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THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPALS AS IT IS RELATED TO INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR AND BILINGUAL/CROSSCULTURAL EDUCATION

Abstract of Dissertation

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to examine the following questions: Are the ratings of principal effectiveness related to (1) the interpersonal behavior orientations of principals, (2) principalship experience, and (3) the principals' reactions to Bilingual/Crosscultural (B/CC) education? Are the reactions of principals to B/CC education related to (1) the interpersonal behavior orientations of principals, and (2) the principals' years of experience in B/CC education?

Proceedures. Thirty elementary school principals in one unified school district made up the sample for this study. They were given the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B) questionnaire and the Bilingual/Crosscultural-Principal Information questionnaire. The FIRO-B questionnaire was used to determine the interpersonal behavior orientations of the principals and the B/CC questionnaire was used to determine the reactions of the principals to B/CC education. The effectiveness of the principals was determined from ratings by four school district central office staff members who were familiar with the job performances of the principals. Analysis of covariance was used to determine if there were any significant differences between the rated effectiveness of principals and the three interpersonal dimensions of FIRO-B. Pearson's r was used to determine if there were any significant relationships between the reactions of principals to B/CC education and the interpersonal behavior orientations of principals and their B/CC experience.

Conclusions. Eighty percent of the principals reacted positively to B/CC education. Seven null hypotheses were derived from the research questions. All of these hypotheses were retained at the 0.05 level of significance. It was thus concluded that there were no significant differences or significant relationships among these variables: the rated effectiveness of principals, their reactions to B/CC education, principalship experience, FIRO-B scores, and years of B/CC experience.

Recommendations. The FIRO-B questionnaire has not been very productive in studies with school administrators, therefore it is recommended that this study be replicated using a different instrument to measure interpersonal behavior. It is also recommended that situational variables that might affect leader behavior and leader effectiveness be taken into account if this study is replicated. Further research is recommended to find those variables that will enhance the acceptance of innovative programs like B/CC education by those in the educational community as well as by the public.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Administrative effectiveness has been a subject of concern in the United States since the writings of Frederick Taylor on "scientific management" in the early 1900's. Following Taylor's initial work, writers who wrote about organizations placed greater emphasis on the human dimension of organizations. In the 1930's and 1940's, Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Fritz J. Roethlisberger, and Chester Barnard wrote about the importance of human relations and communications in organizations. In the 1950's, Douglas M. McGregor and Chris Argyris wrote about


the human side of enterprise and the need for the personal development of individuals in organizations. In the 1960's, Herbert Kaufman wrote about the need for the decentralization of administration and the need for greater employee involvement in the decision making process of organizations. And in the 1970's, the primary issues appear to be the fantastic growth of public employee unions and the demand for equal employment opportunities. Many of the issues and developments in public administration have had a great influence on the issues and developments in educational administration.

Like public administration, educational administration was concerned about Taylor's "scientific management" techniques in the early 1900's. Taylor's ideas for example, influenced Frank E. Spaulding and John F. Bobbitt who wrote on improving school systems by using "scientific management" techniques. Later writers in educational administration placed less emphasis on the techniques and

---


mechanics of school administration and greater emphasis on the human aspects of school administration. J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba wrote about the importance of meeting the needs dispositions of individuals working in schools as well as meeting the goals of the institution. Andrew Halpin and Warren L. Evenson found that the human relationships superintendents and principals have with their staffs were as important to their effectiveness as their organizational skills. James Lipham, John Hemphill, Daniel Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen studied the personal variables related to effectiveness and administrative style in school administration and found that there are personal qualities that effective principals possess that ineffective principals do not possess, although there are no universally accepted set of personal variables that have been identified


12Andrew Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959).


as inherent in effective leaders.

Administrative effectiveness as it relates to human relations continues to be a current subject of concern for the educational establishment. A nationwide survey of elementary principals found "... the largest number of problems identified by principals involved their difficulty in establishing and maintaining successful human relationships."\(^\text{16}\) John Cunniff, writing for the Associated Press, stated:

> Ineptness in dealing with people is emerging in recent years as the fatal flaw for corporate chief executives, although a decade ago it was hardly even mentioned as a weakness.
> The assessment comes from an analysis of top executive changes in the nation's 500 largest industrial concerns ... \(^\text{17}\)

Another major concern related to administrative effectiveness, is an organization's ability to meet the demands of rapid societal change and an administrator's ability to accept the change and implement the innovations. Frederick C. Moser writes:

> ... organizations must, if they are to survive, be responsive, adaptive, flexible, creative, and innovative. This means, among other things, that they will increasingly be structured around projects or problems to be solved rather than as permanent

---


impervious hierarchies of offices, divisions, and sections.\textsuperscript{18}

It was the concern over administrative effectiveness, successful human relationships, and the acceptance and implementation of educational innovations that was the basis for this study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of principals as it relates to the interpersonal behavior orientations of the principals, the principals' reactions to an educational innovation, and experience. The educational innovation investigated in this study was Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

**Hypotheses**

The study was based on the following hypotheses:

\textbf{H-1.} There is a significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Inclusion.

\textbf{H-2.} There is a significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Control.

\textbf{H-3.} There is a significant difference between

effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of **Affection**.

H-4. There is a significant relationship between a principal's effectiveness and the number of years the principal has been a principal.

H-5. There is a significant relationship between the effectiveness of principals and their reaction to the educational innovation—Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

H-6. There is a significant relationship between a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural (B/CC) education and the principal's interpersonal behavior.

H-7. There is a significant relationship between a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education and the number of years of experience a principal has had in Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

**Procedures**

Thirty elementary school principals in one unified school district in California made up the sample for this study. These principals were given the **Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior** questionnaire and the **Bilingual/Crosscultural-Principal Information** questionnaire. The **Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior** inventory was used to determine the interpersonal behavior orientations of the principals and the **Bilingual/Crosscultural-Principal Information** questionnaire was used to determine the elementary principals'
reactions to the educational innovation-B/CC education. The effectiveness of the principals was determined from the ratings by four central office staff members who were familiar with the job performances of the principals. The anonymity of the principals was insured by a procedure which coded the ratings of the raters and the questionnaires of the participants.

Multi-variate and correlational statistical methods were utilized to analyze the data collected from this study. Analysis of covariance was used to determine if there were any significant differences between the rated effectiveness of principals and the three interpersonal dimensions of the FIRO-B. Pearson's r was used to determine if there were any relationships between the principals' reactions to B/CC education, their interpersonal behavior orientation, or their B/CC experience. The significance level of 0.05 was used to test the hypotheses of this study. The University of the Pacific's Burroughs 6700 computer was used to assist in the computation and processing of the data collected in this study.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used:

**FIRO-B.** "F.I.R.O.-B" is an abbreviation for "Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior." It is a 54-item questionnaire which measures 3 fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relations: "inclusion,"
"control," and "affection." 19

Interpersonal. The term "interpersonal" refers to relations that occur between people. It is assumed that, owing to psychological presence of other people, interpersonal situations lead to behavior in an individual that differs from behavior of the individual when he is not in the presence of other persons. An optimally useful definition of "interpersonal" is one such that all situations classified as interpersonal have important properties in common—properties that are in general different from those of non-interpersonal situations. 20

Inclusion. The interpersonal need for inclusion is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with respect to interaction and association. "Satisfactory relation" includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with people on a dimension ranging from originating or initiating interaction with all people to not initiating interaction with anyone; (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always initiating interaction with the self to never initiating interaction with the self. 21

Control. The interpersonal need for control is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to control and power. "Satisfactory relation" includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from controlling all the behavior of other people to not controlling any behavior of others and (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always being controlled by them to never being controlled by them. 22

Affection. The interpersonal need for affection is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with others with respect to love and affection. Affection always refers to a two-person (dyadic)

---

21 Ibid., p. 8. 22 Ibid.
relation. "Satisfactory relation" includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with others somewhere on a dimension ranging from initiating close, personal relations with everyone to originating close, personal relations with no one; (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them on a dimension ranging from always originating close, personal relations toward the self, to never originating close, personal relations toward the self.23

Expressed Behavior. Expressed or manifest behavior is overt, observable behavior in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection.24

Wanted Behavior. Wanted behavior refers to what the person wants from other people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection.25

Principal. The term principal in this study refers to a full-time chief building administrator of a public school having grades pre-school through sixth grade or any portion thereof.

Bilingual/Crosscultural Education. Bilingual/Crosscultural education is defined by the California State Department of Education as a process that uses a pupil's primary language as the principal source of instruction, while at the same time systematically and sequentially teaching him in the language of the predominant culture. The curriculum components of Bilingual/Crosscultural education includes:
- English as a Second Language,
- all areas covered by the Education Code,
- instruction given in the student's own language until he is proficient enough in English to be instructed in that language, and
- cultural awareness, which provides pupils' with a chance to foster their cultural heritage as well as enrich their cognitive and verbal processes.26

23 Ibid., p. 20.
24 Ryan, op. cit., p. 5. 25 Ibid.
Limitations and Delimitations

Generalizations from this study were limited to populations which are in school districts that are similar in size and organizational structure and are in cities which are demographically similar to the city in the sample. The study was delimited to the elementary school principals in the public schools in one unified school district in California. No attempt was made to determine the reasons for the perceptions of those surveyed.

Significance of Study

The findings from this study have both theoretical and practical implications. The study will have implications for educational administration, for the theory upon which the FIRO-B is based, and for Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

FIRO-B is a social psychologically based theoretical model which takes into account both the interpersonal desires of a person as well as the person's interpersonal relations with others. The study might be able to find an useful application of the FIRO-B instrument in the study of leadership behavior in school administration.

Also, the findings from this study could provide useful information for decision making in school districts. The findings could be utilized in the following areas:

1. Decision making in the assignment of principals
to schools with Bilingual/Crosscultural education programs.

2. Counseling with principals in respect to personal and professional development.

3. Counseling university students who are interested in educational administration as a major.

4. Decision making in respect to hiring and assignment of prospective principals to elementary schools.

Overview

The study was organized into five chapters. The description of the chapters follows:

The introduction and general overview of the study is found in Chapter I. The purpose and hypotheses of the study are also included in the chapter.

In Chapter II, the literature in the areas of public administration, educational administration, and Bilingual/Crosscultural education are reviewed. The research in educational administrative behavior and educational innovation are reviewed in the chapter also.

The procedures and methodologies used in the study are described in Chapter III. Also described are the instrumentation and statistical procedures used in the study.

The analyses of the data collected for this study are presented in Chapter IV. A summary of the study, the conclusions drawn from the study, and the recommendations are found in Chapter V.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

Chapter II contains a review of the literature and research pertinent to this study. The chapter is made up of five sections. In the first section an historical overview of public administration is presented. Section two contains an historical overview of educational administration. In the third section the research on educational administrative behavior is discussed. Section four reviews the research on educational innovation as it relates to principals. And section five presents an historical overview of the educational innovation, Bilingual/Crosscultural education in the United States.

In sections one and two a general background for this investigation is presented. Sections three, four, and five present specific research and literature pertinent to this study and its variables.

Public Administration-An Overview

This section contains an historical overview of public administration in the United States beginning with a paper written by President Woodrow Wilson. This section provides an historical background for the next section on educational administration.
Interest in the study of organizational administration probably had its beginnings in America with President Woodrow Wilson's paper, "The Study of Administration."¹ In that paper written in 1887, President Wilson discussed the need for organization and management in government offices. Wilson's paper did not receive much attention at the time, however, in the early 1900's the "science of administration" became a serious subject of study.

During this period, four persons who exemplified the era of "administrative efficiency" were Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, Luther H. Gulick, and Lyndall Urwick. These four men, three of them engineers in top management positions, were primarily concerned with administrative efficiency. Through their experiments and studies, they were able to delineate the role of managers more clearly. This excerpt from Taylor expresses the tenor of organizational administration during this period. He wrote:

'It is only through enforced standardization of methods, enforced adaptation of the best implements and working conditions, and enforced cooperation that this faster work can be assured, and the duty of enforcing this cooperation rests with management alone.'²

The concept of "administrative efficiency" dominated the field of public administration but there were those who felt

¹Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," Political Science Quarterly, 2 (June, 1887).
that this approach was too narrow. These critics did not
dispute the importance of efficiency as a goal, but they
held that the fundamental processes like communication and
shared decision making were important also. 3

Among the best known persons who reacted to the
"gospel of efficiency" preached by the earlier writers in
organizational administration were Mary Parker Follett,
Elton Mayo, Fred Roethlisberger, Chester Barnard, and
Herbert Simon. Unlike the earlier writers, none was an
eengineer and three were university professors. This group
of writers placed greater emphasis on human processes and
human interaction in the production of goods. The
Hawthorne Plant studies of Mayo and Roethlisberger found
that production increased when workers were given more
attention and were treated in a more humane way rather than
when they were treated only as producers on an assembly line.
Human relations in organizations was Follett's major focus.
She was concerned with the behavior and the participation
of workers in the decision making process. Barnard
emphasized the impact of informal groups on the communication
process of formal organizations. And Simon delved deeply
into the social and psychological aspects of organizational

---

3 Bertram M. Gross, "The Scientific Approach to
Administration," Behavioral Science and Educational
Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society
for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of
administration. Follett summarized the emphasis of this period when she wrote:

The real service of businessmen is not just the production and distribution of manufactured articles. It is to give an opportunity for individual development through better organization of human relationships . . . The process of production is as important for the welfare of society as the product of production.4

The writings of these writers in the 1930's and the 1940's influenced the "new industrial humanism" writers of the 1950's.

In the 1950's, Douglas McGregor and Chris Argyris wrote major works on the importance of meeting the personal needs of individuals who function within organizations. Argyris promoted organizational development as a means to improve an organization's capabilities and human resources. McGregor proposed a theory of managing people based on more adequate assumptions about human nature and human motivation. McGregor summarized the thinking of the 1950's in this statement:

The ingenuity and the perseverance of industrial management in the pursuit of economic ends have changed many scientific and technological dreams into commonplace realities. It is now becoming clear that the application of these same talents to the human side of enterprise will not only enhance these materialistic achievements, but will bring us

one step closer to "the good society." The work of McGregor and Argyris led to the height of the behavioral science movement in the study of organizational administration in the 1960's.

The behavioral science movement in the study of organizational administration gained impetus in the 1960's. Organizational development grew as the theories of Argyris and McGregor were confirmed. Also, many of Barnard's theories concerning the dimensions of effectiveness and efficiency as they affect organizations were confirmed. During this decade, administrative decentralization was a concept advocated by proponents who wanted greater representation by members of the organization. Herbert Kaufman wrote:

In short "decentralization" of administration is in the air everywhere. While it is sometimes defended on the grounds of efficiency, it is more frequently justified in terms of effective popular participation in government...6

To improve efficiency, systematic approaches to management in the form of Program Evaluation Review Technique, Critical Path Analysis, and others, were attempted in the 1960's. In the budgeting arena, Program Planning and Budgeting Systems dominated the budgeting process during the 1960's; but by the end of the decade, it was being phased out. The

---


desire for greater representation in the decision making process led to issues that became prominent in the 1970's.

The prominent issues of the 1970's have been the tremendous growth of public employee unions and the demand for equal employment opportunity. During the 1970's, Management by Objectives, a concept introduced by Peter F. Drucker in the mid-1950's gained wide acceptance in public administration. In the area of budgeting, Zero-Based Budgeting was introduced by Peter A Pyhrr. This approach to budget decision making was used by President Jimmy Carter when he was governor of the state of Georgia. The rapid changes in institutions and organizations continued in the 1970's. In discussing this concern, Frederick C. Mosher wrote:

... Societies of the past have of course changed, particularly in the West, but none with such speed and few with such awareness. Basic social changes of long ago can, by historians, be described in terms of eras; later in terms of centuries; more recently in terms of generations. But the "social generation" of today is considerably shorter than the "human generation." The parent of the 70's is preparing his infant offspring for a society not the same as his own and not even once removed from his own. It is more nearly twice removed.7

Mosher points out that this rapid change has important implications for public organizations, especially for

educational institutions.\textsuperscript{8}

The history of public administration in the United States began with a concern for increasing the efficiency in the production of products. Reaction to this concern with production resulted in the human relations movement. The continued concern for the efficiency of organizations as well as for the effectiveness of the members of those organizations led to the behavioral science movement in the study of organizational administration. This study is concerned with organizational administration as it relates to education. The history of educational administration will be the next area of review.

**Educational Administration—An Overview**

Educational administration did not become a separate subject of study in America until the early 1900's.\textsuperscript{9} It was perhaps the work of Taylor that caused the educational community to look seriously at the administration of our public schools. Taylor's "scientific management" concepts caused many organizations to assess the "efficiency" of their shops, plants, and institutions. This concern for efficiency had a tremendous impact on the educational

\textsuperscript{8}Ibid., pp. 53-61.

\textsuperscript{9}Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), 188-89.
community that is still being felt today.  

For example, one of the practices to achieve efficiency during this period was to increase class size, eliminate small classes, and decrease course offerings—these practices are still being used today when there is need to be "efficient" because there is inadequate financing for schools. The concern for efficiency in educational administration was expressed by Frank Spaulding. Spaulding was the main speaker at a special meeting devoted to the consideration of educational administration as a possible subject of study at universities. This meeting was held in March of 1910, and was sponsored by the National Society of College Teachers of Education. Spaulding opened his speech by charging:

... The administration of public education is grossly inefficient; it is the weakest phase of our great educational enterprise. In its present state, school administration is not the live product of clear, far-sighted vision, and keen insight; it is sluggish resultant of tradition, habit, routine prejudice, inertia, slightly modified by occasional and vocal outbursts of spasmodic, semi-intelligent, progressive activity. In school administration there is little thinking and leading, but much feeling and following, with faces turned more often to the rear than to the front.  

In the years that followed, Spaulding continued his criticism of the inefficient administration of the schools. In 1913, he presented his solution to this problem at the

---

10Ibid., p. 251.

first meeting of the Department of the Superintendent of the National Education Association. His topic was "Improving School Systems Through Scientific Management." His proposal, however, bore little resemblance to Taylor's approach to efficiency. Spaulding's ways and means for lowering costs consisted of eliminating small classes, increasing the sizes of others, and reducing the classes offered in the school program. 12 Spaulding's "scientific management" approach to managing school districts was one of the most popular approaches, even though there were others who attempted to interpret Taylor's ideas for the administration of schools.

John F. Bobbitt applied some of the major elements of Taylor's "scientific management" system to educational administration. Like Taylor, Bobbitt's system reduced the "worker" to automatons and placed heavy responsibility for production on management. Bobbitt's work contributed in a general way to the acceptance by school administrators of the business-industrial organizational patterns in education, but his work also contributed to the authoritarian concept of educational administration. 13 The "cult of efficiency" in


education, initiated by Spaulding, had a major impact on the preparation of school administrators at the universities. For the period from 1910 to 1930, Ellwood Cubberley and George D. Strayer were among those who had the greatest influence on the preparation of school administrators. These two men had great influence because they wrote more than all the other educational leaders of their time, because they taught more students and directed more research than other professors, and because they stayed in their field longer than their colleagues. Cubberley was the acting head of Stanford's Department of Education in 1898, and in 1917 became dean when the department became the School of Education. He was also editor of the Riverside Text Series in Education published by Houghton Mifflin— a series in which 106 books, of which he edited 103, were published by 1941.\textsuperscript{14} Cubberley's major influence originated in the textbooks he wrote on school administration. The emphases of his books were upon the organizational, legal, and financial problems of educational administration, and contained frequent references to business and industry. The books were filled with both business and industrial terminology and frequent analogies were made from these two fields to education.\textsuperscript{15}


\textsuperscript{15} Callahan, op. cit., p. 184.
Callahan describes Cubberley's system of administration as "benevolent authoritarianism."\(^{16}\) Cubberley's description of the kind of person the superintendent must be provides support to Callahan's description of him. In his most influential textbook, *Public School Administration*, Cubberley wrote:

... The man who would be superintendent of schools—the educational leader of the city—must be clean, both in person and mind; he must be temperate, both in speech and act; he must be honest and square, and be able to look men straight in the eye; and he must be possessed of a high sense of honor.\(^ {17}\) He must also be ... more than a teacher of teachers, and more than merely the executive officer of the board of education. He must be a man of affairs, possessed of good common sense, and business, and good at getting work out of people, but keeping himself free as possible from routine service so as to have time to observe, to study, to think, to plan, to advise, to guide, and to lead.\(^ {18}\)

George D. Strayer also had substantial influence on the literature in educational administration for the period from 1910 to 1930. Strayer was a professor of educational administration at Teacher's College at Columbia University, which was graduating more students in education during this period than any other institution. In 1926, Teacher's

---


\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 143.
College, Columbia University had 5,333 students; and in that year 1,383 masters degrees were awarded from that institution. According to Callahan, Strayer probably taught more courses in administration, directed more school surveys, and directed more dissertations than any other person in educational administration. Strayer believed school administrators should be trained by working on actual daily problems of the field. He wrote:

... there is no detail of the work of the administrator that may not properly become the subject of intensive investigation by those who are candidates for the doctor's degree in the professional school. As a basis for the study of scientific methods in educational administration, each student will from time to time, be required to collect and present in class, for criticism as to content and method, data from his own school system with regard to the character of the school population, census and attendance, classification and progress of children, efficiency of supervisors, provisions for the physical welfare of students, organization and work of the school board, training and tenure of teachers, salary schedules, school buildings and equipment, costs, records, reports, and the like.

It was because of Strayer's emphasis on the practical aspects of administration that much of the research during this period was on the technical, the financial, and the

20 Callahan, op. cit., p. 185.
22 George D. Strayer, Description of practicum cited in Callahan, op. cit., pp. 197-98.
mechanical problems of education. Continued interest and attention was given to the techniques and methods of the industrial community, but in the early 1930's, interest in the purpose of public education as a topic of concern reappeared after two decades of emphasis on the "scientific management" of the schools.

The empirical studies of Mayo at the Hawthorne Plant, the writings of Follett on human relations, and the studies of Kurt Lewin and his colleagues on democratic and autocratic leadership styles provided the background for the human relations movement in educational administration during the 1930's and 1940's. During this period there was an outpouring of treatises and books with a human relations-group dynamics point of view. Getzels and others cite these sample titles: The World of Work: Industrial Society and Human Relations, Practical Applications of Democratic Leadership, Human Relations in School Administration, and Improving Human Relations in School Administration. 23 Wilbur A. Yauch's general principles of school administration provided a sample of the human relations-group dynamics emphasis of this period. Yauch's general principles were:

1. Democracy is primarily concerned with human relations; therefore a most important consideration is the principal's dealings with teachers individually and collectively.

2. Simple problems of human relations almost always have wider frames of reference.

3. The single-school faculty is the most natural and efficient unit of democratic action.

4. The principal is in the most advantageous position to offer leadership to the faculty in its attempts to provide itself with democratic experiences.

5. The faculty is a complex social group which requires expert handling to achieve its own best desires.

6. The primary responsibility of the principal is that of facilitation of the interactions of the faculty group so that they may result in maximum benefit to the teachers.

7. All individuals affected by any decisions should have a share in determining its character and form.24

By the end of the 1940’s, interest in human relations movement had begun to wane, and the administrative process became a topic of interest in educational administration.

The process approach to organizational administration had earlier applications in the business community.25,26


Paul Mort and Jesse B. Sears applied the process formulation to educational administration in the late 1940's and early 1950's. The descriptive terms used by Sears to describe the functions of the educational administrator were planning, organizing, directing, co-ordinating, and controlling. This process approach to the administrative process continued in education through 1960. Concurrent with the period in which Mort and Sears published their works were two important developments which were very influential in the study of educational administration, the formation of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) and the formation of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) in 1950.

NCPEA and CPEA brought professors and administrators together and stimulated much discussion, critical analysis, and study about educational administration. The Kellogg Foundation provided about seven million dollars to fund the various projects and studies of CPEA from its beginning in

29 Ibid.  
1950 until most of the studies and projects were completed a decade later. Eight Kellogg centers were established throughout the United States to improve the practice of administration, to contribute to the knowledge about administration, and to encourage research and the development of theory in educational administration. It was perhaps the productive works of NCPEA in the areas of research, critical appraisals of preparation programs, and publications in educational administration that influenced the Kellogg Foundation into underwriting the CPEA project.

The work of CPEA and NCPEA was instrumental in focusing attention on the behavioral science approach in educational administration studies for the period from 1950 to mid-1960. In 1959 the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) was formed to continue the work begun by CPEA. Again, the Kellogg Foundation made substantial grants to UCEA to help in the establishment of the new organization. The three major purposes of UCEA


were:

1. To stimulate and produce research in educational administration.

2. To improve the preservice and inservice training of school administrators.

3. To disseminate materials growing out of research and training practices.\textsuperscript{34}

The research conducted and produced, and the theories developed by CPEA, NCPEA, and UCEA in the 1950's and 1960's have had much influence on the studies being conducted in the 1960's. The major areas of emphasis during this period include:

1. Social Systems Theory. Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba established the value of social systems theory in the investigation of problems in school administration.\textsuperscript{35}

2. Leadership Theory. John K. Hemphill postulated a theory of leadership upon which the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed.\textsuperscript{36}

The value of the LBDQ was greatly enhanced by the work of Andrew W. Halpin and B.J. Winer who factored out from the responses to the LBDQ into two dimensions fundamental to leader behavior: Initiating Structure and Consideration.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{34}Campbell and others, op. cit., p. 119.


\textsuperscript{36}John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, \textit{Leadership Behavior Description} (Columbus: Ohio State U Press, 1950).

\textsuperscript{37}Andrew W. Halpin and B.J. Winer, \textit{The Leadership Behavior of the Airplane Commander} (Columbus: Ohio State U Press, 1952).
developed by Ralph M. Stogdill. LBDQ-Form XII includes more dimensions relevant to leader behavior. These two questionnaires have been used extensively in educational administration studies in the last two decades.

3. Decision Theory. Research with a decision-theory base was begun by Andrew W. Halpin. Much of the inquiry and research in this area was taken from the social sciences and from studies of organizations other than education. The works of Chester Barnard and Herbert Simon contributed a great deal to the work done in this area.

4. Organization Theory. Organization theory includes theory concerning the study of the structure and functioning of the organizations, and the behavior of the people within them. The development of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) by Andrew Halpin and Don B. Croft has had a quantitative impact on the research studies related to educational organizations.

The momentum created by CPEA, NCPEA, and UCEA in the 1950's and 1960's did not continue because by the end of the 1960's, the emphasis on the sociological and psychological study of administration within the school as a social

---

38 Ralph M. Stogdill, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (Columbus: Ohio State U Press, 1963).


42 Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools (Chicago: Midwest Administrative Center, 1963).
system was in a state of decline. 43

The accountability movement in industry and
government during the late 1960's and 1970's was having and
is still having a great impact on education. As a result
of this movement, the behavioral science emphasis in the
study of school administration have lost much support. 44
Although there has been less emphasis in the study of
educational administration because of the accountability
movement, the contribution that was made by the research
in educational administrative behavior in the past two
decades has contributed greatly to the understanding and
theory in this field.

The history of educational administration in the
United States reflected the history of public administration
in the larger society. Like in public administration,
educational administration was first concerned with the
"cult of efficiency." The reaction to the "cult of
efficiency" movement resulted in the human relations move-
ment in educational administration. The continued concern
for the achievement of the goals of the institution as well
as concern for the needs of the individuals in those

43 Jacob W. Getzels, "Educational Administration
Twenty Years Later," Educational Administration: The
Developing Decades, eds., Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G.

44 Ibid., p. 13.
institutions resulted in the behavioral science movement in educational administration. It was in the spirit of the behavioral science movement in educational administration that this study was conceived. The research in educational administration as it relates to leader behavior will be reviewed in the next section.

Educational Administrative Behavior-The Research

The behavior of principals in their interpersonal relations with others was a major concern of this study. In this section the related research pertinent to this issue is reviewed. Five areas of the literature on administrative behavior as they relate to principal effectiveness are reviewed. The areas reviewed include (1) studies utilizing the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire, (2) studies on democratic-autocratic styles of leadership, (3) studies based on Social Systems theory, (4) studies which investigated personal variables that affect leadership, and (5) studies that utilized the FIRO-B questionnaire to investigate leader behavior.

Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire Studies

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed as an instrument to be used in the study of leaders in groups and organizations. J. K. Hemphill began his work on the LBDQ while he was at the
University of Maryland. Later, Hemphill joined the Ohio State University's Personnel Research Board and continued his work on the questionnaire. He and his associates developed a list of approximately 1,800 items describing different aspects of leader behavior. These 1,800 items were then sorted and reduced down to 150 items which were used to develop the first form of the LBDQ.

In 1957, Halpin and Winer factor analyzed responses to the LBDQ and factored out two factors, Consideration and Initiating Structure, which appeared, at that time, to be the most relevant in the study of leader behavior. As a result, a LBDQ form with 40 items measuring these two factors was developed. This LBDQ form has been used extensively in leadership studies.

In 1963, Stogdill developed LBDQ Form-XII because leadership theory and research developed and conducted since 1957 have found that the subscales Consideration and Initiating Structure alone were inadequate for describing leadership behavior fully. The LBDQ Form-XII subscales


46 J. K. Hemphill, Leader Behavior Description (Columbus: Ohio State University Personnel Research Board, 1950).

47 Halpin and Winer, loc. cit.

included the original LBDQ subscales: Consideration and Initiating Structure. The 12 subscales and the descriptions of them are presented:

1. **Representation.** The leader speaks and acts as the representative of the group.

2. **Demand Reconciliation.** The leader reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system.

3. **Tolerance of Uncertainty.** The leader is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset.

4. **Persuasiveness.** The leader uses persuasion and argument effectively and exhibits strong convictions.

5. **Initiating Structure.** The leader clearly defines his own role and lets followers know what is expected of them.

6. **Tolerance of Freedom.** The leader allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action.

7. **Role Assumption.** The leader actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.

8. **Consideration.** The leader regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contribution of followers.

9. **Productive Emphasis.** The leader applies pressure for productive output.

10. **Predictive Accuracy.** The leader exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.

11. **Integration.** The leader maintains a closely knit organization and resolves intermember conflicts.

12. **Superior Orientation.** The leader maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them, and strives for higher status.\(^{49}\)

\(^{49}\)Ibid., p. 143.
LBDQ Studies. A number of studies in education found a significant relationship between principal effectiveness and scores on the LBDQ subscales. These findings are particularly pertinent to this study because the subscale Consideration and the FIRO-B subscales Inclusion and Affection are similar in that each is a measure of a person's interpersonal relations. LBDQ's subscale Initiating Structure is similar to the FIRO-B subscale Control. Like the studies to be described, this study attempted to investigate the relationship between a principal's interpersonal behavior and his effectiveness as a principal.

Halpin found that superintendents who were described as effective leaders by both the board of education and staff had high ratings on the two LBDQ subscales Consideration and Initiating Structure. 50 Warren L. Evenson had similar findings in a study with high school principals. 51 R. G. Fast found that teacher satisfaction was positively related to the two LBDQ subscales. 52 Donald Lambert found a direct relationship between the subscales and teacher morale.

50 Andrew W. Halpin, The Leader Behavior of School Superintendents (Columbus: Ohio State University, College of Education, 1956).


as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. These findings suggest that effective principals are indeed leaders who have effective interpersonal relationships with their followers while at the same time are effective in directing the members toward the achievement of the goals of the school. This study attempted to investigate whether the interpersonal behavior of principals, as measured by FIRO-B, is a good predictor of principalship effectiveness or not.

Other studies with LBDQ in education have revealed that principals who are effective in their interpersonal relations with others and who provide adequate structure have a positive impact on student achievement and on work relationships with staff members. B. T. Keeler and J. H. M. Andrews report that high scores of principals on the Consideration and Initiating Structure scales, as described by teachers, are significantly related to student scores on a providence-wide examination in Canada. The two investigators also found that the principal's initiation of structure is positively related to staff cohesiveness. Paul McGhee noted that in schools where no formal grievances had been

---


filed by the teachers, the principal had higher Consideration scores than in schools where formal grievances were filed.\(^{55}\)

**LBDQ Form-XII Studies.** As was noted earlier, LBDQ Form-XII was developed to increase the effectiveness of the instrument's ability to measure leader behavior. LBDQ Form-XII has subscales that are related to some of the variables of this study. Related to FIRO-B's subscales Inclusion and Affection are the LBDQ Form-XII's subscales Consideration and Superior Orientation. Related to FIRO-B's subscale Control are LBDQ Form-XII's subscales Demand Reconciliation, Representation, Persuasiveness, Initiating Structure, Role Assumption, Productive Emphasis, and Integration. Related to the study variable on the reaction of principals to an educational innovation are the LBDQ Form-XII's subscales Tolerance of Uncertainty, Tolerance of Freedom, and Predictive Accuracy.

A. F. Brown found that effective principals scored higher on all of the Form-XII's subscales than ineffective principals. Brown also found that well satisfied principals scored higher on all the subscales except Tolerance of Uncertainty when they were compared with poorly satisfied

---

J. L. Schott studied non-white elementary principals with integrated staffs. Faculty job satisfaction was highly related to the principals' scores on the twelve subscales. The findings from Schott's study suggest that faculties are more satisfied in their jobs when the principals of those faculties (1) actively assume the leadership role, (2) regard the well being, status, and contribution of the faculty members, (3) reconcile conflicts in the school, (4) maintain closely knit organizations, (5) are able to tolerate uncertainty, (6) are effective in persuasion, (7) allow faculty members initiative in decision making and action, and (8) have the foresight to be able to predict the outcomes of decisions made. In Miskel's investigation with 169 principals, he found that effective principals exhibited higher risk propensity, and were described higher in Consideration and Initiating Structure by teachers than ineffective principals. The LBDQ and LBDQ Form-XII studies do indeed support the hypotheses of this study that the principal's interpersonal behavior and

---


57 J. L. Schott, "The Leader Behavior of Non-White Principals in Inner-City Elementary Schools with Integrated Teaching Staffs Under Conditions of High and Low Morale" (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1970).

58 C. Miskel, "Public School Principal's Leader Style, Organizational Situation, and Effectiveness," (Kansas City: University of Kansas, School of Education, 1974). (Mimeographed.)
his ability and willingness to adapt to change are related to his effectiveness as a leader.

LBDQ and LBDQ Form-XII have scales that describe how a leader meets the needs of the staff and how that leader behaves in achieving the objectives of the organization. These interacting dimensions determine the leadership style of the leader. It is in this context that the studies with the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire are related to the studies in the democratic-autocratic styles of leadership.

Democratic-Autocratic Styles of Leadership Studies

According to James M. Lipham, interest in the study of democratic-autocratic styles of leadership had its beginnings with Ralph White's and Ronald Lippitt's classic study which investigated the effects of democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles on groups of ten year old boys in hobby clubs. H. G. Grobman and V. A. Hines conducted a study with 80 principals. The


Researchers had the principals provide responses to eighty-five problem situations. Next, the researchers sorted the responses into two groups; the principals who had operated more democratically in more than half of the situations and those who had not. The responses were then reviewed by ten professors from the University of Florida, who sorted the responses according to the potential appropriateness of the solutions. The researchers found that the most effective solutions in each situation correlated highly with democratic behavior. 61

D. A. Jenkins and C. A. Blackman conducted a study with 50 principals. They found teachers were more satisfied working with principals who were described "low" in authoritarian attitudes and "high" in administrative ability and communication. The researchers found that principals high in administrative ability were described as high in purpose, receptive to ideas, broad in outlook, willing to assume responsibility, free from need for attention, and self-assured without hostility. 62

Ann Lieberman studied the effects of leader behavior of principals on teacher morale and professionalism.


62 D. H. Jenkins and C. A. Blackman, Antecedents and Effects of Administrative Behavior (Columbus: Ohio State University, College of Education, 1956).
Using C. W. Gordon's Teacher Leadership Scale, she found that the principals' scores on Task and Expressiveness were related to teacher scores on professionalism and morale; and she found that principal authority was negatively related to teacher professionalism and morale. 63

The findings from these studies on democratic-autocratic styles of leadership suggest that principals with democratic leadership styles tend to provide more effective solutions to problems and provide a more satisfying work environment for teachers. Autocratic leadership styles tend to be detrimental to teacher professionalism and teacher morale. The "democratic-autocratic" styles of leadership continuum appear to be related to the FIRO-B in the following ways: (1) very high Control scores with low Inclusion scores are probably related to autocratic styles of leadership, and (2) moderate Control scores with moderate Inclusion scores are probably related to democratic styles of leadership; low Control scores and high Inclusion scores are probably related to laissez-faire styles of leadership.

The behavior of leaders involved in democratic style of leadership and the behaviors involved in the transactional leadership style of social systems theory are related. A democratic leader is concerned with the welfare

63 Ann Lieberman, "The Effects of Principal Leadership on Teacher Morale, Professionalism, and Style in the Classroom" (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1969).
and participation of the followers in the process of achieving the organization's goals. Likewise, the transactional leader is concerned with the needs dispositions of group members while at the same time the leader is concerned with the expectations of the institution.

Social Systems Theory

J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba conceived the school as a social system involving two dimensions that are independent and at the same time interactive. The dimensions are (1) the individual dimension which includes the personalities and needs dispositions of the members of the school staff (idiographic dimension), and (2) the institutional dimension with the roles and expectations of the school for the members within the organization (nomothetic dimension).

Lipham and James Hoeh, Jr. wrote about the function of the principal in the social system of the school. They wrote:

... it is a unique function of the principal to integrate the expectations of the organization and the dispositions of the individual in a way that is simultaneously fruitful for the organization and satisfying for the individual.

Three "styles" of leadership mentioned frequently in social systems theory are "nomothetic," "idiographic," and

---

64 Getzels and Guba, loc. cit.

"transactional" leadership styles. Moser defined these terms as follows:

1. The nomothetic style is characterized by behavior which stresses goal accomplishment, rules and regulations, and centralized authority at the expense of the individual. Effectiveness is rated in terms of behavior toward accomplishing the school's objectives.

2. The idiographic style is characterized by behavior which stresses the individuality of people, minimum rules and regulations, decentralized authority, and highly individualistic relationships with subordinates. The primary objective is to keep subordinates happy and contented.

3. The transactional style is characterized by behavior which stresses goal accomplishment, but which also makes provision for individual need fulfillment. The transactional leader balances nomothetic and idiographic behavior and he judiciously utilizes each style as the occasion demands.

Robert Moser studied principals in twelve school districts and found that principals who were rated most effective by superintendents exhibited transactional leadership styles. A study by Jean R. Hills also suggested that the transactional leadership style was the most effective leader style.

D. J. Willower classified 40 principals into two categories: principals using a nomothetic leader style and

---


67 Jean R. Hills, A New Concept of Staff Relations (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1964).
principals using an idiographic style tend to regard teachers as professional persons to a greater extent than those principals using a nomothetic leadership style.

The findings from studies based on social systems theory suggest that effective principals are principals who are able to achieve the expectations of the institution while at the same time are able to satisfy the interpersonal needs of the faculty. These findings support the hypothesis of this study which proposed that a principal's effectiveness is related to his interpersonal relations with others. Personal variables are an important aspect of leadership and are related to the kind of leadership style a person exhibits.

Personal Variables and Leadership Studies

There have been many studies that have attempted to ascertain the personality traits that make a leader. There has also been criticism of this approach to the study of leadership, and yet Ralph M. Stogdill, the person who has probably analyzed and synthesized more studies on leadership than anyone else, suggested that the criticism was unwarranted. He wrote:

Research on the characteristics of leaders indicates that they do indeed exhibit personality,

---

and personality is an important factor in emergence as a leader and in maintaining the role. Early theoretical attempts to define leadership of personality produced a reaction which in some writers denied the importance of this quality, which was said to be determined by the demands of the situation. Most recent theorists maintain that leader characteristics and situational demands interact to determine the extent to which a given leader will prove successful in a group.69

Stogdill examined 124 leadership studies which were completed prior to 1948. He found that leaders and administrators possessed the following characteristics to a greater degree than average group members: intelligence and scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibility, social participation, initiative, persistence, confidence, popularity, ability to adapt, and verbal facility.70 From his survey, Stogdill concluded that a person does not automatically become a leader because he possessed a certain set of personality characteristics. He explained:

A person does not a leader become by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers.71

Cecil A. Gibb also surveyed the leadership literature. He


71 Ibid., p. 71.
listed the following criteria that distinguishes leaders: physical and constitutional factors (height, weight, physique, energy, health, and appearance), intelligence, self confidence, sociability, will (initiative, persistence, ambition), and surgency (cordiality, expressiveness, originality). He emphasized, as did Stogdill and others, that different characteristics of personality are needed in different leadership situations. For example, the personality characteristics needed to be a principal would be different from the personality characteristics needed to be an officer in the armed forces of the United States.

Ralph Kimbrough, using the Tennessee Rating Guide he developed, conducted a study with 48 high school principals. He identified the characteristics of effective administrators and ineffective administrators from the responses to his guide. He found the major variables that distinguished between effective and ineffective principals were: good interpersonal relationships, dependability, good decision making and problem solving, inclusion of others in policy formation, intelligence, and the study of new educational techniques. Kimbrough's findings are


related closely to the objectives of this study which include interpersonal relations, inclusion of others in decision making, and acceptance of educational innovations.

James M. Lipham conducted a study of 84 principals. The principals were rated by the superintendent and four associate superintendents on the effectiveness of the principals. Effective principals scored higher on the following personal variables:

- **Social Ability.** The principal associates successfully with others in the solution of problems. Helping teachers with problems of instruction is his greatest job satisfaction.

- **Emotional Control.** In reacting to frustrating, confusing, and irritating situations, the effective principal exercises greater emotional control than does ineffective principals.

- **Feelings of Security.** The effective principal is secure in his home and work environment. He views family relationships with pride and satisfaction, and regards authority figures as friendly and serving constructive purposes.

- **Activity Drive.** The effective principal is inclined to engage in strong and purposeful activity. While on the job, he seems particularly sensitive to the pressing responsibilities of the principalship.

- **Achievement Drive.** Keen achievement and mobility drives are characteristic of the effective principal. He has set specific goals for further study, stresses better job performance as a goal in life, and views the school superintendency as a desirable ultimate vocational objective.

W. R. Borg, V. F. Burr, and A. Sylvester summarized the leadership characteristics from 25 studies of educational administrators. The criteria they found to be most relevant to effectiveness of principals were: personality, administrative ability, general knowledge, professional knowledge, cooperation, tact, stimulation of co-workers, social activity, good judgment, originality, communicativeness, and attitude toward teachers.\(^7\)

In 1974, Stogdill published the results of a survey he had made on the leadership studies conducted since 1945. From his synthesis of the studies, he developed a list of leadership characteristics that appeared to be most often found in leaders. The list of characteristics are divided into three groups by how frequently the characteristics appear as a relevant variable in the literature. The most frequently occurring factors are descriptive of various skills of the leader. They include the following:

- Social and Interpersonal Skills
- Technical Skills
- Administrative Skills
- Intellectual Skills
- Leadership Effectiveness and Achievement
- Social Nearness and Friendliness
- Group Task Supportiveness
- Task Motivation and Application

These factors describe the leader as making effective use of interpersonal, administrative skills, technical skills,

\(^7\) W. R. Borg, V. F. Burr, and A. Sylvester, *Four Criteria of Principal Effectiveness* (Logan, Utah: Utah State University, 1961).
and intellectual skills which indicates that a leader is highly task motivated but also maintains close, friendly, personal relationships.

The next most frequent set of factors is concerned with the leader's relationship with his group. These factors are as follows:

- Maintaining Cohesive Work Group
- Maintaining Co-ordination and Teamwork
- Maintaining Standards of Performance
- Informal Group Control (group freedom)
- Nurturant Behavior

These factors describe the leader as being concerned with group performance while being concerned with supportive behavior as well.

Next in frequency are factors concerned with personal characteristics of the leader. These factors are:

- Willingness to Assume Responsibility
- Emotional Balance and Control
- Ethical Conduct and Personal Integrity
- Communicative, Verbality
- Ascendence, Dominance
- Personal Soundness, Good Character
- Physical Energy
- Experience and Activity
- Mature, Cultured
- Courage, Daring
- Aloof, Distant
- Creative, Independent
- Conforming

The leader here is described as energetic, emotionally well balanced, accepts responsibility, able to communicate, and is of good character. The above list has several terms that

are contradictory. This is so because situational factors do influence the kind of leadership trait that is most effective.

The findings from the studies on personal variables, as they relate to leadership, suggest that a person's personality and interpersonal relations skills indeed are important factors in leadership effectiveness. An instrument that has been used over two decades in the measurement of interpersonal behavior is the FIRO-B.

FIRO-B Studies

The review of the literature on studies utilizing the FIRO-B questionnaire is especially pertinent to this study because the FIRO-B questionnaire was one of the instruments used in this study for collecting data. The FIRO-B questionnaire has been used in many studies since its development by William Schutz in 1957. By 1972, The Mental Measurements Yearbook by Buros had listed over 170 studies that have utilized the FIRO-B instrument. The studies relevant to this investigation which have used the FIRO-B questionnaire are reviewed in this section.

The relationship between the leader behavior characteristics of 35 elementary principals with the organizational climate of their schools was investigated by Thomas W. Wiggins. Using the t-test, Wiggins found a significant relationship between the interpersonal relations orientations of principals as measured with FIRO-B and the
organizational climates of their schools as measured with the OCDQ. These findings suggest there is a positive relationship between the interpersonal behaviors of principals and the organizational climate of schools.

Hightower found that the FIRO-B scales of Expressed Affection and Expressed Inclusion together were more related to the rating of principal effectiveness than the other four scales. The multiple r for the two combined scales was 0.29. Hightower's findings suggest that there is a weak positive relationship between the FIRO-B subscales Expressed Affection and Expressed Inclusion and the rated effectiveness of secondary principals.

Rex W. Hagans studied the relationships between the scores of 116 elementary principals on the FIRO-B and the scores of their schools on the subtests of the OCDQ as a means of learning more about the interdependence of the principal's interpersonal orientation and school climate. Hagans used multiple regression and analysis of variance to analyze the data collected in this study. In summary, this study found little relationship between the interpersonal orientations of principals as measured by FIRO-B and school climate.

77 Thomas W. Wiggins, "Leader Behavior Characteristics and Organizational Climate" (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School and University Center, 1968).

climate as measured by OCDQ.\textsuperscript{79}

The relationships between the interpersonal orientations of 119 elementary principals and their leader behavior was investigated by David J. Parks. FIRO-B, LBDQ Form-XII, and a biographical information sheet were the instruments used to collect the data for this study. Using analysis of variance, Parks found significant relationships between FIRO-B's Expressed Inclusion scores and the following LBDQ Form-XII scales: Tolerance of Uncertainty, Tolerance of Freedom, and Production Emphasis. No relationships were found between FIRO-B's Expressed Control and Expressed Affection scores and any of the leader behaviors measured by the LBDQ Form-XII.\textsuperscript{80} Parks' findings suggest that principals who include others in their activities are able to tolerate uncertainty, allow initiative in teachers, and are interested in the production output of teachers.

J. D. Fultineer used FIRO-B and LBDQ Form-XII to investigate leader behaviors and the interpersonal needs of 23 principals. Fultineer found FIRO-B scores were not highly related to the leader behavior scores on the LBDQ Form-XII, which meant that Fultineer was unable to find any

\textsuperscript{79}Rex W. Hagans, "School Climate and Interpersonal Orientations of Elementary School Principals" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1969).

\textsuperscript{80}David H. Parks, "A Study of Relationships Between Interpersonal Relations Orientation and Leader Behaviors of Elementary Principals" (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1970).
relationships between interpersonal behavior and leadership behavior. 81

W. J. Underwood and L. J. Krafft investigated the relationship between managerial effectiveness and FIRO-B scores. Their hypothesis regarding the relationship of the FIRO-B scores with effectiveness, work relationships, task performance, and sociometric choice were not confirmed. 82

William Schutz, the author of FIRO-B and FIRO theory, conducted a statewide study involving 5,847 participants in California, but did not include FIRO-B as one of the instruments used in the project. Schutz explains:

When the final battery was being reduced to its final form a decision was made to retain interpersonal feelings (FIRO-F, feeling) as an individual variable and to omit interpersonal behavior (FIRO-B, behavior). Space and time considerations were the main determinants of this decision. Hindsight indicates that retaining FIRO-B as well as FIRO-F would have enhanced the picture. . . . 83

The pilot study to the investigation mentioned will be described in this section because it used FIRO-B for data collection, whereas the major project had not used FIRO-B.


The goal of the pilot study was to develop more effective selection procedures for public school administrators. The sample for the pilot study involved 1,307 participants from four communities in California. The sample included parents, community persons, central office personnel, and 47 principals.

The FIRO theory of interpersonal behavior was used as a starting point in this pilot study. The theory was revised and extended considerably during the study. A number of new instruments were developed to include intellectual, cognitive, and sociological dimensions into the theory.

FIRO-B was used in this pilot study to test the relationship between a teacher's or a parent's rating of a principal's effectiveness as it related to the success of the principal's interpersonal relations and compatibility with teachers and parents. The analysis of the results of this relationship resulted in a mean correlation of 0.20 with a range from 0.17 to 0.26 on the six areas measured.

The use of the FIRO-B in the pilot study differs from the use of the FIRO-B in this dissertation. The pilot study used FIRO-B to find the relationship between the compatibility between principals and their interactors with the interactors' ratings of the principals' effectiveness. The present study used FIRO-B to find the relationship between the rated effectiveness of principals with their scores on the FIRO-B questionnaire.
The findings of Schutz's pilot study indicated a weak positive correlation between rated effectiveness of principals and the compatibility of principals with their interactors as measured by FIRO-B. The studies using FIRO-B as an instrument to investigate relationships between interpersonal relations and leadership have resulted in some conflicting findings. Some studies do suggest that there are relationships between leader behavior and organizational climate with interpersonal behavior as measured by FIRO-B; other studies did not find any significant relationships in these areas.

In reviewing the research literature it was found that leader behavior and leadership style is indeed related to the effectiveness of the principal as well as to the satisfaction of the employees with whom the principal interacted. It was also found that effectiveness of principals is related to personal characteristics and interpersonal behaviors of those principals. Based on this review, it has been hypothesized that the interpersonal behaviors of effective principals are significantly different from the interpersonal behavior of less effective principals. The research on the effectiveness of principals as it relates to innovation will be reviewed in the next section.

**Educational Innovation and the Principal**

A major hypothesis of this study proposed that
effective principals will react more positively to an educational innovation than ineffective principals. Studies on leadership behaviors of principals as they related to innovations are reviewed in this section.

Jan W. Jacobs investigated a sample of principals to ascertain whether the leadership behaviors of principals high in educational innovation differed from leadership behaviors of principals low in educational innovation. Jacobs found that principals high in educational innovation received significantly higher ratings on the following LBDQ Form-XII leadership dimensions: Initiating Structure, Predictive Accuracy, Representation, Integration, Consideration, and Persuasiveness. Jacobs concluded: "One of the important factors in instituting educational change is the leadership behavior of the principal."84

R. C. Williams and others compared four schools high in organizational renewal with four schools low in organizational renewal. The behavior of principals was described by teachers using the LBDQ Form-XII. Principals in high organizational renewal schools were described higher on personal leader behaviors, while those principals low in organizational renewal were described higher in normative

behaviors (Production Emphasis in particular).\(^{85}\) These two studies affirmed that leadership behavior as measured by LBDQ Form-XII did indeed relate positively with the educational innovativeness of principals.

R. T. Sharpe studied the relationship between the staff evaluations of 15 principals with leader behavior. He found that principal effectiveness was highly related to norm conformity and that the ideal principal was described as high in receptivity to change, and high in communication but low in separativism from teachers.\(^{86}\) Therefore, Sharpe's study supports the suggestion that principal effectiveness is related to receptivity to change and perhaps innovation.

C. Miskel studied the effectiveness of 169 principals as perceived by subordinates. Miskel found subordinate perceptions of principal effectiveness were significantly related to organizational innovativeness and support.\(^{87}\)

In reviewing the research literature it was found that there are significant relationships between the

---


\(^{87}\) C. Miskel, "Principal Effectiveness and the School Climate," (Kansas City: University of Kansas, School of Education, 1974). (Mimeographed.)
effectiveness of principals and their reaction to innovation. Based on this review, it was hypothesized that there was a significant relationship between the rated effectiveness of principals and the principals' reactions to the educational innovation, Bilingual/Crosscultural education. The next section will contain the historical review of B/CC education in the United States.

Bilingual/Crosscultural Education-An Overview

The legal mandate for Bilingual/Crosscultural education, on the national level, had its beginnings with the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 provided supplemental funds for the educational needs of limited-English speaking students. The legislation was approved by Congress as a result of a series of Congressional hearings about the plight of the limited-English speaking students in the nation's schools.

Two years after the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued its 1970, May 25th memorandum to the nation's state school chiefs. The memorandum stipulated that federally assisted school districts with more than five percent national origin minority group children have an

obligation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to equalize educational opportunity for language minority students. The memorandum stated:

Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin-minority group children from effective participation in the education program offered by the school district, the school district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students.

Even though there were mandates to schools to meet the educational needs of limited-English students, school districts were slow in compliance. As a result, there were a number of lawsuits filed on behalf of the limited-English students. The Lau vs. Nichols suit was perhaps the suit that has had the greatest impact on improving the educational opportunities of the nation's limited-English speaking students. Basing its decision on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and HEW regulations, the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously ruled that the San Francisco Unified School District had illegally discriminated against 1,800 limited-English speaking Chinese American school children by denying them a meaningful opportunity to participate in the public educational program. The 1974

---


court decision said:

Basic English skills are at the very core of what these public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that, before a child can effectively participate in the educational program, he must already have acquired those basic skills is to make a mockery of public education. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences incomprehensible and in no way meaningful.92

This Supreme Court case has been the basis upon which other court decisions have been won in favor of the limited-English speaking student.93,94,95

In the same year that the Supreme Court rendered its decision in Lau vs. Nichols, Congress passed the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 197496 as a part of the Education Amendments of 1974. The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 was directed primarily toward appropriate remedies in racial desegregation cases, but it also in part provided for language minorities:

Sec. 1703. No state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, or national origin . . . or by the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation

92 Ibid., p. 556.
93 Serna vs. Portales, 499 F2d 1147 (10th Cir. 1974).
95 Rios vs. Read 75 C. 296 (1977).
by students in its instructional programs. 97

Unlike Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 applied to all school districts irrespective of the receipt of federal funds.

By 1975, 24 states permitted instruction in a language other than English which was twice the number of states that had permitted instruction in a language other than English in 1971. 98 Bilingual/Crosscultural education will continue to grow in the United States to the benefit of the limited-English speaking students in the schools. The challenge is to the educational administrators to provide the effective leadership necessary for this educational program to continue to grow and thrive.

Summary

The historical and research literature related to this investigation were reviewed in this chapter. The review of the research literature related to administrative behavior has found that leader behavior and leadership style are indeed related to the effectiveness of the principal. Secondly, the review has revealed that there are personal as well as interpersonal variables that are

97 Ibid.

related to principal effectiveness. And thirdly, the research reviewed has suggested that principal effectiveness is related to how the principal reacts to innovation.

The methods and procedures used in this research study are reported in the next chapter. The analysis of the research data are reported in Chapter IV and the recommendations and conclusions are reported in the last chapter.
Chapter III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGIES

The procedures and methodologies used in this study are reported in this chapter. The four sections of this chapter include (1) the data source, (2) the instruments used in the study, (3) the procedures of the study, and (4) the methods used to treat the data.

The Data Source

Included in this section is a description of the data source. It includes descriptions of the population, community, the school district, and the district's B/CC education program.

The Population

The population for this study was composed of 30 elementary school principals; six of whom were women. Twenty-eight principals had school assignments for the 1978-79 school year, one principal was on sabbatical leave, and one principal was on special assignment. More than half of the study population had ten years of principal experience or less. The span of experience ranged from a person employed as a new principal for the 1978-79 school year to persons who have had 25 years of experience. The mean
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number of years of principalship experience was 11 years; the median was 9.67 years; and the category that had the greatest number of principals in it was principals with 0-5 years of experience--40 percent of the principals fell in this category. The years of experience by five year increments and the percentage and the number of participants in each category are presented in Table 1.

More than 50 percent of the principals had five years or less of B/CC experience. The mean number of years of B/CC experience was 6.47 years; the median was 5.25 years; and the mode was 3 years. The principals' number of years of B/CC experience by five year increments and the number and percentage of principals in each category are presented in Table 2.

The ethnic composition of the 30 participants included Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White. The number and percentage in each category are presented in Table 3.

The Community

In 1978, the incorporated area of the city in which this study was conducted covered 40 square miles. The metropolitan area had a population of 185,000.

Ethnic Composition. At the time of the 1975 San Joaquin County census, 82 percent of the city's population was White (Hispanics were included in this percentage) and 18 percent of the population included Black, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, American Indian, and Hawaiian.
Table 1

A Frequency Distribution of the Number of Years of Principalship Experience of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

A Frequency Distribution of the Number of Years of B/CC Experience of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of B/CC Experience</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

A Frequency Distribution of the Ethnic Composition of the Study's Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Category</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The more detailed 1970 United States census indicated that 67 percent of the population was White, 19 percent was Hispanic, 8 percent was Black, 3 percent was Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, Indian, and "others" together formed approximately 4 percent of the overall count.

**Employment and Income.** The total employment in the city's labor market in September, 1977 was 144,700 which included 114,800 non-agricultural wage and salary workers and 29,900 seasonal agricultural wage and salary workers. There were approximately 283 widely diversified manufacturing plants in the metropolitan area in 1978. The major non-manufacturing industries were in the areas of government, education, and the military. The median income in 1975 for a family was $14,594. In 1975, there were 5,377 poor families in the metropolitan area whose gross yearly income was below $6,490.

**Educational Institutions.** The city had two private colleges and a two-year community college with a combined enrollment of 26,000 students. It had two public unified school districts and fourteen parochial schools with a combined student enrollment of over 36,000 students.

The community where this study was conducted offered a wide variety of employment and educational opportunities. The city's multi-ethnic population contributed to the cultural richness and diversity of this community.
The School District

The Grade Organization. Under a 1977 organizational plan adopted to bring about desegregation, ten of the elementary schools were primary schools (grades 1-3) paired with nine other schools that served only intermediate level students (grades 4-6). Under this plan two regular kindergarten through sixth grade elementary schools were paired together; one of the schools in the pair was designated the primary school and it housed all students in first through third grades from the two schools, while the other school was designated the intermediate school and it housed all students in fourth through sixth grades from the two schools. These schools brought children from all neighborhoods together into schools that were desegregated. Six schools served racially balanced neighborhoods with elementary schools that served kindergarten through sixth grade. Three other schools were opened as "magnet" schools focused on B/CC education, fundamental skills, and open classroom instruction. All of the kindergarten students attended their neighborhood schools.

The Student Population. The average student population for the 28 schools was approximately 448 pupils. The size of the schools ranged from a low of 81 pupils to a high of 832 pupils for the 1978-79 school year. The median school size was 483 students. Sixty-eight percent of the schools had student populations greater than four hundred. A
frequency distribution of the schools by school size is presented in Table 4.

There were 13,106 students in the 28 schools that were administered by the participants of this investigation during the 1978-79 school year. Approximately 36 percent of the student population received assistance from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children programs. More than 50 percent of the district's student population was composed of minority students during the 1978-79 school year. The ethnic composition of the student population by percentages is presented in Table 5.

The Teacher Population. The 28 schools in which the participants worked in 1978 had 799 teachers. The mean salary of these teachers was approximately $17,965 per annum. Approximately 69 percent of the teaching population during the 1978-79 school year were White, while 31 percent were minority. The ethnic composition of the teaching staff of the district for the 1978-79 school year is presented in Table 6.

The educational needs of the diverse student population of this district were in part met by the vigorous affirmative action hiring program of the district in the past seven years. The district's B/CC program was another program implemented to address the educational needs of students who were linguistically and culturally different from the mainstream.
Table 4

A Frequency Distribution of Schools by School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 199</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 299</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 - 399</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 499</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 599</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 - 699</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 - 799</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 899</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

The Ethnic Composition of the Student Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

The Ethnic Composition of the Teacher Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The school district in which this study was conducted has demonstrated much initiative and commitment to B/CC education. In 1968, it had one of the first state funded B/CC pilot programs. In 1976, the district completely renovated a three story building to house the B/CC program's central administrative offices, meeting rooms, and workrooms. The district has provided monies from its own general fund to support B/CC programs since 1975. In 1975, the district allocated $350,000 for B/CC education, $500,000 was allocated in 1976, and the same amount was allocated in 1977, however, in 1978 the amount was reduced to $209,000. The passage of Proposition 13, a California taxpayers initiative, which greatly reduced the amount of local revenue available for public schools was the reason given by the district for reducing its allocation to B/CC education.

There were 1,140 identified limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students in the 28 elementary schools in the 1978-79 school year. The total funds allotted to provide services to these students for the 1978-79 school year was $980,294. The learning environment of the LES/NES students was supervised by 60 bilingual teachers and 91 bilingual instructional aides. The administrative and support staff for this program included a program director, a Title VII co-ordinator, two resource teachers, seven specialists, a multicultural consultant, and clerical staff.
Included in this program was the multilingual/multicultural "magnet" school mentioned earlier. This school was staffed with a principal and ten teachers.

The multilingual/multicultural "magnet" school was one of three alternative schools established under the district's desegregation plan to allow parents an opportunity to participate in a voluntary program of busing for desegregation. In addition to the regular English language curriculum, the school had a curriculum that addressed the needs of the limited/English speaking/non-English speaking students of Chinese, Filipino, and Mexican heritage. The school's program maintained the child's primary language and culture while the child was making the transition into the English curriculum. Approximately one third of the school's student population was fluent-English speaking; these students had the opportunity to learn at least one of the other languages taught as the school as well as receive an excellent multicultural education.

The Instruments Used in the Study

This section has three parts: (1) the description of the FIRO-B questionnaire, (2) the description of the B/CC Education and Principal Information Survey and a description about its development, and (3) the description of the process used to rate the effectiveness of the participants as principals.
FIRO-B

"F.I.R.O.-B." is an abbreviation for "Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior." According to William Schutz, the author of FIRO-B, the two purposes for developing FIRO-B were:

1. to construct a measure of how an individual acts in interpersonal situations,
2. to construct a measure that will lead to the prediction of interaction between people, based upon data from the measuring instrument alone.¹

FIRO-B is a 54 item questionnaire which measures 3 fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relationships: "inclusion," "control," and "affection." Inclusion assesses the degree to which a person associates with others. Control measures the extent to which a person assumes responsibility, makes decisions, or dominates people. The Affection score reflects the degree to which a person becomes emotionally involved with others. For each dimension, there are two subscales: "expressed behavior," and "wanted behavior." Expressed behavior represents the persons expressed or manifest behavior; behavior that is overt, observable behavior in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Wanted behavior represents what the person wants from other people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection.² Examples of each of the scales

¹ Schutz, 1966, op. cit., p. 58.
² Ryan, op. cit., p. 5.
are presented:

Expressed Inclusion
I make efforts to include other people in my activities and to get them to include me in theirs. I try to belong, to join social groups, and to be with people as much as possible.

Wanted Inclusion
I want other people to include me in their activities and to invite me to belong, even if I do not make an effort to be included.

Expressed Control
I try to exert control and influence over things. I take charge of things, I tell other people what to do.

Wanted Control
I want others to control and influence me. I want other people to tell me what to do.

Expressed Affection
I make efforts to become close to people. I express friendly and affectionate feelings, I try to be personal and intimate.

Wanted Affection
I want others to express friendly and affectionate feelings toward me and to try to be close to me.

FIRO Theory. The work leading toward FIRO theory began in 1952, when Schutz was working at the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington D.C. The theory was worked on and refined until it was published in its final form in 1958.

Schutz summarized his FIRO theory in these words:

There are three interpersonal need areas, inclusion, control, and affection, sufficient for the prediction of interpersonal behavior. Orientations which an individual acquires toward behavior in these areas are relatively invariant over time. Compatibility of two or more persons depends on (a)

---

3 Schutz, 1977, op. cit., p. 29.
their ability to satisfy reciprocally each other's interpersonal needs, (b) their complementarity with respect to originating and receiving behavior in each need area, (c) their similarity with respect to the amount of interchange they desire with other people in each need area. "Roles" may be defined in terms of interpersonal requirements in such a way that a measurement can be made of the interaction being experienced. If, for example, individuals are engaged in inclusion behavior, or involved in a primary inclusion relation, then compatibility in the inclusion area is the most important determinant of their compatibility in the situation itself. Areas and degrees of compatibility are therefore distinguishable which are roughly comparable to personal relations that flourish under one set of circumstances but cannot withstand the stress of a different type of relation.

Every interpersonal relation follows the same general developmental sequence. It starts with inclusion behavior, is followed by control behavior and, finally, affection behavior. This cycle may recur. When the relation approaches termination it reverses direction, and investment from the relation is withdrawn in the order of affection, control, and inclusion.

From these postulates it is theoretically possible to predict the course of a relation, if we know the interpersonal orientations of the individual members of the relation and the interpersonal description of the circumstances under which they will interact.4

In 1959, Schutz participated in a research project entitled Procedures for Identifying Persons with Potential for Public School Administrative Positions. It was with this project that Schutz expanded his theory to make it more relevant to the study of school administrators. The 1959 project was a pilot study for a major study that was reported in Leaders of Schools: FIRO Theory Applied to

---

Administrators published in 1977. A summary of Schutz's application of FIRO theory to school administrators follows:

FIRO theory provides a framework for describing administrative functioning and for integrating the empirical work previously summarized with personal experience in the areas of education, administration, and interpersonal relations. The first area of administrative functioning is the inclusion of all available resources for doing the administrative job. The various people and groups that may help administer a school or school district must be identified and developed optimally by the administrator. This area is called effective use of human resources.

Controlling these elements in such a way as to organize and integrate their contributions most usefully is the second major area of administrative functioning called task effectiveness.

Creating a personal bond among the people involved in the educational enterprise is essential for the continuation of the coordinated activity required to run a school efficiently. Ability to create these successful affectional relations is called interpersonal effectiveness.

The closest approximation to measuring the ultimate criteria of administrative success mentioned earlier is to measure the abilities of the administrator most likely to lead to the accomplishment of the ultimate goals. These are the administrator's ability to use available human resources effectively, effectiveness in the task requirements of the job, and interpersonal effectiveness.

FIRO-B's Reliability. Two types of reliability are relevant to FIRO-B, reproducibility and stability. The coefficient of internal consistency is the measure based on internal analysis of the data obtained on a single trial. Essentially this measure indicates the degree to which the items are measuring the same thing.

---


6 Ibid.
On 1,543 subjects tested on the scales, the mean coefficient of internal consistency was 0.94.\textsuperscript{7}

The second measure of reliability was the measure of stability which refers to the correlation between test scores on retest scores after a time lapse. For FIRO-B this is important, since interpersonal orientations are presumably stable traits. The mean coefficient of stability on a test-retest of FIRO-B over a four week period was 0.78.\textsuperscript{8}

**FIRO-B's Validity.** Validity is the extent to which a test measures what it was designed to measure.\textsuperscript{9} The content validity and concurrent validity of the FIRO-B questionnaire is discussed. Content validity is determined by showing how well the content of the questionnaire items samples the class of situations about which conclusions are to be drawn. If the theory underlying the use of the Guttman scales is accepted, then the content validity is a property of all legitimate cumulative scales, and therefore of all FIRO-B scales.\textsuperscript{10} The theory underlying the use of the Guttman scales is discussed by Schutz in more detail.\textsuperscript{11}

The second measure of validity is concurrent validity which is evaluated by showing how well test scores

\begin{align*}
\text{7 Schutz, 1966, op. cit., p. 77.} & \quad \text{8 Ibid., p. 78-9.} \\
\text{9 Lewis R. Aiken, "Glossary For Educational Measurement and Research" (Stockton: University of the Pacific, School of Education, 1977), p. 20. (Mimeographed.)} & \\
\text{10 Schutz, 1966, op. cit., p. 66.} & \quad \text{11 Ibid., p. 59-60.}
\end{align*}
correspond to a measure of concurrent criterion performance. This validity area refers to studies which attempt to demonstrate differences, on the basis of the new measuring instrument, between already existent groups or individuals with already known attitudes. Schutz reviewed the test scores on twelve occupational groups and found the differences among the occupational groups to be striking and consistent with occupational stereotypes. These differences on the test scores between groups tend to support the concurrent validity of the FIRO-B scales.\(^{12}\)

**B/CC Education and Principal Information Survey**

The survey was developed to gather data on the reaction of principals to the educational innovation, Bilingual Crosscultural education, and to gather data on the principals' experience and needs in the B/CC area.

**Survey Description.** The first part of the survey had 17 items. The reactions of the principals to B/CC education was obtained on 14 Likert type scales. Each scale had a continuum that went from a most negative reaction to B/CC education to a most positive reaction to B/CC education. The other 3 items of the 17 items on B/CC education gathered data about the types of B/CC education programs in the principals' schools and data on the amount

\(^{12}\)Ibid., pp. 66-77.
of B/CC education experience of the principals.

The second part of the questionnaire collected information about (1) the number of years the participant had been a principal, (2) the principal's assessment of needs in twelve areas of inservice training, and a self-appraisal of his/her effectiveness as a principal.

Survey Development Process. The advice of ten experts was sought in the development of the questionnaire. Their advice was sought to insure the research soundness of the questionnaire, to insure that items would gather the necessary information for the investigation, and to insure that the items measured what they were intended to measure. The panel included a professor/director of a B/CC doctoral fellows program, a professor of research design, a professor of school administration, and a professor of educational sociology. The rest of the panel consisted of practitioners from the field of education. This group included a district director of B/CC education, a district B/CC staff development and curriculum development coordinator, a B/CC specialist, a district elementary superintendent, a district general curriculum consultant, and a district program evaluator.

The questionnaire was developed over a six week period during which drafts were brought to the experts personally for input and refinement. Each expert commented on the questionnaire on the average of 3-4 times during the
development period.

**Pilot Test.** The refined draft of the questionnaire was administered to a group of ten doctoral fellows at the University of the Pacific. The fellows represented a broad spectrum of B/CC education and had from three to ten years experience in B/CC education. The pilot test provided some useful suggestions and some minor refinements to the questionnaire.

**Questionnaire's Reliability.** It is possible to obtain a measure of reliability from a single administration of a questionnaire by the split-half procedure. The instrument is administered to a group of subjects, and later the items are divided into two halves, usually odd and even items. A Pearson correlation coefficient between the two scores is calculated. Then the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula is used to compensate for the fact that the reliability was estimated from a questionnaire one-half the length of the final form. The above procedure was used to determine the reliability of the B/CC Education and Principal Information Survey. The procedure resulted in a Spearman-Brown prophecy coefficient of 0.94. Most test makers and researchers are satisfied if they obtain reliability coefficient of 0.70 and above but are

---

dissatisfied if they obtain coefficients below 0.70.\textsuperscript{14}

**The Procedures**

The procedures used in this study are presented in this section. The procedures include (1) the rating of the principals on effectiveness, (2) stating the study's hypotheses in null form, (3) gathering the data, (4) scoring the questionnaires, and (5) preparing the data for computer processing.

**The Principal Effectiveness Rating Procedure**

Four persons, from the district's central administrative offices rated the effectiveness of each of the principals. Each of the raters have had direct contact with each of the participants and knew of the performance of these administrators.

**The Process.** The raters were provided with a set of 30 cards with the names of the participants on them. Using criteria provided by the investigator, the raters sorted the cards into five groups according to the effectiveness of the participants as perceived by the raters. The five groups of cards were sorted into groups from the least effective to the most effective administrators.

The criteria for the rating process was selected because it was consistent with what constituted effective administrative behavior in the educational leadership literature reviewed in Chapter II. Another reason for selecting this set of criteria was that the criteria appeared to be related to the interpersonal behaviors measured by FIRO-B's scales Inclusion, Control, and Affection. The criteria used by raters for rating the effectiveness of principals are presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effective</th>
<th>More Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seen as imposing methods on others; sometimes seen as unpleasant, and interested only in short-run output.</td>
<td>Seen as having well defined methods for accomplishing goals that are helpful to the followers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as initiating more structure than is needed by the group and often appears not to be genuine in interpersonal relationships.</td>
<td>Seen as satisfying the needs of the group for setting goals and for organizing work, but also providing high levels of socioemotional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as primarily interested in harmony; sometimes seen as unwilling to accomplish a task if it risks disrupting a relationship or losing a &quot;good person&quot; image.</td>
<td>Seen as having implicit trust in people and as primarily concerned with facilitating their goal accomplishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as providing little structure or socio-emotional support when needed by the group.</td>
<td>Seen as appropriately delegating to subordinates decisions about how the work should be done and providing little socio-emotional support where little is needed.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insuring Anonymity. To insure independent responses and to insure confidentiality, the raters were asked not to discuss the study with each other or with any other person. One of the raters who would normally have access to evaluative data about the principals was willing to summarize the ratings of the other raters and to code the surveys. When each rater was finished with his/her rating of the participants, they gave their cards to the coder who computed the arithmetic mean of the ratings for each participant and then ranked all the principals from least effective to the most effective. The rank of the principals was written down and a code for the identities of the participants was assigned to each rank. The only person that had access to the rankings and code was the coder. This was done to protect the confidentiality of the information on each of the participants. The participants returned their surveys without writing their names on them to assure the anonymity of their responses.

Estimate of Reliability. Analysis of variance was used to obtain an estimate of reliability of the four ratings made by each of the raters on the participants. The Spearman-Brown prediction formula was used to compute the reliability estimate. The estimate of reliability for the four ratings by the raters in this investigation was 0.98.
The Null Hypotheses

The seven null hypotheses to be tested in this study are presented:

H-1. There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Inclusion.

H-2. There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Control.

H-3. There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Affection.

H-4. There is no significant relationship between a principal's effectiveness and the number of years the principal has been a principal.

H-5. There is no significant relationship between the effectiveness of principals and their reaction to the educational innovation—Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

H-6. There is no significant relationship between a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education and the principal's interpersonal behavior.

H-7. There is no significant relationship between a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education and the number of years of experience a principal has had in Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

The seven null hypotheses were tested for
significance by comparing the appropriate pairs of variables among these data sources: ratings of principal effectiveness, FIRO-B scores, B/CC education reaction scores, years of B/CC education experience, and years of principalship experience. The 0.05 level of significance was set as the criterion for retention or acceptance of a null hypothesis.

The Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering procedure included obtaining permission to conduct the study, informing the principals about the study, and administering the survey. This procedure took about one month from beginning to end.

Approval for Study. The study was described to the elementary superintendent, the educational leader of the participants in this study. He gave his permission to conduct the study and indicated his willingness to assist the investigator in the study. Next, a conference was held with the district coordinator of research and evaluation, the person responsible for screening any research project to be conducted in the school district. After reviewing the research project, she gave her approval to conduct the research project in the school district and offered any assistance the investigator needed to complete the study.

Collecting the Data. A letter describing the study and eliciting the cooperation of the thirty participants was sent out two weeks prior to the collection date. The letter
also indicated the willingness of the investigator to answer any questions the participants might have concerning the study. A copy of this letter may be found in Appendix A. The FIRO-B questionnaire and the B/CC Education and Principal Information Survey was administered to the participants at a regular elementary principals' meeting with the elementary superintendent. Copies of the two questionnaires used in this study may be found in Appendix C and Appendix D. The survey and the questionnaire were given out 15 minutes prior to the meeting and collected after the meeting was over. Only three of the participants were unable to complete the instruments at the meeting. These three participants completed the questionnaires and returned them to the investigator within a week, resulting in a 100 percent return on the questionnaires. A letter of appreciation was sent to all the people involved in helping with the study. A copy of the letter may be found in Appendix B.

Scoring the Questionnaires. The participants recorded their responses directly onto the two questionnaires used in this study. The FIRO-B questionnaires were hand scored with the scoring cards provided by the publisher. A score for each participant's reaction to B/CC education was determined by computing the arithmetic mean of the responses on the 14 Likert-type scales on the B/CC education survey.
Preparing the Data. The data was key punched onto IBM computer cards. The effectiveness rating scores for each of the participants were established by computing the arithmetic mean of the ratings of the four raters. These scores were ranked from most effective score to the least effective score resulting in 30 ranks. These ranks were then coded into six levels of effectiveness and key punched onto IBM computer cards for processing. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) programs were used to examine the information gathered from the investigation.

Treatment of the Data

The following SPSS programs were used to examine the data collected in this investigation: FREQUENCIES, CROSSTABS, and ANOVA. This section will report how these programs were used in this study.

FREQUENCIES

FREQUENCIES, a SPSS program, was used to examine the distributional characteristics of the data collected from the FIRO-B and the B/CC Education and Principal Information Survey. Graphic displays in the form of histograms were also obtained from the program for the data collected. This program was useful to the study
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because it provided a summary of the data from the responses given by the participants on the study's two questionnaires.

CROSSTABS

CROSSTABS was used to obtain table displays of the relationships among the variables examined in this investigation. CROSSTABS permits the production of two-way to n-way crosstabulation of variables.

The use of CROSSTABS was useful to this study because the program made it possible to observe graphically the relationships between the variables in each hypothesis. Each table provided column and row percentages of the responses between variables. This was valuable in determining the strength of the interaction between variables.

A number of tests of significance are available with CROSSTABS. The test of significance chosen for use with this study was Pearson's r correlation coefficient which was used with Hypotheses Four through Seven.

ANOVA

The SPSS program, ANOVA, was used to test the statistical significance of Hypotheses One through Three. The objective was to examine the relative effect a participant's professional experience, interpersonal behavior, and reaction to B/CC education had upon the rated effectiveness of the participant. The combined effects and interactions of the variables were assessed. Analysis of covariance,
one of ANOVA's programs, was used to analyze the data gathered for Hypotheses One through Three. This program permitted the investigator to identify years of principalship and B/CC experience as covariates to balance out their effect in the interactions between variables in the study. The program assisted in determining whether the variances between variables were significant or whether the variances happened by chance.

**Summary**

In this chapter the procedures and methods used in this investigation were reported. The chapter included:

1. the data source,  
2. the instruments used in the study,  
3. the procedures of the study, and  
4. the methods used to treat the data.

The data obtained from the various instruments will be in Chapter IV. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations for future research will be presented in Chapter V.
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of the principals with their interpersonal behavior and their reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education, an educational innovation. The effectiveness of the principals was determined by ratings from four central office staff members; the principals' interpersonal behaviors were measured by FIRO-B; and the principals' reaction to the educational innovation, Bilingual/Cross-cultural education, were measured by a survey developed by the investigator. The data collected for this study are presented in this chapter.

The results from the FIRO-B inventory are presented in the first section. The second section contains the participants' responses to the B/CC survey. Data related to the study's seven null hypotheses are contained in the third section.

FIRO-B Results

The scales included in the FIRO-B are Expressed Inclusion, Wanted Inclusion, Expressed Control, Wanted Control, Expressed Affection, and Wanted Affection. On each of the scales, a respondent could have a low score of 0
to a high score of 9 on each of the scales. All the respondents in the study were categorized as having either a low score or a high score on each of the FIRO-B scales. Whether a person had a low score or a high score was dependent upon the criteria described below. For the purpose of this report, the scale scores were grouped so that scores from 0 to 4 were labeled "low scores" and scores from 5 to 9 were labeled "high scores." Grouping the scores in this manner was consistent with the manner in which the scores are labeled in the clinical interpretation of the scores by Ryan.¹

The intensity of the score modifies the strength and applicability of the descriptions to be given of the score's meaning which will be provided later in this report. Persons with a 0, 1, 8, or 9 score on a scale have an extreme score and would likely exhibit compulsively the behavior described below. Persons with a 2 or a 3 score would have a low score, while persons with a 6 or a 7 score would have a high score. Persons with a 2, 3, 6, or 7 score would exhibit behavior characterized in the descriptions below. Persons with a 4 or a 5 score have a borderline score and may reveal a tendency toward the behavior described for high or low scorers.²

¹Ryan, op. cit., p. 8. ²Ibid.
Inclusion Results

According to Schutz, the first area of administrative functioning is the inclusion of all available resources for doing the administrative job. He called this area the effective use of human resources. The results on the Expressed Inclusion and Wanted Inclusion results are reported in this section.

Expressed Inclusion Results. A low Expressed Inclusion score means that the person is uncomfortable around people and will tend to move away from them; a high Expressed Inclusion score suggests that the person is comfortable in social settings and will tend to move toward people. In terms of leadership behavior, effective leaders would be likely to have moderate to high scores on the Expressed Inclusion scale, while ineffective leaders would be likely to have low scores on this scale.

The scores of the participants on the Expressed Inclusion scale ranged from 1 to 8. The mean was 4.467, the median was 4.3, and the mode was 4.0. The frequency distribution of the scores showed that 56.7 percent of the participants had low scores and 43.3 percent had high scores.

Wanted Inclusion Results. A low Wanted Inclusion score indicates that the person does not want to form close, intimate relationships with others, while a high score means

3 Schutz, 1977, op. cit., p. 28. 4 Ryan, loc. cit.
that the person has a strong need to belong and to be accepted. In terms of leadership behavior, effective leaders are likely to have low to moderate scores on the Wanted Inclusion scale, while ineffective leaders are more likely to have high scores on this scale.

The Wanted Inclusion scores for the participants ranged from 0 to 9. The mean score was 3.167, the median was 1.5, and the mode was 0. The frequency distribution of the scores showed that 60 percent of the participants had low scores and 40 percent of the participants had high scores.

Control Results

Controlling the use of human resources in such a way as to organize and integrate their contribution most usefully is the second major area of administrative functioning proposed by Schutz. Schutz called this area task effectiveness. The results from the Expressed Control and Wanted Control scales are reported in this section.

Expressed Control Results. A low Expressed Control score means the person avoids making decisions and taking on responsibility; a high score means that the person can and does take on the responsibilities involved in the leadership role. In relation to leadership behavior,

5Ibid. 6Schutz, loc. cit. 7Ryan, loc. cit.
effective leaders are likely to have moderate to high scores on the Expressed Control scale, while ineffective leaders are more likely to have low scores on this scale.

The participants' scores on the Expressed Control dimension ranged from 0 to 9. The mean was 4.767, the median was 4.875, and the mode was 5.000. The frequency distribution of the scores showed that 40 percent had low scores and 60 percent had high scores.

Wanted Control Results. A low Wanted Control score suggests that the person does not want to be controlled by others; a high score reflects the abdication of responsibility and a disposition toward accepting control from others. In relation to leadership behavior, effective leaders are likely to have moderate to low scores on the Wanted Control scale, while ineffective leaders are more likely to have high scores on this scale.

The Wanted Control scores ranged from 1 to 7. The mean was 3.333, the median was 3.167, and the mode was 2.000. The frequency distribution of the scores showed that 76.6 percent of the participants had low scores and 23.3 percent had high scores.

Affection Results

The third area of administrative functioning, according to Schutz, is the creation of a personal bond
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8 Ibid.
among the people involved in the educational enterprise. Schutz called the ability to create these successful affectional relations, interpersonal effectiveness. The analysis of the data from the Expressed Affection and Wanted Affection scales are presented in this section.

Expressed Affection Results. A low Expressed Affection score describes a person who is cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate relationships; a high score suggests that the person can readily become emotionally involved, establishing intimate relationships with others. In terms of leadership behavior, effective leaders are likely to have moderate to high scores on the Expressed Affection scale, while ineffective leaders are more likely to have low scores on this scale.

The scores of the participants on the Expressed Affection scale ranged from 2 to 8. The mean was 4.967, the median was 4.750, and a mode was not evident in this distribution. The frequency distribution of the scores showed that 46.7 percent of the participants had low scores and 53.3 percent had high scores.

Wanted Affection Results. A low Wanted Affection score indicates that the person does not want to form close, intimate relationships, while a high score describes a person who wants others to initiate close, intimate

9 Schutz, loc. cit. 10 Ryan, loc. cit.
relationships. In relation to leadership behavior, effective leaders would probably have high to moderate scores on the Wanted Affection scale, while ineffective leaders would probably have low scores on this scale.

The participants' scores on the Wanted Affection scale ranged from 2 to 9. The mean was 5.000, the median was 4.900, and the mode was 5.000. The frequency distribution of the scores showed that 36.7 percent of the participants had low scores and 63.3 percent of the participants had high scores.

Bilingual/Crosscultural Survey Data

The B/CC survey had 14 items which obtained the reactions of the respondents to various aspects of B/CC education. The survey obtained reactions in four major areas which included (1) the goals of B/CC education, (2) comparisons of the B/CC program with the regular program, (3) B/CC staff training and staff support of B/CC, and (4) general reactions to B/CC education.

B/CC Education Compared to the Regular Program

This part of the survey obtained the reactions of the principals in 7 areas. They were: (1) the ability of B/CC education to meet the educational needs of LES/NES

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
students, (2) the English acquisition rate of the LES/NES students in the B/CC program, (3) LES/NES student school adjustment, (4) the self-concepts of LES/NES students, (5) the participation of LES/NES students in school activities, (6) the educational program for the fluent-English student in the B/CC program, and (7) the amount of parent involvement of the parents of LES/NES students. The analysis of the data revealed that 79 percent of the principals indicated that the B/CC program was doing as well as or better than the regular program in the 7 areas enumerated above, while 21 percent felt the B/CC education program was not doing as well as the regular program in the same 7 areas.

The Goals of B/CC Education

There were two questions that elicited the reactions of the principals to the goals of B/CC education; all participants responded to both questions. The results showed that 93 percent of the respondents felt that the primary goal of B/CC education should be to help LES/NES students make the transition into the English language curriculum, while 7 percent disagreed with this as being the primary goal of B/CC education. On the second question, 77 percent of the respondents felt that the primary goal of B/CC education should be to maintain the child's primary language and culture while the child makes the transition into the English language curriculum, whereas 23 percent disagreed with this as being the primary goal of B/CC
education. The results indicate that 77 percent of the respondents felt that B/CC education has 2 primary goals which are (1) to help LES/NES students make the transition into the English language curriculum and (2) to maintain the primary language and culture of the LES/NES student.

Staff

Two questions obtained the assessments of the principals on the adequacy of the training of the B/CC instructional staff and the amount of support the staff not part of the B/CC program provided the B/CC program. The data showed that 57 percent of the respondents felt that their B/CC instructional staff was adequately trained, while 43 percent felt that their B/CC instructional staff was inadequately trained. The analysis of the data found that 77 percent of the principals felt that their non-B/CC instructional staff provided the B/CC program with support, while 23 percent felt that little or no support was provided by their non-B/CC instructional staff.

General Reactions to B/CC Education

Three questions obtained general reactions about B/CC education from principals. The areas included in the questions were (1) the amount of knowledge about B/CC education acquired by the principals, (2) the principals' attitudes toward B/CC education, and (3) the principals' assessments of the desirability of having B/CC education for
LES/NES students. The results revealed that 83 percent of the principals felt that they had acquired an adequate amount of knowledge about B/CC education, while 17 percent felt that they had acquired little or no knowledge about B/CC education in the past three years.

The data revealed that 53 percent of the principals had a positive or a more positive attitude toward B/CC education at the time of the survey as compared to three years ago, while 47 percent had a more negative attitude toward B/CC education. A letter was sent to the principals to further investigate and clarify the responses to this survey item. A copy of this letter may be found in Appendix E. The response from the principals for this additional information was excellent; 80 percent of the principals responded to the letter. Positive LES/NES student achievement, greater LES/NES student participation in school activities, and the enhancement of LES/NES student self-concept were the reasons given for a more positive attitude toward B/CC education. Disagreement with the philosophy of B/CC education, belief that the program was politically motivated, the amount of program paperwork, and the lack of materials and trained staff were the reasons given for a more negative attitude toward B/CC education.

Summary

The principals' responses on each item of the B/CC survey were summarized and an overall positive or negative
reaction to B/CC education was determined for each participant. The results revealed that 80 percent of the principals had positive reactions to B/CC education, whereas 20 percent of the principals reacted negatively toward the educational innovation.

Data Related to the Hypotheses

The SPSS programs CROSSTABS and ANOVA were used to test the seven null hypotheses of the study. The SPSS program CROSSTABS computes and displays two-way to n-way crosstabulation tables for any discrete variables, either numeric or alphanumeric. Tests of statistical significance as well as numerous measures of nominal and ordinal association are available. In this study, two-way crosstabulation tables are displayed to graphically show the relationship between the two variables in each of the hypotheses. The test of significance reported with CROSSTABS will be Pearson's r correlation coefficient with its corresponding statistic, the significance of r.

The SPSS program ANOVA performs one to five way analyses of variance and covariance (up to five covariates) and also has the capacity to produce a multiple classification (MCA) table. Analysis of variance is a statistical method of identifying, breaking down and testing for statistical significant variances that come from different sources of variation. Analysis of covariance is a form
of analysis of variance that tests the significance of the differences between means of final experimental data by taking into account the correlation between the dependent variable and one or more covariates, and by adjusting initial mean differences in the experimental groups. In this study, analysis of covariance was utilized as a test of significance in hypotheses one through three and Pearson's r was used as a test of significance for hypotheses four through seven.

**Hypothesis One**

*There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Inclusion.* The dependent variable in this hypothesis was the rated effectiveness of the principals; the independent variable was the FIRO-B dimension Inclusion; and the covariates were principalship experience and B/CC experience. When B/CC experience and principalship experience were considered, the analysis of covariance showed there was no significant difference between the rated effectiveness of principals and the FIRO-B dimension Inclusion. The hypothesis was accepted. The data are presented in Table 7.

---

12 Aiken, op. cit., p. 1.
Table 7

Analysis of Covariance-Rated Effectiveness by Inclusion with Principals' Experience and Principals' B/CC Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals' Experience</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/CC Experience</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Inclusion</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Inclusion</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Interaction</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Inclusion by Wanted Inclusion</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6.685</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Control. The dependent variable in this hypothesis was the effectiveness of principals; the independent variable was the FIRO-B dimension Control and the covariates were principalship experience and B/CC experience. When principalship experience and B/CC experience were considered, the analysis of covariance revealed that there was no significant difference between the rated effectiveness of principals and the FIRO-B dimension Control. The hypothesis was accepted. The data are presented in Table 8.

Hypothesis Three

There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Affection. Rated effectiveness of the principals was the dependent variable in this hypothesis; the FIRO-B dimension Affection was the independent variable; and B/CC experience and principalship experience were the covariates. When B/CC experience and principalship experience were considered, the analysis of covariance showed that there was no significant difference between the rated effectiveness of principals and the interpersonal relations dimension Affection. The hypothesis was accepted. The data are presented in Table 9.
Table 8

Analysis of Covariance-Rated Effectiveness by Control with Principals' Experience and Principals' BJCC Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals' Experience</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJCC Experience</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Control</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Control</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Control</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Interaction</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Control by Wanted Control</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6.707</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Analysis of Covariance-Rated Effectiveness by Affection with Principals' Experience and Principals' B/CC Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals' Experience</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/CC Experience</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affection</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Interactions</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Affection by Wanted Affection</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.836</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Affection by Total Affection</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.990</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Four

There is no significant relationship between a principal's effectiveness and the number of years the principal has been a principal. The variables in this hypothesis were principal effectiveness and the number of years the participant has been a principal. The crosstabulation of the 2 variables showed that 56.7 percent of the principals had 0-10 years of experience and 43.3 percent of the principals had 11-25 years of experience. Of the principals who had 0-10 years of experience, 30.0 percent were rated less effective and 26.7 percent were rated more effective. Of the principals who had 11-25 years of experience, 20.0 percent were rated less effective and 23.3 percent were rated more effective. Pearson's r correlation coefficient showed there was no significant relationship between the rated effectiveness of principals and the number of years they have been principals. The hypothesis was accepted. The data is presented in Table 10.

Hypothesis Five

There is no significant relationship between the effectiveness of principals and their reaction to the educational innovation-Bilingual/Crosscultural education. Rated effectiveness of the principals and their reactions to the educational innovation-B/CC education were the variables in this hypothesis. The crosstabulation of the 2 variables found that 6.7 percent of the less effective
principals had a negative reaction to B/CC education and 13.3 percent of the more effective principals had a negative reaction to B/CC education; 43.3 percent of the less effective principals had a positive reaction to B/CC education, while 36.7 percent of the more effective principals had a positive reaction to the program. The correlational coefficient, Pearson's $r$, revealed that there was no significant relationship between the rated effectiveness of principals and their reaction to B/CC education. The hypothesis was accepted. The data is presented in Table 11.

**Hypothesis Six**

There is no significant relationship between a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education and the principal's interpersonal behavior. The variables in this hypothesis were the reactions of the principals to B/CC education and the interpersonal behavior of the principals as measured by FIRO-B. The results of the crosstabulation of the 2 variables found that 13.3 percent of the principals who had low total FIRO-B scores had negative reactions to B/CC education and 6.7 percent of the principals with high total FIRO-B scores had negative reactions to B/CC education; 46.7 percent of the principals who had low total FIRO-B scores had positive reactions to B/CC education and 33.3 percent of the principals with high FIRO-B scores had positive reactions to B/CC education. No significant relationship was found between a principal's
Table 10

Crosstabulation of Rated Effectiveness by Principal Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>More</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated Effectiveness</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson's r = 0.06727  Significance = 0.3620

Table 11

Crosstabulation of Rated Effectiveness by Reaction to B/CC Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to B/CC Education</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral-Most Positive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson's r = 0.1667  Significance = 0.1894
reaction to B/CC education and the interpersonal behavior of
the principal. The statistic used for testing significance
was Pearson's r. The hypothesis was accepted. The data are
presented in Table 12.

Hypothesis Seven

There is no significant relationship between a
principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education
and the number of years of experience a principal has had
in Bilingual/Crosscultural education. The variables in this
hypothesis were the principals' reaction to B/CC education
and the number of years of experience they have had in B/CC
dercation. The findings from the crosstabulation of the
2 variables found that 20.0 percent of the principals who
had negative reactions to B/CC education had 0 to 5 years
of B/CC experience, while no principals with 6 to 25 years
of B/CC education had negative reactions to the program;
66.7 percent of the principals who had 0-5 years of B/CC
experience had positive reactions to B/CC education, and
13.3 percent of the principals with 6 to 25 years of
experience had positive reactions to the program. Pearson's
r correlation coefficient was not high enough to warrant
rejection of the null hypothesis. The hypothesis was
accepted. There was no significant relationship between a
principals reaction to B/CC education and the number of years
of experience they have had in B/CC education. The data
are presented in Table 13.
Table 12

Crosstabulation of Reaction to B/CC Education by Interpersonal Behavior

**Reaction to B/CC Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total FIRO-B Score</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson's $r = 0.06804$  
Significance = 0.3604

Table 13

Crosstabulation of Reaction to B/CC Education by B/CC Education Experience

**Reaction to B/CC Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B/CC Experience</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-25 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson's $r = 0.19612$  
Significance = 0.1495
Summary

The data from the FIRO-B inventory, the B/CC survey, and the hypotheses of this study were presented and analyzed in this chapter. The results from the FIRO-B inventory revealed that the participants, as a group, obtained moderate scores on each of the FIRO-B scales. The results from the B/CC survey revealed that 80 percent of the participants were positive in their reactions to B/CC education. The results from the seven hypotheses revealed that there were no significant differences or relationships among effectiveness of principals, their interpersonal behavior, their reaction to B/CC education, experience as principals, or experience in B/CC education.

The seven null hypotheses of the study were accepted because the analyses of the data failed to find any significant differences or any significant relationships at or below the 0.05 significance level. Conclusions and recommendations for future research will be presented in Chapter V.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the following questions: (1) Is the effectiveness of a principal related to the principal's interpersonal behavior with others? (2) Is the effectiveness of a principal related to the principal's years of principalship experience? (3) Is the reaction of a principal to an educational innovation related to the principal's effectiveness? (4) Is the reaction of a principal to an educational innovation related to the principal's interpersonal orientation? (5) Is the reaction of a principal to an educational innovation related to the years of experience the principal has had in that innovation? It was generally hypothesized that a principal's interpersonal behavior, a principal's reaction to an educational innovation, and a principal's experiences were all not related to a principal's effectiveness.

Summary

In Chapter I, the problem, the purpose of the study, the hypotheses, procedures, definitions, the limitations and delimitations, the significance of the study, and the overview of the study were presented. Chapter II included a
review of the literature and research in five major areas. The areas reviewed were: (1) the history of public administration, (2) the history of educational administration, (3) a review of the research of educational administrative behavior as it pertained to this study, (4) a review of the research innovations and principals, and (5) the history of Bilingual/Crosscultural education in the United States.

The procedures and methodologies used in the investigation were reported in Chapter III. Chapter III included (1) the description of the data source, (2) the instruments used in the study, (3) the procedures used in the study, and (4) the methods used to treat the data. The findings of the study regarding the relationships of principal effectiveness to the interpersonal variables and reaction to innovation were reported in Chapter IV. Presented in Chapter IV were: (1) the results of the responses to the FIRO-B questionnaire, (2) the results of the responses to the B/CC-Principal Information Questionnaire, and (3) the results from the tests of significance of the study's seven hypotheses.

Conclusions

Several conclusions relative to each of the seven hypotheses are presented and general observations regarding the study are discussed in this section. The first four
hypotheses were based on comparisons of the effectiveness of principals with the three FIRO-B scales and principalship experience. Hypotheses Five through Seven were based on comparisons of the reactions of the principals to B/CC education with effectiveness, interpersonal behavior, and B/CC experience.

Hypothesis One

There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Inclusion. The results of this study confirmed the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the effectiveness of principals and the FIRO-B scale, Inclusion. These results support the findings of Hightower,1 Underwood and Krafft,2 and Schutz3 who also found no significant differences between the rated effectiveness of principals and this interpersonal dimension. According to Schutz,4 the Inclusion dimension is related to the utilization of human resources by the administrator, therefore it is concluded that there are no significant differences between the effectiveness of principals and how they utilize human resources.

1Hightower, loc. cit.
2Underwood and Krafft, loc. cit.
3Schutz, 1966, loc. cit.
There have been studies that are in conflict with the conclusions drawn above; Brown, Schott, Grobman and Hines, and Kimbrough did find significant differences between the effectiveness of principals and the effectiveness of the principals in the utilization of human resources. Perhaps the utilization of human resources was not a factor included in the rated effectiveness of principals in this study; this could be the reason that the findings of this study differed from the findings of other studies reviewed in Chapter II. How human resources were utilized in the district from which this study was made was largely determined by the various employer-employee contracts; therefore principals had little influence over how human resources were utilized in their schools.

**Hypothesis Two**

There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Control. The findings of this study support the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the rated effectiveness of principals and the Control dimension. Schutz proposed that this dimension is related to the administrative function he called task

---

5 Brown, loc. cit. 6 Schott, loc. cit. 7 Grobman and Hines, loc. cit. 8 Kimbrough, loc. cit.
effectiveness;\(^9\) it is thus concluded that there is no significant difference between the effectiveness of principals and task effectiveness. This conclusion is supported by the studies of Fultineer,\(^10\) Hightower,\(^11\) Parks,\(^12\) and Schutz,\(^13\) who also found no relationships between leader behavior and this dimension.

Halpin,\(^14\) Evenson,\(^15\) Brown,\(^16\) and Miskel\(^17\) all had obtained results that conflict with the findings of this study. Their studies revealed that effective principals initiated more structure and emphasized more production than ineffective principals. Lipham's findings also conflict with the findings of this study. He found that effective principals had greater activity drive and achievement drive than ineffective principals. Perhaps one reason for the conflicting findings could be attributed to the instrumentation. Halpin, Evenson, Brown, and Miskel used LBDQ and LBDQ Form XII, whereas Fultineer, Hightower, Parks, Schutz, and this study used FIRO-B to examine leader behavior. This fact may indicate that FIRO-B might not be suited for studies measuring leadership behavior in the

\(^10\) Fultineer, loc. cit.  
\(^11\) Hightower, loc. cit.  
\(^12\) Parks, loc. cit.  
\(^13\) Schutz, 1961, loc. cit.  
\(^14\) Halpin, loc. cit.  
\(^15\) Evenson, loc. cit.  
\(^16\) Brown, loc. cit.  
\(^17\) Miskel, loc. cit.
educational setting when leader effectiveness is one of the variables. Another possible reason for the conflicting findings could be that situational factors that might have influenced principal behavior were not accounted for in this study. Stogdill\textsuperscript{18} and Gibb\textsuperscript{19} both concluded in their studies that leader behavior is situational; leader behavior that is appropriate and effective in one leadership situation might not be appropriate or effective in another leadership situation. For example, a principal who exhibits a great amount of Control behavior might be very effective in one situation but would be a dismal failure in another situation if the principal exhibited the same kind of behavior.

Hypothesis Three

There is no significant difference between effective and less effective principals in the interpersonal relations dimension of Affection. Analyses of the data confirmed the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the effectiveness of principals and the FIRO-B dimension, Affection. Schutz described this area of administrative function as the administrator's ability to create a personal bond among people or the ability to create successful affectional relationships in a group.

\textsuperscript{18}Stogdill, 1948, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{19}Gibb, loc. cit.
He called this area interpersonal effectiveness. Thus it is concluded that the effectiveness of principals is not significantly related to the principals' interpersonal effectiveness. Hightower and Underwood and Kraff obtained similar results in their studies. Halpin, Moser, Evenson, Brown, Schott, Kimbrough, and Lipham arrived at opposite conclusions. These investigators found that interpersonal effectiveness was indeed significantly related to a principal's rated effectiveness as an administrator of a school. Unaccounted for situational factors that might influence principal behavior and instrumentation, the reasons given for the conflicting results in Hypothesis Two, are perhaps the same reasons for the findings in this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Four

There is no significant difference between a principal's effectiveness and the number of years of experience the person has been a principal. The analyses of the data support the hypothesis that there is no

21 Hightower, loc. cit.
22 Underwood and Krafft, loc. cit.
23 Halpin, loc. cit.
24 Moser, loc. cit.
25 Evenson, loc. cit.
26 Brown, loc. cit.
27 Schott, loc. cit.
28 Kimbrough, loc. cit.
29 Lipham, loc. cit.
significant relationship between principal effectiveness and principalship experience. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no significant relationship between the effectiveness of principals and the number of years the person has been a principal. The results obtained in this hypothesis could be attributed to the fact that most principals in this study have had at least three years of experience as vice-principals before becoming principals. By the time a person became a principal, he/she has had at least three years of administrative experience at the school site; perhaps the amount of experience beyond the first two or three years has no relationship to a person's effectiveness as a principal.

Hypothesis Five

There is no significant relationship between the effectiveness of principals and their reaction to the educational innovation-Bilingual/Crosscultural education. The results of the analyses of the data confirmed the hypothesis that the effectiveness of principals is not related to their reaction to B/CC education. It is thus concluded that there is no significant relationships between a principal's effectiveness and a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

The results of this study are in conflict with the
conclusions by Jacobs, Williams, Sharpe, and Miskel who all concluded that leadership effectiveness was related to the leader's reaction to innovation. Perhaps these results conflict with the finding of this study because the principals in this study viewed the B/CC program not as an innovative program designed to meet the educational needs of limited-English speaking/non-English speaking children but as a politically motivated program designed to establish a power base for certain minority groups. Another possible reason for the conflicting results could be that B/CC education is no longer viewed as an innovation because B/CC education has been in this district in various forms for over ten years.

Hypothesis Six

There is no significant relationship between a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education and the principal's interpersonal behavior. The findings support the hypothesis that a principal's reaction to B/CC education is not related to the principal's interpersonal behavior. No previous studies have been conducted in this area. It was conjectured that because studies have shown relationships between effectiveness of principal's with interpersonal behavior as well as with their reaction to

---

30 Jacobs, loc. cit. 31 Williams, loc. cit. 32 Sharpe, loc. cit. 33 Miskel, loc. cit.
innovation that there would also be a relationship between a principal's reaction to innovation with the principal's interpersonal behavior. This conjecture was not substantiated; it is therefore concluded that there is no significant relationship between a principal's reaction to B/CC education and his/her interpersonal behavior.

Hypothesis Seven

There is no significant relationship between a principal's reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education and the number of years of experience a principal has had in Bilingual/Crosscultural education. The analysis of the data support the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between a principal's reaction to B/CC education and the number of years of experience the principal has had in that program. There has been no previous research in this area. Although there were no significant statistical results found in this hypothesis, there was a trend observed. Principals with more experience in B/CC education favored B/CC programs that maintained the child's primary language and culture while the child is making the transition into the English language curriculum. They also felt that staff members not part of the B/CC program provided good support to the B/CC program. They also indicated that the training the B/CC instructional staff received was very good. Therefore, it is concluded that principals with more years of B/CC experience have shown
a tendency to react more positively to B/CC education than principals with less experience in the program.

General Observations

A summary of the scores on each of the FIRO-B scales showed that the participants, as a group, had moderate scores. These moderate scores mean that the typical participant was socially flexible, was able to make decisions and assume responsibilities as well as to share these roles, and was a warm person able to give and receive affection without going to extremes. When the descriptions of these interpersonal behaviors were compared with the criteria for leader effectiveness set for this study, the behaviors described were consistent with the criteria for effectiveness. Therefore, the typical participant had the interpersonal behaviors necessary to be an effective educational leader.

The overall reaction to B/CC education was positive. This was especially true in the participants' reactions to the effect that B/CC education was having on the LES/NES children's self-concept, school participation, and school adjustment. Those participants who did have negative reactions to B/CC education were essentially not dissatisfied about the effect the program was having on students but were dissatisfied because they disagreed with B/CC education on philosophical grounds, believed that B/CC education was politically motivated, or because they
perceived the amount of bureaucracy and paper work involved with the program as excessive. Principals also reflected a concern with the lack of materials and adequately trained instructional staff for the program.

No significant differences or relationships between the rated effectiveness of principals, interpersonal behavior, and reaction to B/CC education were found. Perhaps the findings would have been different if a different measure of interpersonal behavior was used and the situational factors were taken into account.

Recommendations

Recommendations drawn from this study are presented in this section. The recommendations are organized into two sections: (1) recommendations directed to institutions of higher education, educational administration associations, and school districts, and (2) recommendations regarding further investigations of this topic.

Recommendations for Universities, Educational Administration Organizations, and School Districts

Universities, educational administration organizations, and school districts must accept responsibility for selecting and training persons who would be effective school principals. It is also the responsibility of these institutions to provide the necessary information and
training to principals who are charged with the responsibility of implementing an innovative program such as Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

It is therefore recommended that the universities, educational administration organizations, and school districts provide the necessary pre-service and inservice training to principals and future principals which will provide these persons with the interpersonal competencies that will contribute to their effectiveness as school administrators. It is further recommended that these same institutions provide principals and potential principals with the theory, understanding and competencies necessary for these persons to effectively implement change and innovation in the schools. It is also recommended that these three institutions work together to provide principals with the information and training needed to implement emerging school programs like Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

Recommendations for Further Research

There are two recommendations regarding further research into the effectiveness of principals as it is related to interpersonal behavior and reaction to B/CC education. They are as follows:

1. The FIRO-B questionnaire has not been very productive in studies with school administrators, therefore it is recommended that this study be replicated using a
different instrument to measure interpersonal behavior. It is also recommended that situational variables that might affect leader behavior and leader effectiveness be taken into account if this study is replicated.

2. Further research is recommended to find those variables that will enhance the acceptance of innovative programs like B/CC education by those in the educational community as well as by the public.

Effective leadership was the major topic of this study. Programs to train effective leaders for the schools will be greatly enhanced when researchers are able to identify those variables that are important to the interpersonal effectiveness of principals. The enhancement of training programs for educational administrators would result in better educational programs for students which in turn will ultimately result in a life that is more meaningful and productive for everyone.
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APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE TO PRINCIPALS
REGARDING STUDY
Dear ____________________,

At the October 4th elementary principals' meeting, you will have an opportunity to participate in a study that will provide important information about elementary principals.

As you come to the meeting you will be given two questionnaires which will take about ten minutes to complete. Many of you will have it completed before the meeting begins. To encourage candid responses, complete anonymity of your responses will be insured.

The questionnaires are a part of a study to determine if there are relationships among a principal's interpersonal orientation, his/her effectiveness, and his/her reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

Information from your responses could provide valuable information for professional development programs given by the district or offered by the University of the Pacific. When the study is completed, I will be glad to provide each of you with a summary of the findings from the study. I will be looking forward to seeing you on October 4th,

Sincerely,

Raymond Tom
APPENDIX B

LETTER OF APPRECIATION

TO PRINCIPALS
Dear Elementary Principals,

Thank you very much for your cooperation in responding to the FIRO-B questionnaire and the Bilingual/Crosscultural-Principal Information questionnaire last week. Your responses to the questionnaires will provide the data necessary for investigating the relationships between the effectiveness of principals, interpersonal behavior, and reaction to Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

If you have any questions about the study please call me. Summaries of the results of the study will be sent to you sometime in the Spring, when the study is completed and accepted by the University of the Pacific. I wish each of you a very productive school year.

Sincerely,

Raymond Tom
APPENDIX C

FIRO-B QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire explores the typical ways you interact with people. There are no right or wrong answers.

Sometimes people are tempted to answer questions like these in terms of what they think a person should do. This is not what is wanted here. We would like to know how you actually behave.

Some items may seem similar to others. However, each item is different so please answer each one without regard to the others. There is no time limit, but do not debate long over any item.

NAME

GROUP

DATE

AGE

MALE

FEMALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Sum (I + C + A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Diff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS
577 COLLEGE AVENUE, PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94306

© Copyright 1967 by William C. Schutz. Published 1967 by Consulting Psychologists Press. All rights reserved. This test, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without permission of the publisher.
For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you. Place the number of the answer in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as honest as you can.

1. never 2. rarely 3. occasionally 4. sometimes 5. often 6. usually

1. I try to be with people.
2. I let other people decide what to do.
3. I join social groups.
4. I try to have close relationships with people.
5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity.
6. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
7. I try to be included in informal social activities.
8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. nobody 2. one or two 3. a few 4. some 5. many 6. most

17. I try to be friendly to people.
18. I let other people decide what to do.
19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant.
20. I let other people take charge of things.
21. I try to have close relationships with people.
22. I let other people strongly influence my actions.

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. nobody 2. one or two 3. a few 4. some 5. many 6. most

28. I like people to invite me to things.
29. I like people to act close and personal with me.
30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.
31. I like people to invite me to join their activities.
32. I like people to act close toward me.
33. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.
34. I like people to include me in their activities.
35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.
38. I like people to act friendly toward me.
39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
40. I like people to act distant toward me.

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. never 2. rarely 3. occasionally 4. sometimes 5. often 6. usually

41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.
42. I like people to invite me to things.
43. I like people to act close toward me.
44. I try to have other people do things I want done.
45. I like people to invite me to join their activities.
46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.
48. I like people to include me in their activities.
49. I like people to act close and personal with me.
50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.
51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
52. I like people to act distant toward me.
53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
54. I take charge of things when I'm with people.
APPENDIX D

BILINGUAL/CROSSCULTURAL-PRINCIPAL

INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE
BILINGUAL/CROSSCULTURAL-PRINCIPAL
INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Bilingual/Crosscultural Education

1. I have ___ years of experience in Bilingual/Crosscultural education.

2. Compared to the regular school program, Bilingual/Crosscultural education meets the educational needs of limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students . . . 

   1  2  3  4  5
   much less less with about more much more effectively effectively the same effectively effectively effect

3. Compared to the regular school program, Bilingual/Crosscultural education helps limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students to learn English . . . 

   1  2  3  4  5
   much slower slower at the same quicker much quicker rate

4. Compared to the regular school program, Bilingual/Crosscultural education helps limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students adjust socially and emotionally to school . . . 

   1  2  3  4  5
   very poorly poorly about the same well very well

5. Compared to the regular school program, Bilingual/Crosscultural education enhances the self-concepts of limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students . . . 

   1  2  3  4  5
   much worse worse about the same better much better

6. Compared to the regular school program, Bilingual/Crosscultural education motivates limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students to participate in school activities . . . 

   1  2  3  4  5
   much less less about the same more much more
7. Compared to the regular school program, Bilingual/Crosscultural education provides an educational program for fluent-English speaking students that is...

1 2 3 4 5
much worse worse about the same better much better

8. Parent support and involvement from parents of limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students in Bilingual/Crosscultural education when compared to the regular school program is...

1 2 3 4 5
much less less about the same better much better

9. When there is a sufficient number of limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students in a school or a grade level, a Bilingual/Crosscultural educational program in the school would be...

1 2 3 4 5
highly undesirable neither desirable highly desirable
undesirable desirable undesirable desirable

10. The primary goal of Bilingual/Crosscultural education should be to help limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students make a successful transition into the English language curriculum...

1 2 3 4 5
strongly disagree no opinion agree strongly agree

11. The primary goal of Bilingual/Crosscultural education should be to help the limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students make a successful transition into the English curriculum as well as to maintain the students' own language and culture...

1 2 3 4 5
strongly disagree no opinion agree strongly agree

12. My staff members who are a part of the Bilingual/Crosscultural education program have been trained to teach in Bilingual/Crosscultural education...

1 2 3 4 5
very poorly poorly adequately more than superbly adequately

13. The amount of knowledge about Bilingual/Crosscultural education that I have acquired in the past three years have been...

1 2 3 4 5
very little little adequate more than great adequate
14. Compared to my attitude toward Bilingual/Crosscultural education three years ago, my attitude toward Bilingual/Crosscultural education today is ...

1 2 3 4 5
much more more about the same more much more negative negative positive positive

15. The instructional staff not part of the school Bilingual/Crosscultural education program provide the program with ...

1 2 3 4 5
very little little some support much support very much support support

16. Please indicate the Bilingual/Crosscultural education program that most closely resemble the program at your school.

___ The students' mother tongue is used to permit the students to adjust to school and to learn the subject matter. When the students have attained functional use of English, they are expected to receive all their instruction in English.

___ Both aural and oral skills are developed in English as well as in the students' mother tongue. Literacy skills in the mother tongue are not developed. The students are taught to read in English only.

___ Fluency and literacy in English and in the students' mother tongue are both developed. Literacy in the mother tongue is usually restricted to specific areas of study like ethnic studies. Science and math are usually the subjects that are taught in English only.

___ Fluency and literacy are developed and maintained in English and the students' mother tongue. All subjects are taught in both languages.

___ Other. Please describe. ________________________________

17. Check the items below that describe the approaches you are utilizing in your Bilingual/Crosscultural education program. You may check as many items as you need to describe your program.

___ The limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students leave their regular classrooms to receive bilingual instruction.

___ The limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students are in a bilingual classroom with a bilingual teacher.
The limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students are in regular classrooms with an English speaking teachers and bilingual aides.

The limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students are in regular classrooms and are receiving individualized bilingual instruction with the help of parents and others.

The limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students basically have as English as a Second Language program.

Other. Please describe. ______________________________________

Experience, Effectiveness, and Needs

1. I have been a principal for ____ years.

2. Please write a code number on each of the lines below. Use the following code:
   1 = I would like in-depth training in this area.
   2 = I want some additional development in this area.
   3 = I am adequate in this area.
   4 = I am strong in this area.
   5 = I am very strong in this area.

   ____ Knowledge about curriculum.
   ____ Curriculum development.
   ____ Student control and management.
   ____ Community and parent relations.
   ____ Participatory management and shared decision making.
   ____ Contract management.
   ____ Supervision and evaluation of personnel.
   ____ Staff development.
   ____ Program evaluation.
   ____ Conflict resolution.
   ____ Handling job related stress.
   ____ Time management.
   ____ Other. Please specify. ______________________________________
3. In achieving the goals of the school district and in meeting the needs of my staff members, I consider myself . . .

___ as effective as most district elementary principals.
___ more effective than most district elementary principals.
___ among the most effective district elementary principals.
APPENDIX E

CORRESPONDENCE TO PRINCIPALS REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Dear Elementary Principals,

Your responses to my two questionnaires last October provided some interesting information. Your responses on the interpersonal relations orientation questionnaire indicated that, as a group, the principals have interpersonal relations orientation scores that closely resemble the population as a whole. The distribution of the scores look very much like the classic "bell" shaped curve. Your responses on the Bilingual/Crosscultural questionnaire were generally favorable, with 80 percent of the responses indicating that B/CC education is doing as well as and sometimes better than the regular program in meeting the educational needs of limited-English speaking/non-English speaking students.

There is one question on the B/CC questionnaire that I would like to follow-up on so that I might be able to provide an accurate explanation of the responses to the question for my Chapter V. The question read:

"Compared to 3 years ago, my attitude toward B/CC education is . . ."

As a favor to me, would you please respond to this question again, and give a short statement as to why you gave the response you did. To insure candid responses, please do not write your names on the responses. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Raymond Tom

Compared to 3 years ago, my attitude toward B/CC education is . . .

1       2       3       4       5
much more more the more much more
negative negative same positive positive

because
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