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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem.—This study is concerned with the opinions of 139 teachers in Alabama regarding certain undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of their principals.

Purposes of Study.—The purposes of the study are set forth in the following questions:

1. What are the opinions of twenty-two in-service teachers regarding the appearance of certain undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures in principals, and what effect do these traits have upon the teachers' work?

2. What are the opinions of 117 teachers in training regarding the appearance of certain undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures in their principals, and what effect do the traits have upon the work of these teachers?

3. How do the principals of twenty-two in-service teachers rate on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory?

4. What implications can be drawn from data collected?

Need for the Study.—The evolving conception of the role of the teacher in guiding the child towards a maximum of efficiency in a democratic society makes it increasingly necessary for a study of undesirable attitudes and activities of principals to be made.
As pointed out in the Alabama Curriculum Bulletin for Secondary Schools, democracy implies:

... (1) that each individual shall have opportunity for optimum development of his powers and potentialities; (2) that he shall participate in planning and directing affairs which concern him and the group life of which he is a part; (3) that he shall share, cooperate, and assume responsibility in working with others in building a better group life; (4) that he shall have opportunity for free discussion and communications of ideas along with opportunity to examine questions and issues in the light of actual facts; (5) that institutions, programs, and policies should be developed in terms of mutual welfare of the individual and the group, rather than as ends in themselves.1

Throughout the ages, the purposes of education have been to foster devotion to the social conditions existing within certain groups. The purpose of education in America is to foster devotion to American democracy. The general purposes of education in Alabama are the same as elsewhere in the nation. These general purposes have been divided into four groups of objectives. As stated in a study made by the American Council of Education, they are:

1. The Objectives of Self-Realization
2. The Objectives of Human Relationship
3. The Objectives of Economic Efficiency
4. The Objectives of Civic Responsibility2

Although the greatest responsibility for the realization of these objectives lies within the ability of the individual teachers in guiding each child towards a maximum of efficiency in an industrialized society, the author believes that the teacher's efficiency is determined to a large extent by the attitudes and activities of the principals. If the school is to be a laboratory for democratic social living where each child lives,


2Ibid.
studies, discovers, and enjoys the democratic way of life, it is of utmost importance that the principal realizes that the teacher's efficiency in guiding children rests to a large extent upon his attitudes and procedures.

In recent years teachers in Alabama have been inspired to further their education, but from observations and expressions made by a large number of teachers, the writer believes that many principals have remained in the same category in which their forefathers were a decade ago. She realizes that with this increase in education one may be of the opinion that teachers should need less supervision. Regarding this point, the study, Public Education in Alabama makes the following statement: "All teachers, regardless of the extent of their education need guidance and supervision."1

The author further believes that the effectiveness of a school is largely conditioned by the principal's methods and personality. Unfortunately it is not always possible for a teacher to select the kind of principal who will be most helpful; therefore, it is important that each principal should understand to what extent his personality and administrative procedures hinder or improve the effectiveness of his school. He can best understand his effectiveness through a scientific study of the opinions of teachers regarding his personality, social inclinations, and administrative procedures.

The effectiveness of the school is further conditioned by the extent to which the principal understands human nature. Principals should understand that teachers are human beings. Kyte says that teachers prefer the supervisory officer who approaches them with sympathetic understanding,

genuine appreciation of their efforts, a kindly manner, and an earnest desire to be helpful, democratically and constructively.¹

He gives the following as principles which apply to efficient supervision:

1. Efficient supervision of teaching is based upon a definite well-organized plan of activities.

2. Efficient teaching provides for a democratic cooperative program.

3. Efficient supervision of teaching provides for the necessary authority and certain responsibility which will insure educational leadership and professional organization.

4. Efficient supervision of teachers should be characterized by a kindly and sympathetic spirit.²

The following statement from Waddell shows what happens to teachers whose principals do not recognize the above principles of supervision:

If a principal holds to an antiquated psychology, if he looks upon new methods and procedures with distrust, if he organizes and administers his school on the basis of theories of a decade or two ago, if he is an educational dictator rather than an educational leader, if he runs his school as a machine instead of cultivating it as a living, developing organism, if he frowns upon initiative and discourages originality, if he allows the older teachers to coerce the new ideals and the forward look, the progressive teacher either seeks other fields as soon as possible or compromises her ideals and accepts the dictatorship of conservatives.³

Because of the numerous observations made by the author during the time that she taught in semi-rural communities in Alabama and Georgia, because of her experiences as Jeanes Supervisor in Walker and Elmore Counties in Alabama, and finally, because of her experience as instructor at Alabama

²Ibid.
State Teachers College, Montgomery, she felt that there was a need for a further scientific study of the contentions made by many teachers regarding the non-progressiveness of their principals, as well as the attitudes and procedures of principals as they affected the work of teachers. This, she felt, would ascertain the prevalence of the contentions among a large number of teachers, the results of which, would prove of value to institutions of higher learning and to principals who wish to improve their efficiency in supervising teachers, schools, and communities.

The following personal impressions, made by teachers with whom the author worked either in the capacity as supervisor or instructor, point toward non-progressiveness of some principals.

A principal of a two-teacher school, whose assistant was a very efficient young woman, made the following statement regarding a teachers' meeting: "The supervisor was not speaking to me when she mentioned the need for teachers to improve their English; because I does know my English." After working with this teacher for four months the assistant entered the army because she refused to give up her progressive principles and accept the leadership of this inefficient principal.

Another teacher felt that many of the problems of the teachers in her school arose from the fact that her principal was an epileptic. Just before and after these periodic spells, which usually happened at the school, teachers nor students could please him. Temper outbursts were common for him during these periods.

Another teacher said that her principal is interested in raising money, only. She stated that if a teacher gives her full support to financial projects, she has the full cooperation of the principal. "The principal
never uses the money for school improvement; therefore, some of us do not feel it is our responsibility to raise money for her," said this teacher.

Regarding classroom supervision, one teacher said: "My principal drew a conclusion of my first month's work from an observation of a visit to my class and has judged me ever since as being a poor teacher."

Some teachers contend that their principals keep their positions because of unethical reasons. One teacher said that her inefficient principal has held a position in the county for a large number of years because he purchased land from the superintendent. One teacher contends that her principal holds his job because he is the superintendent's general butler, nurse, and cook. Many teachers feel that their principals remain because of the plantation owners who are not interested in efficiency in Negro school administrators.

The majority of the contentions of teachers regarding the principals as they disregard democracy in school administration have been based upon limited observations with no experimental evidence to support these contentions. Therefore, the author feels that a study of the opinions of a large number of teachers in Alabama regarding the non-progressiveness of principals will reveal the extent to which the contentions made to the author are prevalent among a large number of teachers.

Related Literature.—No primary literature dealing specifically with the problem of this study could be found. Since the study is really one of an investigation into undemocratic procedures of principals, the author felt that primary related literature of this nature, too, would be an advantage. After surveying this field, she reached the same conclusion as Anderson who said:
... anyone who attempts to survey the current literature on democracy in school administration is apt to end up with a feeling of frustration in which elements of both encouragement and discouragement are mixed. He is also likely to conclude that the task of getting the schools to operate democratically in administrative matters is one of the unsolved problems of American education.¹

For these reasons, a review of literature used in this study will be a review of studies used to formulate theories or principles of administration, for principles of questionnaire construction, and for the advisability for using the Bernreuter Personality Inventory.

Since this investigation was made in Alabama, the author used the study made by the American Council of Education, Public Education in Alabama as source material showing the need for this type of investigation in Alabama. It states:

If public education in Alabama is to produce an excellent instructional progress, educational leaders must be chosen on the basis of highest professional qualifications. Included in this group would be teachers, supervisors, principals, and superintendents.²

Another statement in this book that has a definite relationship to this study is as follows:

The inadequate qualifications of many teachers in Alabama increase the need of supervision. Some teachers have no college education and many of those who have been to college or have finished college have not attained proficiency. All teachers, regardless of the extent of their education need guidance and supervision.³

Greenhoe's⁴ study, Community Contacts and Participation of Teachers, of first hand experiences of 9,122 teachers of public schools selected as a


³Ibid.

national sample, presented opinions of teachers. It is a study of social and community adjustments to community expectations in respect to teacher behavior. "Personal interest in the matter," says Greenhoe, "arises from the writer's experience as a public school teacher and many problems dealt with statistically have been experienced in a personal way."\(^1\)

Of vital interest in this study was Greenhoe's findings on teacher mobility. The following reasons were given for changing jobs:

1. Desire for higher salary
2. Desire to be in more progressive school
3. Desire to be nearer home
4. Friction with school officials
5. Restrictions on non-school life
6. Interference with teaching
7. Miscellaneous reasons\(^2\)

Greenhoe's chapter on "Conclusions and Interpretations" makes the following observations:

The findings herein reported are based upon a survey of 9,122 public school teachers selected with such care as resources permitted and drawn from every state in the nation. In addition correlative data have been secured from 356 school board members, 2,095 by persons, and 3,054 teachers in training.

For the most part our interest in teacher community contacts centered around four major points; teacher mobility, social fitness for teaching, teacher reaction to conduct codes, and teacher participation in organized community life.\(^3\)

Waddell's\(^4\) "Some Criteria for Elementary Principals" presented basic principles for administrative practices. The aim of the check-list found in this article was to present to a class of prospective elementary school

\(^1\)Op. Cit., 22.
\(^2\)Ibid., 41.
\(^3\)Ibid., 75-76.
principals some of the marks by which one may judge whether a principal is modern and progressive through a study of the principal himself and through observation of his school.

Regarding the attitude of teachers toward non-progressive principals, Waddell makes the following statement:

Much has been done of late to interest and inspire teachers to undertake new and improved methods in their work. Teachers are becoming hospitable toward new ideas regarding the details of their daily practices. How often the edge is taken off their enthusiasm by principals who are either skeptical or actually hostile... How often they are frightened into abandoning their progressive ideas by old-fashioned teachers in the same school who do not wish to be disturbed in their comfortable routine, a little investigation will reveal to any inquirer.1

Regarding the school principal, himself, he says:

If a principal holds to an antiquated psychology, if he looks upon new methods and procedures with distrust, if he organizes and administers his school on the basis of theories of a decade or two ago, if he is an educational dictator rather than an educational leader, if he runs his school as a machine instead of cultivating it as a living, developing organism, if he frowns upon initiative and discourages originality, if he allows the older teachers to coerce the new ideals and the forward look the progressive teacher either seeks other fields as soon as possible or compromises her ideals and accepts the dictatorship of conservatives.2

As secondary source reference used in interpreting the special functioning duties of principals, the author used Kyte’s,3 How to Supervise and the National Education Association’s4 Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy. According to the latter reference, the special

---

1 Charles W. Waddell, op. cit., p. 606.
2 Ibid., pp. 606-607.
3 George C. Kyte, op. cit.
functional duty of the principal is to facilitate the instructional process through:

1. Putting into operation the course of study, instructions, and standards of achievements, and supervising the classroom and extra classroom activities to see that these standards are achieved.

2. Carrying out the adopted policies through approved means....

3. Appraising and reporting educational, social, and physical conditions within the school.¹

To understand to what extent the questionnaire method has been used, as well as the advisability for using it, Koos² The Questionnaire in Education was used to help to formulate principles in questionnaire making.

According to Koos, "Questionnaires should be undertaken only when there is a need for them. The Questionnaire method should be used only if there is no other feasible way of securing the information...."³

He further states that some of the uses to which the questionnaire may be put are to ascertain the state of practice in some field of activity and to secure opinions, judgments, or expressions of attitudes.⁴

Several studies regarding the Bernreuter Personality Inventory were used as basic references for the advisability of its use in this study. Lorge's⁵ "Personality Traits by Fiat" is a part of a larger study of

---

¹National Education Association, op. cit., p. 70.
³Ibid., p. 108.
⁴Ibid.
interests, attitudes, and motives supported in part by a grant from the Columbia University Council of Research in Social Sciences. The author makes the following observations regarding Mr. Bernreuter:

Bernreuter's basic contribution to measurement of personality is that of regarding the subject's response to each item of a test as an indicator of several types of adjustment, of several modes of response or of several traits. Bernreuter was the first person to apply this type of principle of multiple scoring to personality.\(^{1}\)

Sam R. Laycock made a study of the use of the Bernreuter Personality Inventory in the selection of teachers. He was interested in measuring traits which make for successful teaching, considering only those traits which are not measured by tests of intelligence or scholarship. He used eighty students at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada, who had done practice teaching. The marks from practice teaching were correlated by the Pearson Product Moments method with results from four scales of the Bernreuter Personality Inventory.

Laycock makes the following statement regarding these correlations:

It will be seen from the findings ... that marks in practice teaching have a slight negative correlation with neurotic tendency and a slight positive correlation with dominance. The correlation with self-sufficiency ... is negligible.\(^{2}\)

He states further that conclusions would have to be applied with great caution in any individual case.\(^{3}\) "Further research along the lines of the Bernreuter Personality Inventory might make the questions somewhat more directly applicable to types of individual situations faced by the teacher," he says.

---

\(^{1}\)Irving Lorge, op. cit., p. 274.

\(^{2}\)Sam R. Laycock, "Bernreuter Personality Inventory in the Selection of Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, Volume XX, (January, 1934), p. 60.

\(^{3}\)Ibid., p. 63.
Laycock makes the following summary statement:

In any case those who are concerned with the promotion of mental hygiene in the schools are convinced that progress along that line is highly contingent on the selection of teachers who are mentally healthy and on the elimination of neurotic tendencies in whom neurotic tendencies are manifest.1

Studies here presented would indicate a challenge for the use of the Bernreuter Personality Inventory for measuring personality and administrative procedures of principals.

Summary of Related Literature.—No related literature that dealt primarily with the problem of this study could be found. However, three studies were used to help in the formulation of questionnaires to teachers, and in the interpretation of data regarding opinions of teachers. Two references were used relative to the use of the Bernreuter Personality Inventory; while all other related literature was concerned with the formulating of principles of administration, functional duties of principals, and principles of questionnaire making.

1Sam R. Laycock, op. cit., p. 63.
CHAPTER II

METHOD OF STUDY

Setting of Study.—This study was made during the Spring and Summer of 1947, using 139 teachers and principals in rural and semi-rural schools of Alabama. In this number there were 22 in-service teachers and their 10 principals, 12 teachers in training during the Spring of 1947, and 105 teachers in training during the Summer, 1947. All teachers in training were students of the author at Alabama State College, Montgomery, where she was employed.

The twenty-two in-service teachers and ten principals worked in four counties in Alabama; namely, Elmore, Conecuh, Montgomery, and Sumter Counties. The other teachers were employed at some time during the year in forty-five additional counties in the state. None of them, however, worked in the same school.

Most of the teachers used in this study live, teach, and received their early education in or near the county in which they now teach. The majority of them are either alumni or students of the institutions of higher learning in the state of Alabama. Seventy-one are teaching in the counties where they received their early education; thirty-two work in adjoining counties to their native counties.

Seven of the ten principals hold the Bachelor of Arts degree; while one holds a degree of Master of Education from Alabama State College. One principal has completed his residential work for a degree of Master of Arts at Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, and one has done only two years of college work. Only two female principals were used in the study.
All principals referred to in the study are "head teachers"; because all of them have teaching responsibilities. The functional duties of the principals, as understood in this study, may be classified under the following heads: Instructional leadership, community relationships, relationships with the superintendents and boards, and administrative leadership.

Alabama Curriculum Bulletin IX\(^1\) analyzes the functional duties of principals as being that of facilitating the instructional process through:

1. Helping teachers through classroom visitations.
2. Providing for pupil guidance.
3. Making the school a social institution for the community.
4. Maintaining a working relationship with the superintendent and the board of education.
5. Arranging and getting things done which will facilitate wholesome living and effective work in the school.
6. Carrying out legal requirements.
7. Keeping and protecting school facilities and equipment.
8. Maintaining favorable working conditions in classrooms, among teachers, and community.
9. Putting into operation the course of study.
10. Appraising and reporting educational and social conditions.\(^2\)

All principals in this study, as stated previously, are employed in Alabama and therefore their functional duties are in keeping with the aforementioned analysis of the duties of principals.

**Nature of Instruments Used for Gathering Data.**—In order that data for this study could be secured from teachers, the author used the instruments

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 191.
described below as means of collecting opinions of teachers. The Bernreuter
Personality Inventory\(^1\) was used to ascertain the personality rating of prin-
cipals.

During the winter of 1947, she formulated the main questionnaire for
this study, A Check-List of Undesirable Personality Traits and Administrative
Procedures of Principals, which sought the prevailing opinions of teachers
regarding personality traits, social inclinations, and administrative pro-
cedures of principals.

In constructing the questionnaire, an attempt was made to word the
questions as clearly as possible. To prevent the necessity of an undue
amount of writing on the part of the teachers, statements that could be
answered by encircling the letters A, B, and C were used.

This main questionnaire was used twice, in intervals of ten days so
that a fair degree of accuracy could be assured. The following instructions
appeared on the first check-list:

The purpose of this check-list is to secure from teachers a judgment
concerning the degree to which the following traits appear in their
principals. There are sixty statements followed by the letters A, B,
and C. If your principal exhibits the trait frequently encircle the
letter A; if he exhibits the trait seldom, encircle the letter B; if he
never exhibits the trait encircle the letter C.

The following instructions appeared on the questionnaire that was
administered to the same teachers in intervals of ten days:

The purpose of this check-list is to secure from teachers a judgment
concerning the degree to which the following traits of principals affect
the work of teachers. There are sixty statements followed by the letters
A, B, and C. If the trait affects your work frequently, encircle the
A; if it seldom affects your work, encircle the letter B; if it never
affects your work, encircle the letter C.

\(^1\)Robert G. Bernreuter, The Personality Inventory (Stanford University,
1935).
As a try-out the questionnaire was administered to several teachers in Montgomery, Alabama, so that wording and clearness of interpretation could be assured. Dr. W. E. Anderson, Head of the Department of Education and Research, Alabama State College, assisted greatly with this phase of the study. After considering all suggestions, a final questionnaire was formulated and mimeographed by the author.

In order that a fair sample of teachers could be assured, a supplementary check-list of twenty undesirable traits that appeared more frequently on data received thus far was formulated and mimeographed by the author. The purpose of this check-list was to find to what extent did a large number of teachers find twenty undesirable traits exhibited in their principals frequently.

One-hundred five teachers in training wrote personal impressions of their principals. The author requested that they write a narrative paragraph giving personal impressions of some of the twenty traits mentioned above.

The Bernreuter Personality was selected as the instrument to measure the personality of the principals of the twenty-two in-service teachers. The author wanted to find to what extent the principals of these teachers were as their teachers said they were. It is generally accepted that the scales for this inventory possess high reliability. The following is a brief description of the six traits measured by Bernreuters' Inventory:

B1-N A measure of neurotic tendency. Persons scoring high on this scale tend to be emotionally unstable. Those scoring above the 98 percentile would probably benefit from psychiatric or medical advice. Those scoring low tend to be well balanced.

B2-S A measure of self-sufficiency. Persons scoring high on this scale prefer to be alone, rarely ask for sympathy or encouragement, and tend to ignore the advice of others. Those scoring low dislike solitude and often seek advice and encouragement.

B3-I A measure of introversion - extroversion. Persons scoring high on this scale tend to be introverts; that is they are
imaginative and tend to love within themselves. Scores above the 98 percentile bear the same significance as similar scores on the BL-N scale. Those scoring low are extroverts; that is, they rarely worry, seldom suffer emotional upsets and rarely substitute day dreaming for action.

B4-D A measure of dominance - submission. Persons scoring high on this scale prefer to be alone, rarely ask for sympathy or encouragement, and tend to ignore the advice of others. Those scoring low tend to be submissive.

F1-C A measure of confidence in oneself. Persons scoring high on this scale tend to be hamperingly self conscious and to have feelings of inferiority; those scoring above the 98 percentile would probably benefit from psychiatric or medical advice. Those scoring low tend to be wholesomely self-confident and to be very well adjusted to their environment.

F2-S A measure of sociability. Persons scoring high on this scale tend to be non-social, solitary, or independent. Those scoring low tend to be sociable and gregarious.1

Procedure in Gathering Data.-The Normative Survey method of research was used in this study. This method of research is highly desirable for gathering data regarding opinions of a large group of people. All of the main questionnaires in this study were administered individually by the author. The supplementary questionnaires were administered as group tests.

During the latter part of February, 1947, the author received permission from her employer, President H. Councill Trenholm, Alabama State College, both to be away from the campus and to use student teachers at the college as samples in this study. He assured her of his interest in the problem and cooperated very favorably with her requests.

The author visited twenty-two teachers and their ten principals in their respective schools during the first week in March, 1947. The Jeanes Teachers of two counties in Alabama, Elmore and Montgomery Counties, permitted the author to visit three and four schools, respectively, on their routine

trips to these schools. Both Jeanes Teachers had previously received permission from their superintendents for the author to visit schools in their counties.

On the first day, the author and the Jeanes Teacher, Mrs. Thelma Smiley Morris, visited three schools in Montgomery County. Questionnaires were administered to one teacher at the first school, two teachers at the second, and three teachers at the third school. The author administered the Bernreuter Personality Inventory to each principal of the above schools.

On the second day, prior to visiting schools in Elmore County the author and the Jeanes Teacher, Mrs. Jule Clayton Lewis, visited Mr. O. R. Weldon, superintendent, who expressed his interest in the problem and assured them that he approved the study of the schools in his county. Mr. Weldon had once been an employer of the author when she served as Jeanes Teacher of Elmore County in 1940-1942.

On this visit the author administered the main questionnaire of sixty undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals to eleven teachers and the Bernreuter Personality Inventory to five principals. The latter part of the week, at which time the remaining six teachers and two principals scored the check-list and inventory, the author visited one school in Conecuh County and one school in Sumter County, alone.

In many cases, using the same itinerary as described above, the author again visited the same schools and teachers in intervals of ten days. On these visits she administered the second test on which teachers checked the degree to which sixty undesirable traits affected their work.

In most cases the teachers needed only a little instruction to fill the questionnaires. The largest responsibility of the author was that of assuring them that the information requested was confidential. They were
assured of the secrecy of their answers and identifications so that a fair degree of accuracy could be ascertained. Although principals allowed the study to be made in their schools, they were not aware of the nature of the information requested from their teachers, nor were the teachers aware of the nature of the inventory administered to the principals. Thus, the secrecy of information requested was presumed to encourage accuracy and frankness. As a further precaution questionnaires were not filled in the presence of principals in order to put teachers more at ease.

After data for the above questionnaires were compiled, the writer used an additional group of teachers to find out to what extent the opinions of the first group of teachers were similar to those of teachers not employed at the time. Using the same procedure as described above the writer administered two sets of the main questionnaire of sixty undesirable traits and procedures of principals to a group of twelve teachers in training at Alabama State Teachers College during the Spring quarter of 1947. These tests, unlike the first group of tests, were administered as group tests.

During the month of July, 1947, the author administered a check-list of 20 undesirable traits and administrative procedures of principals to 105 teachers attending summer school at the above named college and enrolled in the author's class, "The Curriculum of the Elementary School." This same group of teachers wrote personal impressions of difficulties encountered by them which they felt, resulted from undesirable traits and procedures of their principals.

Each teacher wrote a personal history from which were taken data regarding their birth, early education, teaching experience, and other pertinent information.
Copies of each instrument named above, a copy of Bernreuter Personality Inventory, and instructions for personal history from teachers and principals appear in the Appendix of this study.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS OF STUDY

Data are presented and interpreted according to the questions formulated as purposes in the first chapter of this study. They represent findings of the opinions of teachers regarding the appearance of certain undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of their principals, as well as the opinions of these teachers regarding the degree to which certain undesirable traits and procedures of principals affect their work. These data also show the ratings of the principals of in-service teachers on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. The twenty-two in-service teachers are designated throughout this chapter by the alphabetical combinations Ya-Yv; the twelve teachers in training are designated by the combinations Xa-Xf; the ten principals are designated by alphabets A-J.

Opinions of In-service Teachers. - The following data are presented in answer to the first purpose formulated for this study: "What are the opinions of certain in-service teachers regarding both the appearance of and the effect of sixty undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals?"

Twenty-two in-service teachers in ten schools of Alabama were asked to rate the degree to which certain undesirable traits on the main questionnaire of this study appeared in their principals. Table 1, page 22, shows rank order of undesirable traits appearing in the principals of these teachers according to the opinions of the teachers. The highest number of traits appearing frequently is forty, while the highest number appearing seldom is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ya</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yb</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yc</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yf</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yg</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yj</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ym</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yq</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yv</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>166</strong></td>
<td><strong>744</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thirty. Two teachers rated their principals as having fifty-eight undesirable traits that never appear, thus saying that their principals neither possessed undesirable personality traits or possessed undesirable administrative procedures. In several instances, some teachers did not check all statements; however, all teachers except three showed that these traits are found in their principals to some degree. An average of 7.9 traits appeared frequently in these principals and an average of 7.5 appeared seldom.

Since the same number of teachers was not used in each school, data in Table 1 are also presented in Table 2, page 24. Table 2 represents data received according to the number of teachers in each school.

Principal E and H were rated by only one teacher. Principals A, I, F, and B were rated by two teachers; while principals C, D, G, and J, were rated by three teachers.

The two teachers showed a contrasting picture of Principal A. One teacher checked seven undesirable traits as appearing frequently in this principal; the other checked forty as appearing frequently. The same teachers were of the opinion that twenty-two traits seldom appeared in Principal A. The second teacher found only six undesirable traits appearing seldom in this principal. Although there is a contrasting picture, it is evident that these teachers are of the opinion that Principal A does possess many of these sixty undesirable traits to some degree.

Principal F possessed the next highest number of undesirable traits. His two teachers were of the opinion that a total of twenty-six undesirable traits appeared in him frequently and fifty-five appeared seldom. Both teachers were of the opinion that nineteen traits never appeared.

Principal D's teachers had a contrasting opinion of him. The first teacher was of the opinion that fourteen traits appeared in him frequently
TABLE 2
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 60 UNDESIRABLE TRAITS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES POSSESSED BY 10 PRINCIPALS AS INDICATED BY 22 IN-SERVICE TEACHERS BY PRINCIPALS AND BY NUMBER OF TEACHERS RATING PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers Rating Principals</th>
<th>First Teacher Rated</th>
<th>Second Teacher Rated</th>
<th>Third Teacher Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals rated by one teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals rated by two teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals rated by three teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#F = Frequently
S = Seldom
N = Never
and thirteen seldom appeared; while the second teacher was of the opinion that eighteen traits appeared frequently and none appeared seldom. The third teacher was of the opinion that nine traits appeared in this principal frequently and four seldom appeared.

Principal B, a woman, evidently possessed few of the listed undesirable traits. One teacher was of the opinion that three traits appeared frequently in this principal and seven seldom appeared. The other teacher was of the opinion that fifty-eight of these undesirable traits never appeared in this principal.

In three of the three teacher schools; namely, schools of principals C, G, and J, the teachers showed similar opinions of their principals. All, however, believed that these principals did possess some of the traits to some degree.

Table 3, page 26, is a parallel table to Table 1 in this study. It shows frequency distribution of opinions of the group of twenty-two in-service regarding the effect of sixty undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals on teachers' work. Data for this table and Table 4, page 27, are taken from questionnaires administered individually in intervals of ten days to the same group of in-service teachers mentioned above.

The highest numbers of undesirable traits that affect the work of these teachers are thirty-three for frequently and twenty-six for seldom. Two teachers were of the opinion that their principals never possessed undesirable traits that affected their work, and six were of the opinion that none of these traits affected their work frequently. All other teachers were of the opinion that some of these traits affected their work to some degree.
### TABLE 3

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 60 UNDESIRABLE TRAITS OF PRINCIPALS THAT AFFECT TEACHERS’ WORK AS INDICATED BY 22 IN-SERVICE TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ya</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yb</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yc</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yf</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yj</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ym</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yv</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 60 UNDESIRABLE TRAITS
AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES OF PRINCIPALS THAT
AFFECT 22 TEACHERS' WORK BY PRINCIPALS AND BY
NUMBER OF TEACHERS RATING PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers Rating Principals</th>
<th>First Teacher Rated</th>
<th>Second Teacher Rated</th>
<th>Third Teacher Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals rated by one teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals rated by two teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals rated by three teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F - Frequently
S - Seldom
N - Never
The average number of undesirable traits and procedures found in these principals is listed as follows: Frequently, 7.09; seldom, 8.04; and never, 26.00.

Table 4 is a parallel table to Table 2 in this study. It gives frequency distribution of data found in Table 3 by principals. The teachers of Principal A were of the opinion that a total of forty-three undesirable traits in him affected their work frequently and twenty-five seldom affected their work. The highest total scores by teachers in two-teacher schools were found for Principal F who received thirty-three for undesirable traits as affecting his teachers' work frequently and forty-seven as seldom affecting his teachers' work. Principal D received the largest number of scores for those principals who were rated by three teachers, getting forty-six for traits appearing frequently, and twenty-two for traits as seldom affecting the teachers' work. Principal I and Principal B show the best picture: Principal I's teachers felt that only five and two undesirable traits affected their work frequently, and principal B's teachers were of the opinion that only two traits affected their work frequently and five seldom affected their work.

All teachers but one felt that their principals did possess undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures that affected their work to some degree.

Table 5, page 29, shows frequency distribution of traits found more frequently in data from opinions of in-service teachers regarding the appearance of and the effect of sixty undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals as indicated by twenty-two in-service teachers in Alabama.

Opinions of Teachers in Training.—The following data are presented in answer to the second purpose formulated for this study: "What are the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description of Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Never holds staff meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Does not aid in curriculum planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does not work effectively with divergent lay groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does not show self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is unable to furnish professional leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does not accept just criticisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is not tactful in dealing with people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opinions of teachers in training regarding undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals, and how do these traits affect the teachers' work?"

As a supplementary study, in March 1947, using the same procedure as used with the in-service teachers, the author administered two sets of the main questionnaire to twelve teachers attending Alabama State College. She administered a questionnaire of twenty undesirable traits of principals to a group of 105 teachers attending the same institution during the following summer. These additional groups of teachers were used to ascertain to what extent the findings of the first group of teachers in service were related to those of teachers not employed at the time. Since the teachers were students of the author and since they were not employed at the time of the investigation she felt that their answers were more reliable than the answers from those employed. These traits were administered as group tests; whereas, the first tests were administered individually.

Data in Table 6, page 31, show statistically the opinions of the above mentioned twelve student teachers who were formerly teachers in rural schools in Alabama. They show the degree to which principals of these teachers possessed sixty undesirable traits and administrative procedures. Four principals possessed frequently a total of thirty-two, twenty-nine, twenty, and twenty traits, respectively. The highest numbers possessed by a principal seldom were twenty-three, twenty-two, twenty-two, and twenty. One teacher was of the opinion that his principal did not possess any undesirable traits. Among these teachers there appeared a total of 153 undesirable traits frequently and 176, seldom.

Table 7, page 32, presents the same data that were found in Table 6. It shows frequency distribution of sixty undesirable traits possessed by
### TABLE 6

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 60 UNDESIRABLE TRAITS POSSESSED BY PRINCIPALS AS INDICATED BY 12 TEACHERS IN TRAINING BY SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xb</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xc</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xd</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xf</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xj</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | 153        | 176    | 353   |
| Average | 13         | 14.6   | 29.0  |
TABLE 7

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 60 UNDESIRABLE TRAITS POSSESSED BY PRINCIPALS AS INDICATED BY 12 TEACHERS IN TRAINING BY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xc</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xg</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xj</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xk</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xl</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 153 176 353
principals as indicated by twelve teachers in training. Unlike Table 6, this table gives scores by principals or schools.

Tables 8 and 9, pages 34 and 35, respectively, show data from the second set of questionnaires administered to twelve teachers in training regarding their opinions of the degree to which sixty undesirable traits and administrative procedures of principals affected their work when they were employed as teachers in Alabama. The first four highest scores showed that the teachers were of the opinion that thirty, twenty-seven, twenty-six, and twenty-three undesirable traits of principals affected the work of four teachers frequently. One teacher felt that his principal's personality and administrative methods did not interfere with his work; five teachers were of the opinion that none of these traits affected their work frequently; all others were of the opinion that from four to thirty traits affected their work frequently. One teacher felt that no undesirable traits affected his work seldom; all others felt that from four to twenty traits seldom affected their work.

Table 10, page 36, shows items as indicated more frequently by twelve teachers who scored the main questionnaire on which the author requested their opinions regarding the effect of sixty undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals upon their work.

As a final check of the main questionnaire used in this study, 105 teachers were administered a check list of 20 traits found more frequently on the data from the first two groups of teachers used in the study. Table 11, page 37, shows frequency distribution of items checked on this supplementary questionnaire. The range of the total frequencies for all items checked was from four to thirty-two, which means that from four to thirty-two persons found each trait in their principals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xb</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xc</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xd</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xf</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xj</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>419</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 60 UNDESIRABLE TRAITS OF PRINCIPALS THAT AFFECTED TEACHERS' WORK AS INDICATED BY 12 TEACHERS IN TRAINING BY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xc</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xd</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xg</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xj</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134 149 419
TABLE 10

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OPINIONS OF TEACHERS REGARDING THOSE UNDESIRABLE TRAITS IN PRINCIPALS AS INDICATED MORE FREQUENTLY BY 12 TEACHERS IN TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description of Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Has little self control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Has little intellectual ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sets up drastic musts for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Has poor relationship with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Is jealous of teachers' progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is unable to furnish professional leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does not aid in curriculum planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does not work effectively with lay groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shows partiality in dealing with teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 11
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OPINIONS OF 105 TEACHERS IN TRAINING WHO RATED 20 SELECTED ITEMS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES ON UNDESIRABLE PERSONALITY TRAITS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES OF PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description of Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Never carries through projects started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Has superiority complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Does not work effectively with lay groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Does not aid in curriculum planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Worries excessively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Is selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is dishonest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Has little self control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does not help with disciplinary problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Has low morals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Never holds staff meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Is prejudiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is intolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Has poor working relationship with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Is jealous of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shows partiality with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Is dictatorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is inexperienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is unprepared for job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sets up drastic rules for teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Traits are in the order as they appeared on questionnaires to teachers.*
Trait number five, worries excessively, received the largest number of scores. Trait thirty-four, does not aid in curriculum planning, was the second highest score. Only four teachers checked trait ten, low moral, as being found often in their principals. Six teachers named inexperience and eight named non-preparation for the job. Twenty-two principals did not work effectively with lay groups; twenty-one had superiority complex and nineteen never held staff meetings with teachers. Nineteen never carried through projects started and sixteen showed partiality with staff. Twenty principals set up drastic musts for teachers.

A total of 280 undesirable traits were found to affect the work of these 105 teachers, representing 2.8 per cent of undesirable traits found in each principal by these teachers.

This same group of 105 teachers wrote narrative paragraphs giving personal impressions of some of the above 20 undesirable traits in their principals. Some of these impressions which appeared more frequently among these teachers are found in the Appendix of this study.

Rating of Principals on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory.—The following data are presented in answer to the third purpose formulated for this study: "How do the principals of twenty-two in-service teachers rate on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory?"

The author administered the above named inventory to ten principals on her routine visit to their schools. They scored the inventory while their teachers scored the main questionnaire mentioned above in this study. Table 12, page 39, shows data of ten principals on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. A detail explanation of each trait measured by this inventory was given on pages 16 and 17 of this study, however a brief
TABLE 12
PERCENTILE SCORES OF 10 PRINCIPALS WHO WERE ADMINISTERED
THE BERRENEUTER PERSONALITY INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>% B1-N</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>% B2-S</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>% B3-I</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>% B4-D</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>% F1-C</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>% F2-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
description of each trait follows. Each principal was rated by each of the
scales.

B1-N  A measure of neurotic tendencies
B2-S  A measure of self sufficiency
B3-I  A measure of introversion-extroversion
B4-D  A measure of dominance-submission
F1-C  A measure of confidence in oneself
F2-S  A measure of sociability

Table 12 shows data of percentile rating of eight principals of in-
service teachers who indicated their opinions of sixty undesirable person-
ality traits and administrative procedures of their principals.

The male principals found in the highest percentile fell under
B3-I, 98.8, F2-S, 97.1, and B2-S, 93.8. B1-N, a measure of neurotic ten-
dencies ranged lower among men as far as percentiles were concerned; how-
ever, the mean for this trait was -63.9 and the standard deviation was 79.

Trait F1-C, a measure of confidence in oneself, shows that most of
the male principals have confidence in themselves, in that they fell above
the mean, -53.4 with a range of scores between 1 - 67.2. The standard'
deviation for this trait was 81.4.

B3-I, a measure of introversion-extroversion gives a picture of
high tendencies toward introversion in male principals. The mean for this
trait was -28.4, while the high score received by a principal was 98.8.
Trait B4-D, dominance-submission received high scores among men, but not
as high as B3-I. The mean for this trait was 53.9, and the scores ranged
from 38 - 92.8. The mean for B1-N, neurotic tendencies, was -63.9 with
the range of percentile scores ranged from 3.8 - 58.6.

The two female principals are designated as Principals B and J.
Principal J fell one deviation above the mean of -1.0 with a score of
ninety-four for Trait F1-C, confidence in oneself, and a little above one
deviation above the mean of 18.0 for Trait F2-S, sociability. This shows a high degree of self confidence and non-social tendencies in this principal. For traits B1-N, neurotic tendencies, and B2-S, self sufficiency, she was less than one deviation above the mean, which shows that this principal was a little above the average as sufficiently normal in these traits. The same principal fell less than $.5 per cent below the mean in dominance-submission, which shows that she is sufficiently normal in this trait.

Principal B, the other female principal, ranked higher than principal J in four traits, although she was also less than one standard deviation above the mean in four traits. For trait B1-N, neurotic tendencies, the mean was -27.6 and standard deviation was 79.2. Principal J's percentile score was 42.2 for trait B2-S, self sufficiency. She ranked very high for trait B3-I, introversion-extroversion, at 72.6. She fell less than .5 deviation above the mean 18.8 with a score of 18.4 for Trait B4-D, dominance-submission and about .3 deviation above the mean of -1.0 for Trait F2-S, a measure of sociability. In contrast to the first principal, Principal B is sufficiently normal, socially.

Table 12 also shows a comparative rating of the ten principals on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory.

Principal E, an older principal, seems to rate higher on more traits than any of the other principals. He fell in the following percentiles: For Traits B1-N, neurotic tendencies, 50.6 and Trait F1-C, confidence in self, 67.2. The same principal ranks two for B3-I, introversion, and third for Trait F2-S, sociability, which means that although he has neurotic tendencies, high confidence in self, high tendencies toward introversion-extroversion, he is highly sociable.
Principal A presents a contrasting picture. He has high self-sufficiency, ranging first with a percentile score of 97.1, and he rates eighth in confidence in self with a score of twenty. Persons rating high on self-sufficiency prefer to be alone, rarely ask for sympathy or encouragement and tend to ignore the advice of others.

Principal F, a minister, rates lowest in the following three traits: Neurotic tendencies, 3.8, introversion-extroversion, 6.2, and confidence in self, 1.

Principal I seems sufficiently normal in neurotic tendencies and confidence in self, but possesses very high introversion-extroversion tendencies and domineering traits ranking first and second, respectively, in these traits.

Principal D is sufficiently normal in neurotic tendencies but is very highly non-social. He ranks second for F2-S, sociability, and third for B4-D, domineering tendencies, and B2-S, self-sufficiency.

Principal G fell more nearly within the average in that his scores are more homogeneous than any of the other nine principals. He tends to be better adjusted socially than any of the male principals.

Principal C ranks second for neurotic tendencies: Bl-N, 42.5 and eighth for domineering tendencies, B4-D: 38.

Implications of Data.—The following inferences may be made of the findings in this study of opinions of teachers regarding undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals. The first group of data shows opinions of in-service teachers in training, and the last shows conclusions made from data of the rating of principals on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory.
The conclusions of the opinions of teachers in service are as follows:

1. The twenty-two in-service teachers indicated that from zero to forty undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures appeared in ten principals frequently and from zero to thirty seldom appeared.

2. The same teachers indicated that from zero to thirty-three undesirable traits of principals affected their work frequently and from zero to twenty-six seldom affected their work.

3. All teachers except three indicated that some of the sixty traits appeared in their principals, with an average of 7.9 traits appearing frequently and 7.5 traits appearing seldom.

4. One of the female principals possessed few of the listed undesirable traits.

5. Two teachers were of the opinion that their principals never possessed undesirable traits that affected their work; most of them, however, were of the opinion that some of the undesirable traits of principals affected their work to some degree.

6. The in-service teachers were of the opinion that a total of 170 traits appeared frequently in their principals and 166 seldom appeared while the teachers in training listed 161 as appearing frequently and 176 as seldom appearing.

7. One male principal was rated as never possessing any undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures. No undesirable traits ever affected the work of his teachers. This principal is the only one of his kind in this study, for all others possessed and exhibited some of the traits to some degree.
8. Of the group of 105 teachers used in this study, from 4 to 32 of the teachers scored the same items on the check-list of 20 undesirable traits of principals.

9. Trait 5, worries excessively, received the largest number of scores among the group of 105 teachers in training. Twenty-two of these principals did not work effectively with their communities; twenty-one had superiority complex, and nineteen never held staff meetings with teachers. These same items were checked frequently among the first groups of teachers used in this study.

10. The in-service teachers checked an average of 10.9 traits of principals as affecting their work frequently and an average of 8.04 as seldom affecting their work; the teachers in training checked an average of twelve traits as affecting their work frequently and 12.5 as seldom affecting their work. In proportion, the group of teachers in training were of the opinion that more undesirable traits of principals affected their work than were the in-service teachers. The in-service teachers indicated that a total of 152 undesirable traits of principals affected their work frequently and 176 seldom affected their work; the teachers in training indicated that a total of 149 traits of principals seldom affected their work, and 134 frequently affected their work.

11. High scores for the opinions of teachers in training were more homogenous than those found in the group of in-service teachers. These same teachers were of the opinion that their principals possessed more undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures than the in-service teachers. Because the teachers in training were students and because they were not employed at the time of the study, the author is of the opinion that this group of teachers gave more reliable answers.
The following implications are made from data of ten principals who scored the Bernreuter Personality Inventory.

1. Six principals: A, D, E, I, C, and H, possess non-social tendencies. One ranked very high. Both female principals are a little above normalcy for this trait. Persons scoring high on this trait tend to be non-social solitary, or independent.

2. Three male principals: D, F, and I, scored high on Trait B2-S, self-sufficiency. One female principal ranked very high on this trait.

3. Five male principals seem nearly normal for Trait B3-I, introversion-extroversion. Principal I, however, fell in the 98.8 percentile. He would benefit from psychiatric or medical advice. Both female principals ranked high on this trait, but they are not at the point where they need professional services.

4. Three male principals: E, H, and G, have a large degree of confidence in self (Trait F1-C) being above the average for this trait. Principals C and I and both female principals are a little above the average for this trait. Female principal J is almost at the point where she needs psychiatric or medical advice.

5. Both female principals seem almost normal for Trait B4-D, dominance-submission; while only one male principal seems sufficiently normal for this trait. All other male principals seem to dominate others. Persons scoring high on this trait tend to dominate others in face-to-face situations.

6. Most male principals seem wholesomely normal in neurotic tendencies. Both female principals rank above the average for this trait.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was concerned with determining the opinions of 139 teachers regarding the appearance of 60 undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures of principals in Alabama, and of determining the degree to which these traits affect the work of teachers. It was further concerned with rating principals of certain in-service teachers on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory.

Chapter I presented the statement of the problem, purposes of the study, need for the study, and a review of related literature. Chapter II presented the setting of the study, nature of instruments used in gathering data, and procedure in gathering data. Chapter III presented the findings of the study, presenting and interpreting both data from the opinions of teachers and the ratings of principals on the above named inventory and implications of data found.

For convenience in interpreting the main conclusions drawn from all data collected in this study, the following concise statements are presented:

1. The study took place in four counties of Alabama: Elmore, Conecuh, Montgomery, and Sumter Counties, and at Alabama State College, Montgomery during the Spring and Summer of 1947.

2. A total of 139 teachers and 10 principals of 22 in-service teachers appear in the study. Of the total number of teachers there were 22 in-service teachers and 117 teachers in training at the above named college.
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3. Only teachers and principals from rural and semi-rural and junior and senior high schools were used.

4. Most teachers and principals are products of the communities in which they teach and of the institutions of higher learning in the State of Alabama.

5. Twenty-two in-service teachers and twelve teachers in training composed the first groups of teachers who were administered the main checklist on opinions of teachers regarding undesirable traits in principals. One hundred five teachers attending school at Alabama State College during the summer of 1947 composed the last group of teachers tested.

6. The last group of 105 teachers gave personal impressions of the appearance of 20 undesirable traits in their principals.

7. Seven of the ten principals used in this study hold degrees of Bachelor of Arts from Alabama State College. One has completed his residential work for the degree of Master of Arts at Atlanta University, and one principal has had only two years of college work.

8. Both female principals have completed their college course at the same named institution.

9. Approximately 110 of the 137 teachers were attending school either as full-time students or summer students at Alabama State College. Only eight of the teachers used in the study had completed their requirements for degrees from college.

10. The Bernreuter Personality Inventory was administered to ten principals of the in-service teachers in order to determine to what extent they were as their teachers said they were.

11. The Normative-survey method was used in gathering data for this study. The main questionnaire, A Checklist of 60 Undesirable Personality
Traits and Administrative Procedures of Principals, was administered to twenty-two in-service teachers and twelve teachers in training at two different times—in intervals of ten days so that a fair degree of accuracy could be ascertained. On the first questionnaire each teacher was asked to check the degree to which his principal possessed these traits; on the second the same teachers were asked to check the degree to which these traits affected their work.

12. As supplementary data 105 teachers in training were asked to check a list of 20 undesirable traits that appeared more frequently on data previously collected.

13. No related literature that dealt primarily with the problem of this study could be found. Review of literature in this study presented those references that helped to formulate questionnaires, to interpret data regarding opinions of teachers, to formulate principles of administration, and to present the functional duties of principals in America and in Alabama.

14. All of the 137 teachers, except one, were of the opinion that some of the 60 undesirable traits existed to some degree in their principals. The same is true of the degree to which these undesirable traits affected their work.

15. The teachers of female principals indicated that their principals possessed few of the undesirable traits listed.

16. The teachers in training were of the opinion that their principals possessed more undesirable personality traits and exhibited more undesirable administrative practices than were the in-service teachers.

17. The teachers in training found many of the same undesirable traits in their principals as were found in data from teachers in-service.
18. The author is of the opinion that data from teachers in training are more reliable than those data from in-service teachers; because all teachers in training were students of the author at the time of this study, and further because they were not employed at the time of the study.

19. Six male principals possess non-social tendencies with one ranking very high. Both female principals are a little above normalcy for this trait. These principals, therefore, tend to be non-social, solitary, or independent.

20. Three male principals scored high on self-sufficiency; one female principal scored very high on this trait. These persons tend to ignore the advice of others and rarely ask for sympathy or encouragement.

21. Five male principals seem nearly normal for introversion-extroversion tendencies. One principal fell above the 98 percentile, thus showing that he needs professional advice. Both female principals ranked high on this trait.

22. Three male principals were above the average for the trait—confidence in self. The same is true of female principals; however, one needs professional advice.

23. All male principals seem to dominate in face-to-face situations. Both female principals seem almost normal in domineering tendencies.

24. All male principals seem wholesomely normal in neurotic tendencies; both female principals ranked above the average in neurotic tendencies.

In all statistics shown, the teachers were generally of the opinion that many of the sixty undesirable personality traits and administrative procedures were possessed by their principals to some degree. They further showed that many of the traits affected the work of the teachers. According
to the Bernreuter Personality Inventory many of the principals were not normal in personality traits and two were at the point that they needed professional medical advice. These conclusions point to a need for further study of this problem. Some of the questions that may be raised regarding this point are: "Do most principals possess non-social tendencies?" "Do most principals tend to ignore the advice of others?" "Does confidence in self hinder progressiveness of principals?" "Are female principals generally more wholesomely normal in domineering tendencies than male principals?" and "Are male principals more wholesomely normal in neurotic tendencies?"

Although the average number of traits possessed and exhibited by the principals in this study was small, the author feels that herein lies the trouble. If one of these traits is possessed by principals many teacher problems may arise from it, for attitudes breed attitudes. Attitudes are states of mind whereby a person is in favor of a thing or not in favor of it. An undesirable attitude will affect the work of teachers tremendously. Attitudes are evil germs that make for non-progressiveness on the part of both teachers and principals, thus making for little democracy in school activities.

Educational leaders should be chosen on the basis of highest professional qualifications. Since many of the traits used in this study are not found by the officials who select the principals, and since the trend of education today is towards democracy in all activities connected with the school, the author believes that the teachers should have the opportunity to appraise the principal's personality and administrative procedures just as is the general practice of officials who require the principals to appraise the teachers' work. There are implications in this problem for further investigations as far as the advisability for this
practice is concerned. The author further believes that if the teachers had the opportunity to appraise the work of the principals there would be a better relationship existing in the schools, as well as the fact that the principal would have an opportunity to correct the deficiencies in both his personality and his administrative procedures. She has taken into account the fact that many of the teachers in Alabama may not be able to do this successfully, but the growing number of highly prepared teachers in rural and semi-rural situations makes it increasingly necessary that democracy should be practiced from the head down. This would indirectly make for the establishing of true democracy in the minds of pupils, since many of the teachers contend that it is impossible to establish democratic principles among students since they know of dissention among the teaching staff.

Another field in which further study could be made in Alabama is that of the methods of selecting principals or head teachers. A public school official once said to the author regarding a prospective principal, "The state institution gave him a certificate with which to teach and I must employ him." This teacher would not have made a good fourth grade pupil. Many of the school officials place the blame for pupils' deficiencies upon the state institutions; the teachers generally place the blame upon former teachers; the principals usually place the blame upon the teachers themselves. The author feels that the main problem of poor qualifications of pupils and teachers lies within the root of the prevailing practice of choosing principals not because of their qualifications, personality, efficiency, and administrative practices, but because of political pull, personal interest, unethical practices, and, finally, because of non-interest of many officials in progressive schools.

The chief contention against many of the proposals made in this study is that our schools are not ready for such drastic changes, or that
this type of organization would allow teachers to have too much laxity in their work. The author does not propose a drastic reorganization, nor does she propose that prevailing practices continue; but she does feel that this study should serve as a challenge for a long-range program of solving those problems raised.
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Date...........................................................................................................................................

Name................................................................................................................................. Age.............. Sex..............

Address........................................................................................................................................

Name of school.................................................................................................................................

or business firm.................................................................................................................................

School grade.................................................................................................................................

or occupation......................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B1-N</th>
<th>B2-S</th>
<th>B3-I</th>
<th>B4-D</th>
<th>F1-C</th>
<th>F2-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H.S—COLL.—ADULT

Based on norms

MALE—FEMALE

Copyright 1935 by the Board of Trustees of the
Leland Stanford Junior University

All rights reserved
The questions on this blank are intended to indicate your interests and attitudes. It is not an intelligence test, nor are there any right or wrong answers.

In front of each question you will find: "Yes No ?"

If your answer is "Yes," draw a circle around the "Yes." If your answer is "No," draw a circle around the "No." If you are entirely unable to answer either "Yes" or "No" to the question, then draw a circle around the question mark.

1. Yes No ? Does it make you uncomfortable to be “different” or unconventional?
2. Yes No ? Do you day-dream frequently?
3. Yes No ? Do you usually work things out for yourself rather than get someone to show you?
4. Yes No ? Have you ever crossed the street to avoid meeting some person?
5. Yes No ? Can you stand criticism without feeling hurt?
6. Yes No ? Do you ever give money to beggars?
7. Yes No ? Do you prefer to associate with people who are younger than yourself?
8. Yes No ? Do you often feel just miserable?
9. Yes No ? Do you dislike finding your way about in strange places?
10. Yes No ? Are you easily discouraged when the opinions of others differ from your own?
11. Yes No ? Do you try to get your own way even if you have to fight for it?
12. Yes No ? Do you blush very often?
13. Yes No ? Do athletics interest you more than intellectual affairs?
14. Yes No ? Do you consider yourself a rather nervous person?
15. Yes No ? Do you usually object when a person steps in front of you in a line of people?
16. Yes No ? Have you ever tried to argue or bluff your way past a guard or doorman?
17. Yes No ? Are you much affected by the praise or blame of many people?
18. Yes No ? Are you touchy on various subjects?
19. Yes No ? Do you frequently argue over prices with tradesmen or junkmen?
20. Yes No ? Do you feel self-conscious in the presence of superiors in the academic or business world?
21. Yes No ? Do ideas often run through your head so that you cannot sleep?
22. Yes No ? Are you slow in making decisions?
23. Yes No ? Do you think you could become so absorbed in creative work that you would not notice a lack of intimate friends?
24. Yes No ? Are you troubled with shyness?
25. Yes No ? Are you inclined to study the motives of other people carefully?
26. Yes No ? Do you frequently feel grouchy?
27. Yes No ? Do your interests change rapidly?
28. Yes No ? Are you very talkative at social gatherings?
29. Yes No ? Do you ever heckle or question a public speaker?
30. Yes No ? Do you very much mind taking back articles you have purchased at stores?
31. Yes No ? Do you see more fun or humor in things when you are in a group than when alone?
32. Yes No ? Do you prefer travelling with someone who will make all the necessary arrangements to the adventure of travelling alone?
33. Yes No ? Would you rather work for yourself than carry out the program of a superior whom you respect?
34. Yes No ? Can you usually express yourself better in speech than in writing?
35. Yes No ? Would you dislike any work which might take you into isolation for a few years, such as forest ranging, etc.?
36. Yes No ? Have you ever solicited funds for a cause in which you were interested?
37. Yes No ? Do you usually try to avoid dictatorial or “bossy” people?
38. Yes No ? Do you find conversation more helpful in formulating your ideas than reading?
39. Yes  No  ?  Do you worry too long over humiliating experiences?
40. Yes  No  ?  Have you ever organized any clubs, teams, or other groups on your own initiative?
41. Yes  No  ?  If you see an accident do you quickly take an active part in giving aid?
42. Yes  No  ?  Do you get stage fright?
43. Yes  No  ?  Do you like to bear responsibilities alone?
44. Yes  No  ?  Have books been more entertaining to you than companions?
45. Yes  No  ?  Have you ever had spells of dizziness?
46. Yes  No  ?  Do jeers humiliate you even when you know you are right?
47. Yes  No  ?  Do you want someone to be with you when you receive bad news?
48. Yes  No  ?  Does it bother you to have people watch you at work even when you do it well?
49. Yes  No  ?  Do you often experience periods of loneliness?
50. Yes  No  ?  Do you usually try to avoid arguments?
51. Yes  No  ?  Are your feelings easily hurt?
52. Yes  No  ?  Do you usually prefer to do your own planning alone rather than with others?
53. Yes  No  ?  Do you find that telling others of your own personal good news is the greatest part of the enjoyment of it?
54. Yes  No  ?  Do you often feel lonesome when you are with other people?
55. Yes  No  ?  Are you thrifty and careful about making loans?
56. Yes  No  ?  Are you careful not to say things to hurt other people’s feelings?
57. Yes  No  ?  Are you easily moved to tears?
58. Yes  No  ?  Do you ever complain to the waiter when you are served inferior or poorly prepared food?
59. Yes  No  ?  Do you find it difficult to speak in public?
60. Yes  No  ?  Do you ever rewrite your letters before mailing them?
61. Yes  No  ?  Do you usually enjoy spending an evening alone?
62. Yes  No  ?  Do you make new friends easily?
63. Yes  No  ?  If you are dining out do you prefer to have someone else order dinner for you?
64. Yes  No  ?  Do you usually feel a great deal of hesitancy over borrowing an article from an acquaintance?
65. Yes  No  ?  Are you greatly embarrassed if you have greeted a stranger whom you have mistaken for an acquaintance?
66. Yes  No  ?  Do you find it difficult to get rid of a salesman?
67. Yes  No  ?  Do people ever come to you for advice?
68. Yes  No  ?  Do you usually ignore the feelings of others when accomplishing some end which is important to you?
69. Yes  No  ?  Do you often find that you cannot make up your mind until the time for action has passed?
70. Yes  No  ?  Do you especially like to have attention from acquaintances when you are ill?
71. Yes  No  ?  Do you experience many pleasant or unpleasant moods?
72. Yes  No  ?  Are you troubled with feelings of inferiority?
73. Yes  No  ?  Does some particularly useless thought keep coming into your mind to bother you?
74. Yes  No  ?  Do you ever upbraid a workman who fails to have your work done on time?
75. Yes  No  ?  Are you able to play your best in a game or contest against an opponent who is greatly superior to you?
76. Yes  No  ?  Have you frequently appeared as a lecturer or entertainer before groups of people?
77. Yes  No  ?  Are people sometimes successful in taking advantage of you?
78. Yes  No  ?  When you are in low spirits do you try to find someone to cheer you up?
79. Yes  No  ?  Can you usually understand a problem better by studying it out alone than by discussing it with others?
80. Yes  No  ?  Do you lack self-confidence?
81. Yes  No  ?  Does admiration gratify you more than achievement?
82. Yes  No  ?  Are you willing to take a chance alone in a situation of doubtful outcome?
83. Yes  No  ?  Does your ambition need occasional stimulation through contact with successful people?
84. Yes No ? Do you usually avoid asking advice?
85. Yes No ? Do you consider the observance of social customs and manners an essential aspect of life?
86. Yes No ? If you are spending an evening in the company of other people do you usually let someone else decide upon the entertainment?
87. Yes No ? Do you take the responsibility for introducing people at a party?
88. Yes No ? If you came late to a meeting would you rather stand than take a front seat?
89. Yes No ? Do you like to get many views from others before making an important decision?
90. Yes No ? Do you try to treat a domineering person the same as he treats you?
91. Yes No ? Does your mind often wander so badly that you lose track of what you are doing?
92. Yes No ? Do you ever argue a point with an older person whom you respect?
93. Yes No ? Do you have difficulty in making up your mind for yourself?
94. Yes No ? Do you ever take the lead to enliven a dull party?
95. Yes No ? Would you “have it out” with a person who spread untrue rumors about you?
96. Yes No ? At a reception or tea do you feel reluctant to meet the most important person present?
97. Yes No ? Do you find that people are more stimulating to you than anything else?
98. Yes No ? Do you prefer a play to a dance?
99. Yes No ? Do you tend to be radical in your political, religious, or social beliefs?
100. Yes No ? Do you prefer to be alone at times of emotional stress?
101. Yes No ? Do you usually prefer to work with others?
102. Yes No ? Do you usually work better when you are praised?
103. Yes No ? Do you have difficulty in starting a conversation with a stranger?
104. Yes No ? Do your feelings alternate between happiness and sadness without apparent reason?
105. Yes No ? Are you systematic in caring for your personal property?
106. Yes No ? Do you worry over possible misfortunes?
107. Yes No ? Do you usually prefer to keep your feelings to yourself?
108. Yes No ? Can you stick to a tiresome task for a long time without someone prodding or encouraging you?
109. Yes No ? Do you get as many ideas at the time of reading a book as you do from a discussion of it afterward?
110. Yes No ? Do you usually face your troubles alone without seeking help?
111. Yes No ? Have you been the recognized leader (president, captain, chairman) of a group within the last five years?
112. Yes No ? Do you prefer making hurried decisions alone?
113. Yes No ? If you were hiking with a group of people, where none of you knew the way, would you probably let someone else take the full responsibility for guiding the party?
114. Yes No ? Are you troubled with the idea that people on the street are watching you?
115. Yes No ? Are you often in a state of excitement?
116. Yes No ? Are you considered to be critical of other people?
117. Yes No ? Do you usually try to take added responsibilities on yourself?
118. Yes No ? Do you keep in the background at social functions?
119. Yes No ? Do you greatly dislike being told how you should do things?
120. Yes No ? Do you feel that marriage is essential to your present or future happiness?
121. Yes No ? Do you like to be with people a great deal?
122. Yes No ? Can you be optimistic when others about you are greatly depressed?
123. Yes No ? Does discipline make you discontented?
124. Yes No ? Are you usually considered to be indifferent to the opposite sex?
125. Yes No ? Would you feel very self-conscious if you had to volunteer an idea to start a discussion among a group of people?
APPENDIX B

A CHECK-LIST OF UNDESIRABLE PERSONALITY
TRAITS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES OF
PRINCIPALS

*The purpose of this check-list is to secure from teachers a judgment
concerning the degree to which the following traits appear in their princi-
pals. There are sixty statements followed by the letters A, B, and C. If
your principal exhibits the trait frequently, encircle the letter A. If he
exhibits the trait seldom, encircle the letter B. If he never exhibits the
trait, encircle the letter C.

Please do not sign your name.

1. Does not show self confidence
2. Is not approachable
3. Is deceitful
4. Has superiority complex
5. Has inferiority complex
6. Is sullen in work
7. Lacks self control
8. Is not tactful in dealing with people
9. Worries excessively—to the extent that it hinders his progress
10. Is selfish
11. Is impatient
12. Is inconsiderate

*The same instructions as above appeared on the second check-list,
except that on the second test teachers were asked to check the degree to
which sixty traits of principals affected their work—instead of the degree
to which each principal exhibited the trait.

The letters A, B, and C, do not appear on this copy of the check-
list.
13. Is dishonest
14. Does not have a sense of humor
15. Is a religious fanatic
16. Does not accept criticisms
17. Engages in disorderly conduct
18. Engages in immoral conduct
19. Is uninterested in establishing friendly relationships with staff
20. Is uninterested in establishing friendly relationship with community
21. Shows unfairness in judging social life of teachers
22. Believes in limited social activities of teachers
23. Does not work effectively with divergent lay groups
24. Is prejudiced
25. Makes undesirable advances to teachers
26. General personality hinders progress of teachers
27. Criticism of work made to others instead of to teachers themselves
28. Is intolerant
29. Has poor working relationship with staff
30. Is jealous of teachers' progress
31. Is an arm-chair principal
32. Sets up drastic musts for teachers
33. Does not help with disciplinary problems
34. Does not aid in curriculum planning
35. Gives too many meaningless suggestions
36. Criticizes teachers unfavorably before students
37. Never holds staff meetings with teachers
38. Allows his impression of his own ability to operate to handicap his effectiveness
39. Never carries through projects started
40. Requires compensation for appointments from teachers
41. Shows partiality in dealing with teachers
42. Draws illogical conclusions on classroom problems of teachers
43. Is impatient with beginning teachers
44. Represses enthusiasm of teachers
45. Is dictatorial
46. Is not prepared professionally for position
47. Has little intellectual ability
48. Is inexperienced in his work
49. Is not interested in progressive educational practices
50. Is unable to furnish professional leadership
51. Refuses to furnish professional leadership although he is prepared
52. Is not prepared academically
53. Does not believe in personal improvement
54. Lacks leadership qualities in community activities
55. Has a worn-out philosophy of education
56. Only belongs to professional organizations necessary to get by
57. Has no knowledge of how subjects should be taught
58. Is passe' in general educational practices
59. Has no knowledge of his responsibilities
60. Believes that the chief concern of the administration is to appease the community
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PERSONAL HISTORY FROM TEACHERS

1. Your name ___________________________ Sex ________________________

2. County in which you work ________________________________

3. Your educational status ________________________________

4. The county in which you teach ________________________________

5. The number of teachers in the school where you teach ________________________________

6. The educational institutions that you attended:

   Elementary ________________________________
   County __________________________ City or Town __________________________ State

   High School ________________________________
   Name __________________________ Place __________________________

   College ________________________________
   Name __________________________ Location __________________________

7. Approximate population of town in which you teach ________________________________

8. The educational status of your principal ________________________________

9. The sex of your principal ________________________________
APPENDIX D

PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS OF TEACHERS

The following excerpts are selected from personal impressions of 105 teachers in training during the summer of 1947 at Alabama State College, Montgomery, Alabama.

Case 1

My principal drew a conclusion of my first month’s work from an observation of a visit to my class and has judged me ever since as being a poor teacher.

Case 2

My principal is deceitful, worries excessively, is prejudiced, and is jealous of others. She will find out all that she can about one of her teachers, discuss it with the others, and pretend that someone else did the talking, thus causing confusion among her staff. Above all she will try to make one’s work a failure.

Case 3

My principal has a tendency to pretend that she likes your work in your presence and attack it is your absence....

Case 4

My principal makes teachers and pupils nervous by outbursts of temper over the loud speaking system.

Case 5

My principal is very fair, considerate, and honest, and possesses tremendous self control, but he has never warmed up to the students. He is much too aloof to gain the confidence of pupils. He never whips but has perfect order.

Case 6

My principal possesses all of the 20 undesirable traits, but this may arise from the fact that he is a veteran of World War II. He tries to use army tactics in the school.... It is difficult to develop democratic attitudes among pupils because they know of dissention among teachers.
Case 7

My principal agrees with too much underhand financial work.

Case 8

The most undesirable trait in my principal was that she was late for work almost every day, which made the other teachers carry her responsibilities for at least one hour.

Case 9

The main interest of my principal is to develop good basketball players. Sometimes he keeps pupils out weeks at the time practicing or playing ball.
A CHECK-LIST OF TWENTY UNDESIRABLE TRAITS FOUND IN PRINCIPALS

Directions: Please place a check (x) before the traits that appear frequently in your principal. Do not sign your name.

1. Never carries through projects started.
2. Has superiority complex.
3. Does not work effectively with lay groups.
4. Does not aid in curriculum planning.
5. Worries excessively.
6. Is selfish.
7. Is dishonest.
8. Has little self-control.
10. Has low morals.
11. Never holds staff meetings.
12. Is prejudiced.
13. Is intolerant.
14. Has poor working relationship with staff.
15. Is jealous of others.
16. Shows partiality with staff.
17. Is dictatorial.
18. Is inexperienced.
20. Sets up drastic musts for teachers.
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