

**This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 65-12,952**

**BECHTOLD, Lawrence A., 1920-
ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGIES AND THEIR RELA-
TIONSHIP TO INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHERS.**

**The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1965
Education, administration**

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP
TO INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHERS

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

BY
LAWRENCE A. BECHTOLD
Norman, Oklahoma
1965

ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP
TO INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHERS

APPROVED BY

William L. Dumas

M. B. Pagan

Herbert R. Dwyer

Robert E. Chen

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express indebtedness to Dr. William G. Monahan, who served as chairman of the doctoral committee and advisor, for his invaluable counsel, encouragement, and professional criticisms; to Dr. William B. Ragan, Dr. Robert E. Ohm, and Dr. Herbert R. Hengst, for serving as members of the doctoral committee and for their critical reading and constructive comments regarding the manuscript; and to my wife, Geraldine, and daughters, Linda and Patti, whose encouragement and affection was indispensable to the completion of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| The Problem | 2 |
| The Purpose | 3 |
| Background of Study | 3 |
| Research Design | 8 |
| Delimitations | 8 |
| Definitions | 9 |
| Hypotheses to be Tested..... | 10 |
| Methodology Used in Study | 13 |
| Instrumentation | 13 |
| Sampling Procedures..... | 15 |
| Collecting Data | 15 |
| Treatment and Analysis of Data | 16 |
| Summary and Implications | 17 |
| II. A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH | 20 |
| III. PRESENTATION OF DATA | 37 |
| General Information..... | 37 |
| Selection of Sample | 37 |
| Collection of Data | 38 |
| Analysis of Data | 39 |
| IV. COMPARISON OF FIRO-B SCORES WITH PREFERRED ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGY IN THE SITUATIONS INVENTORY..... | 43 |
| V. COMPARISON OF FIRO-B SCORES WITH THE LEAST PREFERRED ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGY IN THE SITUATIONS INVENTORY..... | 54 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| VI. TESTING THE HYPOTHESES..... | 62 |
| VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 67 |
| Summary..... | 67 |
| Conclusions..... | 68 |
| Implications and Recommendations | 70 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 73 |
| APPENDIX | |
| A. DATA FOR ENTIRE SAMPLE..... | 77 |
| Table A: Preferred Typologies..... | 78 |
| Table B: Least Preferred Typologies | 82 |
| B. FIRO-B SCALE | 86 |
| C. ADMINISTRATIVE SITUATIONS INVENTORY | 89 |
| D. COMPARISONS OF FIRO-B SCORES WITH PREFERRED TYPOLOGIES AND WITH LEAST PREFERRED TYPOLOGIES..... | 97 |
| Tables C through T: Preferred Typologies . | 98 |
| Tables U through LL: Least Preferred Typologies | 116 |
| E. LETTERS TO BUILDING PRINCIPALS | 134 |
| F. INSTRUCTIONS TO TEACHERS | 137 |
| G. RESEARCH PROPOSAL FORM | 141 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Means and SD's for FIRO Scale for Total Sample..... | 40 |
| 2. Correlation Between Age, Years of Teaching, and Number of Principals and FIRO Scales for Total Sample..... | 41 |
| 3. The Externalizer Typology Compared with FIRO-B Scores in Preferred Situations..... | 45 |
| 4. The Instructional Leader Typology Compared with FIRO-B Scores in Preferred Situations.. | 47 |
| 5. The Operational-Mediator Typology Compared with FIRO-B Scores in Preferred Situations.. | 48 |
| 6. Comparisons Between FIRO-B Scores and the Preferred Administrative Typologies that are Significant..... | 50 |
| 7. The Externalizer Typology Compared with FIRO-B Scores in Least Preferred Situations..... | 55 |
| 8. The Instructional Leader Typology Compared with FIRO-B Scores in the Least Preferred Situations..... | 57 |
| 9. The Operational-Mediator Typology Compared with FIRO-B Scores in Least Preferred Situations..... | 58 |
| 10. Comparisons Between the FIRO-B Scores and the Administrative Typologies Least Preferred that are Significant..... | 60 |

ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP
TO INTERPERSONAL NEEDS OF TEACHERS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The study and practice of educational administration is experiencing a great deal of change. Concepts of all phases of the administrative process are becoming more scientific in their approach to problems confronting the typical administrator. In recent years administrators have felt a growing need to know more about human relations in order to increase the effectiveness of their daily tasks. Those who are engaged in school administration, like all other people in administrative fields, are constantly making predictions of what is going to happen next in their daily relations with people. In most cases the predictions suggest implicit responses to events that give little consideration to the underlying interaction of human behavior. More and more school administrators are recognizing the vast complexity of human relations in their work with staff members. This recognition has created a growing concern for

the need of more knowledge in the area of teacher personality and its relationship to educational administration.

Perhaps one of the best ways to secure the necessary data is to conduct personal interviews with teachers, which is a very time consuming process. An alternative is to develop an instrument that outlines simulated situations in which a teacher might find himself. The reactions of the subjects to specific situations are recorded and later analyzed. The use of simulated conditions appears to hold promise for the researcher involved in studying the interpersonal relationships of teachers and administrators. Reviews of research studies that investigate human behavior in an organizational setting are beginning to appear in various professional journals. Although administrative thought has made tremendous advances, the greatest advances still lie ahead. The impact of the knowledge thus gained should prove to be invaluable to the advancement of school administration and further improvement in the institution known as the public school.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

This study is fundamentally exploratory in nature. In analyzing the interpersonal needs of teachers, as measured by the FIRO-B inventory, what is the relationship of these needs to the selection of different administrative typologies

in various simulated situations? What effect will the variables of age, teaching experience, and the number of principals for whom they have worked have on the teacher's interpersonal need scores as measured by the FIRO-B scale?

The Purpose

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine what relationship exists between the interpersonal needs of teachers and selected administrative typologies. The typologies of administrative behavior identified in situations are compared to those factors of interpersonal need described by Schutz as inclusion, control, and affection. Analysis is made to determine what relationship exists between these factors. In making this exploration of human behavior, it is anticipated that the information secured will contribute to a better understanding of the school organization. This study provides additional information on the nature of the relationship between personality and organizational behavior.

Background of Study

There are theories being developed that will have an impact on education and administration. Various authorities in the field have outlined different theories. Probably one of the best known theories in educational administration

comes from Getzels.¹ This theory describes administration as a social process in which behavior is conceived as a function of both the nomothetic and the idiographic dimensions of a social system. Another theory is one of motivation in which the needs, drives, and motives of individuals are considered.² The Barnard theory of organizational equilibrium illustrates this type of theory. An additional theory is concerned with decision-making in which man is considered a rational being with certain limitations. This approach is illustrated by Griffiths' work in the area of decision-making.

In addition to these categories there are two theories which may portend what lies ahead in theory construction. The first of these is the work of Presthus, in which he used the Weber bureaucratic model,³ and the second is the work of Griffiths in which he employs general system theory as a model.⁴ The Presthus theory deals largely with conflict

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

²James March and Herbert Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley, 1958), p. 13.

³Robert Presthus, The Organizational Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962).

⁴Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," in Mathew B. Miles (ed.), Innovations in Education (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1963).

and motivation. Yet it also discusses man as a rational being. It is an attempt to explain the behavior of man within an organizational context. The work of Griffiths looks at a social organization as a whole and uses general system theory as a model to investigate the problem of change in organizations. System theory is the result of an attempt to develop a general theory which enables the researcher to describe, explain, and predict a wide range of human behavior within organizations. The two theories represent the direction in which theoreticians might move in the coming years.

Paralleling this concern for developing an administrative theory has been a concern with the study of leadership. There have been numerous and intensive investigations of leadership and leader behavior. Any distinction made between leadership and administration carries no implication that one is universally more appropriate, more important, or more difficult than the other. In both leadership and administration, the same organizational and individual variables are involved.

The scientific study of administration may contribute to a clearer perception of the nature of the school organization in the society of which it is a part. Here sociology can make a contribution, and the work of Parsons may be taken as an example. Parsons suggests that formal organizations have three levels of systems which he designates as the

technical, the managerial, and the institutional levels. In education, the technical functions are ascribed chiefly to the teachers, and the managerial functions largely to administrators. To an extent, the controlling boards of organizations perform the institutional functions, but in another sense society itself serves as a superior agency into which organizations must articulate. As Parsons states:

A formal organization in the present sense is a mechanism by which goals somehow important to the society, or to various subsystems of it, are implemented and to some degree defined. But not only does such an organization have to operate in a social environment which imposes the conditions governing the processes of disposal and procurement, it is also part of a wider social system which is the source of the "meaning" legitimation, or higher-level support which makes the implementation of the organization's goals possible. Essentially, this means that just as a technical organization (at a sufficiently high level of the division of labor) is controlled and "serviced" by a managerial organization, so, in turn, is the managerial organization controlled by the "institutional" structure and agencies of the community.⁵

An organization generally offers certain inducements or incentives to motivate its workers to effectively achieve the tasks of the organization. Organizational analysis must consider not only an organization as a social system but the personalities and interpersonal relationships of its personnel as well.

⁵Talcott Parsons, "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Formal Organizations," in Andrew Halpin (ed.), Administrative Theory in Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958), p. 44.

Schutz⁶ has derived a theory of interpersonal behavior built around a basic postulate that each person has three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. Each person has the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with other people in each of the need areas, and in each, any given item of behavior may be ideal, deficient, excessive, or pathological, and tends to be conditioned by the nature of interpersonal relations as experienced early in life between parents and children. In the development of a group, the same three needs must be met in the same sequence. Another postulate by Schutz holds that there is a relationship between compatibility and goal-achievement, such that a group high in one would tend to be high in the other. Compatibility is a relation between two or more persons, between an individual and a role, or between an individual and a task situation, that leads to mutual satisfaction of interpersonal needs and harmonious existence.⁷

There are various methods employed to study organizational behavior. In an administrative system typologies of administrative behavior are used as a device for analysis. The typologies used in this study were designed by Leo Haak

⁶William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Personal Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958).

⁷Ibid. p. 105.

and discussed in a paper he delivered before the American Sociological Society in 1957.⁸ They were later revised and modified by Dr. William Monahan of the University of Oklahoma. The typologies are known as the externalizer, the instructional leader, and the operational-mediator.

Research Design

Delimitations

This study was limited to elementary teachers in the Wichita, Kansas, public school system. It was further limited to fifty elementary teachers. In this study major emphasis was given only to the interpersonal relations factors known as inclusion, control, and affection as measured by the FIRO-B measuring instrument. Identification of the different typologies of administration as listed above was made by the subjects in identifying that typology which they prefer in various simulated situations. The length of teaching assignment, number of principals for whom each subject has worked, and age were the different variables considered. Assumptions were made that these variables will influence the responses of the participants.

⁸Leo Haak, "Conflicting Expectations as an Impediment to School-Community Communication," a paper delivered at the annual meeting, American Sociological Society, August 28, 1957, (Washington, D. C.).

Definitions

An interpersonal situation is one that involves two or more persons. Each individual takes into account the other individual for some purpose or decision.

An interpersonal need is one that may be satisfied only through the attainment of a satisfactory relation with other people.

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

FIRO-B is a measuring instrument which stands for Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior. That aspect of personality being explored is behavior.

Individual behavior is measured by behavior toward others and behavior wanted from others. The former is known as expressed behavior and the latter is known as wanted behavior.

Typologies of administrative behavior are patterns or styles exhibited by individuals in an organizational setting.

The three administrative typologies are known as the externalizer (EX), the instructional leader (IL), and the operational-mediator (OM). The typologies are designed to encompass different aspects of administrative behavior and are defined in the following manner.

The externalizer typology. This type of administrator is very sensitive to the attitudes and values of the school's patrons. He considers himself "close"

to the community and is not overly concerned with philosophical considerations. He feels that the best way to insure public confidence in the schools is to build public confidence in himself. He listens to the board of education and to the power structure in the community and has learned to speak the language of the school's clientele. He is occupationally secure and upwardly mobile within his profession. He frequently uses the phrase, "Our patrons feel . . ." in his conversations with school personnel.

The instructional leader typology. This type tends to identify more with the "academic" values of education than with the managerial. He is primarily concerned about "programs." He is fond of saying that he is primarily interested in results. Since he "keeps up" with the literature, he feels that he is an authority who should be followed but he will explain if questioned. He frequently uses the phrase, "Get the job done..." in his conversations with personnel.

The operational-mediator typology. This type conceives his primary responsibility as facilitating the operation of the school. He likes orderliness and generally regards himself as a good manager. He is interested in the school plant and is somewhat guarded in his interpersonal relationships with both the staff and the school's patrons. He is fond of saying that he believes in running his business and letting other people run theirs so that they can exercise initiative in doing their work. He frequently uses the phrase, "do the job well...." in his conversations with staff.

These typological descriptions as presented to the subjects who participated in this study are found in Appendix C.

Hypotheses to be Tested

This study is fundamentally exploratory in nature. Establishing hypotheses for investigation will in essence be mainly concerned with the relationship that may exist between

the interpersonal needs of certain individuals, and with their choice of one of these administrative typologies most appropriate for specific situations. The measuring instrument FIRO-B is designed to measure the individual's behavior toward others and the behavior he wants from others in the three areas of interpersonal interaction known as inclusion, control and affection.

Identification of administrative typologies as they operate in various situations provided information related to the teacher's orientation within a school system. Participants selected these typologies preferred and least preferred in different simulated situations.

It was assumed that the variables described as age, teaching experience, and the number of principals for whom teachers worked would be reflected in the individual scores on the FIRO-B inventory. It was also assumed that the selection of the administrative typologies in the different simulated situations would significantly correspond to the three interpersonal needs identified as inclusion, control and affection. It was further assumed that: (1) individuals who scored high on the interpersonal need "inclusion" would indicate a positive relationship to the administrative typology designated as the externalizer; (2) individuals who scored high on the interpersonal need "control" would correspond significantly to that administrative typology identified as the instructional leader; and (3) individuals who

scored high on the interpersonal need "affection" would correspondingly select the administrative typology designated the operational-mediator. On the basis of these assumptions, the following null hypotheses were tested:

1. The age of a teacher will not affect the relationship between interpersonal needs and the choice of administrative typologies in simulated situations.

2. Experience of a teacher will not affect the relationship between interpersonal needs and the choice of administrative typologies in simulated situations.

3. The number of principals for whom an individual has worked will not affect the relationship between interpersonal needs and the choice of administrative typologies in simulated situations.

4. There is no significant difference between those who rank high on the interpersonal need "inclusion" as determined by the FIRO-B scores and those who select the administrative typology designated as the externalizer.

5. There is no significant difference between those who rank high on the interpersonal need "control" as determined by the FIRO-B scores and those who select the administrative typology designated as the instructional leader.

6. There is no significant difference between those who rank high on the interpersonal need "affection" as determined by the FIRO-B scores and those who select the administrative typology known as the operational-mediator.

Methodology Used in Study

Instrumentation

The primary purposes of the measuring instrument, called FIRO-B, (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior) are: (1) to measure the way an individual acts in interpersonal situations and (2) to predict interaction between people, based on data from the measuring instrument alone. It is designed not only to measure individual characteristics but to measure specifically characteristics that may be combined in particular ways to predict relations between people.

FIRO-B is designed to measure the individual's behavior toward others (e) and behavior he wants from others (w) in the three areas of interpersonal interaction. The diagram of each need area as they are related to the aspects of the (e) and (w) are presented below:

Schema of Interpersonal Behaviors

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

In each of the two aspects of the three dimensions, everyone has some propensity. The FIRO-B inventory leads to six scores: expressed inclusion behavior (e^I), wanted inclusion behavior (w^I), expressed control behavior (e^C), wanted control behavior (w^C), expressed affection behavior (e^A), and wanted affection behavior (w^A).

The Guttman⁹ technique for cumulative scale analysis was selected as the most appropriate to measure the six interpersonal aspects adequately. The scales were developed on about 150 subjects gathered from the Boston area colleges and a military Air Force reserve unit. They were then cross-validated to ensure that the scales maintained the required characteristics of acceptable Guttman scales. There were about 1,500 subjects made up of students from colleges in the Boston area.

The FIRO-B inventory was designed to measure orientation toward interpersonal relations. These interpersonal orientations are developed early in life and become deeply rooted and a part of personality. Thus, they are related to all situations in which the interpersonal element is significant. A copy of the FIRO-B instrument is found in Appendix B.

An Administrative Situations Inventory was developed to enable participants to designate the administrative

⁹Schutz, loc. cit., p. 59.

typology preferred in various simulated situations. These situations were typical in nature to problems that confront teachers and administrators in their daily routine. Eighteen situations were developed in which teachers designated the administrative typology preferred and least preferred. This instrument presented a sample of opinions of the typology most preferred by teachers in their association with principals. This instrument is found in Appendix C.

Sampling Procedures

The population in this study was drawn from elementary school teachers in Wichita, Kansas. Stratified random sampling methods were employed. This method increased the representativeness of the sample and was more precise in sampling the population.¹⁰ Selected elementary schools were chosen that represented the various areas of the city. Within each of these schools, teachers were assigned a number. The selection of teachers in the sample was made using a table of random numbers and fifty teachers were chosen. Employing these techniques, a representative sample of the population was available.

Collecting Data

The FIRO-B questionnaire was administered to the

¹⁰Deobold B. Van Dalen and William J. Meyer, Understanding Educational Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), p. 252.

selected participants. Tabulations were made of each respondent's score. The FIRO-B results are expressed as a set of six single digit numbers ranging from 0 to 9 and presented in the order Ie, Ce, Ae, Iw, Cw, Aw. Results are presented in tabular form. The instrument concerning the administrative typologies was completed by the participants following the administration of the FIRO-B inventory. Replies to the Administrative Situations Inventory were tabulated according to preferred and least preferred. The eighteen simulated situations in the Administrative Situations Inventory indicated which administrative typology described as the externalizer (EX), the instructional leader (IL), and the operational-mediator (OM) were preferred and least preferred. The instrument provided data that permitted an analysis of the relationship that exists between interpersonal needs and the defined administrative typologies. The instruments completed by each participant were numbered so a relationship between the two instruments could be investigated.

Treatment and Analysis of Data

The scores of the subjects on the FIRO-B scale were analyzed to determine if definite patterns existed in the various areas of interpersonal needs. Determination was made to find if there was a relationship between the FIRO-B scores and the selected administrative typologies.

The FIRO-B scores were statistically analyzed by determining the mean and standard deviation of each score. A coefficient of correlation was made between each FIRO-B score and the age of the teacher, years of teaching experience, and number of principals for whom each teacher has worked. The results were analyzed for significance. The t-test was used to determine relationship between the respondents' FIRO-B scores and the selection of administrative typology. Each of the three selections of the participants was compared by this technique. The values of the comparisons indicate those that are significant at the .05 and .01 level of significance. All of the statistical analysis of the data was programmed and solutions were completed by the use of an IBM Computer.

Summary and Implications

This study is exploratory in nature and may be used to determine if further investigation of interpersonal needs of individuals will produce evidence that will provide a greater insight into the personality of teachers in their association with educational administrators. Educational administrators are found in various levels and are generally categorized by level of school which are elementary, secondary, and higher education. This investigation has been concerned with the elementary school organization. It was proposed to determine what relationships

exist between the interpersonal needs of elementary school teachers and the defined administrative typologies.

There are implications that result from a consideration of administrative behavior. It is anticipated that this study will provide some basis for further clarification of human behavior in an educational organization. As the administrator understands the organization and the needs of individuals, he should become a more efficient and effective leader. The process of decision-making in administration further implies the need for greater techniques for analysis. Parsons has suggested that no organization is wholly independent. As we develop better techniques for investigation, it will be possible to provide the insight necessary to determine the position of the educational organization within the larger society.

Furthermore, the direction that administrative study will take is another implication of this research. This will reveal itself in a study of the organization and personality conflict. Employment and assignment of personnel are related to this area. The effect of staff specialization will leave its impact on an organization. As the administrator of the future will necessarily be more skillful, it is the contention that there will be a need for greater knowledge and insights. The greater knowledge that will be available for analysis should provide a boon to administrative practice. These implications portend a need for

continued research and investigation of the behavior and personality of individuals within an organization.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

There have been important advances made in the study of administration and more will come. Administrative theory, as it concerns human behavior, is still relatively undeveloped. The area of human personality and its relationship to administration is attracting an increasing amount of attention. Research in this field focuses on the need for information in order to make available to the practitioner a sounder basis for effective management of human enterprise.

It is pertinent to the study of organizations and organizational behavior to determine what emphasis is given to the human personality as an aspect of interpersonal relations. The study of institutions and organizations is in some ways comparable to the clinical study of personality. Selznick states that "...it requires a genetic and developmental approach, an emphasis on historical origins and growth stages."¹ He further elaborates, "...there is a

¹ Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957), pp. 141-152.

need to see the enterprise as a whole and to see how it is transformed as new ways of dealing with a changing environment evolve."²

In attempts to better understand organizations, several theories of administration have been proposed in the past fifteen years. March and Simon have categorized these theories as follows:

1. Theories of conflict, i.e., role conflict, personality conflict, and role-personality conflict. This is best illustrated by the Getzels' theory.
2. Theories of motivation in which the needs, drives, and motives of individuals are considered. The Barnard-Simon theory of organizational equilibrium illustrates this type of theory.
3. Theories of decision-making in which man is considered as a rational being with certain limitations. Theory of decision-making by Griffiths is an illustration of this approach.³

In addition there are other constructs that go even further and have broad implications for research. For example, the work of Presthus, in which he uses the Weber bureaucratic model,⁴ has some promising analytic potential. Another promising set of theoretical concepts that have

²Ibid.

³James March and Herbert Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley, 1958), p. 13.

⁴Robert Presthus, The Organizational Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), p. 5.

much to offer the student of administrative behavior are embodied in the idea of "systems." System theory is discussed by Robert Chin in the following manner:

The terms or concepts that are a part of the system model are "boundary," "stress or tension," "equilibrium," and "feedback." All these terms are related to "open system," "closed system," and "intersystem" models. We shall first define these concepts, illustrate their meaning, and then point out how they can be used by the change-agent as aids in observing, analyzing, or diagnosing--and perhaps intervening in--concrete situations.

System. Laymen sometimes say, "you can't beat the system" (economic or political), or "he is a product of the system" (juvenile delinquent or Soviet citizen). But readers of social science writings will find the term used in a rather more specific way. It is used as an abbreviated term for a longer phrase that the reader is asked to supply. The "economic system" might be read as: "we treat price indices, employment figures, etc., as if they were closely interdependent with each other and we temporarily leave out unusual or external events, such as the discovery of a new gold mine." Or in talking about juvenile delinquency in "system" terms, the sociologists choose to treat the lower-class values, lack of job opportunities, ragged parental images, as interrelated with each other, in back-and-forth cause-and-effect fashion, as determinants of delinquent behavior. Or the industrial sociologist may regard the factory as a "social system," as people working together in relative isolation from the outside, in order to examine what goes on in interactions and interdependencies of the people, their positions, and other variables. In our descriptions and analyses of a particular concrete system, we can recognize the shadowy figure of some such analytic model of "system."

The analytic model of system demands that we treat the phenomena and the concepts for organizing the phenomena as if there existed organization, interaction, interdependency, and integration of parts and elements. System analysis assumes structure and stability within some arbitrarily sliced and frozen time period.

Boundary. In order to specify what is inside or outside the system, we need to define its "boundary" line. The boundary of a system may exist physically: a tightly corked vacuum bottle, the skin of a person, the number of people in a group, etc. But, in addition, we may delimit the system in a less tangible way, by placing our boundary according to what variables are being focused upon. We can construct a system consisting of the multiple roles of a person, or a system composed of varied roles among members in a small work group, or a system interrelating roles in a family. The components or variables used are roles, acts, expectations, communications, influence and power relationships, and so forth, and not necessarily persons.

The operational definition of boundary is: the line forming a closed circle around selected variables, where there is less interchange of energy (or communication, etc.) across the line of the circle than within the delimiting circle. The multiple systems of a community may have boundaries that do or do not coincide. For example, treating the power relationships may require a boundary line different from that for the system of interpersonal likes or dislikes in a community. In small groups we tend to draw the same boundary line for the multiple systems of power, communications, leadership, and so on, a major advantage for purposes of study.

Tension, stress, strain, and conflict. Because the components within a system are different from each other, are not perfectly integrated, or are changing and reacting to change, or because outside disturbances occur, we need ways of dealing with these differences. The differences lead to varying degrees of tension within the system. Examples: males are not like females, foremen see things differently from workers and from executives, children in a family grow, a committee has to work with a new chairman, a change in the market condition requires a new sales response from a factory. To restate the above examples in conceptual terms: we find built-in differences, gaps of ignorance, misperceptions, or differential perceptions, internal changes in a component reactive adjustments and defenses, and the requirements of system survival generating tensions. Tensions that are internal and arise out of the structural arrangements

of the system may be called stresses and strains of the system. When tensions gang up and become more or less sharply opposed along the lines of two or more components, we have conflict.

A word of warning. The presence of tensions, stresses or strains, and conflict within the system often are reacted to by people in the system as if they were shameful and must be done away with. Tension reduction, relief of stress and strain, and conflict resolution become the working goals of practitioners but sometimes at the price of overlooking the possibility of increasing tensions and conflict in order to facilitate creativity, innovation, and social change. System analysts have been accused of being conservative and even reactionary in assuming that a social system always tends to reduce tension, resist innovation, abhor deviancy and change. It is obvious, however, that tension and conflict are "in" any system, and that no living system exists without tension. Whether these facts of life in a system are to be abhorred or welcomed is determined by attitudes or value judgments not derivable from system theory as such.

Equilibrium and "steady state." A system is assumed to have a tendency to achieve a balance among the various forces operating within and upon it. Two terms have been used to denote two different ideas about balance. When the balance is thought of as a fixed point or level, it is called "equilibrium." "Steady state," on the other hand, is the term recently used to describe the balanced relationship of parts that is not dependent upon any fixed equilibrium point or level.

There are many kinds of equilibria. A stationary equilibrium exists when there is a fixed point or level of balance to which the system returns after a disturbance. We rarely find such instances in human relationships. A dynamic equilibrium exists when the equilibrium shifts to a new position of balance after disturbance. Among examples of the latter, we can observe a neutral type of situation.

Feedback. Concrete systems are never closed off completely. They have inputs and outputs across the boundary; they are affected by and in turn affect the environment. While affecting the environment, a process we call output, systems gather information about how they are doing. Such information is then fed back into the system as input to guide and steer its operations. This process is called feedback. The "discovery" of feedback has led to radical

inventions in the physical world in designing self-guiding and self-correcting instruments. It has also become a major concept in the behavioral sciences, and a central tool in the practitioner's social technology.⁵

Among those interested in the study of educational organizations, Griffiths' work employs a system model.⁶ The theory developed by Presthus deals largely with the conflict and motivation of people. Yet it also discusses man as a rational being. It is an attempt to explain the behavior of man within an organizational context. System theory is the result of an attempt to develop a general theory which enables the researcher to describe, explain, and predict a wide range of human behavior within organizations. In establishing the rationale for his systematic analysis of organizations and groups, Talcott Parsons holds that behavior is not only anchored in personality but also in the culture itself, the individual's group memberships, and the qualities of the interactions that take place within and among these. These three components, and the interactions among them -- personality, culture, and social system -- constitute the essential elements in emerging theories of action.

⁵Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 202-206.

⁶Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," in Mathew B. Miles (ed.) Innovations in Education (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1963), p. 47.

A knowledge of groups and the effect they have on individual personality and the relationships between people is very important. Although little controlled research has been made concerning the effects of highly formal groups on the behavior of their members, there is an interesting body of literature on bureaucracy as the prototype of formal group structure. According to one sociologist, the bureaucratic structure requires discipline and strict conformity to regulations in order to be effective.⁷

In his discussion of organizational behavior, Argyris⁸ relates that the theoretical framework hypothesizes that the direction of impact of formal organizational structure, directive leadership, and managerial controls are the same. One of the basic assumptions of this approach is that the individual and the organization are not separable. They interact, fuse with,⁹ or interpenetrate.¹⁰ Personality is highly influenced by the organization and vice versa.

⁷Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: The Dryden Press, 1950), p. 497.

⁸Chris Argyris, Understanding Organizational Behavior (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1960), pp. 20-21.

⁹E. W. Bakke, The Fusion Process (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1954), p. 247.

¹⁰Talcott Parsons, "Social Structure and the Development of Personality Trends: Construction to the Integration of Psychology and Sociology," Psychiatry, XXI, No. 4 (November, 1958), pp. 321-340.

There are all kinds of organizations. They vary in size and composition. As organizations increase in size and complexity, members must begin to specialize. Such division of labor has advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, the technical quality of the work improves. On the other hand, interpersonal relationships deteriorate; so also does the sense of identification with the organization.¹¹

In the study of an organization there is a need to understand its structure. Berne¹² has stated that there are several structures within organizations. The organizational structure of a group is based on its constitution; the individual structure is made up of the personnel who occupy the organizational slots at a given moment, and the private structure is based on the personal feelings of each member.

A familiar approach to the study of organization has frequently attempted to analyze the character of key personnel. Such an approach can lead to difficult problems of subjective classification. For example, Lindop¹³

¹¹Daniel E. Griffiths and Joseph J. Azzarelli, "Better School Administration is a Matter of Theory," Kansas Elementary Principal, XII, No. 1 (Fall, 1964), p. 7.

¹²Eric Berne, The Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1963), p. 64.

¹³Boyd Lindop, "Qualities of the Leader," School Activities, XXXV, (February, 1964), pp. 175-181.

elaborates on this by pointing out that for every single quality or characteristic one might list as essential and for every individual selected as an illustration, someone else might list a characteristic or quality almost directly opposed.

A potentially fruitful solution to this problem may be had through a kind of "clustering" of many traits into a coherent and meaningful role-personality type. A selected administrative typology will encompass various traits. It is difficult to categorize specific traits with a specific typology. In educational administration, there is a concern for ways of determining those who display leadership qualities or possess special traits.

Eaton¹⁴ has stated that leadership selection may never be completely refined. However, leadership tests which could separate the extreme cases -- those very likely to succeed or fail as leaders -- would be an important scientific achievement.

In our concern with organizations and the interpersonal relations of its members, it should be remembered that people influence people. The human personality is not doomed to endure in a static fashion but is enhanced through interaction. As Karen Horney has said:

¹⁴Joseph W. Eaton, "Is Scientific Leadership Selection Possible?" in Alvin W. Gouldner (ed.) Studies in Leadership (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 641-642.

My own belief is that man has the capacity as well as the desire to develop his potentialities and become a decent human being, and that these deteriorate if his relationship to others and hence to himself is, and continues to be, disturbed. I believe that man can change and keep on changing as long as he lives.¹⁵

A listing of all personality traits that one can think of will disclose each of them is influenced in some way by social interaction. According to Horney,¹⁶ every child works out a strategy which in the main follows one of three main lines: moving toward people, against them, or away from them. These are continued and manifested on through adult life. Each of these corresponds to one's general attitude toward his social world. Although one of the three is usually predominant for each individual, there are always traces of the other two.

People whose dominant attitude is one of moving toward people are described by Horney¹⁷ as "compliant." Such a person shows a marked need for affection and approval and an especial need for a "partner." He often subordinates himself to others, seeks good things for others, but not for himself. Those whose dominant characteristic is one of moving against people are primarily interested in

¹⁵Karen Horney, Our Inner Conflicts (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1945), p. 19.

¹⁶Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: The Dryden Press: 1950), p. 383.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 385.

being "tough." Those who develop neither characteristic develop a neurotic detachment because they have been unable to relieve basic anxiety either by compliance or toughness.

Attempts are being made to describe those characteristics that constitute an adequate personality. In discussing the adequate personality, Combs¹⁸ describes adequate, self-actualizing persons as characterized by an essentially positive view of self. This is not to suggest that adequate people never have negative ways of regarding themselves, but that this tendency does not dominate.

The positive view of self is further discussed by Combs as he relates the following statements.

Having a positive view of self is much like having money in the bank. It provides a kind of security that permits the owner a freedom he could not have otherwise. With a positive view of self one can risk taking changes; one does not have to be afraid of what is new and different. This permits him to be creative, original and spontaneous. What is more, he can afford to be generous, to give of himself freely or to become personally involved in events. Feeling he is much more, he has so much more to give.¹⁹

The study of personality is relevant to the area of interpersonal relations. Various authorities have incorporated these factors in their writings. The

¹⁸Arthur W. Combs, "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, 1962 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962), p. 51.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 53.

relationships are pertinent to the study of social systems.

The use of interpersonal relations in the study of administration is relatively new and in its early stages. This is due in no small measure to the fact that those disciplines and professions most closely associated with the development of research and theory in interpersonal behavior are themselves barely beyond the growing edge. Tannenbaum and others have stated in this regard:

Interpersonal effectiveness is influenced by three types of variables: personality variables, interpersonal variables, and situational variables. Much recent research has arrived at broad statistical generalizations about groups of individuals, types of relations, and varieties of situations. These generalizations represent good beginnings. However, work must rapidly proceed to the point where individual predictions can be made; that is, where it can be predicted how a specific individual with a given personality involved in a given interpersonal relation in a given situation will behave.²⁰

All organizations must have concern for the people within them. The needs of individuals have received a great deal of attention as an aspect of organizational study. Numerous authorities have developed theories and concepts in the area. Murray²¹ has made a monumental study of personality in the area of individual needs and motivation.

²⁰Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massorik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 12.

²¹Henry A. Murray et al., Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938), p. 54.

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

Need-dispositions . . . are tendencies to orient and act with respect to objects in certain manners and to expect certain consequences from these actions. The conjoined word "need-disposition" itself has a double connotation; on the one hand it refers to tendency to fulfill some requirement of the organism, a tendency to accomplish some end state; on the other hand, it refers to a disposition to do something with an object designed to accomplish this end state.²²

Maslow formulated a theory of motivation based upon a hierarchy of needs. Physiological needs were at the bottom of the hierarchy. At the top he refers to man's desire for self-fulfillment, namely, to the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially. This tendency may be phrased as the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming.²³

Schutz²⁴ used a different rationale from those of Murray, Parsons and Shils, or Maslow. A theory of interpersonal behavior was developed and built around a basic postulate that each person has three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control and affection. Each person has the

²²Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, Personality as a System of Action, in Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (ed.) Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1955), pp. 114-155.

²³A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), p. 28.

²⁴William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Personal Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958).

need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with other people in each of these three areas, where inclusion means interaction and association; control also includes power; and affection includes love and refers to a close, personal relationship. In each of these areas any given behavior may be ideal, deficient, excessive, or pathological, and tends to be conditioned between parents and children. In the development of a group, the same three needs must be met in the same sequence displayed in the family organization.²⁵

There is as yet no single comprehensive theory of interpersonal relations although sociology, social psychology, and psychiatry have offered important insights to the understanding of interpersonal phenomena.

The two principle ways of ascertaining interpersonal feelings are some form of self-description and some observation system, whereby an observer scores interpersonal interactions, usually act-by-act.

An increasingly well-known inventory for self-description in identifying and measuring interpersonal feelings is FIRO. A second example is the list developed by Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey²⁶ in their recent book.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 13-25.

²⁶David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield, and Edgerton L. Ballachey, Individual in Society (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), p. 106.

This list presents twelve primary response traits derived from self-descriptions. These are classified into three arbitrary categories and supposedly are representative of the salient interpersonal dimensions. The three categories used in this list are role dispositions, sociometric dispositions, and expressive dispositions.

There are those who question the validity of self-rating forms. They maintain individuals frequently do not see themselves accurately and it is obvious that our interpersonal relations contain important areas of ignorance due to inadequate information, systematic distortions, and selective inattentions. Recently, for example, Bennis and Peabody²⁷ showed that self-ratings on FIRO were not significantly correlated with observer's ratings. It will be profitable for researchers to investigate this discrepancy between self and observer's ratings in greater detail.

There are other systems more specifically geared for observing and recording interpersonal feelings. Leary²⁸ has developed a measurement system of sixteen interpersonal variables based on the theories of Harry Stack Sullivan.

²⁷Warren G. Bennis and D. Peabody, "The Conceptualization of Two Personality Orientations and Sociometric Choice," The Journal of Social Psychology, LVII (1962), pp. 203-215.

²⁸Timothy Leary, "The Theory and Measurement Methodology of Interpersonal Communication," Psychiatry, XVII (1955), pp. 147-161.

Mann has developed an observation scheme which is designed to assess and record the implications of each act initiated by a group member for the state of his feelings toward the leader of the group.²⁹ Observational schemes for measuring interpersonal behavior also have their shortcomings.

There is no single theory of interpersonal relations. This is discussed by Bennis³⁰ as he notes the main influences have come from psychoanalytic theory, interpersonal theory, and existential theory. The important factor to be remembered is that progress is being made in the study and analysis of interpersonal relations.

In the measurement of interpersonal feelings, various methods are employed. The FIRO theory by Schutz has been explained and the scheme of Leary is in the same sphere of interest. The group theory by Bion, the interaction scheme of Bales, and the philosophical speculations of Martin Buber also show some relationship. While there are differences among all of these, they place primary emphasis on the relationship of man to man.³¹

The time has come for those concerned with human behavior to make use of some of the recent findings in the

²⁹Warren G. Bennis et al., Interpersonal Dynamics (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964), p. 26.

³⁰Ibid., p. 28.

³¹Ibid., p. 31.

areas of human interaction. A brief review of the related research and writings suggests the importance of human interactional behavior in educational administration and organizations. The study of the interpersonal behavior of individuals is receiving a great deal of attention. Improved concepts are being made available to the theory builder. The need for future research and exploration is challenging to students of education and administration.

In the present study an attempt was made to explore aspects of the interaction processes between certain personality dimensions, the social system, and unique cultural phenomena. Personality, manifested in the current study in terms of interpersonal bases, was involved through the use of FIRO-B; the social system, manifested in this case by the school, was involved through the use of role-typologies of administrators; the culture was introduced, however specifically, through the development of a number of contrived "school situations" and the mandate that a group of subjects had to choose from among three typologies of administrators that person they thought would be most effective in each of the contrived situations. These choices were compared to the scores of the choosing group on the FIRO-B scales for the purpose of determining whether a pattern was discernible.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

General Information

The raw data used in this study are found in Appendix A. The scores of the participants on the FIRO-B instrument and the number of the selected administrative typology in the various simulated situations are listed for all members of the selected sample. The information contained is further analyzed and is presented in the tables that follow throughout this study. A review of some of the material is necessary in order to insure better interpretation of the data presented.

Selection of Sample

The total sample of fifty elementary teachers represented 2.9 per cent of the elementary teachers in the Wichita, Kansas, Public Schools. The sample was randomly drawn by the use of the table of random numbers from three stratified age groupings. There are sixteen teachers or thirty-two per cent of the sample whose age is between twenty-one years and thirty-five years. The sample includes

fifteen teachers or thirty per cent between the ages of thirty-six and fifty years. The third category includes nineteen teachers or thirty-eight per cent whose age is between fifty-one years and sixty-five years.

The number and percentage of teachers in the sample correspond with the total teacher population in the Wichita, Kansas, Public Schools in that the various age categories represented in the total teacher population are 32.2 per cent, 29.1 per cent, and 38.2 per cent respectively. The sample consisted of five male teachers and forty-five female teachers; ten per cent and ninety per cent of the total sample respectively. This compares favorably with the total population from which the sample was selected. Male teachers represent eleven per cent and female teachers represent eighty-nine per cent of the total teacher population.

Three variables are used in this study. They are age, years of teaching experience, and the number of principals for whom teachers worked.

Collection of Data

Eight elementary schools were selected to represent all areas of the Wichita Public Schools. The FIRO-B inventory and the Administrative Typology Situations Inventory were administered to all teachers from which a sample of fifty teachers was selected. The scores and selections made by the participants were key-punched. A

computer program was written to treat the collected data. This program was designed to consider the three variables previously outlined to determine the mean and standard deviation of each. The mean, the standard deviation, and the standard error of the mean was found for each of the FIRO-B scores. A coefficient of correlation was made between each variable and the FIRO-B score. Selections of typologies were statistically analyzed and comparisons made with the FIRO-B score through application of a t-test to determine significance. The entire program was designed for the IBM 1620 computer.

Analysis of Data

Analysis of three variables. The data secured from the sample indicated that for the first variable the mean age of the teachers was 43.46 years, with a standard deviation of 14.19. The second variable revealed that mean years of teaching experience was 14.92 years with a standard deviation of 11.32. The variable for the number of principals for whom each teacher worked indicated a mean of 4.38 people with a standard deviation of 2.79.

The means and standard deviation of the FIRO-B scores of the total sample were determined. This is presented in Table 1. The lowest mean score of 2.14 with a standard deviation of 2.06 is the interpersonal need "control expressed" (Ce). The highest mean score is the interpersonal need

"control wanted" (Cw) with a score of 5.26 and a standard deviation of 1.85. The FIRO-B scores are expressed on a scale of 0 to 9. In a previous study by Schutz he also found that teachers ranked highest on "control wanted."

TABLE 1
MEANS AND SD'S FOR FIRO SCALE FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

| Scale | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------------------|------|--------------------|
| 1. Inclusion expressed (Ie) | 4.84 | 2.06 |
| 2. Control expressed (Ce) | 2.14 | 2.06 |
| 3. Affection expressed (Ae) | 3.46 | 2.00 |
| 4. Inclusion wanted (Iw) | 3.30 | 3.43 |
| 5. Control wanted (Cw) | 5.26 | 1.85 |
| 6. Affection wanted (Aw) | 5.02 | 2.18 |

N = 50

Correlations were made between the three variables and the FIRO-B scores. The Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation formula was used. The correlations are presented in Table 2. The scores for each need area were correlated with the three variables at the .05 and .01 levels of significance. The variable of age reveals a significant correlation with the need "inclusion wanted" (Iw) at the .01 level of significance and with the need "affection

wanted" (Aw) at the .05 level of significance. The variable of teaching experience indicates a significant correlation with the need "inclusion wanted" (Iw) at the .05 level of significance. The variable of number of principals for whom participants worked presented no significant correlations.

TABLE 2
CORRELATION BETWEEN AGE, YEARS OF TEACHING,
AND NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS AND FIRO
SCALES FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

| Scale | Age | Years of Teaching | Number of Principals |
|--------------------------|---------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Inclusion expressed (Ie) | - .21 | - .19 | - .21 |
| Control expressed (Ce) | - .25 | - .25 | - .25 |
| Affection expressed (Ae) | - .17 | - .19 | - .22 |
| Inclusion wanted (Iw) | - .49** | - .33* | - .26 |
| Control wanted (Cw) | - .08 | - .08 | + .002 |
| Affection wanted (Aw) | - .29* | - .10 | - .06 |

Sig. at .05 = .28*

N = 50

Sig. at .01 = .36**

Degrees of freedom = 48

The coefficient of correlation produced relatively low scores and significance only in those areas described. In analyzing the correlations, it is possible to state that they approached the levels of significance in some areas.

The statistical data available indicate that the scores made on the FIRO-B inventory are not influenced greatly by the variables of age, years of teaching experience, and number of principals for whom participants worked. However, there is a significant difference when age and years of teaching experience was the criterion variable compared with two interpersonal needs -- "inclusion wanted" and "affection wanted." This suggests that age and years of teaching experience is a factor in the teachers' desire to be wanted and desire to be liked.

CHAPTER IV

COMPARISON OF FIRO-B SCORES WITH PREFERRED ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGY IN THE SITUATIONS INVENTORY

This study proposed to determine if the use of the FIRO-B scale with teachers and comparing the scores of the participants with their choices of certain administrative typologies in various simulated situations would provide information in the area of human behavior that could be useful in the study of educational administration. It was anticipated that various hypotheses could be derived from the information secured.

There were eighteen situations developed in which each teacher in the sample indicated which administrative typology was preferred. The administrative typology known as the instructional leader (IL) was selected fifty per cent of the time. The externalizer (EX) typology was preferred in thirty-three per cent of the situations. The typology known as the operational-mediator (OM) was selected seventeen per cent of the time. A comparison was made between the six FIRO-B scales and the participants' designated

preferred administrative typology. A further comparison was made by determining the t-values between the three typologies selected in each situation. Significance was determined at the .05 and .01 levels for each situation in the inventory. The entire compilation of the data secured and the complete analysis is found in Appendix D.

The externalizer (EX) typology was preferred in situations two, five, nine, ten, thirteen, and seventeen. This is presented in Table 3.

The score of the interpersonal need "control wanted" received the highest score of the participants selecting the externalizer (EX) typology. The mean score was 5.38. The next highest score was for the interpersonal need "affection wanted" and had a mean score of 5.06. This was closely followed by "inclusion expressed" with a mean score of 4.91. Respondents scored lowest on "control expressed" with a mean score of 2.43. The teachers selecting the externalizer (EX) typology indicated an interpersonal need for "control wanted." They were relatively low on the need "control expressed." The externalizer (EX) typology indicates a rather high expression of action toward people. The participants did not score high on the need "inclusion expressed" or "inclusion wanted." The data would indicate that a definite relationship between the externalizer (EX) typology and the need "inclusion" did not develop. No pattern was evident in the choices made by those in the sample.

The instructional leader (IL) was the preferred choice of those in the sample in situations one, four, seven, eight, eleven, twelve, fourteen, sixteen, and eighteen. These are presented in Table 4.

The highest score for the participants indicating a preference for the instructional leader (IL) typology was received by the interpersonal need "control wanted." The mean score was 5.16. The need "affection wanted" was the next highest and received a mean score of 4.99. The interpersonal need "inclusion expressed" received a score of 4.85. The interpersonal need known as "control expressed" received the lowest score and had a mean score of 1.95. In analyzing the scores made by the participants, they indicated a need for "control wanted." The preferred typology known as the instructional leader (IL) denotes a rather high expression of action against people. It is possible to state that in these areas the scores of members would indicate a relationship. Those who desire to be controlled prefer the administrative typology that indicates a rather high expression of control over or action against people.

The administrative typology known as the operational-mediator (OM) was preferred in situations three, six, and fifteen. This is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 4

THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER TYPOLOGY COMPARED WITH
FIRO-B SCORES IN PREFERRED SITUATIONS

| MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR FIRO SCALE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Situation Number | Ie | | Ce | | Ae | | Iw | | Cw | | Aw | | | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | | |
| 1 | 4.66 | 2.19 | 2.17 | 2.12 | 3.49 | 2.33 | 3.34 | 3.44 | 5.17 | 1.87 | 5.26 | 2.18 | | |
| 4 | 4.68 | 2.04 | 2.00 | 1.95 | 3.40 | 2.07 | 3.47 | 3.40 | 5.00 | 1.75 | 5.13 | 2.18 | | |
| 7 | 4.71 | 2.11 | 1.71 | 1.74 | 3.17 | 1.86 | 3.58 | 3.38 | 5.08 | 1.15 | 5.04 | 2.19 | | |
| 8 | 4.84 | 2.02 | 2.29 | 2.19 | 3.39 | 2.08 | 3.18 | 3.50 | 5.00 | 1.85 | 4.84 | 2.22 | 47 | |
| 11 | 4.74 | 2.24 | 1.78 | 1.89 | 3.48 | 2.10 | 3.11 | 3.61 | 5.11 | 1.99 | 4.67 | 2.07 | | |
| 12 | 5.05 | 2.01 | <u>1.58</u> * | 1.63 | 3.05 | 1.64 | 3.21 | 3.44 | <u>5.42</u> ** | 1.35 | 4.84 | 2.39 | | |
| 14 | 4.93 | 1.76 | 1.96 | 2.20 | 3.78 | 2.02 | 2.89 | 3.12 | 5.22 | 1.32 | 5.15 | 2.29 | | |
| 16 | 4.90 | 1.90 | 2.41 | 2.19 | 3.69 | 2.18 | 3.65 | 3.77 | 5.34 | 1.32 | 5.24 | 2.25 | | |
| 18 | 5.10 | 2.07 | 1.90 | 2.21 | 4.05 | 2.38 | 3.05 | 3.58 | 5.10 | 1.37 | 4.80 | 2.42 | | |
| T o t a l (50%) | 9 | 4.85 | 2.04 | 1.98 | 2.01 | 3.50 | 2.07 | 3.28 | 3.47 | 5.16 | 1.55 | 4.99 | 2.44 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* = lowest \bar{X}
** = highest \bar{X}

The FIRO-B score for the interpersonal need "affection wanted" received the highest score for those preferring the administrative typology known as the "operational-mediator." The score received had a mean of 5.20. This was closely followed by the score for the need "control wanted" and indicates a mean of 5.15. The need "inclusion expressed" had a mean score of 4.76. The lowest score was received by the interpersonal need "control expressed" and had a mean of 1.92. However, since this typology was not a frequent choice, these data are of doubtful value except for speculation.

In order to further analyze the FIRO-B scores received by the participants in this study, the scores were compared with the various responses for the administrative typologies. T-tests were administered to determine comparison between the scores and responses of the people sampled in this study. A complete analysis is presented in Appendix D. A brief summary of the comparisons is found in Table 6.

It was appropriate to this study to determine if members of the sample when selecting the preferred typology in simulated situations would score significantly different on the FIRO-B inventory. There were significant differences between the participants' scores on the FIRO-B scale and the selection of the various typologies in nine of the simulated situations. It was determined that this occurred in six of

TABLE 6

COMPARISONS BETWEEN FIRO-B SCORES AND THE PREFERRED
ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGIES THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT

| Situation Number | Typology | Significant Comparisons | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| | | FIRO-B Scale | | | | | |
| | | Ie | Ce | Ae | Iw | Cw | Aw |
| 1 | (IL) | x * | | | x * | | |
| 2 | (EX) | | | | | x * | |
| 3 | (OM) | | | | x * | | x * |
| 6 | (OM) | | x * | | | | |
| 7 | (IL) | | | x * | | x ** | |
| 8 | (IL) | | | | | x * | |
| 14 | (IL) | | | | | x * | |
| 16 | (IL) | | | | | x * | |
| 18 | (IL) | | x * | x * | | | |

* = Sig. at .05 level

** = Sig. at .01 level

the situations in which the instructional leader (IL) typology was selected as the preferred typology. Significant differences in the FIRO-B scores were found in two situations when the operational-mediator (OM) typology was selected and in one situation when the externalizer (EX) typology was selected.

In pursuing this aspect of the investigation some summarization of these data is necessary. It will be noted from Table 6 that there were nine situations in which significant differences were found between FIRO-B scores on certain interpersonal needs and choices of administrative typologies as being most effective in handling the specific situation. The situations described are found in Appendix C. For example, in situation one, which involved the poor study habits of entering seventh graders, there was a significant difference between those who preferred the externalizer (EX) and those who preferred the operational-mediator (OM) in both the "inclusion expressed" and "inclusion wanted" interpersonal needs. There was no significance in other areas for situation one. In situation two, which concerns a homework policy, there was significant difference in the "control wanted" scores for those who preferred the externalizer (EX) and those who preferred the instructional leader (IL). There was no significant difference in other areas in situation two. Situation three involves cooperation with the custodian. There was a significant difference in the areas of "inclusion wanted" and "affection wanted" between those who preferred the instructional leader (IL) and those who preferred the operational-mediator (OM). All other areas were not significantly different in situation three. In situation six, which involves playground supervision, there was a significant

difference in "control expressed" scores for those who preferred the externalizer (EX) and those who preferred the operational-mediator (OM). There was no significance evident in other areas for situation six. Situation seven is concerned with a music class schedule. There was a significant difference in the area "affection expressed" and "control wanted" for those who preferred the externalizer (EX) and those who preferred the operational-mediator (OM). A significant difference was also found in the area of "control wanted" between those selecting the externalizer (EX) and those selecting the instructional leader (IL). There is a significant difference in scores for the interpersonal need "control wanted" and the selection of administrative typologies most effective in situations eight, fourteen and sixteen. Situation eight involves a conflict in teaching methods; situation fourteen is concerned with minority group pressures; and situation sixteen is related to pupil assignment. There was no significance in other areas for situations eight, fourteen, and sixteen. In situation eighteen, which involves the role of the school in teaching social graces, there was a significant difference between those who preferred the externalizer (EX) and those who preferred the operational-mediator (OM) in the interpersonal need "control expressed." In the same situation the need scores for "affection expressed" were significantly different for those who selected the

instructional leader (IL) and those who selected the operational-mediator (OM). There was no significance for the scores in other areas for situation eighteen.

This analysis of the data was made to determine if certain patterns existed in the selection of administrative typologies and the scores made on the FIRO-B inventory. No definite patterns of relationship could be established. The participants who preferred the instructional leader (IL) typology did score significantly different on the FIRO-B scale in more situations than the other typologies. There was no overall definite pattern of relationship that could be established.

However, analysis of the FIRO-B scores and the preferred administrative typology indicates that the interpersonal need "control wanted" received the highest FIRO-B score and the typology known as the instructional leader (IL) was preferred over the other administrative typologies on the situations inventory. Unquestionably there was a pattern of relationships between choices of the instructional leader (IL) typology and the interpersonal need "control wanted." The interpersonal need "control expressed" received the lowest scores of the participants. The typology described as the operational-mediator (OM) was selected least in the situations inventory.

CHAPTER V

COMPARISON OF FIRO-B SCORES WITH THE LEAST PREFERRED ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGY IN THE SITUATIONS INVENTORY

It was considered appropriate to determine what information was available for study and analysis when the scores of the different interpersonal needs on the FIRO-B instrument were compared to the least preferred typology on the situations inventory. The same technique was followed as for the most preferred typologies. The compilation of all data and a complete analysis is found in Appendix D.

The externalizer (EX) typology was preferred least in sixty-seven per cent of the simulated situations. The instructional leader (IL) typology was least preferred in eleven per cent of the situations. The administrative typology known as the operational-mediator (OM) was designated as the least preferred in twenty-two per cent of the situations.

The externalizer (EX) typology was least preferred in situations one, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, eleven, twelve, fourteen, fifteen, and eighteen. These are presented in Table 7.

The FIRC-B score for "control wanted" received the highest score for those selecting the externalizer (EX) typology as least preferred in the situations inventory. The mean score was 5.10 for the members of the sample. The next highest score was received by "inclusion expressed" and had a mean score of 4.96. Next in order was "affection wanted" with a mean score of 4.86. The interpersonal need "control expressed" received the lowest score with a mean of 2.07.

The administrative typology known as the instructional leader (IL) was the least preferred in situations nine and ten. This is indicated in Table 8.

The highest score for the participants indicating the least preference for the instructional leader (IL) typology was received by the interpersonal need "control wanted" and had a mean of 5.22. Next in order is the need "affection wanted" and received a mean score of 5.14. The interpersonal need "inclusion expressed" was next and is found to have a mean of 4.66. The interpersonal behavior known as "control expressed" received the lowest score and had a mean score of 1.95 for those designating the instructional leader (IL) as the least preferred typology.

The operational-mediator (OM) typology was selected as the least preferred in situations two, thirteen, sixteen, and seventeen. This information is listed in Table 9.

The FIRO-B score for the interpersonal need "affection wanted" received the highest score for those listing the operational-mediator (OM) as the typology least preferred. The score received had a mean of 5.40. This was closely followed by the score for "control wanted" and with a mean of 5.34. The need "inclusion expressed" had a mean score of 5.14. The interpersonal need "control expressed" received the lowest score and had a mean of 2.51.

A further analysis of the FIRO-B scores of the sample was made by comparing the scores with the selection of the various typologies that were least preferred. T-tests were used to determine comparisons between the scores and responses of the teachers sampled. A complete analysis is found in Appendix D. Table 10 presents a brief summary of the comparisons.

It was considered relevant to this study to statistically analyze the FIRO-B scores made by respondents to determine if any significant differences exist in these scores as the selection of administrative typologies vary in handling specific situations. These situations are described in Appendix C. In this chapter consideration is given to those typologies that were preferred least in the situations inventory. Analysis was made identical to that previously discussed for the preferred typologies.

The analysis reveals there were significant differences in the respondents' FIRO-B scores in situations

TABLE 10

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE FIRO-B SCORES AND THE
ADMINISTRATIVE TYPOLOGIES LEAST PREFERRED
THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT

| Significant Comparisons | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|--------------|----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Situation Number | Typology | FIRO-B SCALE | | | | | |
| | | Ie | Ce | Ae | Iw | Cw | Aw |
| 3 | (EX) | | | | x * | x * | |
| 8 | (EX) | x ** | | x * | | x * | |
| 11 | (EX) | | | | x * | x * | |
| 12 | (EX) | | | | | x * | |
| 14 | (EX) | | | | x * | | |
| 15 | (EX) | | | | x * | x * | |

* = Sig. at .05 level

** = Sig. at .01 level

three, eight, eleven, twelve, fourteen, and fifteen. In each of these situations the externalizer (EX) typology was selected by the participants. There was a significant difference in the FIRO-B scores for those who selected the externalizer (EX) typology rather than the instructional leader (IL) or operational-mediator (OM) typologies in certain areas. The scores for the interpersonal needs that are significantly different are described in Table 10. It is impossible to state that a definite pattern was

established. The results would be useful for speculation.

In summarizing the analysis of the FIRO-B scores and the administrative typologies preferred least, it is revealed that "control wanted" scores were highest for the participants and the externalizer (EX) typology was least preferred. "Control expressed" received the lowest FIRO-B scores. It is also evident that there are significant differences in the interpersonal need scores for participants and between the different typologies selected as least preferred in the situations inventory.

CHAPTER VI

TESTING THE HYPOTHESES

This study was concerned with the interpersonal needs of teachers as measured by the FIRO-B instrument and the selection of administrative typologies in various simulated situations. Various comparisons between the two measuring instruments were made. Certain assumptions were made and six null hypotheses were formulated on these assumptions. They are:

1. The age of a teacher will not affect the relationship between interpersonal needs and the choice of administrative typologies in simulated situations.

2. Experience of a teacher will not affect the relationship between interpersonal needs and the choice of administrative typologies in simulated situations.

3. The number of principals for whom an individual has worked will not affect the relationship between interpersonal needs and the choice of administrative typologies in simulated situations.

4. There is no significant difference between those who rank high on the interpersonal need "inclusion" as

determined by the FIRO-B scores and those who select the administrative typology designated as the externalizer.

5. There is no significant difference between those who rank high on the interpersonal need "control" as determined by the FIRO-B scores and those who select the administrative typology designated as the instructional leader.

6. There is no significant difference between those who rank high on the interpersonal need "affection" as determined by the FIRO-B scores and those who select the administrative typology known as the operational-mediator.

Analysis of Hypotheses

Hypothesis number 1. Using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation for comparing age and FIRO-B scores, the age of a teacher and the correlation between their FIRO-B scores indicated there was no significant variation for all areas of interpersonal need. There was no difference in the selection of the administrative typologies that was attributable to the age of the person making the selection. The hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number 2. A correlation between the interpersonal needs of teachers as measured by the FIRO-B instrument and the years of teaching experience revealed that there was an insignificant influence by this variable

on the FIRO-B scores. The years of teaching experience did not influence the selection of the administrative typologies. The hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number 3. The third variable was concerned with the number of principals for whom individuals worked and the correlation between the interpersonal needs of people when measured by the FIRO-B scale varied to some degree. They are not significantly influenced by this variable. There was little influence found in the selection of the administrative typologies. The hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number 4. The interpersonal need "inclusion" and the administrative typology known as the externalizer (EX) did correspond in some situations. No definite pattern could be determined. The "inclusion expressed" mean score was 4.84 with a standard deviation of 2.06 and the "inclusion wanted" mean score was 3.30 with a standard deviation of 3.43. In selecting the typology known as the externalizer (EX), it was preferred in thirty-three per cent of the situations and preferred least in sixty-seven per cent of the situations. A significant relationship could not be determined. The hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number 5. The interpersonal need "control wanted" and the administrative typology designated as the instructional leader (IL) show a relationship. A

definite pattern could not be determined but statistical analysis indicates that teachers want to be "controlled" and prefer that typology that denotes a rather high expression of action against people. The "control expressed" score had a mean of 2.14 and a standard deviation of 2.05. Such a low score indicates a low amount of control toward people. The "control wanted" score had a mean of 5.26 and a standard deviation of 1.85. The high score on this scale indicates the interpersonal need for control from others. The administrative typology known as the instructional leader (IL) was preferred in fifty per cent of the simulated situations. The instructional leader (IL) indicates a rather high expression of action against people as defined in this study. The participants in sample indicated a need for control and preferred that administrative typology that would express action against people or express control in interpersonal relations. The hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis number 6. The interpersonal interaction known as "affection expressed" had a FIRO-B mean score of 3.46 with a standard deviation of 2.00. This indicates their behavior toward others was relatively low in this need area. The "affection wanted" score had a mean of 5.02 with a standard deviation of 2.18. This would indicate that the individuals wanted affection from others. The operational-mediator (OM) does not display a marked expression of action toward people, away from people, or

against people. The operational-mediator (OM) typology was preferred in seventeen per cent of the situations and preferred least in twenty-two per cent of the situations. The analysis indicates low scores for "affection expressed" and high scores for "affection wanted." A low percentage of the sample preferred the operational-mediator (OM) typology. It may be stated that a significant relationship does not exist. The hypothesis was not rejected.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Since this study was primarily exploratory, it was anticipated that through the use of the FIRO-B instrument for measuring the interpersonal needs of teachers and the determination of preferred administrative typologies in various simulated situations, certain assumptions could be made and various hypotheses could be developed. A sample of fifty elementary teachers in the Wichita, Kansas Public Schools was used. They were randomly selected from eight elementary schools.

Three independent variables were used to determine if they affected the interpersonal needs of teachers as measured by the FIRO-B instrument. These variables were: (1) age of teachers; (2) years of teaching experience; and (3) number of principals for whom individuals worked.

A situations inventory was developed to determine the preferred administrative typology. These typologies were classified as the externalizer (EX), the instructional

leader (IL), and the operational-mediator (OM). The situations developed were simulated to correspond to actual situations encountered by teachers in their daily association with administrators.

Correlations were made between the independent variables and the FIRO-B scores of the sample. Comparisons between the FIRO-B scores and the administrative typologies were made through the computing of t-values.

The statistical analysis in the study was programmed for use with a computer for an accurate evaluation. An IBM 1620 computer was used.

Conclusions

The underlying purpose of the study was to explore the area of interpersonal needs of teachers and to determine if comparisons between these needs and the defined administrative typologies would provide significant data that could be used in further research and exploration.

The data secured in this study support the following conclusions:

1. The three interpersonal needs used and known as inclusion, control, and affection are valuable in measuring the personality and behavior of teachers.
2. The age of teachers does not affect the FIRO-B score.
3. The years of teaching experience does not affect

the interpersonal need scores of teachers as measured by the FIRO-B inventory.

4. The number of principals for whom the teachers have worked does not affect the scores made on the FIRO-B instrument.

5. Teachers score high on the "inclusion expressed" need and relatively low on the "inclusion wanted" need.

6. Teachers score low on the need "control expressed" and high on the "control wanted" need.

7. Teachers score relatively low on "affection expressed" and high on "affection wanted."

8. The administrative typology designated as the instructional leader (IL) was preferred in the large number of simulated situations.

9. The administrative typology classified as the externalizer (EX) was the least preferred in the various situations.

10. Teachers indicated a desire for the behavioral need "control wanted" and preferred that typology, the instructional leader (IL), that indicates a rather high expression of behavior against people.

11. A situations inventory as used in this study provides little information regarding teachers' real administrative preference. The tendency seemed to indicate that teachers responded in terms of the function specified by the typologies rather than the values and personality

orientations implicit in the typologies. In other words, the instructional leader was called forth in "instructional" situations, the operationally oriented typology in "maintenance" situations, and the externalizer in "public relations" situations; the fact that there were important differences in the ways these typologies related to people seemed not relevant to their being chosen and statistical analysis supported this conclusion.

Implications and Recommendations

Certain implications and assumptions may be made by the information secured in this study. A careful analysis of the available data indicates that the following avenues may be proposed for additional research.

1. It is probable that independent variables will not affect the interpersonal needs of teachers. This suggests that there may be some causal factors in the system of relationships in which teachers function, or which attract people to teaching which in turn explains the apparent desire for control and expression of inclusion.
2. Additional system analysis offers the best analytical tool for investigating and explaining the complex interrelationships of persons in educational organizations.
3. In light of the generalized notion that teachers are affectionate people, additional research should examine

the findings of this study to the effect that teachers score low on the interpersonal need "affection expressed."

4. A situations inventory may be useful in determining teachers' preferred administrative styles; it would perhaps be best to present it without a priori typologies but, rather, allow teachers to freely describe an appropriate administrative style without establishing a prior frame of reference.

5. If it is a valid generalization that teachers display a high need for control, there are important implications; this is a hypothesis which deserves additional and rigorous attention.

6. The FIRO-B is a measuring instrument that is valuable for determining the interpersonal needs of people. This study was limited to elementary teachers. It is recommended that a similar study be conducted with a sample composed of teachers from all grade levels from grade one through grade twelve. Information secured may be analyzed to determine if the needs of teachers vary according to their assignment.

7. It is recommended that a study be conducted using certain information made available in this study to determine the interpersonal needs of administrators. Compatibility between teachers and administrators would be extremely valuable for improving educational administration.

8. It would be useful to conduct similar studies within various school systems. Comparisons between various organizational settings would provide important data.

9. A follow-up study conducted after a period of years would verify the current overall findings and conclusions. A follow-up effort would contribute to strengthening or refuting those findings indicated in this study.

10. Additional experimentation and research is needed to determine the behavioral patterns of teachers and how they might function more efficiently with administrators in various organizational settings.

It is appropriate to state that the role of the administrator is changing. Research is pointing to the need for continually changing emphases. It is becoming increasingly evident that a high degree of knowledge is needed in the area of interpersonal skills.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris. Understanding Organizational Behavior. New York: The Dryden Press, 1950.
- Bakke, E. W. The Fusion Process. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1954.
- Bennis, Warren G., Schein, Edgar H., Berlew, David E., and Steele, Fred I. Interpersonal Dynamics. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964.
- Bennis, Warren G., Benne, Kenneth D., and Chin, Robert. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Bennis, Warren G., and Peabody, D. "The Conceptualization of Two Personality Orientations and Sociometric Choice." The Journal of Social Psychology, LVII (1962), pp. 203-215.
- Berne, Eric. The Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1963.
- Combs, Arthur W. "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, 1962 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962.
- Eaton, Joseph W. "Is Scientific Leadership Selection Possible?" Edited by Alvin W. Gouldner. Studies in Leadership. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Fiegel, Herbert. "Principles and Problems of Theory Construction in Psychology," Current Trends in Psychological Theory. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1951.

- Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process," Administrative Theory in Education. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," Innovations in Education. Edited by Mathew B. Miles. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1963.
- Griffiths, Daniel E., and Azzarelli, Joseph J. "Better School Administration is a Matter of Theory," Kansas Elementary Principal, VII, No. 1 (Fall, 1964) pp. 4-10.
- Haak, Leo. "Conflicting Expectations as an Impediment to School-Community Communication," a paper delivered at the annual meeting, American Sociological Society, August 28, 1957. (Washington, D. C.)
- Horney, Karen. Our Inner Conflicts. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1945.
- Krech, David, Crutchfield, Richard S., and Ballachey, Edgerton L. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Leary, Timothy. "The Theory and Measurement Methodology of Interpersonal Communication," Psychiatry, XVII (1955), pp. 147-161.
- Lindop, Boyd. "Qualities of the Leader," School Activities, XXXV (February, 1964) pp. 175-181.
- March, James, and Simon, Herbert. Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1958.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- Murray, Henry A., et al. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology. New York: The Dryden Press, 1950.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Formal Organization." Edited by Andrew Halpin. Administrative Theory in Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958.

- Parsons, Talcott. "Social Structure and the Development of Personality Trends: Construction to the Integration of Psychology and Sociology," Psychiatry, XXI, No. 4 (November, 1958), pp. 321-340.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Shils, Edward A. "Personality as a System of Action." Edited by Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils. Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962.
- Schutz, William C. FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Personal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958.
- Selznick, Philip. Leadership in Administration. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.
- Tannenbaum, Robert, Weschler, Irving R., and Massarik, Fred. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Van Dalen, Deobold B., and Meyer, William J. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

APPENDIX A

DATA FOR ENTIRE SAMPLE

APPENDIX A
TABLE A

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | No. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | Iw | Cw | Aw | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 1 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 23 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 6 | 35 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 7 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 9 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 35 | 14 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 13 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 14 | 35 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 15 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

APPENDIX A
TABLE A

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | No. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | IW | CW | AW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 16 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 17 | 42 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18 | 49 | 28 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 19 | 39 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 20 | 49 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | 46 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 22 | 48 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 23 | 40 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 24 | 43 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 25 | 42 | 9 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 26 | 36 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 27 | 47 | 27 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 28 | 50 | 30 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 29 | 43 | 15 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 30 | 44 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

APPENDIX A
TABLE A

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | NO. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | IW | CW | AW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | |
| 31 | 40 | 15 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 32 | 60 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 33 | 53 | 23 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 34 | 51 | 18 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 35 | 59 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| 36 | 54 | 28 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 37 | 58 | 18 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| 38 | 56 | 22 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 39 | 54 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| 40 | 62 | 30 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| 41 | 63 | 30 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| 42 | 66 | 35 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| 43 | 58 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| 44 | 60 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 45 | 63 | 40 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | |

APPENDIX A
TABLE A

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | No. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------------------------------|---|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | IW | CW | AW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 46 | 51 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 47 | 53 | 22 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 48 | 64 | 31 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 49 | 62 | 36 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 50 | 56 | 32 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

APPENDIX A

TABLE B

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | No. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - LEAST PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | IW | CW | AW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 1 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 23 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 6 | 35 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 9 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 10 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11 | 35 | 14 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 13 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 14 | 35 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 15 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

APPENDIX A

TABLE B

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | No. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - LEAST PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | IW | CW | AW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 16 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 17 | 42 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 18 | 49 | 28 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 19 | 39 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 20 | 49 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 21 | 46 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 22 | 48 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 23 | 40 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 24 | 43 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 25 | 42 | 9 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 26 | 36 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 27 | 47 | 27 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 28 | 50 | 30 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 29 | 43 | 15 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 30 | 44 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

APPENDIX A

TABLE B

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | No. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - LEAST PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | IW | CW | AW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | | |
| 31 | 40 | 15 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 32 | 60 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 33 | 53 | 23 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 34 | 51 | 18 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 35 | 59 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 36 | 54 | 28 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 37 | 58 | 18 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 38 | 56 | 22 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 39 | 54 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 40 | 62 | 30 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 41 | 63 | 30 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 42 | 66 | 35 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 43 | 58 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 44 | 60 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 45 | 63 | 40 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |

APPENDIX A

TABLE B

| No. | AGE | YEARS OF TEACH EXP. | NO. OF PRINC. FOR WHOM WORKED | FIRO SCALE | | | | | | SITUATIONS NUMBER - LEAST PREFERRED TYPOLOGY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | | | IE | CE | AE | IW | CW | AW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | |
| 46 | 51 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 47 | 53 | 22 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 48 | 64 | 31 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 49 | 62 | 36 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 50 | 56 | 32 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

APPENDIX B

FIRO-B INVENTORY

NAME

GROUP

DATE

MALE FEMALE

AGE

FIRO-B

| | I | C | A |
|---|---|---|---|
| c | | | |
| w | | | |

Please place number of the answer that best applies to you in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as honest as you can.

1. I try to be with people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
2. I let other people decide what to do.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
3. I join social groups.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
4. I try to have close relationships with people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
6. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
7. I try to be included in informal social activities.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
9. I try to include other people in my plans.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
10. I let other people control my actions.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
11. I try to have people around me.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
12. I try to get close and personal with people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
13. When people are doing things together I tend to join them.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
14. I am easily led by people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
15. I try to avoid being alone.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
16. I try to participate in group activities.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never

PLEASE BE AS HONEST AS YOU CAN

17. I try to be friendly to people.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
18. I let other people decide what to do.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
20. I let other people take charge of things.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
21. I try to have close relationships with people.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
22. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
23. I try to get close and personal with people.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
24. I let other people control my actions.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
25. I act cool and distant with people.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
26. I am easily led by people.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody

28. I like people to invite me to things.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people— 5. one or two people 6. nobody
29. I like people to act close and personal with me.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
32. I like people to act close toward me.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
34. I like people to include me in their activities.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
38. I like people to act friendly toward me.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody
40. I like people to act distant toward me.
1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody

PLEASE REMEMBER TO BE AS HONEST AS YOU CAN

41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
42. I like people to invite me to things.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
43. I like people to act close toward me.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
44. I try to have other people do things I want done.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
45. I like people to invite me to join their activities.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
48. I like people to include me in their activities.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
49. I like people to act close and personal with me.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
52. I like people to act distant toward me.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never
54. I take charge of things when I'm with people.
1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATIVE SITUATIONS INVENTORY

FUNCTIONAL TYPOLOGIES OF ADMINISTRATION

A brief description is given below of three functional types of school principals. These different types are typical of principals that work in the public schools today.

1. Mr. Green is the type of principal that is very sensitive to the attitudes and values of the school's patrons. He considers himself "close" to the community and is not overly concerned with philosophical considerations. He feels that the best way to insure public confidence in the schools is to build public confidence in himself. He listens to the board of education and to the power structure in the community, and has learned to speak the language of the school's clientele. He is occupationally secure and upwardly mobile within his profession. He frequently uses the phrase, "Our patrons feel" in his conversations with school personnel.

2. Mr. Blue is the type of principal that tends to identify more with the "academic" values of education than with the managerial. He is primarily concerned about "programs." He is fond of saying that he is primarily interested in results. Since he "keeps up" with the literature, he feels that he is an authority who should be followed but he will explain if questioned. He frequently uses the phrase, "Get the job done" in his conversations with personnel.

3. Mr. Gray is the type of principal that conceives his primary responsibility as facilitating the operation of the school. He likes orderliness and generally regards himself as a good manager. He is interested in the school plant and is somewhat guarded in his interpersonal relationships with both the staff and the school's patrons. He is fond of saying that he believes in running his business and letting other people run theirs so he likes to stay out of the way of his staff so that they can exercise initiative in doing their work. He frequently uses the phrase, "Do the job well" in his conversations with staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE SITUATIONS INVENTORY

Name _____ Age _____

Years of Teaching Experience _____

Number of Principals for whom you have worked _____

A number of situations are listed below that may happen in any school system. In view of your past experiences with school principals for whom you have worked, rank in order from the one most desirable to the one least desirable that type of school principal described in the three typologies that would best display their administrative ability in working with the problem. Type I is identified as Mr. Green, Type II as Mr. Blue, and Type III as Mr. Gray. Please refer to the descriptions of the various typologies of administration as needed.

- I. Teachers from a local junior high school complain about the poor study habits of many of the entering seventh grade pupils. The elementary school teachers affected by this complaint are divided in their reaction. They ask for direction in resolving the problem.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

- II. A group parent-teacher conference is held early in the school year. A number of complaints are registered concerning homework and the lack of it at the present time. A general policy relative to homework has been in effect for a number of years. There is a vocal group who believes that the present policy is inadequate in view of the renewed importance of education.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

III. The school custodian reports that an undue amount of litter and paper is left on the floors after dismissal of school. He states that he wants to be cooperative but feels that teachers are taking advantage of him. It is his request that this matter be corrected and the teachers informed immediately.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

IV. In-service meetings to assist teachers in the teaching of modern mathematics are planned. These meetings are voluntary according to present school policy. It is hoped that all teachers will participate in order that the academic program may be strengthened. Leadership direction will determine the proper attitude and insure attendance of all teachers.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

V. Two members of the faculty come in to complain about Rudy Z____'s Mother interfering in their classrooms. She has been in to "visit" the classrooms three times the past week. They are unhappy with her interference. Mrs. Z____ is unhappy with the way classes are being handled. Some agreement must be forthcoming to prevent a troublesome situation.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

VI. A lower grade teacher sends a note stating that some upper grade children are disturbing their play at recess time and provoking fights. Teacher supervision is on the grounds throughout the period. Action is requested that will remedy this situation and prevent further disturbances.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

VII. Miss Brahms complains that children from Mrs. Y_____'s class are always late for their music classes. This disrupts her entire schedule for the day. Her schedule is such that any variation from it renders it inadequate.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

VIII. Mrs. H_____ insists on teaching the sounds of letters in isolation in her speech therapy classes. This concerns Miss A_____ who feels it is her responsibility in her first grade reading to teach the sounds according to her method, which she says has been quite successful for years. This is developing into a distressing situation.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

IX. A well known lady from a prominent family in the community lives near the school. Children pass her home going to and from school. She issues a complaint concerning children disturbing her property and being destructive. Action is required and improvement must be evident.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

X. Children have been observed riding their bicycles on the sidewalks with little regard for the pedestrian traffic. The police are unable to cope with the situation. School and community cooperation has been solicited. A policy is necessary to correct this problem.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

XI. A committee representing life insurance underwriters desire to strengthen the teaching of economic education in the local school. Most teachers involved are rather indifferent to the request. A feeling persists that curriculum matters are of concern to educators and decisions are to be made by them. An adequate reply to the pressure of the insurance group is needed.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

XII. A letter is received from a local parent stating that it is his judgment that Miss Q_____ is temperamentally unsuited to teach in the first grade. It was hoped that his first impressions would prove to be incorrect. Continually checking with their son and parents of children in the room indicate a classroom filled with tensions and frustrations. Since no improvement in the situation is evident and a dangerous problem exists, immediate action is desirable.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

XIII. Children in the school are permitted to receive religious instruction at St. Patrick's one hour each week. Mary attends with several other fifth grade children on a voluntary basis. The period that is necessary to be away from school falls within her library period which she misses. Her mother charges that this is discrimination and desires that the library period be changed.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

XIV. An ultra-conservative group writes a letter of protest concerning a United Nation's Day program held in Mr. W_____ 's room. They question whether it is wise and prudent to indoctrinate young minds about an organization that is overrun by enemy and alien factions. Better control of these practices in the future is expected.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

XV. The number of non-white students in the school is increasing. One of the faculty members, both directly and indirectly, indicates a biased and intolerable attitude toward minority groups. The situation has not become explosive. Action must be taken before an embarrassing situation arises.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

XVI. A highly emotional child who has been under the care of a local clinic has decided to enroll in your school. The parents have made a specific request for a certain teacher whom they have known personally. It is felt that another teacher who has had previous experience with this type of child would be a wiser selection. Placement of the child should be according to the best knowledge available and in light of past experience.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

XVII. A member of the faculty writes a letter to the editor of the Daily Record that appears in the paper. It is critical of one of the major political parties and its designated leader. A local citizen feels that this teacher is dangerous to the school system and its pupils by spreading distrust about its leaders. This matter needs to be investigated.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

XVIII. The complaint is registered that children are not taught manners at school. The basis for the complaint is that in the home at meal time it is regular bedlam at the table. It is felt that the school has a responsibility to teach manners and social graces. Attention is necessary in this area of child development.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

APPENDIX D

**COMPARISONS OF FIRO-B SCORES WITH
PREFERRED TYPOLOGIES AND WITH
LEAST PREFERRED TYPOLOGIES**

TABLE C

| SITUATION NUMBER | | <u>1</u> | | PREFERENCE | | <u>Preferred</u> | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|----------|----------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | <u>5 (10%)</u> | 2 | <u>35 (70%)</u> | 3 | <u>10 (20%)</u> | | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 38 | 13 | 43 |
| 1. | Ie | 3.80 | .98 | 4.66 | 2.19 | 6.00 | 1.41 | | .84 | 2.91* | 1.79 |
| 2. | Ce | 1.60 | 1.74 | 2.17 | 2.12 | 2.30 | 1.95 | | .56 | .63 | .17 |
| 3. | Ae | 3.00 | .00 | 3.49 | 2.33 | 3.60 | .92 | | .45 | 1.36 | .15 |
| 4. | Iw | 5.80 | 3.25 | 3.34 | 3.44 | 1.90 | 2.66 | | 1.47 | 2.31* | 1.20 |
| 5. | Cw | 6.20 | 1.72 | 5.17 | 1.87 | 5.10 | 1.70 | | 1.13 | 1.09 | .11 |
| 6. | Aw | 5.60 | 1.96 | 5.26 | 2.18 | 3.90 | 1.87 | | .32 | 1.52 | 1.75 |
| * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.16 | 2.02 |
| ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 3.01 | 2.70 |

TABLE D

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 2 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 23 (46%) | | 2 20 (40%) | | 3 7 (14%) | | | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 41 | 28 | 25 | | |
| 1. I e | 5.09 | 1.86 | 4.85 | 2.01 | 4.00 | 2.56 | .39 | 1.19 | .86 | | |
| 2. C e | 2.65 | 2.16 | 1.80 | 2.04 | 1.43 | 1.17 | 1.29 | 1.39 | .44 | | |
| 3. A e | 3.78 | 1.98 | 3.35 | 2.01 | 2.71 | 1.82 | .69 | 1.23 | .71 | | |
| 4. I w | 3.96 | 3.48 | 2.60 | 3.10 | 3.14 | 3.72 | 1.31 | .52 | .36 | | |
| 5. C w | 5.78 | 1.38 | 4.85 | 1.49 | 4.71 | 3.19 | 2.08* | 1.22 | .14 | | |
| 6. A w | 5.13 | 2.42 | 5.05 | 1.99 | 4.57 | 1.76 | .16 | .55 | .54 | | |
| * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.05 | 2.06 | |
| ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 2.76 | 2.79 | |

TABLE D

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 3 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|------------|---------|---------------------------------|--------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 5 (10%) | | 2 35 (70%) | | 3 10 (20%) | | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | |
| FIRO SCALE | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 12 | 36 | 46 | |
| 1. I e | 3.50 | 1.50 | 4.75 | 1.83 | 4.94 | 2.13 | .85 | .91 | .28 | |
| 2. C e | 3.00 | 2.00 | 1.50 | 1.55 | 2.31 | 2.16 | 1.12 | .43 | 1.17 | |
| 3. A e | 3.00 | 1.00 | 3.25 | 1.42 | 3.56 | 2.19 | .22 | .35 | .44 | |
| 4. I w | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.58 | 2.50 | 4.00 | 3.53 | .30 | 1.17 | 2.15 * | |
| 5. C w | 4.50 | 1.50 | 4.83 | 1.07 | 5.44 | 2.03 | .35 | .63 | .98 | |
| 6. A w | 5.00 | .00 | 3.75 | 2.09 | 5.44 | 2.10 | .78 | .29 | 2.37 * | |
| * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.18 | 2.03 | 2.02 | |
| ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 3.06 | 2.72 | 2.71 | |

TABLE F

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 4 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|------|--------|------------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------------------------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | 3 (6%) | 2 | 38 (76%) | 3 | 9 (18%) | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | |
| FIRO SCALE | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 39 | 10 | 45 | |
| 1. I e | 4.33 | 1.69 | 4.68 | 2.04 | 5.67 | 2.05 | .28 | .93 | 1.27 | |
| 2. C e | 1.00 | .00 | 2.00 | 1.95 | 3.11 | 2.47 | .87 | 1.35 | 1.43 | |
| 3. A e | 3.33 | .47 | 3.40 | 2.07 | 3.78 | 1.99 | .05 | .35 | .49 | |
| 4. I w | 5.67 | 4.03 | 3.47 | 3.40 | 1.78 | 2.61 | .10 | 1.76 | 1.37 | |
| 5. C w | 6.67 | 1.70 | 5.00 | 1.75 | 5.89 | 1.97 | .16 | .56 | 1.31 | |
| 6. A w | 5.67 | 1.70 | 5.13 | 2.18 | 4.33 | 2.16 | .41 | .89 | .97 | |
| * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | | 2.02 | 2.16 | 2.02 | |
| ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | | 2.70 | 3.01 | 2.70 | |

TABLE G

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 5 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 21 (42%) | | 2 16 (32%) | | 3 13 (26%) | | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 35 | 32 | 27 | |
| 1. I e | 5.10 | 1.60 | 4.50 | 2.15 | 4.85 | 2.51 | .94 | .34 | .39 | |
| 2. C e | 2.71 | 2.45 | 1.56 | 1.80 | 1.92 | 1.27 | 1.54 | 1.05 | .59 | |
| 3. A e | 3.86 | 1.91 | 3.00 | 1.17 | 3.39 | 2.70 | 1.54 | .58 | .49 | |
| 4. I w | 2.95 | 3.14 | 3.31 | 3.14 | 3.85 | 4.10 | .34 | .70 | .38 | |
| 5. C w | 5.48 | 1.50 | 5.13 | 1.45 | 5.08 | 2.62 | .70 | .55 | .06 | |
| 6. A w | 4.76 | 2.07 | 5.50 | 1.54 | 4.85 | 2.82 | 1.16 | .10 | .76 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | 2.04 | 2.04 | 2.05 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.77 | |

TABLE H

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 6 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-----------|------|------------|------|------------|------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 6 (12%) | | 2 19 (38%) | | 3 25 (50%) | | | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 23 | 29 | 42 |
| 1. | I e | 5.00 | .82 | 4.84 | 2.18 | 4.80 | 2.17 | | 1.66 | .21 | .06 |
| 2. | C e | 4.00 | 2.94 | 2.47 | 1.60 | 1.44 | 1.75 | | 1.56 | 2.68* | 1.97 |
| 3. | A e | 4.67 | 1.89 | 3.16 | 1.66 | 3.40 | 2.15 | | 1.80 | 1.28 | .40 |
| 4. | I w | 3.83 | 3.24 | 3.05 | 3.30 | 3.36 | 3.55 | | .49 | .29 | .29 |
| 5. | C w | 6.00 | 1.63 | 5.21 | 1.64 | 5.12 | 2.01 | | .99 | .97 | .16 |
| 6. | A w | 5.50 | 1.71 | 4.84 | 2.08 | 5.04 | 2.32 | | .67 | .44 | .29 |
| * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | | | 2.07 | 2.05 | 2.02 |
| ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | | | 2.81 | 2.76 | 2.70 |

TABLE I

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 7 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|------|------------|------|------------|---------------------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 3 (6%) | | 2 24 (48%) | | 3 23 (46%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 25 | 24 | 45 | |
| 1. I e | 3.00 | 2.94 | 4.71 | 2.11 | 5.22 | 1.69 | | 1.21 | 1.85 | .89 | |
| 2. C e | 2.00 | 2.16 | 1.71 | 1.74 | 2.61 | 2.24 | | .26 | .43 | 1.51 | |
| 3. A e | 1.33 | 1.25 | 3.17 | 1.86 | 4.04 | 1.97 | | 1.60 | 2.24* | 1.54 | |
| 4. I w | 1.33 | 1.89 | 3.58 | 3.38 | 3.26 | 3.55 | | 1.09 | .87 | .31 | |
| 5. C w | 2.00 | 2.83 | 5.08 | 1.15 | 5.87 | 1.80 | | 3.37** | 3.11** | 1.75 | |
| 6. A w | 4.33 | .47 | 5.04 | 2.19 | 5.09 | 2.28 | | .54 | .55 | .07 | |
| | | | | | | | t .05 | 2.06 | 2.06 | 2.02 | |
| | | | | | | | t .01 | 2.79 | 2.80 | 2.70 | |

TABLE J

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 8 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------|------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 5 (10%) | | 2 38 (76%) | | 3 7 (14%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 41 | 10 | 43 | |
| 1. I e | 3.80 | 2.13 | 4.84 | 2.02 | 5.57 | 1.92 | | 1.05 | 1.37 | .87 | |
| 2. C e | 1.80 | 1.72 | 2.29 | 2.19 | 1.57 | 1.29 | | .47 | .24 | .82 | |
| 3. A e | 3.20 | 1.33 | 3.39 | 2.08 | 4.00 | 1.85 | | .20 | .75 | .70 | |
| 4. I w | 3.20 | 3.19 | 3.18 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.12 | | .01 | .40 | .56 | |
| 5. C w | 5.20 | 1.17 | 5.00 | 1.85 | 6.71 | 1.58 | | .23 | 1.66 | 2.25* | |
| 6. A w | 5.20 | 1.94 | 4.84 | 2.22 | 5.86 | 1.88 | | .34 | .54 | 1.11 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.23 | 2.02 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 3.17 | 2.70 | |

TABLE K

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 9 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 41 (82%) | | 2 3 (6%) | | 3 6 (12%) | | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 42 | 45 | 7 |
| 1. I e | 4.83 | 2.05 | 3.67 | .94 | 5.50 | 2.29 | | .95 | .72 | 1.17 |
| 2. C e | 2.17 | 2.19 | 1.67 | .47 | 2.17 | 1.57 | | .39 | .004 | .48 |
| 3. A e | 3.51 | 2.05 | 3.33 | 2.05 | 3.17 | 1.57 | | .14 | .39 | .12 |
| 4. I w | 3.12 | 3.31 | 1.00 | 1.41 | 5.67 | 3.73 | | 1.08 | 1.69 | 1.85 |
| 5. C w | 5.17 | 1.92 | 5.33 | .47 | 5.83 | 1.68 | | .14 | .78 | .45 |
| 6. A w | 4.85 | 2.18 | 4.33 | 1.86 | 6.50 | 1.61 | | .39 | 1.74 | 1.58 |
| * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.02 | 2.37 |
| ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 3.50 |

TABLE I

| SITUATION NUMBER | | <u>10</u> | | PREFERENCE | | <u>Preferred</u> | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------|------|------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | <u>28 (56%)</u> | 2 | <u>10 (20%)</u> | 3 | <u>12 (24%)</u> | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | | | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 36 | 38 | 20 | | |
| 1. I e | 4.96 | 1.97 | 5.40 | 1.49 | 4.08 | 2.43 | | .62 | 1.17 | 1.42 | | |
| 2. C e | 2.00 | 2.10 | 2.50 | 1.91 | 2.17 | 2.03 | | .64 | .23 | .38 | | |
| 3. A e | 3.86 | 2.20 | 3.20 | 1.94 | 2.75 | 1.16 | | .81 | 1.61 | .64 | | |
| 4. I w | 3.61 | 3.47 | 2.70 | 2.90 | 3.08 | 3.66 | | .72 | .42 | .26 | | |
| 5. C w | 4.75 | 1.88 | 5.90 | 1.45 | 5.92 | 1.71 | | 1.71 | 1.80 | .02 | | |
| 6. A w | 5.32 | 2.19 | 4.20 | 2.27 | 5.00 | 1.87 | | 1.34 | .43 | .86 | | |
| | | | | | | | | * = Sig. at .05 level | t .05 | 2.03 | 2.02 | 2.09 |
| | | | | | | | | ** = Sig. at .01 level | t .01 | 2.72 | 2.70 | 2.85 |

TABLE M

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 11 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|----------|------------|----------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | 13 (26%) | 2 | 27 (54%) | 3 | 10 (20%) | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 38 | 21 | 35 | |
| 1. I e | 4.77 | 2.12 | 4.74 | 2.24 | 5.20 | 2.12 | .04 | .54 | .59 | |
| 2. C e | 2.15 | 1.61 | 1.78 | 1.89 | 3.10 | 1.61 | .60 | 1.02 | 1.64 | |
| 3. A e | 3.23 | 1.37 | 3.48 | 2.10 | 3.70 | 1.37 | .38 | .57 | .26 | |
| 4. I w | 3.85 | 3.09 | 3.11 | 3.61 | 3.10 | 3.08 | .62 | .54 | .01 | |
| 5. C w | 4.92 | 1.69 | 5.11 | 1.99 | 6.10 | 1.69 | .29 | .17 | 1.41 | |
| 6. A w | 5.77 | 2.01 | 4.67 | 2.07 | 5.00 | 2.01 | .16 | .80 | .40 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.08 | 2.03 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 2.83 | 2.72 |

TABLE N

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 12 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|-------|------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 18 (36%) | | 2 19 (38%) | | 3 13 (26%) | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 35 | 29 | 30 | |
| 1. I e | 4.50 | 1.83 | 5.05 | 2.01 | 5.00 | 2.35 | .85 | .64 | .07 | |
| 2. C e | 2.11 | 1.99 | 1.58 | 1.63 | 3.00 | 2.39 | .87 | 1.09 | 1.94 | |
| 3. A e | 3.78 | 1.93 | 3.05 | 1.64 | 3.62 | 2.43 | 1.20 | .20 | .75 | |
| 4. I w | 3.06 | 3.01 | 3.21 | 3.44 | 3.77 | 3.53 | .14 | .56 | .43 | |
| 5. C w | 5.11 | 1.56 | 5.42 | 1.35 | 5.23 | 2.67 | .63 | .15 | .26 | |
| 6. A w | 4.94 | 2.34 | 4.84 | 2.39 | 5.39 | 1.44 | .13 | .58 | .71 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | t .05 | | 2.03 | 2.05 | 2.04 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | t .01 | | 2.72 | 2.76 | 2.75 | |

TABLE 0

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 13 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------|--|------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 26 (52%) | | 2 18 (36%) | | 3 6 (12%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | <u>t</u> values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 42 | 30 | 22 | |
| 1. I e | 4.50 | 2.02 | 5.00 | 2.19 | 5.83 | 1.34 | | .76 | 1.49 | .84 | |
| 2. C e | 2.62 | 2.42 | 1.61 | 1.46 | 1.67 | 1.25 | | 1.54 | .90 | .08 | |
| 3. A e | 3.54 | 2.08 | 3.17 | 1.86 | 4.00 | 1.91 | | .59 | .48 | .90 | |
| 4. I w | 3.54 | 3.43 | 2.50 | 3.22 | 4.67 | 3.45 | | .99 | .70 | 1.34 | |
| 5. C w | 5.65 | 2.24 | 4.61 | 1.16 | 5.50 | .96 | | 1.78 | .16 | 1.62 | |
| 6. A w | 5.08 | 2.04 | 4.78 | 2.44 | 5.50 | 1.80 | | .43 | .45 | .64 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.04 | 2.07 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 2.75 | 2.82 | |

TABLE P

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 14 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|--|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 10 (20%) | | 2 27 (54%) | | 3 13 (26%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | <u>t</u> values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 35 | 21 | 38 | |
| 1. I e | 5.20 | 1.89 | 4.93 | 1.76 | 4.39 | 2.62 | | .40 | .80 | .75 | |
| 2. C e | 3.10 | 1.92 | 1.96 | 2.20 | 1.77 | 1.58 | | 1.40 | 1.74 | .28 | |
| 3. A e | 3.60 | 1.63 | 3.78 | 2.02 | 2.69 | 2.02 | | .24 | 1.11 | 1.55 | |
| 4. I w | 5.10 | 3.70 | 2.89 | 3.12 | 2.77 | 3.38 | | 1.77 | 1.50 | .11 | |
| 5. C w | 6.50 | 1.91 | 5.22 | 1.32 | 4.39 | 2.20 | | 2.24* | 2.31* | 1.46 | |
| 6. A w | 4.80 | 2.27 | 5.15 | 2.26 | 4.92 | 1.90 | | .41 | 1.35 | .30 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.03 | 2.08 | 2.02 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.72 | 2.83 | 2.70 | |

TABLE Q

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 15 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 18 (36%) | | 2 13 (26%) | | 3 19 (38%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 29 | 35 | 30 |
| 1. | I e | 4.61 | 1.80 | 5.62 | 2.10 | 4.53 | 2.14 | | 1.38 | .13 | 1.38 |
| 2. | C e | 2.22 | 2.15 | 2.23 | 2.61 | 2.00 | 1.45 | | .01 | .36 | .31 |
| 3. | A e | 3.17 | 1.12 | 4.00 | 2.39 | 3.37 | 2.28 | | 1.26 | .33 | .73 |
| 4. | I w | 4.39 | 3.48 | 2.39 | 3.05 | 2.90 | 3.35 | | 1.61 | 1.29 | .42 |
| 5. | C w | 5.61 | 1.46 | 5.31 | 1.49 | 4.90 | 2.29 | | .55 | 1.10 | .55 |
| 6. | A w | 5.50 | 1.77 | 4.23 | 2.33 | 5.11 | 2.27 | | 1.67 | .57 | 1.03 |
| | | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | t .05 | | 2.05 | | 2.03 | 2.04 |
| | | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | t .01 | | 2.76 | | 2.72 | 2.75 |

TABLE R

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 16 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | Number of People responding: 1 14 (28%) 2 29 (58%) 3 7 (14%) | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|------|------|------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|--|-------|--|
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 41 | 19 | 34 | |
| 1. I e | 5.29 | 1.83 | 4.90 | 1.90 | 3.71 | 2.66 | .62 | 1.51 | 1.32 | |
| 2. C e | 1.71 | 1.94 | 2.41 | 2.19 | 1.86 | 1.46 | .99 | .16 | .62 | |
| 3. A e | 3.50 | 1.50 | 3.69 | 2.18 | 2.43 | 1.76 | .29 | 1.38 | 1.38 | |
| 4. I w | 3.07 | 2.76 | 3.65 | 3.77 | 2.29 | 2.86 | .50 | .58 | .88 | |
| 5. C w | 5.79 | 2.01 | 5.34 | 1.32 | 3.86 | 2.59 | .84 | 1.79 | 2.09* | |
| 6. A w | 4.57 | 2.16 | 5.24 | 2.25 | 5.00 | 1.69 | .90 | .44 | .26 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.09 | 2.04 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 2.86 | 2.70 | |

TABLE S

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 17 | | PREFERENCE | | Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|-------|------------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 25 (50%) | | 2 12 (24%) | | 3 13 (26%) | | | | |
| MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 35 | 36 | 23 |
| 1. I e | 5.00 | 1.90 | 5.00 | 1.91 | 4.39 | 2.40 | | .00 | .84 | .68 |
| 2. C e | 2.40 | 2.04 | 1.75 | 1.69 | 2.00 | 2.32 | | .93 | .53 | .29 |
| 3. A e | 3.56 | 1.92 | 3.42 | 1.80 | 3.31 | 2.30 | | .21 | .35 | .13 |
| 4. I w | 4.28 | 3.11 | 2.50 | 3.45 | 2.15 | 3.46 | | 1.53 | 1.87 | .24 |
| 5. C w | 5.44 | 1.30 | 5.25 | 1.59 | 4.92 | 2.73 | | .38 | .77 | .35 |
| 6. A w | 5.24 | 2.01 | 4.50 | 3.04 | 5.08 | 1.27 | | .86 | .26 | .60 |
| * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | | | 2.03 | 2.03 | 2.07 |
| ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | | | 2.72 | 2.72 | 2.81 |

TABLE T

| SITUATION NUMBER <u>18</u> | | PREFERENCE <u>Preferred</u> | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | <u>14 (28%)</u> | | 2 | <u>20 (40%)</u> | | 3 | <u>16 (32%)</u> | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 32 | 28 | 34 | |
| 1. I e | 5.21 | 1.66 | 5.10 | 2.07 | 4.19 | 2.21 | | .17 | 1.37 | 1.24 | |
| 2. C e | 3.21 | 2.11 | 1.90 | 2.21 | 1.50 | 1.32 | | 1.69 | 2.61* | .62 | |
| 3. A e | 3.57 | 1.72 | 4.05 | 2.38 | 2.63 | 1.32 | | .63 | 1.65 | 2.09* | |
| 4. I w | 4.21 | 3.05 | 3.05 | 3.58 | 2.81 | 3.40 | | .96 | 1.14 | 1.97 | |
| 5. C w | 5.64 | 1.49 | 5.10 | 1.37 | 5.13 | 2.50 | | 1.06 | .65 | .04 | |
| 6. A w | 5.93 | 1.62 | 4.80 | 2.42 | 4.50 | 2.03 | | 1.48 | 2.04 | .39 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.04 | 2.05 | 2.04 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.75 | 2.76 | 2.75 | |

TABLE U

| SITUATION NUMBER | | <u>1</u> | | PREFERENCE | | <u>Least Preferred</u> | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|-----------------|------------|---------------|------------------------|--|------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | <u>32 (64%)</u> | 2 | <u>4 (8%)</u> | 3 | <u>14 (28%)</u> | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | <u>t</u> values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 34 | 44 | 16 | |
| 1. I e | 5.16 | 1.97 | 5.75 | 1.30 | 3.86 | 2.10 | | .57 | 1.97 | 1.61 | |
| 2. C e | 2.34 | 2.10 | 1.50 | 1.12 | 1.86 | 2.10 | | .77 | .71 | .31 | |
| 3. A e | 3.66 | 2.30 | 3.75 | 1.30 | 2.93 | 1.16 | | .08 | 1.10 | 1.14 | |
| 4. I w | 3.19 | 3.40 | 2.75 | 3.70 | 3.71 | 3.37 | | .23 | .47 | .47 | |
| 5. C w | 4.94 | 2.02 | 6.75 | 1.30 | 5.57 | 1.24 | | 1.70 | 1.07 | 1.57 | |
| 6. A w | 5.16 | 2.24 | 4.25 | 2.77 | 4.93 | 1.75 | | .72 | .33 | .56 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.04 | 2.02 | 2.12 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.75 | 2.70 | 2.92 | |

TABLE V

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 2 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 15 (30%) | | 2 11 (22%) | | 3 24 (48%) | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 24 | 37 | 33 |
| 1. I e | 4.20 | 2.43 | 4.55 | 1.92 | 5.38 | 1.70 | | .38 | 1.73 | 1.25 |
| 2. C e | 2.07 | 2.29 | 1.55 | 1.73 | 2.46 | 1.98 | | .61 | .55 | 1.28 |
| 3. A e | 2.73 | 2.11 | 3.55 | 1.31 | 3.88 | 2.07 | | 1.08 | 1.62 | .47 |
| 4. I w | 2.07 | 3.09 | 3.46 | 3.63 | 4.00 | 3.33 | | 1.01 | 1.77 | .43 |
| 5. C w | 4.47 | 2.28 | 6.09 | 1.56 | 5.38 | 1.44 | | 1.96 | 1.49 | 1.29 |
| 6. A w | 5.00 | 1.97 | 4.36 | 1.61 | 5.33 | 2.44 | | .84 | .43 | 1.17 |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.06 | 2.02 | 2.04 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.75 |

TABLE W

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 3 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Number of People Responding: | | 1 32 (64%) | | 2 12 (24%) | | 3 6 (12%) | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 42 | 36 | 16 |
| 1. I e | 5.09 | 2.04 | 4.33 | 2.21 | 4.50 | 1.61 | | 1.05 | .66 | .15 |
| 2. C e | 1.88 | 1.62 | 3.08 | 2.87 | 1.67 | 1.60 | | 1.71 | .28 | 1.06 |
| 3. A e | 3.47 | 2.18 | 3.67 | 1.93 | 3.00 | .58 | | .27 | .51 | .78 |
| 4. I w | 2.84 | 3.16 | 5.50 | 3.80 | 1.33 | 1.11 | | 2.29* | 1.13 | 2.48* |
| 5. C w | 4.91 | 1.72 | 6.50 | 1.76 | 4.67 | 1.60 | | 2.66* | .31 | 2.03 |
| 6. A w | 4.84 | 2.20 | 5.75 | 2.24 | 4.50 | 1.50 | | 1.18 | .36 | 1.16 |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | | 2.02 | 2.03 | 2.12 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | | 2.70 | 2.72 | 2.92 |

TABLE X

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 4 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|--|------|-------|------|-------|
| Number of People Responding: | | 1 32 (64%) | | 2 4 (8%) | | 3 14 (28%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | <u>t</u> values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 34 | 44 | 16 | |
| 1. I e | 4.84 | 2.16 | 4.25 | 1.30 | 5.00 | 1.89 | | .52 | .23 | .70 | |
| 2. C e | 2.34 | 2.22 | 2.50 | 1.12 | 1.57 | 1.76 | | .14 | 1.13 | .94 | |
| 3. A e | 3.38 | 2.20 | 3.50 | 1.80 | 3.64 | 1.49 | | .11 | .41 | .15 | |
| 4. I w | 3.09 | 3.29 | 2.25 | 2.49 | 4.07 | 3.81 | | .48 | .86 | .85 | |
| 5. C w | 5.31 | 2.05 | 5.25 | 4.33 | 5.14 | 1.60 | | .06 | .27 | .13 | |
| 6. A w | 4.75 | 2.41 | 5.50 | 1.66 | 5.50 | 1.55 | | .59 | 1.05 | .00 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.03 | 2.02 | 2.12 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.75 | 2.70 | 2.92 | |

TABLE Y

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 5 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 20 (40%) | | 2 11 (22%) | | 3 19 (38%) | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 29 | 37 | 28 | |
| 1. I e | 5.00 | 1.87 | 4.73 | 2.45 | 4.74 | 2.00 | .34 | .41 | .01 | |
| 2. C e | 2.10 | 1.73 | 2.27 | 2.70 | 2.11 | 1.94 | .21 | .01 | .19 | |
| 3. A e | 3.20 | 1.97 | 3.64 | 2.38 | 3.63 | 1.75 | .53 | .70 | .06 | |
| 4. I w | 3.60 | 3.51 | 3.91 | 3.60 | 2.63 | 3.12 | .22 | .89 | .99 | |
| 5. C w | 5.55 | 1.43 | 5.36 | 3.08 | 4.90 | 1.07 | .22 | .16 | .58 | |
| 6. A w | 5.05 | 2.38 | 5.18 | 1.53 | 4.90 | 2.27 | .16 | .20 | .36 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.05 | 2.02 | 2.05 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.76 | 2.70 | 2.76 |

TABLE Z

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 6 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|----------|------------|----------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------|------|------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | 34 (68%) | 2 | 12 (24%) | 3 | 4 (8%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | | | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 44 | 36 | 14 | | |
| 1. I e | 5.00 | 2.28 | 4.58 | 1.61 | 4.25 | .83 | | .57 | .64 | .37 | | |
| 2. C e | 2.18 | 1.84 | 2.33 | 2.78 | 1.25 | .43 | | .22 | .98 | .73 | | |
| 3. A e | 3.27 | 2.19 | 4.17 | 1.57 | 3.00 | .00 | | 1.29 | .24 | 1.39 | | |
| 4. I w | 2.88 | 3.36 | 4.33 | 3.50 | 3.75 | 3.11 | | 1.25 | .48 | .28 | | |
| 5. C w | 5.15 | 2.09 | 5.58 | 1.26 | 5.25 | .83 | | .67 | .09 | .46 | | |
| 6. A w | 4.71 | 2.16 | 5.67 | 1.84 | 5.75 | 2.59 | | 1.34 | .87 | .07 | | |
| | | | | | | | | * = Sig. at .05 level | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.03 | 2.15 |
| | | | | | | | | ** = Sig. at .01 level | t .01 | 2.70 | 2.72 | 2.98 |

TABLE AA

| SITUATIONS NUMBER <u>7</u> | | PREFERENCE <u>Least Preferred</u> | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------|------|----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | <u>33 (66%)</u> | | 2 | <u>5 (10%)</u> | | 3 | <u>12 (24%)</u> | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 36 | 43 | 15 | |
| 1. I e | 5.09 | 1.93 | 5.40 | 1.96 | 3.92 | 2.18 | .32 | 1.70 | 1.24 | |
| 2. C e | 2.03 | 2.14 | 2.40 | 1.50 | 2.33 | 2.01 | .36 | 4.17 | .07 | |
| 3. A e | 3.61 | 2.21 | 3.80 | 1.17 | 2.92 | 1.50 | .19 | .98 | 1.11 | |
| 4. I w | 3.03 | 3.28 | 3.80 | 3.92 | 3.83 | 3.53 | .46 | .70 | .02 | |
| 5. C w | 5.39 | 1.48 | 6.60 | 2.06 | 4.33 | 2.21 | 1.56 | 1.81 | 1.85 | |
| 6. A w | 5.00 | 2.07 | 3.80 | 2.64 | 5.58 | 2.02 | 1.13 | .82 | 1.42 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.03 | 2.02 | 2.13 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.75 | 2.70 | 2.95 |

TABLE BB

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 8 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|--------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 31 (62%) | | 2 4 (8%) | | 3 15 (30%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 33 | 44 | 17 | |
| 1. I e | 5.58 | 1.64 | 4.50 | 1.80 | 3.40 | 2.12 | | 1.19 | 3.74** | .90 | |
| 2. C e | 2.45 | 2.18 | 2.25 | 1.64 | 1.47 | 1.71 | | .17 | 1.50 | .78 | |
| 3. A e | 3.97 | 2.13 | 3.50 | .87 | 2.40 | 1.45 | | .42 | 2.52* | 1.37 | |
| 4. I w | 2.97 | 3.29 | 6.00 | 3.08 | 3.27 | 3.49 | | 1.70 | .28 | 1.35 | |
| 5. C w | 5.61 | 1.56 | 6.50 | 1.50 | 4.20 | 2.01 | | 1.04 | 2.56* | 2.02 | |
| 6. A w | 4.87 | 2.24 | 5.00 | 2.12 | 5.33 | 2.02 | | .11 | .66 | .27 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.04 | 2.02 | 2.11 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t. 01 | 2.75 | 2.70 | 2.90 | |

TABLE CC

| SITUATION NUMBER <u>9</u> | | PREFERENCE <u>Least Preferred</u> | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 <u>6 (12%)</u> | 2 <u>25 (50%)</u> | 3 <u>19 (38%)</u> | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 29 | 23 | 42 |
| 1. I e | 5.67 | 2.06 | 4.68 | 2.01 | 4.79 | 2.07 | 1.04 | .87 | .17 |
| 2. C e | 2.33 | 1.49 | 2.08 | 2.21 | 2.16 | 2.01 | .26 | .19 | .12 |
| 3. A e | 2.83 | 1.77 | 3.56 | 2.19 | 3.53 | 1.76 | .73 | .81 | .05 |
| 4. I w | 4.17 | 3.89 | 3.12 | 3.15 | 3.26 | 3.58 | .67 | .51 | .14 |
| 5. C w | 5.17 | .90 | 5.28 | 2.39 | 5.26 | 1.17 | 1.10 | .19 | .03 |
| 6. A w | 6.17 | 2.03 | 4.84 | 1.91 | 4.89 | 2.43 | 1.46 | 1.11 | ..08 |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | 2.05 | 2.07 | 2.02 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | 2.76 | 2.81 | 2.70 |

TABLE DD

SITUATION NUMBER 10 PREFERENCE Least Preferred

Number of People responding: 1 13 (26%) 2 27 (54%) 3 10 (20%)

| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 38 | 21 | 35 | |
| 1. I e | 5.23 | 2.19 | 4.63 | 1.97 | 4.90 | 2.07 | .85 | .35 | .36 | |
| 2. C e | 2.23 | 2.01 | 2.04 | 2.17 | 2.30 | 1.79 | .26 | .08 | .33 | |
| 3. A e | 3.00 | 1.71 | 3.78 | 2.13 | 3.20 | 1.83 | 1.12 | .26 | .74 | |
| 4. I w | 2.85 | 2.96 | 3.96 | 3.74 | 2.10 | 2.63 | .92 | .60 | 1.41 | |
| 5. C w | 5.69 | 1.54 | 5.15 | 2.21 | 5.00 | .78 | .78 | 1.24 | .20 | |
| 6. A w | 4.85 | 2.07 | 5.44 | 2.18 | 4.10 | 1.97 | .80 | .84 | 1.66 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.02 | 2.08 | 2.03 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.70 | 2.83 | 2.72 |

TABLE EE

| SITUATION NUMBER <u>11</u> | | PREFERENCE <u>Least Preferred</u> | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------|------|----------------|--|-------|-----------------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | <u>26 (52%)</u> | | 2 | <u>9 (18%)</u> | | 3 | <u>15 (30%)</u> | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | <u>t</u> values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 33 | 39 | 22 |
| 1. I e | 5.15 | 2.07 | 4.89 | 1.73 | 4.27 | 2.11 | | .34 | 1.28 | .72 |
| 2. C e | 1.92 | 2.25 | 2.78 | 1.62 | 2.13 | 1.86 | | 1.02 | .30 | .83 |
| 3. A e | 3.58 | 2.50 | 3.44 | .69 | 3.27 | 1.48 | | .15 | .43 | .32 |
| 4. I w | 2.50 | 3.32 | 5.44 | 3.13 | 3.40 | 3.22 | | 2.26* | .82 | 1.46 |
| 5. C w | 5.15 | 2.09 | 6.33 | 1.70 | 4.80 | 1.11 | | 1.48 | .59 | 2.56* |
| 6. A w | 4.77 | 2.45 | 5.00 | 1.76 | 5.47 | 1.78 | | .25 | .94 | .60 |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.04 | 2.02 | 2.07 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.74 | 2.70 | 2.82 |

TABLE FF

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 12 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 23 (46%) | | 2 8 (16%) | | 3 19 (38%) | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 29 | 40 | 25 | |
| 1. I e | 4.91 | 2.08 | 5.13 | 2.15 | 4.63 | 1.98 | | .24 | .44 | .56 | |
| 2. C e | 1.91 | 1.72 | 2.88 | 2.42 | 2.11 | 2.20 | | 1.18 | .31 | .78 | |
| 3. A e | 2.91 | 1.82 | 4.38 | 2.34 | 3.74 | 1.86 | | 1.75 | 1.41 | .72 | |
| 4. I w | 2.96 | 3.30 | 5.38 | 3.39 | 2.84 | 3.28 | | 1.71 | .11 | 1.75 | |
| 5. C w | 4.87 | 1.90 | 6.63 | 2.12 | 5.16 | 1.35 | | 2.12* | .54 | 2.07* | |
| 6. A w | 4.87 | 2.17 | 5.63 | 1.58 | 4.95 | 2.35 | | .87 | .11 | .72 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.05 | 2.02 | 2.06 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.76 | 2.70 | 2.79 | |

TABLE GG

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 13 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 15 (30%) | | 2 13 (26%) | | 3 22 (44%) | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 26 | 35 | 33 | |
| 1. I e | 4.93 | 1.95 | 4.92 | 2.13 | 4.73 | 2.09 | .01 | .29 | .26 | |
| 2. C e | 1.93 | 1.57 | 2.62 | 2.62 | 2.00 | 1.93 | .82 | .11 | .77 | |
| 3. A e | 2.87 | 1.50 | 4.08 | 2.59 | 3.50 | 1.78 | 1.48 | 1.10 | .76 | |
| 4. I w | 2.40 | 2.98 | 3.31 | 3.47 | 3.91 | 3.55 | .72 | 1.32 | .47 | |
| 5. C w | 5.07 | 1.00 | 5.46 | 2.82 | 5.27 | 1.54 | .49 | .44 | .25 | |
| 6. A w | 4.60 | 2.42 | 4.92 | 2.40 | 5.36 | 1.77 | .34 | 1.08 | .60 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | 2.06 | 2.03 | 2.04 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | 2.78 | 2.72 | 2.74 | |

TABLE HH

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 14 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|----------|------------|----------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 | 23 (46%) | 2 | 11 (22%) | 3 | 16 (32%) | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 32 | 37 | 25 | |
| 1. I e | 4.52 | 1.93 | 5.00 | 2.73 | 5.19 | 1.59 | .57 | 1.11 | .22 | |
| 2. C e | 1.78 | 2.04 | 2.45 | 1.88 | 2.44 | 2.12 | .89 | .95 | .03 | |
| 3. A e | 3.48 | 2.12 | 2.82 | 1.99 | 3.88 | 1.69 | .84 | .61 | 1.43 | |
| 4. I w | 2.09 | 2.57 | 4.00 | 3.54 | 4.56 | 3.82 | 1.73 | 2.36* | .37 | |
| 5. C w | 5.13 | 1.26 | 4.91 | 2.68 | 5.69 | 1.79 | .32 | 1.11 | .87 | |
| 6. A w | 4.96 | 2.22 | 4.64 | 1.92 | 5.38 | 2.23 | .40 | .56 | .86 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | 2.04 | 2.02 | 2.06 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | 2.75 | 2.70 | 2.79 | |

TABLE II

| SITUATION NUMBER <u>15</u> | | PREFERENCE <u>Least Preferred</u> | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|-------------------|------|-------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 <u>18 (36%)</u> | | 2 <u>18 (36%)</u> | | 3 <u>14 (28%)</u> | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | <u>t</u> values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 34 | 30 | 30 |
| 1. I e | 4.61 | 1.92 | 5.17 | 1.74 | 4.71 | 2.52 | | .88 | .13 | .58 |
| 2. C e | 1.94 | 2.25 | 2.39 | 1.67 | 2.07 | 2.22 | | .65 | .15 | .45 |
| 3. A e | 3.22 | 2.15 | 3.61 | 1.77 | 3.57 | 2.06 | | .58 | .45 | .06 |
| 4. I w | 1.83 | 2.75 | 4.44 | 3.45 | 3.71 | 3.51 | | 2.44* | 1.64 | .57 |
| 5. C w | 4.39 | 2.09 | 5.94 | 1.78 | 5.50 | .98 | | 2.34* | 1.78 | .81 |
| 6. A w | 4.22 | 2.17 | 5.28 | 2.18 | 5.71 | 1.83 | | 1.41 | 2.00 | .58 |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.03 | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.72 | 2.75 | 2.75 |

TABLE JJ

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 16 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 18 (36%) | | 2 11 (22%) | | 3 21 (42%) | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = | 27 | 37 | 30 |
| 1. I e | 4.44 | 2.29 | 4.55 | 2.35 | 5.33 | 1.52 | | .11 | 1.41 | 1.11 |
| 2. C e | 1.83 | 1.42 | 2.09 | 2.02 | 2.43 | 2.46 | | .39 | .88 | .38 |
| 3. A e | 3.06 | 2.20 | 3.18 | 2.08 | 3.95 | 1.65 | | .15 | 1.42 | 1.11 |
| 4. I w | 2.94 | 3.29 | 3.09 | 3.20 | 3.71 | 3.61 | | .11 | .67 | .47 |
| 5. C w | 5.06 | 1.22 | 5.45 | 3.06 | 5.33 | 1.39 | | .48 | .64 | .15 |
| 6. A w | 4.94 | 2.12 | 4.36 | 2.27 | 5.43 | 2.08 | | .67 | .70 | 1.29 |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.05 | 2.02 | 2.04 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.77 | 2.70 | 2.75 |

TABLE KK

| SITUATION NUMBER | | 17 | | PREFERENCE | | Least Preferred | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of people responding: | | 1 13 (26%) | | 2 18 (36%) | | 3 19 (38%) | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 29 | 30 | 35 | |
| 1. I e | 4.85 | 2.32 | 4.56 | 2.24 | 5.11 | 1.62 | .34 | .36 | .84 | |
| 2. C e | 1.69 | 1.32 | 2.44 | 2.27 | 2.16 | 2.21 | 1.04 | .66 | .38 | |
| 3. A e | 2.62 | .92 | 3.56 | 2.19 | 3.95 | 2.16 | 1.41 | 2.03 | .53 | |
| 4. I w | 1.77 | 2.78 | 3.56 | 3.42 | 4.11 | 3.51 | 1.50 | 1.95 | .47 | |
| 5. C w | 5.23 | 1.76 | 5.17 | 2.50 | 5.37 | .99 | .08 | .27 | .32 | |
| 6. A w | 4.62 | 2.13 | 4.83 | 1.68 | 5.47 | 2.52 | .31 | .97 | .88 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | t .05 | 2.05 | 2.04 | 2.03 | |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | t .01 | 2.76 | 2.75 | 2.72 | |

TABLE LL

| SITUATION NUMBER <u>18</u> | | PREFERENCE <u>Least Preferred</u> | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Number of People responding: | | 1 <u>23 (46%)</u> | 2 <u>11 (22%)</u> | 3 <u>16 (32%)</u> | | | | | | |
| FIRO SCALE | MEANS AND SD'S FOR RESPONSES | | | | | | t values and DF for comparisons | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 - 2 | 1 - 3 | 2 - 3 | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | df = 32 | 37 | 25 | |
| 1. I e | 4.61 | 2.16 | 5.18 | 1.70 | 4.94 | 2.11 | .75 | .46 | .31 | |
| 2. C e | 1.91 | 2.02 | 2.82 | 1.85 | 2.00 | 2.15 | 1.22 | .13 | .99 | |
| 3. A e | 3.48 | 2.14 | 3.18 | 1.19 | 3.63 | 2.20 | .42 | .20 | .59 | |
| 4. I w | 3.22 | 3.51 | 3.73 | 3.02 | 3.13 | 3.55 | .40 | .08 | .44 | |
| 5. C w | 4.83 | 2.20 | 6.00 | 1.81 | 5.38 | 9.27 | 1.49 | .92 | 1.13 | |
| 6. A w | 5.13 | 1.75 | 4.55 | 2.15 | 5.19 | 2.65 | .82 | .08 | .64 | |
| | * = Sig. at .05 level | | | | | | t .05 | 2.04 | 2.02 | 2.06 |
| | ** = Sig. at .01 level | | | | | | t .01 | 2.74 | 2.70 | 2.79 |

APPENDIX E

LETTERS TO BUILDING PRINCIPALS

1770 So. Broadview
Wichita, Kansas
March 19, 1965

Dear Principal:

You are receiving the material necessary for your teachers who will participate in this study. I would like to briefly point out certain procedures that may be followed.

Each teacher will receive a letter which briefly outlines the purpose of this study. Brief directions for completing the FIRO-B is included. A FIRO-B instrument is provided which should be taken in a group setting without any specific instructions and generally takes fifteen minutes to complete. Upon completion they are to place same in an envelope and seal. These may be left with you to be collected later. The second instrument may then be given to each participant including instructions. Once again an envelope is provided for the participant to place the completed instrument which will be sealed and left with you. It is highly important that each participant receive the same number on each instrument. This is absolutely necessary in order that results may be analyzed for relationships between the two measuring instruments. Upon the return of all instruments to you, I will pick them up as soon as possible.

Your assistance and the generous attitude of your faculty is greatly appreciated. Your cooperation and that of the various participants is most gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence A. Bechtold

March 19, 1965

TO: Benton, Buckner, Dodge, Linwood,
Martinson, McLean, Price and Rogers

FROM: Lawrence A. Bechtold

SUBJECT: Materials included for each participant
in study.

1. Letter to each participant
2. Brief instruction for completing FIRO-B
3. FIRO-B instrument
4. Instruction for Administrative
Situations Inventory
5. Administrative Situations Inventory Form
6. Envelopes for each instrument
7. Envelope in which instruments are to be
collected

APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTION TO TEACHERS

1770 So. Broadview
Wichita, Kansas
March 18, 1965

Dear Fellow Educator:

Many exciting changes are taking place in education today. The field of educational leadership is one area that is experiencing a great deal of change. The improvement of administrator competence will result in a clearer perception of the nature of that role in the society of which it is a part.

Indication has been given that you are willing to cooperate in this study. An analysis will be made of the interpersonal needs of teachers and a determination will be made if there is a relationship to the different types of administration as they function in various educational situations.

Two measuring instruments will be used. The first of these is called FIRO-B and determines the interpersonal behavior of individuals. This instrument may be completed in a group setting without any special direction. The second instrument will indicate what type of administrator is preferred in various school situations. Completion of this instrument may be completed in a reasonable period of time. The results of these measuring instruments will be keyed together to permit a careful statistical analysis to determine what relationship may exist.

Your cooperation and participation is sincerely appreciated. It is felt that through your interest that a significant contribution may be made in strengthening school administration.

Sincerely yours,

LAB:g

Lawrence A. Bechtold

March 18, 1965

TO: All Participants
FROM: Lawrence A. Bechtold
SUBJECT: FIRO-B Measuring Instrument

Upon completion of this instrument, please place in numbered envelope provided and seal. Leave it with your principal who will forward same to me. You are reminded that at no place are you to sign your name as all participants will remain anonymous.

March 17, 1965

TO: All Participants
FROM: Lawrence A. Bechtold
SUBJECT: Administrative Situations Inventory

This inventory may be completed at your convenience. You are asked to read carefully the three typologies of administration as used in this study. After you have in mind the characteristics of the three types, you are asked to indicate that type you prefer and the one you least prefer as they would function in various situations that exist in a simulated educational setting. You are encouraged to review the three typologies of administration whenever it is necessary to enable you to clearly indicate your preference.

When you have completed this inventory, please place in envelope provided and seal. Once again you are reminded that you are not to sign your name. This may be left with your principal who will forward same to the investigator. You are requested to complete the inventory as soon as possible and no later than April 1, 1965.

Your participation and interest is sincerely appreciated.

APPENDIX G

RESEARCH PROPOSAL FORM

APPENDIX G

RESEARCH PROPOSAL FORM

RESEARCH PROPOSAL FORM

Name _____ Date _____

School _____ Home Address _____

Complete this form using brief concise statements. Send three copies to the Director of Research for approval prior to the initiation of any new project.

1. A description of the proposed study.-The study and practice of administration is experiencing a great deal of change. The scientific study of administration may contribute to a clearer perception of the nature of the school organization in society of which it is a part. An organization generally offers certain inducements or incentives to motivate its workers to effectively achieve the tasks of the organization. There are basic interpersonal needs of individuals that should be understood to permit a better analysis of behavior of people. There are various typologies of administration, when researched, that will present significant information for the theorist.
2. A statement of the problem as seen by the building principal. In studying the interpersonal needs of teachers an analysis will be made to determine if there is a relationship to the administrative typologies. The comparison will be exploratory in nature and determine what emphasis can be used to explore administrator competence.
3. The purposes and expected outcomes. Through exploring human behavior it is anticipated that it may lay the foundation for the development of concepts to make a significant contribution to organizational theory. This research will provide additional information on the nature of the relationship between personality and organizational behavior.
4. The personnel to be involved (star the name of the group's chairman).

The measuring instruments will be administered to approximately one hundred selected elementary school teachers. Schools cooperating in this study will be the Buckner, Benton, McLean, Price, Linwood, Martinson, Dodge, and Rogers elementary schools.

5. The anticipated duration of the study.

The administration of the instruments will be completed by April 15, 1965.

6. The materials and supplies needed.

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Estimated Cost</u> | <u>Account Number</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| To be supplied by the investigator. | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
| Total | _____ | _____ |

7. The procedures and methods to be employed. The FIRO-B scale will be administered to determine the interpersonal needs of the participants. These needs are defined as inclusion, control, and affection. The participants will also indicate on a prepared scale the type of administrator that would be preferred to handle certain simulated situations that will exist in typical elementary schools.
8. A method of evaluation. A coefficient correlation will be made between each FIRO-B score and the age of the teacher, the years of teaching experience, and the number of principals for whom each teacher worked. T-tests will be administered to determine comparisons. All statistics will be programmed and treated through the use of a computer.
9. Suggested follow-up activities. This study will be exploratory and will be used to determine if further investigation of interpersonal needs of individuals will produce evidence that will assist in developing a theory of administration that will be beneficial in the future. The more knowledge that is available for analysis will provide a boon to administrative practice.

APPROVED: Principal _____
 Director of Research _____
 Assistant Superintendent _____
 Deputy Superintendent _____