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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships between certain personality traits and leadership actions of elementary school principals.

To achieve this purpose it was necessary first to obtain a description of the leadership actions of elementary school principals. Second, it was necessary to obtain data concerning the personalities of these elementary school principals. Third, the significance of the relationships between personality and leadership actions was tested statistically. Fourth, the significant relationships between personality and leadership actions were expressed in the form of mathematical equations so that predictions concerning leader behavior could be made.

Hypotheses

This study tested the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between the personality of elementary school principals as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the
Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and their rank in leadership actions of "initiating structure" as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

2. There is no significant relationship between the personality of elementary school principals as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and their rank in leadership actions of "consideration" as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Background and Significance of the Study

The selection of individuals for the position of elementary school principal offers many challenging problems to the field of educational administration. The problem of selection can be approached from several different points of view. One approach would be to try to determine what are the characteristics or traits of an individual who is considered to be successful as an elementary administrator. This approach would be based on the assumption that there are certain intrinsic elements of leadership that a person either possesses or does not possess.

Another approach would be to determine the various activities or jobs that an elementary principal would be required to perform. This concept then supposes that a person can be taught to perform these duties. The
extremely large number of variables in each individual administrative action would practically eliminate the possibility of ever establishing such a set of rules that would apply to all administrative situations.

There has also been a large number of researches concerning how an administrator "ought" to act. Such descriptions, however, do not constitute an adequate theory of selection upon which to base decisions.

The immediate purpose of research should be to make possible more accurate predictions of leadership actions. The description of how a person will act in an administrative position rather than how he should act would be of more assistance in the selection process. One should be able to state that given $X$, consequence $A$ will be the result; and given $Y$, consequence $B$ will be the result. The decision as to whether consequence $A$ or consequence $B$ is desired is one to be made by the selecting person or persons. Once this decision has been made it would be of value to be able to decide which of the applicants for an administrative position would most nearly act as desired.

With the preceding in mind it should become clear that one of the major problems of educational administration is the prediction of the actions of elementary school principals. It was the purpose of this study to attempt to determine a method whereby the actions of elementary
school principals could be predicted. That there is a lack of such a predictive device is pointed out by Leo Goldman (4) in his study of student leadership where he notes that there is a scarcity of instruments and research data on the prediction of leadership behavior.

The prediction of administrator behavior would involve the evaluation of many variables. This study, however, will only be concerned with the possible relationships between personality and leadership actions as measured by the particular instruments employed.

David H. Jenkins (9) and others, in the book Antecedents and Effects of Administrator Behavior indicate that selection procedures for school administrators should include specific and thoughtful attention to the personality of the applicant. Roy M. Hall (5) is more specific in the book Administrative Behavior in Education, in which he says that there is no question that personality factors are important in leadership prediction.

If some device or technique could be established that would permit the prediction of administrator behavior, even though this prediction would be a generalized one, then a contribution would have been made to the field of educational administration.
Definitions of Terms

For purposes of this study certain terms must be defined. These terms and their definitions are as follows:

**Leadership Actions**--The behavior of an elementary school principal in the administration of his staff.

**Initiating Structure**--The behavior of an elementary school principal used to establish relationships between himself and the members of his staff. Specifically, the actions taken to establish well-defined patterns of organization, communication channels, and procedure.

**Consideration**--The behavior of an elementary school principal indicative of friendship, trust, respect, and warmth in the administration of his staff.

**Personality Traits**--The attitude as interpreted from the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory* and the personality traits of general activity, restraint, ascendance, social interest, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness, thoughtfulness, personal relations, and masculinity as interpreted from the *Profile Chart for The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey*.

Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted within the bounds of the following limitations:
1. No attempt was made to evaluate the personality of an elementary school principal or to evaluate his leadership actions.

2. Data were collected only from elementary school principals and their staffs in a large Southwestern school district so as to keep the number of variables to a minimum. This limitation will require that any conclusion reached will apply only to this school district in particular.

3. Only those factors of personality as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory are considered in this study.

4. Only those leadership actions as described by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire are considered in this study.

5. Elementary school principals new to a particular school are not included in this study.

6. Staff members new to a particular school are not included in this study.

7. Any elementary school in the district with nine or less staff members was not included in this study.

Sources of Data

The data for this investigation came from a large school district in the Southwest. From the slightly less
than 100 elementary schools in this district, 86 are included in this study. Schools new to the district, schools with new principals, and schools with less than ten staff members were omitted. Of the 86 schools included in the study, 7 did not respond and 2 returned incomplete data. Thus there are 77 schools included in the final analysis of data.

To obtain data concerning his personality, the principal of each school was asked to complete the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.

From a list of staff members ten names were chosen at random, by a mathematically sound system, for each participating school. Each of these ten staff members was asked to describe the actions of his or her principal by completing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

There were eleven schools from which all ten of the staff members completed and returned the questionnaire. There were ten schools from which only four staff members completed and returned the questionnaire. The remaining fifty-six schools had various numbers of respondents ranging between five and nine.

Treatment of the Problem

Each of the participating principals was asked to complete the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the
Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. These instruments were used to obtain data concerning the personality of each principal.

From a list of staff members ten names were selected at random, by a mathematically sound system, for each participating school. Each of these ten staff members was asked to describe the actions of his or her principal by completing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Each principal was then assigned a score for "initiating structure" and "consideration." The scores assigned were the averages of all such scores as obtained from their respective staffs.

The principals were then ranked in order of score as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in the area of "initiating structure." Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient was then computed for the relationship between "initiating structure" rank and score obtained on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The same correlation coefficient was also computed for each of the relationships between "initiating structure" rank and score obtained on each of the ten personality traits of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

The above procedure produced eleven correlation coefficients. The significance of each of these eleven correlation coefficients was then tested statistically.
The principals were then ranked in order of score as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in the area of "consideration." Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient was then computed for the relationship between "consideration" rank and score obtained on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The same correlation coefficient was also computed for each of the relationships between "consideration" rank and score obtained on each of the ten personality traits of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. This procedure also produced eleven correlation coefficients. The significance of each of these eleven correlation coefficients was then tested statistically.

As a result of this test of significance, there were six correlation coefficients found to be significant at the 5 per cent level of significance.

Mathematical equations were developed for these six significant relationships established above so that predictions could be made about leadership actions based on scores obtained on the various personality traits. The correlation coefficients and mathematical equations that were developed are stated in Chapter IV.

Related Studies

There have been certain studies conducted which have contributed to this study. Among them the ones that led
to the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire are the most significant.

Hemphill and Coons (10) developed the original form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as part of a project at the Ohio State University.

The two fundamental dimensions of "initiating structure" and "consideration" were identified by Halpin and Winer (7) in an adaptation of the instrument for use in a study in the Air Force. The two dimensions were identified by the analysis of the responses from 300 B-29 crew members in the description of the leader behavior of their commanders. The correlation of the scores on these two dimensions were found by further sampling of 249 aircraft commanders.

Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt applied the questionnaire to industry (2,3). Their study differs from this study in that no effort was made to predict leader behavior. Their study showed that the two leader behavior dimensions are helpful in evaluating leader training programs.

Hemphill (8), in a study of twenty-two departments of a liberal arts college, found that those department heads that scored high on both dimensions of leader behavior were the ones whose departments had reputations of being well administered.
Closely related to these two dimensions of leader behavior are the functions of the leader as defined by Barnard (1) in his study where he distinguishes between "effectiveness" and "efficiency" in the leadership process.

The study which most nearly relates to this study is the one made by Andrew W. Halpin (6). Halpin, in his study *The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents*, investigates the relationships between how the superintendent perceives his own behavior, how the school board perceives his behavior, and how the superintendent's staff perceives his behavior. The major contribution of Halpin's study is that of validating the **Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire** for use in educational settings.
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CHAPTER II

PERSONALITY OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

There are many and varied opinions as to what constitutes personality. Frequently the descriptions and explanations are in terms of patterns of behavior, attitudes or concepts of one's self which sets one individual apart from another individual.

Guilford (7) groups the definitions of personality according to various core ideas. He sees personality definitions as being in one of the following groups:

1. Personality as a stimulus.
2. Omnibus definitions.
3. Integrative definitions.
4. Totality definitions.
5. Personality as adjustment.

Guilford continues by defining personality as a unique pattern of traits. In this definition the word traits refers to any distinguishable, lasting way in which one individual differs from others.

Hall and Lindsey (8, p. 572) feel that the definition of personality should be determined by the concepts, variables, or dimensions selected for use by the particular observer.
A number of scientists feel that ultimately the definition of personality must be made in terms of genetics, biochemistry, and physiology. Williams (18, p. 214) argues for this concept of the biological uniqueness of the individual.

There are those that adopt the behavioristic approach to personality study and therefore focus upon learning and the process of development. These people play down unchanging traits and deal for the most part with changes in behavior as indicative of the functioning personality.

Still others adopt the intrapersonal approach in which emphasis is placed more on conscious than unconscious determinants of behavior.

Ferguson (5) concludes that studies of personality really are dealing with attributes of behavior that have attained some degree of stability through a lengthy learning process. This view is also upheld by Kelley (10).

Sears (12) feels that no matter what the approach to personality, the purpose for personality measurement is to examine those properties of an individual which specify his or her potentialities for action.

When one desires to predict a certain type of behavior it would be convenient to administer a certain test to this individual and compare his score on this test with a standardized scale.
Prediction in the broadest sense of the word is the goal of any scientific investigation. The social sciences are especially interested in the prediction of individual behavior.

In the selection of an elementary school principal, the objective is to obtain an individual whose probability of success is greater than that of the typical applicant. To help in this selection process it would be beneficial to identify certain personality traits that could be used as predictors of behavior.

The behavior of an individual is determined largely by the situation and his or her personality. Personality traits are dispositions that persist through various environmental changes. Behavior can be to some extent accounted for by these personal properties called traits. It is not necessary to assume that personality traits cause behavior; it is only necessary to assume that there may be significant relationships between personality and actions to establish a basis for a study of such relationships.

The theory that leadership may be accounted for in terms of the personality traits and characteristics of the leader is substantiated by several studies in this area.

One of the best known works in this field was a study by Thrasher of 1313 boys' gangs in Chicago. It was found
that gameness, physical power, and speed and absoluteness of decision were the personality traits that tended to determine leadership in the gang (17).

Stogdill (16) concludes from an examination of fifteen studies that the person who occupies a position of leadership is higher than the average person in his group in intelligence, scholarship, dependability, activity, and socio-economic status. Ten of these studies surveyed by Stogdill also indicate that the leader is above average in sociability, initiative, persistence, self-confidence, alertness, cooperativeness, popularity, adaptability and verbal facility.

Smith and Krueger (14) examined several studies concerning the relationship of physical characteristics and leadership and found that the person who is above average in height and weight, and who is attractive in appearance, has a better chance of being elected to a position of leadership in a face-to-face situation.

The present study was conducted with the hope of locating certain personality traits that could be used in the prediction of the leadership actions of elementary school principals.

It was felt that if a significant relationship could be established between certain personality traits and
leadership actions then a contribution would have been made to the field of the selection of elementary principals.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory were used to collect data concerning the personality of the elementary principal.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was selected for use for the following reasons:

1. The clear delineation of separate traits.
2. Adequate validity and reliability.
3. The rather general high esteem of the Survey held by authorities in the field.
4. The ease and rapidity of scoring.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was used by Goedinghaus (6) in the prediction of college grade point averages. He found that for the R, T and F scores the coefficients of correlation were .42, .34, and .25, respectively.

Bendig and Sprague (3) used the survey with some success in the prediction of grades in an introductory psychology class.

There is also an indication of predictive ability of the instrument for achievement among students in nurses' training as indicated by Healy and Borg (9).
Bendig (2) also found the survey useful in the prediction of success of instructors of psychology.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was used by Bass, Wurster, Doll, and Clair in an investigation of the personality factors in leadership among freshman sorority women.

The survey has also been applied to industrial settings by Mackie (11). Mackie found that several of the scores correlated with the success of foremen. One interesting note about this study and others is that curved relationships are found. That is, the trait score that corresponds to the highest performance score is not at the top of the trait scale but rather some position between the top and the middle of the scale.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey identifies the following ten personality traits:

- G - General Activity
- R - Restraint
- A - Ascendance
- S - Social Interest
- E - Emotional Stability
- O - Objectivity
- F - Friendliness
- T - Thoughtfulness
P - Personal Relations
M - Masculinity.

The data collected with the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were compared with the data collected with the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as described in Chapter IV.

In the opinion of authorities in the field, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a superior instrument of its kind. Lawrence F. Shaffer (13), in reviewing the test in the Journal of Consulting Psychology, says the survey will be useful for screening, evaluation, and research. Neil Van Steenberg (15) feels that the survey is a well-rounded, carefully worked out method of evaluating an important portion of the total personality.

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was selected for use because of ease of administration, the test measures a person's attitude toward the control and administration of those people immediately under their supervision, and authorities in the field believe the inventory to have value for research.

Dwight L. Arnold (1) states that he believes that the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory presents a new and promising approach to a difficult but important problem. He feels that the inventory deserves extensive use in research.
Lee J. Cronbach (4) indicates that he believes the inventory is as well designed and executed as an actuarial test can be. Cronbach also feels that the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory is a promising tool for research on teacher success.

The data collected with the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory were compared with the data collected with the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as described in Chapter IV.


Leader behavior is described in many different ways. Haiman (9, p. 4) describes leadership as that process whereby a person directs, guides, or controls the behavior, feelings, or thoughts of other persons.

Tead and Pigors (23, pp. 11-14, and 18, pp. 95-99) feel that leadership implies a subtle method of control. They therefore differentiate it from commanding, overt, forceful control.

Another definition states that leadership implies a dominant kind of influence. This connotation makes a distinction between leadership and guidance. The democratic administrator in this frame of reference is only a "guide" and not really a leader (9, p. 5).

Aristotle and Machiavelli develop the concept of a leader being a person dominating the mindless masses (2).

Jennings (13, p. 349) maintains that leadership is an interaction with others and is characterized not so much by any trait as by the interpersonal actions which elicit the contribution of leadership from him. Leadership is therefore to be defined in terms of actions--what a leader does.
This definition is close to those of Gurnee (8) and Lapiere and Farnsworth (15) who define leaders as agents of charge. It conforms to Smith's (19) conceptualization of controlled interaction.

Gibb (6) states simply that a leader is the person that is assigned a specific office.

Leadership behavior has been described by Morris (16) as that which is involved in the execution of the task required in a given position. This means any positive influential act exerted by the individual selected as leader.

Krech and Crutchfield (14) describe the leader as the executive, planner, policy maker, expert, group symbol, father figure, and scapegoat.

In recent years the concept of leadership has undergone a revision to the extent that another vein of thinking has emerged. The newer approach is developed around the concept that leadership is different in different situations. Leadership is therefore relative and varies according to the nature and functions of the group being led.

Ralph M. Stogdill (20) illustrates this approach when he summarizes the experimental literature of recent years on the subject of the personal factors associated with leadership. He concludes that the qualities,
characteristics and skills required of a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader.

Terman (24) concludes that what the leader actually does therefore becomes a resultant of what he and others think he ought to do, and what he can do in light of the kinds of behavior that are permitted.

This dependency upon the situation to determine the definition of leadership can be so enamored of the concept of interaction of variables that it leads to the point where nothing can be said in a general way about leadership.

A less extreme stand is taken in this study. It is recognized that situational differences are indeed important, and that any generalizations made about the sources of leadership must be modified according to the functions of the group in which the leader operated; however, this does not mean that leadership cannot be discussed validly without reference to a specific group. As Stogdill (20, p. 65) points out, the studies which provide the strongest arguments for the situational nature of leadership also supply the strongest evidence indicating that leadership patterns of behavior are persistent and relatively stable.

In the present study the leader was defined as the person holding the position of elementary principal of the
individual school. Leader behavior was defined to be the actions of the elementary principal as described by certain members of his staff.

From each staff ten members were selected at random and asked to complete the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire is reproduced in the Appendix.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (10, p. 4) identifies two specific dimensions of leader behavior, "initiating structure" and "consideration." Initiating structure refers to the leader's behavior in establishing the relationship between himself and the members of his staff. In other words the actions taken to establish well-defined patterns of organization, communication channels, and procedure comprise initiating structure. Consideration refers to the leader's behavior indicative of friendship, trust, respect, and warmth in the administration of his staff.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire is the result of research done by the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University.

Stogdill and Coons (21) indicate eleven field studies in industry, military, business, and educational organizations which have been used to develop and evaluate the
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. These studies provide firm experimental support for using "consideration" as one of the dimensions of leader behavior.

Hemphill (12), from 1790 items describing leader behavior, selected 150 items and classified them into ten clusters as follows: initiation, membership, representation, integration, organization, domination, communication-up, communication-down, recognition, and production.

Halpin and Winer (11) then administered a modified version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, which had been developed by Hemphill and Coons, to fifty-two air crews flying B-50 bombers to have the 300 crew members describe their commanders. Half of the variance in the described leader behavior was accounted for by the factor which they designated "consideration."

Other factor studies revealed a factor similar to "consideration" in accounting for leader behavior among combat infantry squads, army officers, and naval fleet officers. These various factors were labeled "successful interpersonal relations" by Wherry (25), "social relations" by Clark (3), and "consideration or motivation" by Glickman (7).

Bass (1) points out that when members of a group fail to perform new or more effective behavior because of the lack of abilities or when the structure or patterns of
interaction is inadequate, changes in the members' behavior will only result as a consequence of initiation of structure by the leader. This leader behavior includes various leadership functions. Krech and Crutchfield (14) list these leadership functions as executive planner, policy maker, expert, arbitrator, mediator, and ideologist.

Mafe (17) very nearly describes initiating structure with his consideration of the leader as one who restructures members' perceptions.

Suttell (22), after a survey of the literature on leadership, offers five areas of structuring behavior as follows:

A. Instructing
B. Supervising
C. Informing
D. Ordering
E. Deciding.

The specific designation "initiating structure" was introduced by Halpin and Winer (11) in describing the behavior of air crew commanders. "Initiating structure" accounted for one third of the total variation behavior attributed to commanders.

The two factors "consideration" and "initiating structure" accounted for 83 per cent of the differences in the crew commanders' behavior.
Fleishman (4, 5) modified the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire for industrial use and isolated items of leader behavior highly correlating with initiating structure.

As previously mentioned in this chapter, the leader behavior of the elementary principal was determined by having ten members of his staff complete the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. These ten members were selected at random from a list of the complete staff.

Each principal was then assigned a score for "initiating structure" and "consideration." The scores assigned were the averages of all such scores as obtained from their respective staffs.

The principals were then ranked in order of score first on "initiating structure" and then on "consideration." Each of these rankings was then compared statistically with the information collected in Chapter II. A description of these comparisons is included in Chapter IV.
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CHAPTER IV

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PERSONALITY AND ACTIONS

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was given to each of ten members of the staff of all seventy-seven participating elementary school principals. These staff members were asked to describe the approximate frequency with which the leader engages in each of the activities as suggested by the questionnaire items.

There were eleven schools from which all ten of the staff members completed and returned the questionnaire. There were ten schools from which only four staff members completed and returned the questionnaire. The remaining fifty-six schools had various numbers of respondents ranging between five and nine.

The Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (1, p. 7) indicates that experience has shown that a minimum of four respondents is desirable, and that additional respondents above ten do not increase significantly the scores obtained.

The questionnaire yields information concerning the leader behavior of the elementary principal under headings of "initiating structure" and "consideration." The score
assigned to each principal for each of these two headings was the average of all such ratings as obtained from the staff members.

The Appendix contains a listing of all of the participating elementary principals with the first column being the number assigned at random to each of the elementary principals, the second column being the average of the ratings of the individual principal on the leader behavior action "initiating structure," and the third column being the average of the ratings of the individual principal on the leader behavior action "consideration."

Each of the seventy-seven participating elementary principals completed and returned the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. These data are presented in Column 4 of Table III in the Appendix.

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient as described in Chapter VIII of McNemar's (3) *Psychological Statistics* was calculated for the relationship between the leader behavior action of "initiating structure" and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory score. The correlation coefficient was found to be 0.14.

The correlation coefficient was then calculated for the relationship between the leader behavior action of "consideration" and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory score. The correlation coefficient was found to be 0.04.
Each of the seventy-seven participating elementary principals completed and returned the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey yields data concerning ten personality traits that are labeled G, R, A, S, E, O, F, T, P, and M. These data are presented in Columns 5 through 14 of Table III in the Appendix.

The correlation coefficients were calculated for the relationships between the leader behavior action of "initiating structure" and each of the ten trait scores as obtained from the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the G factor was found to be 0.39.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the R factor was found to be 0.08.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the A factor was found to be 0.29.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the S factor was found to be -0.17.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the E factor was found to be 0.16.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the O factor was found to be -0.04.
The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the P factor was found to be -0.05.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the T factor was found to be -0.02.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the F factor was found to be 0.12.

The correlation coefficient between "initiating structure" and the M factor was found to be -0.19.

The correlation coefficients were calculated for the relationships between the leader behavior action of "consideration" and each of the ten trait scores as obtained from the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the G factor was found to be 0.05.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the R factor was found to be 0.38.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the A factor was found to be -0.55.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the S factor was found to be -0.25.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the B factor was found to be 0.12.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the O factor was found to be -0.06.
The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the F factor was found to be -0.00.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the T factor was found to be 0.16.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the P factor was found to be 0.04.

The correlation coefficient between "consideration" and the M factor was found to be -0.29.

For the convenience of reference, these twenty-two correlation coefficients are presented in tabular form in Table I.

**TABLE I**

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN LEADER BEHAVIOR AND PERSONALITY TRAITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behavior</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>IS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTAI</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first row indicates the leader behavior action, C for "consideration," and IS for "initiating structure." The second row indicates the correlation coefficients between the two leader behavior actions and scores obtained on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Rows three through twelve indicate the correlation coefficients between the two leader behavior actions and the ten trait scores of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

The significance of these correlation coefficients was then tested statistically to determine which, if any, were significantly different from chance values.

As outlined in Hoel's book *Introduction to Mathematical Statistics* (2), if the correlation coefficients are converted to a z-score by the equation

\[ z = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1 + r}{1 - r} \]

then the distribution of \( z \) will be approximately a normal distribution with standard error, \( \sigma_z \) defined as

\[ \sigma_z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N - 3}}. \]

Using a significance level of .05 and two tails of a normal distribution for the critical region, a correlation coefficient will be significant if it has a value of \( z \) such that \(|z| > 0.2308\). Thus, if \(|r| > 0.227\) it will be a significant correlation.
Of the twenty-two correlation coefficients found in this study there are six that are significant correlations. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was not significantly related with the leader behavior actions. The six significant correlations were between certain factors of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and leader behavior actions. These six are presented in Table II.

**TABLE II**

**SIGNIFICANT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behavior</th>
<th>Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first column indicates the leader behavior action, IS for "initiating structure" and C for "consideration." Columns two through six indicate the significant correlation coefficients for the five personality factors.

To be able to use the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey traits that have been established as having significant relationships with leader behavior actions for predictions of leader behavior, it was necessary to establish the regression equation for each of these six
correlations. These equations indicate the mathematical relationship between a certain personality trait and leader behavior. Thus, given a particular score on one of these personality traits, one can predict the score that would be made on the particular leader behavior action. There is, however, a possibility of error in this prediction; therefore, the equation must also include confidence limits.

The regression equation for the relationship between a personality factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and a leader behavior action, with its confidence limits, was determined from the general equation:

\[ A = r \frac{\sigma_A}{\sigma_T} T + \left[ M_A - r \frac{\sigma_A}{\sigma_T} M_T \right] + 1.96 \sigma_{A,T} \]

where 
- \( A \) = Prediction of leader behavior score
- \( r \) = Correlation coefficient
- \( \sigma_A \) = Standard deviation of leader behavior scores
- \( \sigma_T \) = Standard deviation of Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey
- \( T \) = Trait score as obtained from Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey
- \( M_A \) = Mean of leader behavior scores
- \( M_T \) = Mean of trait scores from Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey
- \( \sigma_{A,T} \) = Standard error of predicting \( A \) from \( T \)
- \( + 1.96 \sigma_{A,T} \) = The confidence interval.
The regression equation thus determined, together with a 95 per cent confidence interval for the relationship between the G factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action of "initiating structure," is:

\[ A_{IS} = .435 T_G + 43.72 \pm 3.66. \]

The regression equation with 95 per cent confidence interval for the relationship between the A factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action of "initiating structure" is:

\[ A_{IS} = .296 T_A + 44.38 \pm 3.82. \]

The regression equation with 95 per cent confidence interval for the relationship between the R factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action of "consideration" is:

\[ A_{C} = 1.25 T_R + 39.84 \pm 9.85. \]

The regression equation with 95 per cent confidence interval for the relationship between the A factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action of "consideration" is:

\[ A_{C} = 1.50 T_A + 54.29 \pm 8.88. \]

The regression equation with 95 per cent confidence interval for the relationship between the S factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action of "consideration" is:
$A_C = -1.04 T_S + 52.72 \pm 10.32.$

The regression equation with 95 per cent confidence interval for the relationship between the M factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action of "consideration" is:

$A_C = -0.73 T_M + 50.82 \pm 10.21.$

These six regression equations constitute the significant findings of this study.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summation

This study was conducted to examine the relationships that exist between certain personality traits and leadership actions of elementary school principals.

To achieve this purpose, data were collected from seventy-seven elementary school principals of a large school district in the Southwest.

Each of the elementary principals completed the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey so that data could be obtained concerning their personalities.

Ten staff members of each of the principals were asked to complete the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire so that data could be obtained concerning the leadership actions of the principals.

There were eleven schools from which all ten of the staff members completed and returned the questionnaire. There were ten schools from which only four staff members completed and returned the questionnaire. The remaining fifty-six schools had various numbers of respondents ranging between five and nine.
These data were used to establish correlation coefficients between the various personality factors and leader behavior actions. These correlation coefficients were then tested statistically and of the twenty-two correlation coefficients calculated, six were found to be significant. The six significant correlation coefficients and their values are as follows:

1. The correlation coefficient between the G factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action "initiating structure" was found to be 0.39.

2. The correlation coefficient between the A factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action "initiating structure" was found to be 0.29.

3. The correlation coefficient between the R factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action "consideration" was found to be 0.38.

4. The correlation coefficient between the A factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action "consideration" was found to be -0.55.

5. The correlation coefficient between the S factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the
leader behavior action "consideration" was found to be 
-0.25.

6. The correlation coefficient between the M factor of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action of "consideration" was found to be 
-0.29.

Conclusions

The findings of this study indicate that the two hypotheses stated in Chapter I should be rejected in part.

This study did not establish any significant relationship between scores obtained on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the leader behavior actions of elementary school principals as described by their staffs.

This study did not establish any significant relationships between the R, E, O, F, T, P, and M factors of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action "initiating structure" of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

This study did not establish any significant relationships between the G, E, C, F, T, and P factors of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the leader behavior action "consideration" of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

These parts of the hypotheses must therefore be accepted.
The previously mentioned correlation coefficients that were found to be significantly related constitute the parts of the hypotheses that should be rejected.

The findings of this study do not indicate or imply that a cause-effect relationship exists between any of the various factors. The significant correlations simply indicate that predictions can be made concerning leader behavior based upon results obtained from an administration of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

Predictions of leader behavior actions should be made in accordance with the regression equations established in Chapter IV. Such predictions of leader behavior actions must be interpreted as lying within the range as indicated by the confidence interval at the end of each equation.

Recommendations

In terms of the criteria established for this study the findings could be used for predictive purposes in two fields.

First, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey could be used as one phase of a screening program in the selection of elementary school principals. The factors of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey which have been shown to be significantly correlated with leader behavior actions would yield predictive information
concerning expected actions of the candidate which should prove valuable to the person or persons doing the selection.

Second, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey could be used in teacher training institutions as an instrument to yield information concerning expected future leader behavior actions of students preparing for elementary school administrative positions and/or certification. Such information should be of value to these institutions in the counseling and guidance of persons studying for administrative certification.

Additional study could be made to determine the extent to which these traits could be developed. If these traits could be developed, this information could be used in a possible modification of educational programs designed to produce administrators.
APPENDIX

The following table is a compilation of the data collected for this study. The first column contains the number assigned to the individual principal. The second column contains the leader behavior action score for "initiating structure"; this score is the average of all such scores obtained for this principal. The third column contains the leader behavior action score for "consideration"; this score is the average of all such scores obtained for this principal. The fourth column contains the score obtained by the principal on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The fifth through fourteenth columns contain the c-score for each trait of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>MTAI</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>MTAI</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>MTAI</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.
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Copyright 1957
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A--Always
B--Often
C--Occasionally
D--Seldom
E--Never

1. He does personal favors for group members.  
2. He makes his attitudes clear to the group.  
3. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.  
4. He tries out his new ideas with the group.  
5. He acts as the real leader of the group.  
6. He is easy to understand.  
7. He rules with an iron hand.  
8. He finds time to listen to group members.  
9. He criticizes poor work.  
10. He gives advance notice of changes.  
11. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.  
12. He keeps to himself.
13. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E
14. He assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E
15. He is the spokesman of the group. A B C D E
16. He schedules the work to be done. A B C D E
17. He maintains definite standards of performance. A B C D E
18. He refuses to explain his actions. A B C D E
19. He keeps the group informed. A B C D E
20. He acts without consulting the group. A B C D E
21. He backs up the members in their actions. A B C D E
22. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. A B C D E
23. He treats all group members as his equals. A B C D E
24. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E
25. He gets what he asks for from his superiors. A B C D E
26. He is willing to make changes. A B C D E
27. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. A B C D E
28. He is friendly and approachable. A B C D E
29. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations. A B C D E
30. He fails to take necessary action. A B C D E
31. He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them. A B C D E
32. He lets group members know what is expected of them. A B C D E
33. He speaks as the representative of the group.

34. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

35. He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.

36. He lets other people take away his leadership in the group.

37. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.

38. He gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.

39. He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

40. He keeps the group working together as a team.
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