportunities for selection as an administrator.
- H₀9: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their professional career objectives.
- H₀10: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as a classroom teacher.
- H₀11: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the number of years served as administrators.
- H₀12: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their current age.

- H₀13: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their age upon selection for their first administrative position.
- H₀14: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to the size of the district (based on Average Daily Attendance) in which they are employed.
- H₀15: There is no statistically significant difference among minority, white, male, and female administrators with regard to their self-assessments concerning their job effectiveness.

The data for the study were collected by the Demographic Data Questionnaire and the Self-Assessment of Effectiveness Questionnaire. Both of the instruments were designed especially for use in this study.

After an intensive search of the literature, the two instruments were developed, incorporating those concepts identified in the literature as being critical for effective secondary administration. To establish content validity, the effectiveness instrument was submitted to a panel of ten judges, who were selected for their knowledge in the field of secondary administration. As a pilot test, both instruments were completed by thirty white male secondary administrators in graduate administration classes at the University of Oklahoma.

The instruments were mailed to a sample of 121 white male administrators and 121 white female, minority male, and minority female administrators. Of the 242 persons in the total sample, responses were received from 217, or 90 percent. Usable questionnaires totaled 207, which included 99 white males, 41 white females, 59 minority males, and

8 minority females.

Reliability of the effectiveness instrument was established by submitting a second questionnaire to 35 of the 207 participants (17 percent) approximately four weeks after they had completed the first questionnaire. The Pearson r correlation test was used to determine the value of the reliability. The mean value of r was .581.

The statistical treatments applied to the data obtained from the 207 questionnaires included determining the means for quantifiable data and the frequencies for non-numeric data. The t test was utilized for determining the statistical significance of relationships between quantifiable data. Chi-square tests were employed to assess data for which only frequency distributions were available. The .05 level of significance was the criterion used for accepting or rejecting each hypothesis based on the result of the statistical tests.

The results of the mathematical computations of t or chi-square for each set of comparisons led to the rejection of H_{01} , H_{02} , H_{03} , H_{05} , H_{06} , H_{07} , H_{08} , H_{09} , H_{011} , and H_{014} . Each of these hypotheses was determined to have had a statistically significant difference found among minority, white, male, and female administrators.

Five hypotheses-- H_{04} , H_{010} , H_{012} , H_{013} , and H_{015} --were accepted based on the values obtained from the statistical tests. No statistically significant difference was found to exist among minority, white, male, and female administrators for five of the fifteen tested areas.

The results of the data analyses were remarkably consistent with the results found in other similar studies done in different states and nationwide. This study provided the information that made possible a

comparison of Oklahoma's public secondary school administrators with the administrators described in the two national studies conducted in 1977. Secondary administrators in Oklahoma did not differ much from the typical administrator described in the national studies, as the majority of Oklahoma's secondary administrators were white males with an average age of 43, who aspired to a central office position.

However, there were a few points of difference between Oklahoma's secondary administrators and secondary administrators of other studies. Examples of these differences and the significant findings of the study are discussed together in the following section.

Findings

The 207 respondents represented 20 percent of all public secondary school administrators in the state of Oklahoma for the school year 1979-1980. This percentage should be noted when reviewing the findings.

Statistically significant differences existed for most of the demographic characteristics among public secondary school administrators in Oklahoma with regard to race and gender. These findings were consistent with those found in other studies as reported in the literature. However, for the area of current age, the findings in this study did not show that the women, on the average, were older than the men. Other studies done in the nation had found such differences.

Gender, and not race, was more likely to be associated with statistically significant differences in the comparison of demographic characteristics. An example of this was found when the men perceived lack of experience as the major constraint on their being employed as an

administrator. The women, on the other hand, listed their sex as the major constraint.

In regard to the self-assessment of effectiveness, the respondents viewed themselves as average or above average on every aspect of administration covered by the instrument except one. The respondents, as a group and with no exceptions, rated themselves below average in their ability to speak to civic groups about the school.

In addition to the major findings listed above, several other items of interest were revealed through the data. That there were no American Indian females as public secondary school administrators in the state of Oklahoma was noteworthy.

Of the 207 respondents, only 77 (37 percent) indicated that they would be leaving public education within the next ten years either through retirement or because they would pursue a career in another field. This finding may be of note concerning the supply of available positions in the field of secondary administration.

Personal notes from the respondents concerning some areas covered on the effectiveness questionnaire indicated that several of the activities were outside the scope of their assigned responsibility. They often explained why they utilized the "not applicable" response by stating this reason. Most often, the person's position was that of nonteaching assistant principal in a large (2,000 ADA or over) district.

And finally, the area of evaluation was listed by more respondents as the role with which they felt the least comfort as an administrator. Conversely, the area of instructional leadership was listed by no one as an area of discomfort.

Conclusions

From the study, several conclusions were reached concerning the secondary administrator in the state of Oklahoma.

First, self-perception of administrative effectiveness was not influenced significantly by either race or gender; nor did significant differences in background profiles affect the self-assessment of administrative effectiveness. Therefore, it could be concluded that race and gender were of less importance once the individual obtained a secondary administrative position and began to focus on being effective in that position.

Second, although the women in the study perceived their sex as more of a constraint on their originally being employed as an administrator than minority members viewed their race as a constraint, it was concluded that the women currently perceived themselves as being effective administrators. The perception of constraints because of gender apparently did not affect the women's perceptions of their effectiveness as administrators.

The two conclusions discussed above support the view that race and/or gender need not cause the position of secondary administrator to be viewed as a hopeless aspiration for white females and minority members.

Third, as the majority of public secondary school administrators in the state of Oklahoma planned to remain in the field of education, they apparently found some personal satisfaction with their positions. Further, as the desire to stay in education and in the position of secondary administrator cut across racial and gender classifications, additional support was given to the conclusion that the incumbents were ostensibly satisfied

with their performances on the job and with the role of secondary administrator.

Fourth, when significant differences were found in demographic characteristics, gender, and not race, was most often the distinguishing variable. Therefore, it was concluded that differences in background profiles were probably a product of the person's gender and not his or her race.

Recommendations

Several areas for further research were revealed through the development of the study. Among these are:

1. investigating the factors contributing to the below average self-assessment by the administrators of their ability to speak to the public about the school (It should be noted that only 27 respondents gave a "not applicable" answer to the item on the effectiveness questionnaire which covered this area. The majority of the respondents simply rated themselves as being "below average" or "poor.")
2. refining the Self-Assessment of Effectiveness Questionnaire to enable faculty members and others to assess how well the administrator performs his/her job activities in order to provide a comparison of the responses of the administrators themselves with the responses of others
3. examining the impact of position on the activities performed by secondary administrators (Responses written on the questionnaires indicated that position rather than the size of the district affected the activities performed by the individuals.)
4. ascertaining the attitudes of or the problems perceived by secondary

administrators regarding the area of evaluation

5. discovering the reasons why no American Indian females have become secondary administrators in Oklahoma (Given the state's unique historical development and the fact that several American Indian males are currently serving as secondary administrators, the lack of any American Indian females in secondary administration is singularly curious.)

Final Remarks

Because race and gender do not appear to affect the self-perceptions of administrative effectiveness, every effort must be made to encourage the entrance of women or minority members into secondary administration. This should be done in order to provide the highest quality education by having a broad talent pool from which to select administrators and to furnish individuals an equal opportunity for self-fulfillment in their careers.

If it is accepted that people tend to perform to the level that they think they can perform, then the self-perception of a secondary administrator as to his/her job performance is significant. Further, if it is also accepted that self-assessment is the first step in developing a comprehensive evaluation program, then asking administrators to evaluate themselves thoughtfully and truthfully is worthwhile.

Hopefully, this study will have contributed to furthering the development of the best talent for the critical position of secondary administrator in the public secondary schools of Oklahoma.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1938; reprint ed., 1966.
- Beck, William R. "The Teachers and the Principal." In Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, pp. 79-88. Edited by Richard W. Saxe. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.
- Boardman, Charles W.; Douglass, Harl R.; and Bent, Rudyard K. Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1953.
- Borg, Walter R., and Gall, Meredith Damien. Educational Research. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 1979.
- Campbell, Roald F. "What Peculiarities in Educational Administration Make It a Special Case?" In Administrative Theory In Education, pp. 166-185. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Campbell, Roald F.; Corbally, John E., Jr.; and Ramseyer, John A. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1961.
- Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin. Group Dynamics. 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Clement, Jacqueline Parker. Sex Bias in School Leadership. Evanston, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates, 1975.
- Corbally, John E., Jr.; Jensen, T.J.; and Staub, W. Frederick. Educational Administration: The Secondary School. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1961.
- Culbertson, Jack A.; Jacobson, Paul B.; and Reller, Theodore L. Administrative Relationships. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

- Douglass, Harl R. Organization and Administration. Revised ed. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1945.
- English, Fenwick. "The Ailing Principalship." In The Secondary School Principal In Action, pp. 43-48. Edited by Leonard E. Kraft. USA: Wm. C. Brown, 1971.
- English, Fenwick W. School Organization and Management. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1975.
- Fayol, Henri. General and Industrial Management. Translated by Constance Storrs. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1949.
- Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Fisk, Robert S. "The Task of Educational Administration." In Administrative Behavior in Education, pp. 211-225. Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.
- Galfo, Armand J. Interpreting Educational Research. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1975.
- Gay, L.R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1976.
- Getzels, Jacob W.; Lipham, James M.; and Campbell, Roald F. Educational Administration As A Social Process. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Gorman, Burton W. Secondary Education. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Gregg, Russell T. "The Administrative Process." In Administrative Behavior in Education, pp. 273-311. Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.
- _____. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.
- Gross, Neal, and Trask, Anne E. The Sex Factor and the Management of Schools. New York: John Wiley, 1976.
- Halpin, Andrew W. "The Development of Theory in Educational Administration." In Administrative Theory in Education, pp. 1-19. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- _____. "A Paradigm for Research on Administrator Behavior." In Administrative Behavior in Education, pp. 166-167. Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

- Hemphill, John K. "Administration as Problem-Solving." In Administrative Theory In Education, pp. 89-118. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Jacobson, Paul B.; Logsdon, James D.; and Wiegman, Robert R. The Principalsip: New Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Jacobson, Paul B.; Revis, William C.; and Logsdon, James D. The Effective School Principal. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Jones, James J.; Salisbury, C. Jackson; and Spencer, Ralph L. Secondary School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Kimbrough, Ralph B., and Nunnery, Michael Y. Educational Administration. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Likert, R., The Human Organization. Quoted in Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, p. 22. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- Lipham, James M. "Personal Variables Related to Administrative Effectiveness." Quoted in Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration As A Social Process, pp. 229-233. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Lipham, James M., and Hoeh, James A., Jr. The Principalsip: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Marks, James R.; Stoops, Emery; and King-Stoops, Joyce. Handbook of Educational Supervision. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E. "What Kind of Person (If Any) Is Needed?" In The Principalsip in the 1970's, pp. 79-90. Edited by Kenneth E. McIntyre. Austin: Bureau of Laboratory Schools, 1971.
- Minium, Edward W. Statistical Reasoning in Psychology and Education. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roe L.; and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Morris, Richard T., and Seeman, Melvin. "The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach." In The Study of Leadership, pp. 12-21. Edited by C.G. Browne and Thomas S. Cohn. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers & Publishers, 1958.
- Mouly, George J. Educational Research. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

- Ovard, Glen F. Administration of the Changing Secondary School. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Ramseyer, John A.; Harris, L.E.; Pond, M.Z.; and Wakefield, H. Factors Affecting Educational Administration. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1955.
- Raubinger, Frederick M.; Sumption, Merle R.; and Kamm, Richard M. Leadership in the Secondary School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1974.
- Roe, William H., and Drake, Thelbert L. The Principalship. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- Rummel, J. Francis. An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education. New York: Harper & Bros., 1958.
- Sax, Gilbert. Foundations of Educational Research. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- Schutz, Will. Leaders of Schools. LaJolla, Calif.: University Associates, 1977.
- Sears, Jesse B. The Nature of the Administrative Process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Sellitiz, Claire; Wrightsman, Lawrence S.; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1976.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Starratt, Robert J. Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1948.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972.
- Tye, Kenneth A. "The School Principal: Key Man in Educational Change." In Leadership in the Secondary School, pp. 87-89. Edited by Frederick M. Raubinger, Merle R. Sumption, and Richard M. Kamm. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1974.
- Weast, Robert C., ed. Standard Mathematical Tables. 12th ed. Cleveland: The Chemical Rubber Co., 1964.
- Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950.

Wiles, Kimball, and Lovell, John T. Supervision for Better Schools. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Wood, Charles L.; Nicholson, Everett, W.; and Findley, Dale G. The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1979.

Periodicals

Abrams, Joan D. "From one who made it: Advice to women on their way up in school administration." American School Board Journal 165 (July 1978):27-28.

Argyris, Chris. "Some Characteristics of Successful Executives." Personnel Journal 32 (June 1953):50-55.

Barnes, Thelma. "America's Forgotten Minority: Women School Administrators." NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):87-93.

Becker, Ernest J. "A Principal Rates Himself." The Clearing House 19 (October 1944):76-77.

Blumberg, Arthur; Greenfield, William D., Jr.; and Nason, David. "The Substance of Trust Between Teachers and Principals." NASSP Bulletin 62 (December 1978):76-86.

Brandt, Robert G. "Administrator Attributes for Success." NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973):37-39.

Briggs, Thomas J. "A Self-Rating Scale for School Principals." NASSP Bulletin 27 (December 1943):49-62.

Burch, Barbara G., and Danley, W. Elzie, Sr. "Self-Perception: An Essential in Staff Development." NASSP Bulletin 62 (April 1978):15-17.

Butera, Thomas S. "Principal, Know Thyself!" NASSP Bulletin 60 (September 1976):84-88.

Casburn, Edwin H. "Bureaucracy vs. Shared Decision Making." NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):62-68.

Cirincione-Coles, Kathryn. "The Administrator: Male or Female?" Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Winter 1975):326-327.

Collins, Lorraine. "About Those Few Females Who Scale the Heights of School Management." Integrated Education 15 (January/February 1977):19-21.

- Dale, Charlene. "Women Are Still Missing Persons in Administrative and Supervisory Jobs." Educational Leadership 31 (November 1973):123-127.
- Doughty, Rosie N. "The Black Woman in School Administration." Integrated Education 15 (July/August 1977):34-37.
- Erickson, Kenneth A. "Humaneness--A Management Essential." NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):10-11.
- Fiorello, Anthony. "Leadership Concepts for Principals." NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973):19-23.
- Fish, Kenneth L. "The Principal as Coach." NASSP Bulletin 60 (November 1976):36-41.
- Fishel, Andrew, and Pottker, Janice. "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies." Journal of NAWDAC 38 (Spring 1975):110-117.
- Grambs, Jean Dresden. "Women and Administration: Confrontation or Accommodation?" Theory Into Practice 15 (October 1973):293-299.
- Harris, Evans H. "The Impact of Authenticity on the Black School Administrator." NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):82-86.
- Hedges, William D. "Being a Leader." NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973):29-36.
- Hoeh, James J. "Feeling Guilty for Not Being an Instructional Leader? Don't." NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973):1-7.
- "How to Tell an Effective Principal From an Ordinary One." The Executive Educator 1 (January 1979):30-32.
- Jenkins, Leo W. "The Effective Principals." American School Board Journal 121 (October 1950):17-18.
- Johnson, Dorothy L. "Ms. Administrators, Where Are They?" The School Administrator 29 (August 1972):19-20.
- Katz, Robert L. "Skills of an Effective Administrator." Harvard Business Review 33 (January-February 1955):33-42.
- Landers, Thomas J., and Silverman, Robert S. "It's the Principal of the Thing." NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974):45-47.
- Levandowski, Barbara S. "Women in Educational Administration: Where Do They Stand?" NASSP Bulletin 61 (September 1977):101-105.
- McMillin, Marvin R. "Leadership Aspirations of Prospective Teachers--A Comparison of Men and Women." Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Winter 1975):323-325.

- McVey, Marcia A., and Harris, J. Jerome. "School Climate: The Administrator Makes the Difference." Thrust for Education Leadership 5 (March 1976):14-16, 20.
- Miller, Dorothy I. "Native American Women: Leadership Images." Integrated Education 16 (January-February 1978):37-39.
- Morsink, Helen M. "Leader Behavior of Men and Women Principals." NASSP Bulletin 54 (September 1970):80-87.
- Ortiz, Flora Ida, and Covel, Janice. "Women in School Administration A Case Analysis." Urban Education 13 (July 1978):213-236.
- Patterson, Walter G. "To the Principal: Are You There?" NASSP Bulletin 61 (March 1977):104-106.
- Pine, Gerald J., and Boy, Angelo V. "Theory as a Guide to Administrative Behavior." NASSP Bulletin 63 (March 1979):32-38.
- Poll, Dwayne C. "The Interpersonal Relationships of the Principal." NASSP Bulletin 60 (November 1976):1-10.
- Robin, Stanley S. "A Procedure for Securing Returns to Mail Questionnaires." Sociology and Social Research 50 (October 1965):24-35.
- Robinson, Phil Clayton. "What Skills Are Needed by Today's School Leaders." Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977):15-18.
- Sexton, Michael J., and Switzer, Karen Dawn Dill. "Educational Leadership: No Longer A Potpourri." Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977):19-24.
- Smith, Judith A. "Encouraging Women to Enter Administration." NASSP Bulletin 62 (May 1978):114-119.
- Smith, Rosa A. "Women Administrators--Is the Price Too High?" NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):99-102.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership." Journal of Psychology 25 (January 1948):35-71.
- Stone, Marvin. "Women in Leadership Roles." U.S. News and World Report, May 21, 1979, p. 108.
- Thomas, Donald. "Who Is An Effective Principal?" NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974):48-52.
- Thomas, M. Donald. "The Complexities of Educational Leadership." NASSP Bulletin 61 (December 1977):34-40.
- Tye, Kenneth A. "The Times They Are A Changin' for School Principals." Thrust for Education Leadership 7 (October 1977):4-7.

Van Meir, Edward J. "Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities." Journal of NAWDAC 38 (Summer 1975):163-167.

Walsh, W. Bruce. "Validity of Self-Report." Journal of Counseling Psychology 14 (January 1967):18-23.

_____. "Validity of Self-Report: Another Look." Journal of Counseling Psychology 15 (March 1968):180-186.

Washington, Roosevelt, Jr., and Watson, Hoyt F. "Positive Teacher Morale--The Principal's Responsibility." NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):4-6.

Youngs, Bettie Burres. "Effective School Leadership Can Foster Model Relationships." Education 99 (Summer 1979):428-432.

Zakrajsek, Barbra. "Obtaining a Principalship." NASSP Bulletin 60 (April 1976):94-98.

Government Documents

Oklahoma. State Department of Education. Finance Division. Legislative Report 13. (1980).

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1970 Census of Population General Population Characteristics United States Summary, Appendix B--Definitions and Explanations of Subject Characteristics.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Education. High School '77 A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals, by Susan Abramowitz and Ellen Tenenbaum. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools 1977-1978 School Year (Final), by Betty J. Foster and Judi M. Carpenter. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

Unpublished Materials

Fox, Frances Juanita. "Black Women Administrators in the Denver Public Schools." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1975.

Garrison, Joe Mac. "The Leader Behavior of Oklahoma Secondary School Principals." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.

- Gaut, Robert Neal. "Teacher-Principal Assessment of Principal Performance in Selected Secondary Schools of Oklahoma." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.
- Nance, Jack Lee. "A Study of the Leadership Role of the Superintendent and High School Principal within Selected Communities of Oklahoma." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1965.
- Reese, Richard Louis. "Leadership Effectiveness of High School Principals." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1973.
- Seifert, Edward H. III. "The Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in Oklahoma." Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976.
- Smith, Harold B. "Descriptions of Effective and Ineffective Behavior of School Principals." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1974.
- Way, Joyce Washnok. "A Comparison of Background Profiles, Career Expectations and Career Aspirations of Men and Women Public School Administrators." Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1976.

Miscellaneous Sources

Encyclopedias and Dictionaries

- Encyclopedia of Education, 1971 ed. S.v. "Administration, Education: Role of Administrators," by James R. Deneen.
- Encyclopedia of Education, 1971 ed. S.v. "Principal, Profile of," by Neal H. Tracy.
- Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- The Educator's Encyclopedia. S.v. "School Administrator," by Edward W. Smith, Stanley W. Krouse, Jr., and Mark M. Atkinson.
- The Random House Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged ed. S.v. "Background Profile," and "Effective."

Special Publications

- Byrne, David R.; Hines, Susan A.; and McCleary, Lloyd E. The Senior High School Principalship Volume I: The National Survey. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.
- Gorton, Richard A., and McIntyre, Kenneth E. The Senior High School Principalship Volume II: The Effective Principal. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.
- McCleary, Lloyd E., and Thomson, Scott D. The Senior High School Principalship Volume III: The Summary Report. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
- McCune, Shirley. Quoted in the Foreward of Why Aren't Women Administering Our Schools? By Suzanne Howard. Arlington, Va.: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1975.
- Weldy, Gilbert R. Principals What They Do and Who They Are. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

Microform Reproductions

- Abungu, Cornelio O. The Characteristics of Successful Principals in AA High Schools of Texas. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 122 397, 1976.
- Coursen, David. Women and Minorities in Administration. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 102 640, 1975.
- Demeke, Howard J. Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Principalship: Seven Areas of Competence. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 057 479, 1971.
- Mangers, Dennis. The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 165 325, 1978.
- Niedermayer, Gretchen, and Kramer, Vicki W. Women in Administrative Positions in Public Education. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 096 742, 1974.
- Redfern, George B. Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How? Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 062 693, 1972.
- Saif, Philip S. A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 133 371.
- Shaver, Louis Harold. The Texas High School Principal: Characteristics and Views on Selected Educational Issues. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 046 077, 1970.

Abstracts

- Anderson, Earlie Bridges. "The Life-History Correlates, Work-Related Motivational Characteristics, and Role-Identification Factors of On-Site Women Administrators in Hawaiian Public Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International 38 (1977):5809-A.
- Baron, Eleanor B. "The Status of Women Senior High School Principals in the United States." Dissertation Abstracts International 37 (1977): 4259-4260-A.
- Brooks, Barbara Jean Roberts. "A Profile of Black Females in Selected Administrative Positions in the Public School System of Florida." Dissertation Abstracts International 36 (1976):6385-A.
- Hannah, Marion Kay. "A Comparison of Demographic Characteristics and Selected Role Functions of Michigan Public School Administrators." Dissertation Abstracts International 40 (1979):579-A.
- Prascher, Ronald Eugene. "Effective and Ineffective Administrative Behavior Exhibited by High School Principals as Judged by a Selected Group of Colorado Classroom Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts International 36 (1975):2556-A.
- Robinson, Wilma C. "Secondary School Women Principals and Assistant Principals in Ohio: Characteristics and Aspirations." Dissertation Abstracts International 39 (1978):1976-A.
- Smith, Judith Ann. "A Study of Women Who Are Certified and Employed as Principals and Assistant Principals in Pennsylvania." Dissertation Abstracts International 37 (1977):7463-A.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PANEL MEMBERS

AND

MATERIALS UTILIZED FOR

THE PANEL EVALUATION

PANEL OF JUDGES

Mr. Herb Bacon, Assistant Superintendent
Claremore Public Schools
Claremore, Oklahoma

Dr. James E. Christian
Director of Secondary Education
Muskogee Public Schools
Muskogee, Oklahoma

Dr. Harold Crain, Principal
Harding Middle School
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dr. Ira Eyster, Associate Director
Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Ms. Martha Hayes
Director of Teacher Corps Project
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma

Dr. Dale Mullins, Dean
School of Education
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma

Mr. Jim Myers, Assistant Superintendent
Tecumseh Public Schools
Tecumseh, Oklahoma

Mr. Gene Rochelle, Principal
MacArthur High School
Lawton, Oklahoma

Dr. Melvin Todd
Special Assistant to the Chancellor
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dr. Betty Williams
Director of Elementary Schools
Oklahoma City Public Schools
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

LETTER TO PANEL MEMBERS

Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire mentioned to you in our recent phone conversation. Your willingness to evaluate the questionnaire is sincerely appreciated.

One of the purposes of the study is to determine and analyze the self-assessed effectiveness of Oklahoma public secondary school administrators. Therefore, the questionnaire is designed to elicit the respondent's perception as to how effectively he or she performs the various behaviors listed. The types of activities have been drawn from and are fully supported by appropriate literature.

Specifically, you are being asked to critique the questionnaire on the areas of: clarity of thought; phrasing; format; and overall appropriateness of the activity to a secondary administrator. Please make comments or suggestions on the questionnaire and/or on a separate sheet and return your remarks to me by February 25, 1980. A stamped, addressed return envelope is included for your convenience in responding.

Again, thank you for helping with this very important aspect of my study.

Sincerely,

Carol Snow Frosch
Doctoral Candidate
University of Oklahoma

Enclosures (2)

ORIGINAL QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO PANEL

SELF-ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR THE STUDY OF SECONDARY ADMINISTRATORS

The following statements describe activities or behaviors that you may perform as part of your job. You are being asked to thoughtfully and realistically assess your performance on each. Please circle only one (1) response for each.

Scale: You believe your performance of the activity is how effective: (i.e., how well do you believe you do?)

- 5 -- Excellent
- 4 -- Above Average
- 3 -- Average
- 2 -- Below Average
- 1 -- Poor
- 0 -- Not Applicable

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I incorporate subordinates' suggestions into implemented programs or plans. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I elicit staff comments and suggestions about improving existing programs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I discuss topics other than strictly school-related matters with every teacher. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I praise teachers for special achievement. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I visit with students in non-disciplinary situations on a daily basis. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I aid faculty with personal problems. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I help faculty with discipline problems. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I confer with parents for other than strictly discipline reasons. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I speak to civic groups about the school. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I explain new and current school programs to parents. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I evaluate faculty members. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

30. I mediate interpersonal conflicts between faculty members.	0	1	2	3	4	5
31. I read current, professional literature on education.	0	1	2	3	4	5
32. I discuss innovations in education with members of the faculty.	0	1	2	3	4	5
33. I propose new or innovative ideas to the faculty.	0	1	2	3	4	5
34. I devise evaluations of new or innovative programs in the school.	0	1	2	3	4	5
35. I establish faculty committees for developing new or innovative curriculum programs.	0	1	2	3	4	5
36. I arrange for new or innovative ideas to be tried on a limited basis at first.	0	1	2	3	4	5
37. I advocate faculty members' trying new or innovative programs.	0	1	2	3	4	5
38. I publicly acknowledge faculty who have successful innovative programs.	0	1	2	3	4	5
39. I foster small group meetings of faculty to exchange ideas.	0	1	2	3	4	5
40. I furnish as many of the resources needed by faculty members as the budget allows.	0	1	2	3	4	5
41. I integrate goals of the school with personal needs of staff members.	0	1	2	3	4	5
42. I invite parental advice when making plans for educational goals.	0	1	2	3	4	5
43. I cooperate with other administrative units (such as elementary schools) in forming educational goals.	0	1	2	3	4	5
44. I suggest organizational improvements to my supervisor(s).	0	1	2	3	4	5
45. I base my decisions on an identified theory of administration.	0	1	2	3	4	5
46. I strive to reduce anxiety and frustration of staff members.	0	1	2	3	4	5

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 47. I publicize school activities in the local community. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 48. I accord more attention and resources to certain curriculum areas than to others. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49. I approve requests for supplies and/or materials. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. I allocate limited supplies on an equitable basis. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 51. I direct discipline procedures. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 52. I oversee custodial and other support activities. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 53. I inspect the buildings and grounds. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 54. I report repair needs to my supervisor(s). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 55. I ask faculty members for suggestions for improving the physical plant. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 56. I work with custodial and other staff to improve the care of the physical facilities. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 57. I guide preparation of the school activity calendar. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 58. I supervise state and/or federal reports. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 59. I develop a budget request for my school. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 60. I recommend the hiring or termination of personnel. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

The following ask for your perception of your position. Check () as many as apply to you.

1. I feel that I am fully accepted in my role as an administrator by:

☐ the faculty ☐ the community ☐ the students
☐ my supervisor(s) ☐ the non-certified staff ☐ no one.

2. I feel discrimination because of my:

☐ age ☐ race ☐ sex ☐ position ☐ background.

☐ I do not feel any discrimination.

3. I do NOT feel comfortable with my role as:

___disciplinarian ___instructional leader ___change agent

___community liaison _____other (specify).

___I feel comfortable with all roles.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES AND CORRESPONDENCE
UTILIZED IN THE STUDY

COVER LETTER SENT TO ADMINISTRATORS

You have been selected to participate in a research project being conducted concerning secondary administrators. The purpose of the study is to determine and analyze the background profiles and self-assessed effectiveness of public secondary school administrators in Oklahoma. Because the project involves original research, your participation is vital.

Enclosed you will find two questionnaires and a stamped, addressed return envelope. One questionnaire seeks information about demographic data; the other is a self-assessment of your effectiveness as a secondary administrator.

Although there is a number on each of your questionnaires, it is for response return tabulation and will be removed and discarded upon receipt of your replies. Your privacy and anonymity are completely assured.

Recognizing that your time is valuable, the questionnaires have been kept purposefully brief. However, if you wish to make a written response to any item(s) or the project, please feel free to do so on a separate sheet and enclose it with your responses.

Your participation will be greatly appreciated, and you will have the personal satisfaction of knowing that your replies will be used--in confidence, of course--in describing the secondary administrator in the state of Oklahoma.

Sincerely,

Carol Snow Frosch
Doctoral Candidate
University of Oklahoma

Enclosures (3)

QUESTIONNAIRES UTILIZED IN THE STUDY

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR THE STUDY OF SECONDARY ADMINISTRATORS

Please place a check (✓) by only one (1) response for each of the following that best describes you. Please respond to all items.

1. Sex: ☐ Female ☐ Male
2. Racial Identification: ☐ American Indian ☐ Black ☐ Caucasian
☐ Oriental ☐ Spanish American
3. Marital Status: ☐ Married ☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ Widowed
4. Number of Children: ☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ More(??)
5. Undergraduate major: ☐ Business ☐ Education ☐ Fine Arts
☐ Language Arts ☐ Mathematics ☐ Natural Sciences
☐ Physical Education ☐ Social Sciences ☐ Vocational
☐ Other (specify) _____
6. The highest degree or number of graduate hours you have currently:
☐ Baccalaureate (Bachelor's) Degree ☐ Master's Degree
☐ Ed.D. or Ph.D. ☐ 16 Hours above Master's
☐ 32 Hours above Master's ☐ 60 Hours above Master's
☐ Specialist Degree in Education
7. The position you held just prior to your current assignment:
☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Classroom Teacher ☐ Counselor
☐ Athletic Director/Coach ☐ Classroom Teacher/Coach
☐ Elementary Principal ☐ Junior High Principal
☐ Department Chairperson ☐ High School Principal
☐ Other (specify) _____

8. Immediately before the first administrative position you ever held, you held the position of:

☐ Athletic Director/Coach ☐ Classroom Teacher/Coach ☐ Coach
☐ Counselor ☐ Classroom Teacher ☐ Department Chairperson
☐ _____ Other (specify)

9. The one (1) most important reason you chose to become an administrator was:

☐ to foster change in education. ☐ to receive a higher salary.
☐ to obtain a more prestigious position. ☐ to advance my career.
☐ to meet expectations of supervisor(s).
☐ to have a more challenging job. ☐ _____ Other (specify)

10. Select the one (1) factor you believe contributed the most to your being employed as an administrator:

☐ Age ☐ Race ☐ Sex ☐ Personality ☐ Experience
☐ Mobility ☐ Family Situation ☐ Preparation ☐ Nothing
☐ _____ Other (specify)

11. Select the one (1) factor you believe served as the greatest constraint or hindrance to your being hired as an administrator:

☐ Age ☐ Race ☐ Sex ☐ Personality ☐ Lack of Experience
☐ Family Situation ☐ Lack of Preparation ☐ Lack of Mobility
☐ Nothing ☐ _____ Other (specify)

12. Ten years from now, your career goal is:

☐ to be a superintendent. ☐ to be a college or university
 professor. ☐ to work in the central office of a school district.
☐ to be a principal. ☐ to leave education for another field.
☐ to retire. ☐ _____ Other (specify)

The following ask for a specific number. Please respond to each.

13. Total years of classroom teaching experience: _____(years)

14. Total years as an administrator (count this year):____(years)
15. Total years as a professional educator (count this year):____(years)
16. Number of years in current position (count this year):____(years)
17. Your current age:____(years)
18. Your age when you first became an administrator:____(years)

SELF-ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR THE STUDY OF SECONDARY ADMINISTRATORS

The following statements describe activities or behaviors in which you engage as part of your job. You are being asked to thoughtfully and realistically assess your performance on each. Please circle only one (1) response for each.

Scale: Rate your performance using the following scale
(i.e., how well do you believe you do?)

- 5 -- Excellent
- 4 -- Above Average
- 3 -- Average
- 2 -- Below Average
- 1 -- Poor
- 0 -- Not Applicable

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I incorporate staff members' suggestions into the implementation of programs or plans. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I solicit staff comments and suggestions about improving existing programs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I frequently discuss topics other than strictly school-related matters with teachers. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I praise teachers for special achievement. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I frequently visit with students in non-disciplinary situations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I aid faculty with personal problems when possible. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I help faculty with discipline problems. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I confer with parents for other than discipline reasons. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I speak to civic groups about the school. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I explain new and current school programs to parents. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I evaluate faculty members. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I consult faculty and other staff members on decisions which directly affect them. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

13.	I assign routine clerical activities to subordinates.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I solicit students' ideas concerning decisions which will directly affect them.	0	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I delegate non-clerical activities to various staff members.	0	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I give every faculty member an opportunity for leadership.	0	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I implement procedures for the evaluation of existing programs.	0	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I write plans for achieving short-range (semester or less) educational goals.	0	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I keep an up-to-date plan showing the division of responsibilities.	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I formulate written plans for achieving long-range (more than a semester) goals.	0	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I encourage faculty members to also socialize outside of school hours.	0	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I uphold the teacher in most conflict situations with students.	0	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I soften criticism of staff members with praise when possible.	0	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I admit when I have made an error in a decision.	0	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I try to capitalize on the strengths of each faculty member.	0	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I recommend persons for faculty who come from various socio-economic or ethnic backgrounds.	0	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I endeavor to build a faculty team.	0	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I stress faculty interaction and cooperation in curriculum programs.	0	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I demonstrate my trust in staff members.	0	1	2	3	4	5
30.	I mediate interpersonal conflicts between faculty members.	0	1	2	3	4	5

31.	I read current, professional literature on education.	0	1	2	3	4	5
32.	I devise evaluations of new or innovative programs in the school.	0	1	2	3	4	5
33.	I establish faculty committees for developing new or innovative curriculum programs.	0	1	2	3	4	5
34.	I arrange for new or innovative ideas to be tried on a limited basis at first.	0	1	2	3	4	5
35.	I advocate faculty members' trying new or innovative programs.	0	1	2	3	4	5
36.	I promote small group meetings of faculty to exchange ideas.	0	1	2	3	4	5
37.	I furnish as many of the resources needed by faculty members as the budget allows.	0	1	2	3	4	5
38.	I integrate goals of the school with personal needs of staff members.	0	1	2	3	4	5
39.	I seek parental input when making plans for educational goals.	0	1	2	3	4	5
40.	I cooperate with other administrative units (such as elementary schools) in forming educational goals.	0	1	2	3	4	5
41.	I suggest organizational improvements to my supervisor(s).	0	1	2	3	4	5
42.	I base my decisions on an identified theory of administration.	0	1	2	3	4	5
43.	I strive to reduce high levels of anxiety and frustration of staff members.	0	1	2	3	4	5
44.	I publicize school activities in the local community.	0	1	2	3	4	5
45.	I accord more attention and resources to certain curriculum areas than to others.	0	1	2	3	4	5
46.	I manage the process of supply and/or material requests.	0	1	2	3	4	5
47.	I monitor the flow of money in and out of on-site accounts.	0	1	2	3	4	5

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48. I allocate supplies on an equitable basis. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49. I direct discipline procedures. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. I oversee custodial and other support activities. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 51. I inspect the buildings and grounds. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 52. I report repair needs to my supervisor(s). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 53. I ask staff members for suggestions for improving the care of the physical facilities. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 54. I guide preparation of the school activity calendar. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 55. I supervise state and/or federal reports. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 56. I develop a budget request for my school. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 57. I recommend the employment or termination of personnel. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

The following ask for your perception of your position. Check () as many as apply to you.

1. I feel that I am fully accepted in my role as administrator by:

___the faculty ___the community ___the students
___my supervisor(s) ___the non-certified staff ___no one.

2. I feel discrimination because of my:

___age ___race ___sex ___position ___background.
___I do not feel any discrimination.

3. I do NOT feel comfortable with my role as:

___disciplinarian ___instructional leader ___change agent
___community liaison ___evaluator ___management representative
____Other (specify)
___I feel comfortable with all roles associated with my position.

POST CARD REMINDER SENT
TO ADMINISTRATORS

Dear

March 28, 1980

To date, I have not received the questionnaires sent to you for the study of secondary administrators. Please take a few minutes, complete the forms, and return them to me by April 7, 1980.

If you did not receive, or have misplaced, the questionnaires, please write me at once, and I will send another set.

Thank you!

Carol Frosch
2902 Del Arbole
Midwest City, OK 73110

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT WITH SECOND
SET OF QUESTIONNAIRES
TO ADMINISTRATORS

April 10, 1980

Dear Administrator:

On March 10 and again on March 31, you should have received questionnaires or a reminder for the study of secondary administrators. To date, I have not received your response.

I am enclosing another set of questionnaires and a stamped, return envelope. Please complete the questionnaires at this time.

If, however, you do not wish to participate in the study, please write across the top of the questionnaires your refusal and return the forms to me. This will then conclude any further communication on the matter.

Sincerely,

Carol Snow Frosch
Doctoral Candidate
University of Oklahoma

Enclosures (3)

Please return by April 21. Thank you!

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO ADMINISTRATORS
AFTER COMPLETION OF THE STUDY

June, 1980

Dear Administrator:

In March, you completed two questionnaires for the study of public secondary school administrators in the state of Oklahoma. Your participation was most sincerely appreciated.

Recognizing the frustration that often comes when such a project is completed and then never heard of again, I am enclosing an abstract of the study for you to have as a follow-up.

If you have any specific questions or comments about the study or its findings, please feel free to write me at the address listed below.

Again, thank you for your participation in the study. Have a good summer!

Sincerely,

Carol Snow Frosch
2902 Del Arbole
Midwest City, OK 73110

Enclosure

ABSTRACT SENT AS FOLLOW-UP
AN ANALYSIS OF THE BACKGROUND PROFILES AND SELF-ASSESSED
EFFECTIVENESS OF OKLAHOMA PUBLIC SECONDARY
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS BY RACE AND GENDER

BY: CAROL SNOW FROSCHE

MAJOR PROFESSOR: ROBERT F. BIBENS, Ed.D.

This study was designed to determine and analyze the background profiles and self-assessed effectiveness of public secondary school administrators in Oklahoma by race and gender. Two instruments, the Demographic Data Questionnaire and the Self-Assessment of Effectiveness Questionnaire, were designed for use in the study.

The instruments were mailed to a random sample of 121 white male secondary administrators and to 121 white female, minority male, and minority female secondary administrators, who were employed in administrative positions for the 1979-1980 school year in the state of Oklahoma. Of the 242 persons to whom the questionnaires were mailed, responses were received from 217, or 90 percent. Usable questionnaires totaled 207, with 99 white males, 41 white females, 59 minority males, and 8 minority females as the respondents.

Statistically significant differences at the .05 level were found in the comparisons for the demographic characteristics of: marital status, number of children, undergraduate majors, previous work experience in education, reason for becoming an administrator, perception of contributing factors to being hired as an administrator, perception of constraints on being hired as an administrator, professional career objectives, number

of years as an administrator, and size of the district where employed.

No statistically significant differences were found for the demographic characteristics of: highest degree or hours attained, years as a classroom teacher, current age, and age at first administrative appointment. It must be carefully noted that no statistically significant difference was found for the self-assessment of effectiveness.

From the data, the average administrator was 42 years of age, was married, had two children, had served 11 years as a classroom teacher and 7 years as an administrator, had additional work beyond the Master's degree, saw the main reason for becoming an administrator as career advancement, viewed experience as the contributing factor to being employed as an administrator, perceived no constraints on employment opportunities, and planned to remain in the educational field for the next ten years.

Reliability of the self-assessment instrument was established by having 35, 17 percent, of the respondents complete a second effectiveness questionnaire approximately four weeks after the original completion. A composite reliability of .581 (Pearson r) was found.

The study concluded: 1. self-perception of effectiveness was not influenced significantly by either race or gender; 2. the women in the study perceived their sex as more of a constraint on their being employed as an administrator than minority members viewed their race as a constraint; and 3. when significant differences were found in demographic characteristics, gender, and not race, was the contributing variable.