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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

During the past decade the position of school superintendent has undergone vast changes in structure, in status, and in image. No longer can a superintendent anticipate spending a career of productive leadership in a given community. So great are the demands and so rapidly are the community changes that superintendents often are at a loss to adjust to the position. This has led to frequent administrative changes and often to superintendents leaving the profession.

At the same time schools have experienced unprecedented pupil growth, extensive building programs, and ever burgeoning budgets. Most recently superintendents have had to deal with a downward trend in enrollments, the beginning of excess classrooms, and a continued spiral of costs.

Not only have the business related problems brought forth concern, but the academic or cognitive areas, the public relations areas, and the entire area of administering personnel have also undergone great change. As a result the school superintendent has found an entirely new setting in which to work; communities and school boards have come to expect a new type of educational leader in their schools.
The emerging new type school superintendent is finding it necessary to respond to these new challenges. Even the long accepted definitions of a superintendent are being looked at and analyzed to determine if they are appropriate for today.

The position of superintendent of schools has often been thought of as an administrative position dealing in such substantive problems as personnel and business management.¹

As the position has grown and developed, many definitions have been generated. Some of these definitions are descriptive of the position, others tend to be more role-related. Thus Miller² described school administration as the making and carrying out of educational decisions. Getzels, Lipham and Campbell³ conceived of school administration as a social process. A third definition was that offered by Stoops and Rafferty,⁴ which emphasizes organization and leadership.

While these definitions serve a definite purpose, they fail to identify the school superintendent as a separate individual functioning successfully in a school district. It is entirely understandable that no definition can specifically identify all the various tasks a superintendent performs; neither can a given definition be expected to analyze task performance or reasons for such performances. Furthermore, definitions fail to take into account the importance that individual superintendents attach to various administrative functions.

School superintendents generally have very similar educational backgrounds. Most have begun as teachers, earned graduate credits in administration, and advanced to the position of school superintendent. At the same time all superintendents must go through the appropriate licensing procedures, which includes institutional recommendation as well as completion of certain course work and/or a related internship.

The mere fact that a superintendent acquires and retains a position might be an indication of compatibility of his administrative task priorities with that of the community. One might ask, then, what inherent differences exist in present day school superintendents that lead to chosen task priorities. What are the personality types of superintendents making decisions? While it is recognized that there are many similarities to be found among all school superintendents, these similarities are not all readily identifiable. Job preparation
is probably the most easily identifiable similarity. Beyond that, a great debate on superintendents' qualities--similar or dissimilar--seems to prevail.

It is clearly recognized that community type has a great deal to do with the administrative approach a superintendent of schools selects. Nevertheless a position of such great importance in a community requires the superintendent to determine the importance each area of responsibility must be assigned. He must decide if issues including dollars are more important than issues of public relations; he must decide how important his preference is for curricular areas, for staff areas, and for virtually all other areas in the school district. Decisions such as these are made because the superintendent is where he is and what he is. It is to the latter reference this research is aimed.

School boards are elected by citizens or appointed by elected officials to operate the public schools. Perhaps their most important decision is to select a superintendent to act as their executive officer. In so doing, each board member must try to assess exactly what an individual will bring to the job. And after the superintendent has been selected and on the job, the board must evaluate whether he should stay on the job. Evaluation is difficult, often because it is very subjective. If a board could objectively evaluate the type of superintendent it has
and how important he feels each area of his responsibility is, the board's decision to retain or dismiss the superintendent would be much more significant.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the importance that superintendents attach to certain common administrative functions and their relationships to basic personality preferences. It is important because it will help to explain why certain types of administrative decisions are made by one type of superintendent as opposed to different decisions being made by another. All too often school boards or citizens are quick to point to decisions made by a superintendent in a neighboring district as an example of what should have been in their own district. This kind of thinking fails to take into account two factors of paramount importance. First, superintendents, like everyone else, have different types of personalities which influence their daily life style and action patterns. All that they do and say is a direct result of these differences. Second, different superintendents attach varied levels of importance to administrative tasks at hand. This second point is directly related to the first one.

Often the success and effectiveness of a school superintendent can be judged subjectively by peers based on production, practices in
the district, and sometimes good public relations. But none of these alone or in combination is a guarantee of success. No known instrument measures education, weighs experience and interprets personality and background to establish commonalities among the accepted successful. Educational background and administrative experience necessarily do and should play highly prominent roles in the selection of a superintendent, but beyond that there is little objective data to guide the employing body in its selection.

The current study used one of the several studies of the superintendency, that done by Griffiths, as a point of departure and related four parts of the superintendent's job to categories of personality classification that could be determined by a standardized instrument. The Griffiths\textsuperscript{5} study included the following points in the superintendent's description: 1) Improving educational opportunity; 2) Obtaining and developing personnel; 3) Maintaining effective relations with the community; and 4) Providing and maintaining funds and facilities.

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were developed for use in this study:

1. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the function of improving educational opportunity and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

2. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of providing and maintaining funds and facilities and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

3. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of developing and maintaining effective community relations and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

4. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of obtaining and developing personnel and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Significant relationship refers to the statistical level of significance. In this particular research project a 5% level of significance was used, employing the Pearson
product-moment coefficient of correlation. Therefore a decision to accept a hypotheses was based on the evidence gathered in the study.

2. Educational opportunity refers to Griffiths' concept of program quality within a school.

3. Most important functions for purposes of this study are to be those functions conceptually held by superintendents in the study to be most important.

4. School superintendent for the purpose of this study is the chief administrative officer in the local school district.

5. A small sized school district is one that has less than 1,000 students enrolled.

6. A medium sized school district is one that has more than 1,000 students enrolled but less than 5,000.

7. A large sized school district is one that has more than 5,000 students enrolled.

8. A union high school district is a district containing students in grades 9-12 and having its own school board.
Acceptance or Rejection of Hypotheses

The statistical acceptance of the hypotheses was based on data analysis, using a significance level of .05. A two-tailed T test was used for variability of response comparisons within each instrument set and inter-test correlations were used to find the coefficient of correlation. The various response options provided data for simple correlation coefficients, sums, means and other relevant data. The data included total scores of preferences; difference in point totals of preferences; transformation of preference scores into continuous scores; inter-correlations of indicator continuous scores; frequency and mean strength of the preferences of various groups; product-moment inter-correlations of groups; and questionnaire response to individual preference score.

Acceptance was also based on results of the personal interview. (Appendix C).

A simple correlation was made between the personal preference ranking list given to the superintendents in the sample, and the four hypotheses. This was done by relating keyed basic type preference responses of the instrument to each of the Griffiths' descriptor points.
As indicated above, the acceptance or rejection of each hypothesis was based essentially on the use of statistics. Beyond that, however, a great deal of interpretive analysis was done and was included as part of the basis for acceptance or rejection. From the Myers-Briggs Instrument, analysis determined areas where a superintendent was likely to be most interested, most successful, and most easily motivated. Both extrovert and introvert types were revealed and a determination of qualities of openness, accessibility, communicativeness, and friendliness, or of silence, reservedness or the inclination to keep to oneself was revealed.

The two basic preference scores were reflected from the Type Indicator along with their varied combinations. All preferences were determined on each scale by a simple formula and a transformation chart. The classification type resulted in four specific scores. For statistical purposes continuous scores were used. A uniform method assumed corresponding interpretations.

It is important to know the frequency of each preference. It is also important to know the mean reported strength of each preference.
Knowing this, inferences were drawn on relationship to type and what the relationship was. The preferences for Extroversion (E), Introversion (I), Sensing (S), Intuition (N), Thinking (T), Feeling (F), Judging (J), and Perception (P), lead to descriptor groups.

Using the type testing data it was possible to relate such things as perception and judgment to interests, needs, values, and consequently motivations. The researcher was able to conclude which judgment kinds team up with one or the other perception kinds.

Since the hypotheses of the study sought to determine certain relationships, namely Myers-Briggs scores and their relationships to certain specified administrative functions, the type was also compared to the actual functional performance. Through the interview instrument it was determined how much importance has been placed on each of the four Griffiths' functions.

For example, following the determination of each extrovert or introvert type, the combinations were summarized. A step by step approach was used beginning with the kind of perception each superintendent prefers. It was either sensing or intuition. Next, a determination of judgment was typed, either thinking or feeling. The person was then placed in a Type Table column and other entries made. His interests, abilities and present situation are a type. From additional tables the
researcher was able to determine the effects of each preference in work situations. An Extrovert-Sensing-Feeling-Judging type, for example, communicates well, is patient with routine details, is aware of others feelings, and makes decisions quickly.

At the same time the results of the personal interview instrument based on the Griffiths' descriptors have been analyzed. Again many possible alternatives were present. These results have been computed individually to the Myers-Briggs' results as well as collectively. A superintendent may reveal a pattern that shows he ranks finance and facilities as the most important part of job performance. Such a result may verify the Myers-Briggs' classification to the extent that he is working in an area where he will find success. It might also show he is performing functions he considers administratively important, but not in the area where he enjoys working or finds particular success. All four functions have been analyzed with relation to the Myers-Briggs type. From the data analysis the researcher was able to chart the trends that were found in the practicing superintendents.

Further analysis of each superintendent was achieved through the interview instrument. (Appendix C) The answers given on this part are added narrative in the total interpretation found in Chapter III. They provided qualitative information used to clarify and helped to determine the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses.
The Research Design

Selection of the Sample

The selection of the sample of school districts was made after some considerable discussion between the researcher and his advisor. It was agreed that the sample should reflect all areas of the state, should include all organizational types of districts, and should include all size school districts. Accordingly, it was agreed that by selecting districts from within each Cooperative Educational Service Agency, the geographic representation would be adequately provided. And since most of the agencies have about the same number of districts within their boundaries, a like number could be selected from each.

Sizes of school districts vary, so a determination was made that small districts would include those with 1,000 or fewer students, medium size would have 1,000 to 5,000 students, and large districts would have more than 5,000 students. The size determination is consistent with the generally accepted classification of districts in Wisconsin by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. An equal balance of small, medium, and large size districts from the state was selected when all sizes and organizational types were available for selection. Not each agency had large districts, however. When an agency had several large districts, at least one was included in the original mailing request.
Since K-8 and union free high school districts are confined to three educational service areas, their inclusion was necessarily geographically limited. Within each Cooperative Educational Service Agency, however, they were then selected equally from the several counties within the agency.

A sample of thirty school superintendents was used in the study. This represents about 9% of practicing superintendents in Wisconsin, and allowed an adequate selection from all of the Cooperative Educational Service Agency areas. Each of the thirty superintendents in the sample was asked to participate in the study by completing on his own, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Personal Preference Ranking List. The former instrument was used as one of the basic validators for the hypotheses. (A further explanation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator can be found later in this chapter.)

Use of the indicator has enabled the researcher to determine the variations in behavior that school superintendents exhibit. This was done by using the numerical portion of the score on each direction. The higher the score in either direction, the greater the preference choice.
The Personal Preference Ranking List was carefully designed to relate the Griffiths' item with the Myers-Briggs results. Through completion of the Personal Preference Ranking List, the researcher was able to determine how closely superintendents rank actual job performance items with their personality preference, as shown on Myers-Briggs. The Personal Preference Ranking List was necessary to determine the performance factors. Individual analysis as well as the development of trends and patterns was made possible through this technique.

The Interview Instrument is a tool designed to determine other actual job functions of superintendents. This gets at the type of information not included elsewhere because it involves personalized approaches, opinions, and techniques. The responses were not of a totally measurable or statistical nature but provided clarification and supplemental data. The Interview Instrument was used as an additional tool for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses.

The Interview

An interview with fifteen superintendents selected in stratified random fashion from the sample list of thirty took place following the administration of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Personal Preference Ranking List. The superintendents interviewed represented
large, medium, and small school districts in close proportion to the total sample. The general purpose of the interview was to probe for some specific examples of administrative behavior relative to the terms used in the hypotheses. These examples provided further data used in accepting or rejecting hypotheses.

The Personal Preference Ranking List and the Interview Instrument were used to determine how superintendents conceptually viewed various functions of administration in terms of importance. The four areas of administration that are part of the superintendents job description were used as main descriptors. They included the areas of finance and facilities, curriculum, personnel, and public relations. Specific performance items generally considered to fall within each category were incorporated in the instrument. Respondents were asked to rank order each of four items in eleven sets according to the perceived importance in the Personal Preference Ranking List. Each item representing a specific function was keyed by category and related directly to the hypotheses. Each part of the preference ranking list is composed of four items associated with various areas of administration. One item, therefore, is an example of educational improvement, one is an example of the area of personnel, one item is an example of the area of community relations, and one is an example of the area of finance or the administration of facilities.
Similar examples were included on the Interview Instrument. The respondents were asked to rank them in order of importance as they applied to their own positions. The findings are explained and analyzed in Chapter III.

The Interview Instrument was composed of a series of questions that sought to determine how superintendents felt relative to what they did as well as to find out exactly how they function. This part of the research is seen as important because it allows for specific examples of performance choices and follow-up questions of clarification. The responses generated as a result of this questionnaire are included in the analysis of each hypothesis.

Specific questions that compose the Interview Instrument (Appendix C) are directly related to the hypotheses. Each seeks to clarify or confirm the information acquired through the other two instruments, namely the Myers-Briggs and the Personal Preference Ranking List. It is recognized that an interview is designed to supplement and not to supplant any other instrument being used.

Question number one of the interview asked what the superintendent saw as the most important role of his job and also asked for an example. The nature of the responses determined which hypotheses the
question would best relate to. A discussion of the findings is found later in this paper.

Question two approached the same concerns, the importance of administrative functions, in a different way. Discussion of this data elsewhere in the paper explains which hypotheses it relates to and why.

Question three relates directly to hypothesis four because it asks about the superintendents role in staff evaluation, which is a part of personnel function. The general nature of the response was such that it could relate quite well to the other instruments. The clearly supportive implications are discussed in Chapter III.

Question four was designed to gather insight from superintendents that could relate to hypothesis one. Interview information received, although somewhat limited, was directly tied to a personality type as well as related to the Personal Preference Ranking List findings.

Question five was included to gather data that could relate to hypothesis two. The intent was that responses would indicate a clear position that could be used in corroboration, as in the other questions. Later discussion reveals that this was only partially achieved.

Question six was developed by the researcher with the advice of his advisor to tie in to all four of the hypotheses. Each function
included in the hypotheses was included in this question. Rank order findings were used to correlate with the other instrument findings. The question design also was such that it asked for specific examples. This forced the respondents to give some thought to the question and allowed the interviewer an opportunity to determine whether there was common understanding of the terms and the classifications. The findings discussed later reveal the degree to which this was accomplished.

Question seven, closely related to question six, was included simply to probe the accuracy of previous responses. In the initial conception the question could have related to any or all of the hypotheses.

The final question, question eight, was added to help determine the effect community expectations might have on the superintendents' own responses. The findings of this question were analyzed with the findings of the Myers-Briggs. Discussion on this question is also found later in this paper.

The Interview Instrument was validated with superintendents not participating in the study and in consultation with the writer's advisor. Seven superintendents participated in the validation which resulted in changing the original format somewhat. The changes made were for clarification of the questions or for acquiring information actually necessary.
Overview of the Instruments

The Myers-Briggs Indicator was utilized for the collection of personality data. It is not a complicated instrument to administer, but is rather lengthy. Its purpose is to implement Jung's theory of type. Generally the gist of that theory is that "much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment."\(^6\)

The indicator aims to ascertain peoples' basic preferences in regard to perception and judgment. Four separate indices are used for determining each of the four basic preferences. Under this theory, the individual's personality is thus structured.

Four preferences are possible under this theory, and are shown below:

**The Four Preferences**

The indicator contains separate indices for determining each of the four basic preferences which, under this theory, structure the individual's personality.

Index | Preference as between | Affects individual's choice as to
---|---|---
EI | Extroversion or Introversion | Whether to direct perception and judgment upon environment or world of ideas.
SN | Sensing or Intuition | Which of these two kinds of perception to rely on.
TF | Thinking or Feeling | Which of these two kinds of judgment to rely on.
JP | Judgment or Perception | Whether to use judging or perceptive attitude for dealing with environment.

The significance of all of the indicies to educational administration is no different than to any other group; a personality type is determined through the Indicator. While it may be true that educational administration as well as each other profession may tend to be composed of individuals with certain common personality preferences, the preference type is a determination from which to extend additional research. A discussion of the types determined in this research project can be found in Chapter III.
The type indicator yields four scores (sixteen possible combinations). The reliability coefficient on the indices ranges from 0.71 to 0.94 using the split-half method and the indicator has been positively correlated with the following instruments to ascertain concurrent validity: 7

1. Gray-Wheelright Psychological Type Questionnaire.
2. Strong Vocational Interest Blank.
3. Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values.
5. Personality Research Inventory.

Additional information on reliability and validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator can be found in Appendix A.

The EI index of the Myers-Briggs determines whether the person being tested is an extrovert or an introvert. The former, oriented to the outer world, focuses his perception and judgment upon people and things while the latter, an inner world person, focuses upon concepts and ideas. 8

7Ibid, pp. 21-26.
Persons with more points for E than for I are classed as extroverts and are said to have E scores, as E 7, E 13, etc. Those with more points for I than for E are classed as introverts and are said to have I scores, as I 7, I 13, etc. Since the EI "score" is based on the difference between the points for E and the points for I, any given person may have either an E score or an I score, but not both.  

Items within each of the indices are forced choices. Responses are weighted in each direction enabling evidence in each direction to be summed separately. Classification of each respondent is based on what he likes; this reflection is intended to show a habitual choice, analogous to being right or left handed.

The numerical portion of the score shows how strongly the preference is reported. On every index the score runs in both directions. The scores are based on the differences between points on each end of the scale; a person therefore has either an E or an I score, for example, but not both.

---

9 Ibid., p. 2-3.
10 Ibid., p. 3.
Basic differences are therefore reflected in the way people use their minds, especially in the way they use perception and judgment. Behavior is therefore directly affected by these processes. As a result we note corresponding differences in behavior. The following reflect the test author's definition of the separate indicies:

"The extrovert is oriented primarily to the outer world, and thus tends to focus his perception and judgment upon people and things."\(^{11}\)

"The introvert is oriented primarily to the inner world...and thus tends to focus his perception and judgment upon concepts and ideas."\(^{12}\)

"A person who uses the process of sensing as a way of perception is made aware of things directly through one or another of his five senses."\(^{13}\)

\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 1.

\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 1.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 2.
"A person who uses the process of intuition is seen as using indirect perception by way of the unconscious, with the emphasis on ideas or associations which the unconscious tacks on to the outside things perceived." 14

"The TF index is designed to reflect the person's preference as between two opposite ways of judging, i.e., whether he relies primarily upon thinking, which discriminates impersonally between true and false, or primarily upon feeling, which discriminates between valued and not valued." 15

"The JP index is designed to reflect whether the person relies primarily upon a judging process or upon a perceptive process in his dealings with the outer world, that is, in the extraverted part of his life." 16

14 Ibid., p. 2.
15 Ibid., p. 2.
16 Ibid., p. 2.
"Perception in the Myers-Briggs is understood to include the processes of becoming aware of things or people or occurrences or ideas. Judgment is understood to include the processes of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived. These two elements determine a large part of mental ability and outer behavior."17 A more detailed explanation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator can be found in Chapter III. The instrument can be seen in Appendix A.

**Personal Preference Ranking List**

The second instrument used in the research was the Personal Preference Ranking List, referred to on page 14. This instrument was administered to the same superintendents that completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The Personal Preference Ranking List was designed to determine the importance superintendents attach to specific administrative functions. The functions represented the areas of finance and facilities, curriculum, personnel matters, and public or community relations. Eleven questions were included; each contained four items, one in each of the function areas. The respondents were asked to rank them in order of importance as it applied to their positions.

---

17 Ibid.
The Personal Preference Ranking List was validated by administration to superintendents not participating in the study. As a result of initial validation procedures the researcher along with his advisor thought a number of changes should be made. Ultimately the present instrument evolved and was once again given to a group of superintendents not participating in this present study. Its acceptance was mutual between the researcher and his advisor.

Analysis of this instrument is contained in Chapter III. The instrument can be seen in Appendix B.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The study is limited to participating school superintendents in Wisconsin. It also reflects preferences and points of view of positions held at the time of the administration of the instruments. Subsequent job positions of the respondents may necessarily alter data, particularly on the Personal Preference Ranking List.

In addition the study was limited to a one-exposure interview. The study did not attempt to assess the overall effectiveness of the superintendents participating in the sampling.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Over the years a great number of studies have been made on the administration of public schools. Similarly, studies have been done on the functions of school superintendents, their relationship to staff members, to school boards, to the community, and more recently to their students. Books have been written about superintendents' educational training, about their on-the-job experience, minimum standards, as leaders in the community, in the Parent-Teachers Association, and in every walk of life. Many superintendent practitioners and professors of educational administration have attempted to define the position or the role through definitions and examples.

Since this study dealt with the importance superintendents attach to various administrative functions and certain identified personality types, a voluminous amount of literature was reviewed. The researcher utilized the many references made in the literature in general, taking advantage as well of the Wisconsin Instant Retrieval of Educational material (WIRE) system, the Educational Resources Information Center, (ERIC), the Dissertation Abstracts, the Comprehensive Dissertation Abstracts, and the Dissertation Abstracts International. This review includes a review of literature dealing with (a) personality traits, and (b) with administrative functions.
Review of Literature on Personality Traits

Early studies of the Jungian typology such as found in the Myers-Briggs instrument have shown mixed results. A well known early study was done by Stephenson. In his study the Jungian typology was employed to represent Stephenson's position regarding correlation between persons as contrasted with correlations between tests. The study was primarily procedural rather than substantive.

Gray did research to determine what applicability questionnaires might have for the assessment of types. In addition, Eysenck provided research that led to the identification of an intraversion-extroversion factor. His work was limited to this single dimension, however.

A more recent study by Stricker and Ross examined some of the properties of the Jungian typology by utilizing the Myers-Briggs instrument.

While they were unable to find support for many of the properties attributed to the Jungian Typology, they were also unable to say that the Myers-Briggs indicator failed to adequately represent the typology.

Still others have sought to show that certain of the traits measured by the Myers-Briggs instrument are commonalities in personalities that run through all individuals. Such common traits include achievement, anxiety, creativity, dominance, and even extroversion. Kluckhorn, Murray, and Schneider⁵ have said that every man is in certain respects: a. like all other men; b. like some other men; or c. like no other men. These respectively represent universal norms, group norms and idiosyncratic norms.

The entire study of traits is not only somewhat overwhelming, but almost nonending. As many of 17,953 trait names were found by Allport and Odbert.⁶

Leary⁷ offers a somewhat different approach which involves patterns of interpersonal relationships. Personality patterns are arranged in a circle so that similar actions are spatially near, and actions of opposite meaning are at opposite ends of the diameter. This can be seen in Model I.

⁷Ibid. p. 166.
Model I - Leary's System of Trait of Classification

It is also apparent that there is a relation of traits of personal styles.

"Dominance, for example, involves perception of others as available to be bossed around. It is well known, however, that some individuals are quite dominant, even domineering, with persons of inferior status, but are quite submissive with persons of higher status than themselves. On the other hand, some are domineering regardless of status of the other person. We might plausibly assume that the latter group tends towards leveling (i.e., denying differences in perceived objects), whereas the former manifests sharpening, at least on a relative basis." 

---

8Ibid. p. 173
Cattell and Stice\textsuperscript{9} investigated leader characteristics in a 1954 study. This rather complex study attempted to maximize the incorporation of situational differences through an approach in which the leader type was identified according to his relationship to the group. Personality measurements were taken of all the leaders in each group situation using the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. The results indicated certain similarities among the leaders without regard to the situation type. That is, association was found between leader behavior and the propensity for risk taking; leaders were found to be confident, self-assured, and serene; leaders scored high in self concept control, thereby being consistent behavior in group settings; and leaders scored consistently high in superego strength, providing a strong sense of duty and a conscientious value pattern. The value of this study was in the area of trait identification and influence.

Another citation dealing with the importance of personality traits and the superintendent can be summarized in the following article written for beginning superintendents:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
"In the process of self-analysis and job analysis, it might be well to get assistance from a wise administrator, one who knows the difficulties which will have to be met, and the skills, the knowledge, the understandings, and the personal qualities essential for success."

and,

"Not content with his appraisal of his professional background, he (the new administrator) should look at his personal characteristics. Not everyone who is professionally qualified and intellectually able possesses the emotion and physical qualities necessary to cope with the task of being a superintendent of schools...the thin skinned individual endeavors to other than being a superintendent of schools."\(^\text{10}\)

Since the academic performance involves so much that is non-creative, the identification of creativity is all the more elusive. Getzels and Jackson,\(^\text{11}\) Torrance,\(^\text{12}\) and MacKinnon\(^\text{13}\) all corroborate this and their respective studies of the late 50's found that intelligence tests of that period also lacked a creative measure. More recently


\(^{13}\)D.W. MacKinnon, "What Do We Mean By Talent and How Do We Test For It?" The Search for Talent, (College Entrance Examination Board, 1960), pp. 20-29.
Guilford\textsuperscript{14} has concluded that creative activity, like behavior, represents many learned skills, and that those skills might be limited by heredity; however, he was convinced that through learning, skills could be extended within those limitations.

Fifty school superintendents were studied in Ohio to determine if behavior could be predicted. This study, done by Seeman,\textsuperscript{15} found that certain types of attitudes could predict types of behavior.

Shiroda\textsuperscript{16} recently studied Wisconsin school superintendents to determine the relationship of their personality characteristics to career ascendency. Using the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, he analyzed each measured factor as to its relationship to career ascendencies. The factors measured included the following: intelligence, ego strength, dominance, surgency, superego strength, venturesomeness, tendermindedness,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15}Melvin Seeman, "Social Mobility and Administrative Behavior." American Sociological Review, 23:633, December, 1958.
\end{itemize}
suspiciousness, creativity, shrewdness, apprehensiveness, radicalism, self-sufficiency, self-control and tenseness.

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions are summarized:

1. The personality profile of superintendents of schools appears to differ from that of the general population in that superintendents tend to be more outgoing, more intelligent, more surgent, more venturesome, more self-controlled, and to exhibit a stronger measure of superego strength.

2. There does not appear to be a strong relationship between the personality characteristics of practicing superintendents and their career ascendency. There is, however, the indication that the more career ascendent superintendents tend to be more apprehensive, more venturesome, and more forthright than their less ascendent fellows.

3. Advancement from within is an effective avenue of career ascendency. This was true of two categories of superintendents in this study, namely, the younger and less experienced superintendents who had been advanced to the superintendency from the principalship in smaller districts, and in a number of instances the advancement of assistant superintendents to superintendents in larger districts.
4. Being an aggressive applier for position advancement is one of the more important factors in career ascendency. Indications are that this is true in those situations involving advancement from within as well as those involving the selection of the superintendent from outside of the district.

5. The acquisition of an advanced degree is an important prerequisite for career ascendency. This seems to be particularly true with reference to the Doctor's degree.

6. There is an inverse relationship between the age of the superintendent and his potential for career ascendency. Younger superintendents apparently are motivated by the seeking of power and prestige to a much greater degree than older superintendents.

7. While appreciation for the utility of theory in the day-to-day practice of the superintendency exhibited one of the high correlations with career ascendency in the straight-forward statistical analysis, the absence of this variable in the regression analysis leads to the conclusion that appreciation for theory is a function of the advanced training of the more career ascendent superintendents rather than being of itself a prerequisite for career ascendency.
8. Financial reward and the quest for challenge, power and prestige are common motivators for the selection of the superintendency as a career.

A recent study on managerial effectiveness as it relates to personality traits was done by Palmer.¹⁷ Using a sample of 90 branch managers from a large industry, he attempted to prove the hypothesis that management effectiveness is a function of the personality characteristics of the individual. Like the present study he used scores on personality measurement instruments, but unlike the present study, used a questionnaire to determine "how good a job do you think is being done by your immediate manager?" As a result of the study, no support was shown for the hypothesis.

Some educational administration writers and many educational psychology writers perceive certain other human factors as significant in the total composite of administrative success. Included in these perceptions is the quality of creativity, which undeniably is a desirable trait for a school superintendent to possess. "The mark of a creative person is that he is tolerant, always ready for a change, and will...

listen to other people. He is the fuller citizen."\textsuperscript{18}

A number of studies have been conducted on creativity, previously identified as a desirable trait for a school superintendent. Torrance,\textsuperscript{19} for example, devoted a lifetime of study to creativity. He found that creativity in thinking has an important inter-relationship to mental health, educational achievement, and vocational success in individuals. But Taylor found that school grades--academic achievement--are not efficient predictors of creativity.\textsuperscript{20}


Two significant studies were done involving administrative personalities and leadership behaviors. Hemphill and Coons developed a Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) that consisted of a broad list of descriptive statements which could apply to the behavior of leaders. Members of a group were asked to rate the number of times behaviors were exhibited. From the responses patterns of behavior for individual leaders were identified. From a factor analysis of responses to the LBDQ Halpin and Winer were able to determine two dimensions of leadership which they called "initiating structure and "consideration." The former refers to the leader behavior directed at creating a relationship between himself and members of his group. The latter involves behavior directed at establishing mutual trust and respect between the leader and his staff. 21

Stogdill, however, felt that the two factors did not sufficiently explain administrative leadership behavior. He therefore revised the LBDQ by incorporating additional factors. Subscales

composed of five or ten items and representing a complex pattern of behaviors were developed. They may be listed as follows:

1. **Representation** - speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)
2. **Demand Reconciliation** - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder of system. (5 items)
3. **Tolerance of Uncertainty** - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)
4. **Persuasiveness** - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)
5. **Initiation of Structure** - clearly defines own role and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)
6. **Tolerance of Freedom** - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. (10 items)
7. **Role Assumption** - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)
8. **Consideration** - has regard for the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)

---

9. **Production Emphasis** - applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)

10. **Predictive Accuracy** - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately. (5 items)

11. **Integration** - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves intermember conflicts. (5 items)

12. **Superior Orientation** - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)

Wall used the LBDQ by relating it to the Getzels and Guba leadership model. Questionnaires were used to identify the ideal behavior of a leader and the actual behavior of a leader. Such use of LBDQ can provide a means for a leader to receive feedback of his actions as perceived by others as well as to help him see the degree to which group expectations were being met.

---

23 Ralph M. Stogdill, *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*, Form XII, Bureau of Research, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1963.

Some rather interesting research done by Boehr and Williams reported on 15 different personal trait items that represented 680 males in a sample. A factoring process produced five second-order factors that purported to represent broad behavioral patterns associated with an individual's needs and achievement drives.

Using factor scores, tests were run to measure the extent to which differences occurred among 10 occupational groups, including school superintendents. The results indicated that particular dimensions of personal background were related to occupational classification, job demands, and to occupational choice.25

Review of Literature on Administrative Functions

In addition to the review of literature on personality traits, the entire area of functions of a superintendent was also reviewed. Generally the responsibilities associated with the position of superintendent did not vary to any great degree. Some writers tended to be very specific, taking care to itemize a category in a very detailed, limited manner. Other writers chose to identify broader areas of responsibility.

Smith, Krouse, and Atkinson\textsuperscript{26} have taken the latter option. They used the following seven categories to describe position responsibility: "1. General Functions; 2. Staff Coordination; 3. Curriculum; 4. Finance; 5. Plant; 6. Pupils, and 7. Public Relations".

Griffiths\textsuperscript{27} identifies certain other traits:

"The essence of leadership is innovation. The superintendent who understands the issues of the day will not change for the sake of change, but he will introduce new ideas as they are generated if they meet the needs of the school system..."


\textsuperscript{27}Griffiths, The School Superintendent, p. 101-105.
The personal courage of the superintendent must be of the highest level. His is a role that requires taking positions of controversial issues. He must be able to withstand the many pressures which will be exerted on him. Courage is a sine qua non of the superintendent...

Modern America does not need businessmen to run its schools; it needs philosophers—superintendents to lead education to heights never before imagined."

It was further revealed in the literature that decision-making was an oft-used term related to the superintendency.

A study by Griffiths and Hemphill\(^{28}\) on administrative decision-making employed an empirical test of the administrative decision-making process. According to Griffiths\(^{29}\) the decision-making process includes not only the decision "but also the acts necessary to put the decision into operation and so actually affect the course of action of an enterprise". Administrators are those who effect the decision. And of course no descriptive analysis of administrative process would be complete without mention of that well known acronym of Gulick's, "POSDCORB".\(^{30}\)


Administrative theorists have continually tried to define the administrative process by including various taxonomies. Litchfield\textsuperscript{31} included five priorities in the administrative process: decision-making, programming, communicating, controlling, and reappraising. Similar components in the administrative process were noted by Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer.\textsuperscript{32} They include decision-making, programming, stimulating, coordinating and appraising.

Chester Barnard\textsuperscript{33} in The Functions of the Executive points to the relationship between effectiveness and efficiency, the former being nonpersonal in character and the latter being personal in character, a satisfaction motive. The superintendent is faced with the responsibility of being both effective and efficient. Institutional needs and individual needs must coincide if the maximum of efficiency and effectiveness is to be achieved.


\textsuperscript{32}Roald Campbell, J. E. Corbally, Jr., and J. A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, (Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, 1965), p. 145.

While Griffiths\(^{34}\) emphasized human relations in the elevation of a superintendent, Campbell\(^{35}\) stressed communication. Personal relationships are crucial according to Halpin.\(^{36}\) Rafferty and Stoops\(^{37}\) listed finance and business administration as a top priority in school administration. Planning the school plant and personnel management are also seen by Rafferty and Stoops\(^{38}\) as critical functions of the superintendent.

Fowlkes\(^{39}\) has recognized educational administration as a complex process that includes the formulation, execution and appraisal of policies.


\(^{35}\)Roald Campbell, "Research and the Selection and Preparation of School Administrators", Educational Research Bulletin, (Columbus, Ohio, State University, February 8, 1956), pp. 29-33.

\(^{36}\)Andrew Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, School-Community Development Study Monograph, No. 4 (Columbus, Ohio State University, 1956).

\(^{37}\)Stoops and Rafferty, Practices & Trends in School Administration, p. 5.

\(^{38}\)Ibid.

Another Wisconsin writer, Gregg,\textsuperscript{40} acknowledged that only in recent years--since the 50's--has an attempt been made to analyze specifically the administrative process.

Collins\textsuperscript{41} did a study on administrative competency of superintendents in Tennessee. Twenty-seven superintendents were used in the study. They were asked to list items of competency that they felt would be important to the superintendent during the next three to five years. A list was then compiled and again sent to the sample. The list was then ranked in ascending order on both the importance and the utilization. A third probe was used for consensus.

Analysis of the items on the first probe showed the following ranking: 1) public relations, 2) school law, 3) personnel management, 4) human relations, 5) finance, 6) curriculum, 7) other, 8) personnel evaluation, 9) planning, 10) non-personnel evaluations, 11) superintendent-school board relations.


The second probe had the following results: 1) superintendent-school board relations, 2) finance, 3) public relations, 4) planning, 5) curriculum, 6) personnel evaluation, 7) personnel management, 8) human relations, 9) school law, 10) non-personnel evaluation, 11) other.

Probe three categories ranked as follows: 1) superintendent-school board relations, 2) public relations, 3) finance, 4) curriculum, 5) planning, 6) human relations, 7) other, 8) school law, 9) personnel evaluation, 10) non-personnel evaluation, and 11) personnel management.

Analyses of the modes showed as highly important 82.8 percent of the items on probe two and 83.6 percent of probe three. Busing to achieve racial balance was the only item of low importance.

This study included some of the same terms used by other writers such as Griffiths, which was a pattern for terms used in the present study. Collins also used a similar sample size to the present study, and dealt with matters of administrative functions. His approach, however, was considerably different.
The literature also revealed a degree of conflict in its attempts to come to grips with the definition of administration. Gregg\textsuperscript{42} has simplified the process of administration by reducing it to seven components: "1) Decision-Making, 2) Planning, 3) Organizing, 4) Communicating, 5) Influencing, 6) Coordinating, 7) Evaluating. These seven components can encompass the entire administrative process. They cannot be separated, all are needed.

At the same time Fisk\textsuperscript{43} writes the following:

"No brief or simple statement will suffice for defining the task of educational administration. The field of public administration is replete with illustrations of the dynamic character of major executive offices. From that of the President of the United States to the office of mayor of a village, there is constant concern about the ever-increasing load placed upon executives. The position of the school administrator is no exception...".


Some have seen the superintendent as an innovator. A number of studies have been done on innovative qualities including one by Barnett, who related innovations and inventions to five separate ethnic groups. His inference, as well as a similar inference by Linton, was that the innovator was impractical or a social misfit. It is quite apparent that a successful administrator must be practical in presenting any so-called innovation if it is to be implemented. Carlson has said that it is the public school superintendent who is to a great extent going to determine the success of an innovation. The superintendent is crucial in introducing innovations to a school district.

Almost twenty years have elapsed since a committee of eighteen professors of educational administration concluded, "that many traditional concepts of administrative leadership or leader behavior are


not supported by the evidence that is now available. Interestingly enough a study done by Stogdill prior to the professors' report surveyed 124 studies on the relationship of personality factors to leadership. Part of his conclusions are quoted as follows:

1. Conclusion from 15 or more studies are supported uniformly with positive evidence.

   A. "The average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of his group in the following respects: (1) intelligence, (2) scholarship, (3) dependability in exercising responsibilities, (4) activity and school participation, and (5) socio-economic status."

   B. "The qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader."

2. Conclusions from 10 or more of the studies supported by uniform positive evidence as as follows:

   A. "The average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of this group to some degree in the following


respects: (1) sociability, (2) initiative, (3) persistance, (4) knowing how to get things done, (5) self-confidence, (6) alertness to and insight into situations, (7) cooperativeness, (8) popularity, (9) adaptability, (10) verbal facility".

After additional study Stogdill concluded: "A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of the interactions of variables which are in constant flux and change."

Lipham distinguished between administration and leadership. He suggested that administration keeps things moving in its customary direction while leadership changes the goals or procedures of the organization. This distinction is accepted by Campbell, Cunningham and McPhee who therefore believe that superintendents operate within a political role but one with educational underpinning. The superintendent

49Ibid.


must therefore "attempt to manipulate the environment to the end that adequate educational programs are supported."

A study by Bowman\textsuperscript{52} suggested three varied approaches a superintendent uses in influencing school board decisions. He may make the board decision, known as determining; he may provide merely information to the board, known as informing; or he may inform and then suggest a course of action, which is called recommending. All three behavior modes influence decision-making. To be sure, each approach will vary with the type of board and the operating style of the superintendent.

Perhaps a superintendent's success in a community is summed up by his self-understanding of his working limitations. At the same time he must understand his community and have a workable relationship with the community at large, the school board, the staff, and certainly the media.

It has long been accepted that man cannot be separated from his environment. In view of this one must look closely at the individual and organizational relationship. Argyris\textsuperscript{53} spent considerable time

\begin{itemize}
  \item Thomas Bowman, from R. Campbell, L. Cunningham, and R. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools, op. cit., p. 216.
\end{itemize}
studying individual actualization in complex organizations. He de-
termined certain personality aspects in high skill and low skill
employees. High skill employees expressed needs to be active, to work
with others, to have variety and challenge, to produce quality work,
and expressed a high sense of self-worth, amongst other qualities.
One would generally expect a successful school superintendent to possess
similar traits. Corwin used nine expectations in describing the
behavior of professionals. While using the term professional in a
rather generic sense, his statements do provide a lead in the direction
of behavior one would come to expect from school superintendents. His
stress is on attitudes toward others, and are listed below:

1. Stress on uniqueness of client's problems.
2. Stress on research and change.
3. Rules stated as alternatives.
4. Stress on achievement of goals; client orientation.
5. Skill based primarily on monopoly of knowledge.
6. Decisions concerning policy in professional matters and
unique problems.

---

7. Rules sanctioned by legally sanctioned professionals.
8. Loyalty to professional associations and clients.
9. Authority from professional competence.

In his book, *Walk, Run or Retreat*, Sullivan, a practicing superintendent, described what he perceived as common characteristics of school superintendents. While he mentions qualities often listed in educational administration textbooks, he places the emphasis on the superintendent as a leader. Not only in the educational arena, but in the political arena as well. Sullivan cited many weaknesses of superintendents that have led to pitfalls, including their failure to look favorably at change. Perhaps the most enlightening comments he made were on the need for good superintendents.

"The great school systems, almost without exception, are built by strong boards of education who have the intelligence and courage to select an outstanding educator as their superintendent. They then develop policy that is fair to all concerned, and turn the daily operation of the schools over to the superintendents.

The superintendent in turn must select a staff that has demonstrated ability, must set the tone for all by working diligently with them on critical issues, and must demonstrate courage by refusing to be coerced by school board, fellow staff members, students, or parents. He must accept constructive suggestions graciously and give credit to those making the suggestions. He must discipline privately those who

need disciplining. He must acknowledge that he is only one member of a much larger team and must encourage the entire staff to try new creative approaches...And, above all, he must keep the channels of communication wide open at every level of the school system."

A critical issue that Mayer and Wilson see facing the modern school superintendent is change. They see the need for a superintendent to be able to analyze new problems, find ways to meet the problems, and plan for future problems. These writers feel a superintendent must be a problem solver early enough to utilize all variables open to him. To do this a superintendent must be well informed in his field of education and sensitive to the community.

A great deal of research has been done on roles of individuals in the area of scientific management. To some extent the writings of Fayol as well as Taylor and Weber influenced not only practices


found in industry, but also those in schools. According to Callahan, school superintendents adapted tenets of the industrial management concept.

An interesting study on educational administration was done by Anderson. He attempted to show that bureaucracy in a school system was related to students alienation from school. He concluded also that bureaucratization becomes more extensive as the social class of students becomes lower.

A major work on the school superintendent was done by Griffiths. Virtually every aspiring superintendent ponders the Griffiths material which sees as the major function of the superintendent "the improving of educational opportunity for each child in the school district and the revising of the level of the public's expectation regarding education". He further sees the superintendent's job as having four parts: 1) Improving educational opportunity, 2) Obtaining and developing personnel, 3) Using personnel, and 4) Planning and implementing the programs of the school district.

---


3) Maintaining effective relations with the community, and 4) Providing and maintaining funds and facilities." Griffiths also points out necessary administrative skills, meaning the ability to use one's knowledge effectively. Those skills include the following:

1. Conceptual skill--ability to see the organization as a whole.

2. Human skills--ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the faculty.

3. Technical skill--specialized knowledge and ability involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques within a specific vocation.

From this extensive review of the literature it can be concluded that a great deal has been written about the school superintendent in general. It is equally clear, however, that few studies have been made on the superintendent's functions and his personality type. Hence this study.
CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF THE DATA

The data described and analyzed in this chapter were generated from the administration of the instruments referred to in Chapter I, namely the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the Personal Preference Ranking List, and the personal interview.

Thirty-eight superintendents were asked to participate in the study by completing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Of those thirty-eight originally selected, thirty-two responded by completing the instrument and returning it to the researcher. Of the remaining six that failed to complete the instrument, five did not acknowledge at all, and one answered five questions only, returning it with a note saying, "busy superintendents do not have time for this."

Following the return of the Myers-Briggs, the thirty-two superintendents were asked to complete the Personal Preference Ranking List. Thirty did complete it and two did not. The two that did not had left their positions between the time the first instrument was administered and the second one was presented. The result was the analysis of thirty respondents on the two instruments.
General Summary of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Since the Myers-Briggs was the first instrument used it will also be the first one analyzed. The data collected on the thirty respondents are classified as personality attitudes. All of the respondents are identified as either an extrovert or an introvert. Extroversion and introversion are called personality attitudes. An attitude does not stand alone however. It is complemented by the personality's functions.

The main purpose of the Indicator is to ascertain a person's basic preferences. Extroversion or Introversion, Sensing or Intuition, Thinking of Feeling, and Judging or Perception are indicies designed to point one way or the other, rather than scales designed to measure traits. What each is intended to reflect is a habitual choice between opposites, analogous to right- or left-handedness. Thus E-I means E or I, rather than E to I. Figure I shows the Preference summary and the choice affected by each preference.
A SUMMARY OF THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Preference as between</th>
<th>Affects individual's choice as to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Extroversion or Introversion</td>
<td>Whether to direct perception and judgment upon environment or world of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Sensing or Intuition</td>
<td>Which of these two kinds of perception to rely on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Thinking or Feeling</td>
<td>Which of these two kinds of judgment to rely on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Judgment or Perception</td>
<td>Whether to use judging or perception attitude for dealing with environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items of each index offer "forced" choices involving the preference at issue. Responses pointing in opposite directions bear separate weights of 0, 1 or 2, enabling the evidence in each direction to be separately summed. This device permits (a) control of the effect of omissions, and (b) an item-by-item correction for social desirability, undistorted by omissions.

Since some degree of difference exists between people willing to concur, and since no opportunity is given to say "no", the respondent can choose to omit an answer. Greater validity is more likely by the omission of doubtful answers than their inclusion. Similarly people
tend to respond to popular or less extreme answers. The instrument compensates for this by its weighting system.

For example, persons with more points for E than for I are classed as extroverts and are said to have E scores, as E 7, E 13, etc. Those with more points for I than for E are classed as introverts and are said to have I scores, as I 7, I 13, etc. Since the E I "score" is based on the difference between the points for E and the points for I, any given person may have either an E score or an I score, but not both.

The letter is considered the most important part of the score, as indicating which of the opposite sides of his nature the person prefers to use, and presumably, has developed—or can develop—to a higher degree. For instance, E suggests that he enjoys extroverting more than he enjoys introverting, has therefore given his extrovert side considerably more practice, is likely to be better at activities involving extraversion, and will probably find a vocation requiring extroversion most satisfying as a life work. The letter from all four scores, each with corresponding implications, make up the type formula, ENFP, which describes the type.¹

The numerical portion of the score shows how strongly the preference is reported, which is not necessarily the same thing as how strongly it is felt. The importance of this is that preference of dichotomies based on inner disposition are difficult to measure. The division point must therefore be as accurate as possible in order to classify people with a maximum of accuracy.

On every index, the scores run in both directions from the zero at the center, where the direction of the reported preference changes. The ranges are seen in Figure 2.

**FIGURE 2**

**INDEX SCORE RANGE OF MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>53-0-I 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>67-0-N 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>49-0-F 51 (males)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>61-0-F 49 (females)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>55-0-P 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preference of People

The division of each index into two separate scales emphasizes the respectful recognition which type theory accords to opposite kinds of people. Each person is classified in positive terms, by what he likes, not what he lacks. The theory attaches no priority value judgment to one preference as compared with another, but considers each one valuable and at times indispensable in its own field.2

These basic differences concern the way people prefer to use their minds, specifically the way they use perception and judgment. "Perception" is here understood to include the processes of becoming aware of things or people or occurrences or ideas, and "judgment" is understood to include the processes of coming-to-conclusions about what has been perceived. Together, perception and judgment thus constitute a large portion of the individual's total mental activity. They must also govern a large portion of his outer behavior, since by definition his perception determines what he sees in a situation and his judgment determines what he decides to do about it.

Thus behavior is directly affected by the processes of perception and judgment, and it is entirely reasonable that basic differences

2Ibid., p. 3.
in perception or judgment should result in corresponding differences in behavior.

A basic difference in the use of perception arises from the fact that mankind is equipped with two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of perceiving. There is not only the familiar process of sensing, by which we become aware of things directly through our five senses. There is also the process of intuition, which is indirect perception by way of the unconscious, accompanied by ideas or associations which the unconscious tacks on to the perceptions coming from the merest masculine "hunch" or "woman's intuition" to the crowning examples of creative art of scientific discovery.

Undoubtedly all persons make use of both sorts of perception. But most individuals, from infancy up, enjoy one way of perceiving more than the other. When people prefer sensing, they find too much of interest in the actuality around them to spend much energy listening for ideas out of nowhere. When people prefer intuition, they are too much interested in all the possibilities that occur to them to give a whole lot of notice to the actualities. For instance, the reader who confines his attention strictly to what is said here in the page is following the habit of the people who prefer sensing. One who reads between the lines and runs ahead to the possibilities which arise in
his own mind is illustrating the way of the people who prefer intuition.  

A similar basic difference, this time in the use of judgment, arises from the existence of two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of coming to conclusions. One way is by the use of thinking, which is a logical process, aimed at an impersonal finding. The other way is by the use of feeling, which is a process of appreciation equally reasonable in its fashion, bestowing on things a personal, subjective value.

Everyone undoubtedly makes some decisions with thinking and some with feeling. But each person is almost certain to like and trust one way of judging more than the other. If, when one judges these ideas, he concentrates on whether or not they are true, that is thinking-judgment. If one is conscious first of like or dislike, of whether these concepts are sympathetic or antagonistic to other ideas he prizes, that is feeling-judgment.

The basic matrix shown in Figure 3 is for the functions of perception and judgment. As explained in the following paragraph, one corner of the matrix is representative of a leading function.

---

3Ibid., p. 51-52.
Whatever a person's leading function (and hence his type), his remaining three functions will descend in hierarchy 'downward.' That is, he will have a steadily lessening degree of access to them. We have discovered that there is an absolute law concerning this hierarchy: One's second function cannot be 'the diagonal' of the first--i.e., diagonally opposite in the matrix. Thus, a feeling type must have either sensation or intuition, but never thinking, for his second function.\(^4\)

Because of this matrix, the function scores are determined much as the attitudes are found. The number of responses that relate to each function is determined. For example, a test might show a thinking score of 12, a sensation score of 17, a feeling score of 24, and an intuition score of 15.

If these four scores are put into the matrix, Figure 4 results.

---

Since the diagonals are the opposite functions, the smaller is subtracted from the larger. In this example, "feeling 24" minus "thinking 12" results in "feeling 12" (F_{12}). The function with the larger number becomes the dominant function of the two.

Repeating the same procedure for the other diagonal, "sensation 17" minus "intuition 15" equals "sensation 2" (S_2).

Thus, the two dominant functions are F_{12} and S_2. Whichever has the larger number is the primary function while the other becomes the secondary function. In this case, feeling is primary, while sensation is secondary.

Combining these personality functions with the attitude in the other example results in an extraverted feeling sensation type (ESF). (This type is explained in Table I.)
Introverts, Extroverts and the General Population

Several studies involving college age and adult men and women indicate that about 54 percent are extroverted and 46 percent are introverted. Smoke's study concurs, stating that "there are more extroverts than introverts." As shall be discussed later in this chapter, the present study finds somewhat similar results.

Some generalities, however, may be drawn about the introvert and extrovert.

According to Smoke each has advantages and disadvantages:

The great advantage of extroversion is ease of action in the world; the great advantage of introversion is ease and perceptiveness of introspection. Introverts are likely to find vigorous, rapid or sustained physical action difficult and unpleasant. Extroverts tend to equate solitude with loneliness and find introspection boring and, if continued, mentally tiring. The slogan of the introvert would be 'the world is too much with us,' while that of the extrovert could be 'why isn't anything happening?'

The extrovert thinker is exemplified as using his thinking to run as much of the world as is his to run. Extroverted thinkers have

---

6Smoke, p. 5.
high respect for impersonal truth, order, and efficiency. They are analytical, impersonal, objectively critical, and not likely to be convinced by anything but reasoning. They organize facts, situations, and operations well in advance and make a systematic effort to reach carefully planned objectives on schedule.

Extroverted types also enjoy being executives and put a great deal of themselves into their job. They tend to like deciding what ought to be done and give the necessary orders. They dislike confusion, inefficiency, and half-way measures.

If a judging type, perception may be neglected. It is difficult to listen to other peoples views, especially those people under him.

Combining Traits

In addition to the E-I identification, other personality functions are also measured in the Myers-Briggs. The primary functions, thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition categories are not equally divided in the population at large. Smoke\textsuperscript{7} indicates the population is generally distributed as shown in Figure 5.

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., p. 4.
It can be seen that 'sensing' accounts for the greatest percent of the population while the function of 'intuition' accounts for the least. Any of these functions of course, can be found not only with the extrovert, but with the introvert as well.

**FIGURE 5**

NORMAL POPULATION DISTRIBUTION FOR MYERS-BRIGGS PERSONALITY FUNCTIONS

Since it is the combination of traits that makes up the whole personality type, mention must be made of some of the resulting types. When the extroverted thinking type has sensing as an auxiliary, EST, reality is easily seen. This type tends to be matter-of-fact, practical, and factually minded. They are more curious about new things than new
ideas, and prefer ideas based on fact.

Using intuition as an auxiliary, ENT, the type has more intellectual interest and curiosity for new ideas. This type would have a taste for complex problems and long range possibilities, but may overlook important details.

The extroverted feeling type, representing five on the sample, is concerned chiefly with people. This type values fellowship and harmonious human contacts above all else. They try to live up to ideals and tend to idealize whatever they admire. Security is had from others' warmth of feeling.

Being judging types, the ESTJ like to have matters settled, but not necessarily by themselves. They like orderliness in themselves and others, and openly express "shoulds" and "should nots."

With sensing as the auxiliary (ESFJ), the type is practical, realistic, and tends to adopt to routine. With intuition as the auxiliary (ENFJ), there is curiosity for new ideas and insight. This type may be expressive, but prefer using it in speaking to groups rather than writing.
Two other extroverted types that were evidenced in the present study should also be mentioned. (See Table V) ESTP types are good natured realists who use the facts as they are. Being perceptive they look for satisfying solutions, possibly compromise solutions. Much is gained from first-hand experience. With thinking as an auxiliary, there is a general understanding of principles. This type will "crack down" when it is necessary. If feeling is the auxiliary, ESFP, there may be difficulty in discipline.

Being an extroverted intuitive type, there is enthusiasm for new and creative ideas. There is also motivation of other people. The type, however, does not like routine and consequently pays little attention to detail. If thinkers, they will be analytical and critical, and likely somewhat impersonal in their relations to others.

A summary of each preference combination can be seen in Tables I and II. By taking the combination of the four identifying letters the reader can draw some basic conclusions as to the individual's personality characteristics. A brief phrase suggests a general contribution that could be made by the respective type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  Depth and concentration</td>
<td>I  Depth and concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S  Thoroughness and respect for detail</td>
<td>S  Thoroughness and respect for detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T  Realism, analysis, logic, critical faculty</td>
<td>T  Sympathetic handling of people, grasp of group feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J  Organization</td>
<td>J  Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  Depth and concentration</td>
<td>I  Depth and concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S  Realism and observation</td>
<td>S  Observation and attention to detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T  Capacity for analysis and logic</td>
<td>T  Capacity for devotion and sympathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P  Adaptability</td>
<td>P  Adaptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>ESFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E  Ease with environment</td>
<td>E  Ease with environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S  Observation, realism, enjoyment, reliance on experience</td>
<td>S  Observation, realism, enjoyment, reliance on experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T  Impersonality, with structural, mechanical and some analytical ability</td>
<td>T  Sociability, no analytical powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P  Adaptability</td>
<td>P  Adaptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E  Ease with environment</td>
<td>E  Ease with environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S  Practicality, observation, reliance on experience</td>
<td>S  Reliance on experience, no analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T  Logical, executive, decisive, critical, demands efficiency</td>
<td>T  Sympathetic awareness of people, grasp of group feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J  Organization</td>
<td>J  Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II

**CONTRIBUTION MADE BY EACH PREFERENCE TO EACH TYPE**

**INTUITIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WITH FEELING</th>
<th>WITH THINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Depth and concentration</td>
<td>Depth and concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Insight and penetration, originality, grasp of the complicated</td>
<td>Insight and penetration, originality, grasp of the complicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sympathetic understanding and handling of people</td>
<td>Analysis, logic, impersonal critical faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **INFP** | | |
| I | Depth and concentration | Depth and concentration |
| N | Insight, ingenuity, grasp of the complicated | Insight, ingenuity, grasp of the complicated |
| F | Capacity for devotion and sympathy | Capacity for analysis and logic |
| P | Adaptability | Adaptability |

| **ENFP** | | |
| E | Ease with environment | Ease with environment |
| N | Drive for projects, Initiative, versatility, ingenuity, invention | Drive for projects, initiative, versatility, ingenuity, invention |
| F | Enthusiasm, insight into people, persuasiveness, charm | Objectivity, analysis, some executive ability |
| P | Adaptability | Adaptability |

| **ENFJ** | | |
| E | Ease with environment | Ease with environment |
| N | Interest in possibilities, facility with language, insight | Awareness of possibilities, insight, ingenuity, bent for experiment |
| F | Sympathetic awareness of people, grasp of group feeling | Logical, executive, decisive, critical, demands efficiency |
| J | Organization | Organization |

| **INTJ** | | |
| I | Depth and concentration | Depth and concentration |
| N | Insight and penetration, originality, grasp of the complicated | Insight and penetration, originality, grasp of the complicated |
| T | Analysis, logic, impersonal critical faculty | Capacity for analysis and logic |
| J | Organization | Organization |

| **INTP** | | |
| I | Depth and concentration | Depth and concentration |
| N | Insight, ingenuity, grasp of the complicated | Insight, ingenuity, grasp of the complicated |
| T | Capacity for analysis and logic | Capacity for analysis and logic |
| P | Adaptability | Adaptability |

| **ENTP** | | |
| E | Ease with environment | Ease with environment |
| N | Drive for projects, initiative, versatility, ingenuity, invention | Drive for projects, initiative, versatility, ingenuity, invention |
| T | Objectivity, analysis, some executive ability | Objectivity, analysis, some executive ability |
| P | Adaptability | Adaptability |

| **ENTJ** | | |
| E | Ease with environment | Ease with environment |
| N | Awareness of possibilities, insight, ingenuity, bent for experiment | Logical, executive, decisive, critical, demands efficiency |
| T | Logical, executive, decisive, critical, demands efficiency | Logical, executive, decisive, critical, demands efficiency |
| J | Organization | Organization |
The Introvert

Introverted thinkers\(^8\) use their thinking to analyze the world rather than to run it. They are more interested in underlying principles than in the things themselves. They prefer to organize ideas and facts and not people or situations.

Outward personality is perceptive; they are quiet, detached but curious, and reserved. This type has trouble being understood. For this type, thinking is done in a vacuum.

With intuition as an auxiliary, there is insight and quick understanding. Interest is in reaching solutions rather than in implementing them.

The introverted feeling type chooses values without regard to the judgment of outsiders and sticks to them. Work is done for a purpose, not just for money. He does have a conflict between inner ideal and outward reality. If intuition is present, there is interest in long range ideas.

Introverted sensing types are very dependable. They have a realistic yet practical respect for facts. They like things factual.

---

\(^8\)Myers, pp. 57-63.
but uncomplicated. There is an outer calmness, but an intense inner observation of the facts. Personal private reaction to something may be different from the actual way it will be handled, probably very sensibly.

As a judging type, ISTJ or ISFJ, they are very thorough, able to persevere, and are non-impulsive. If administrators they are practical and conservative. They will see a job done to the end, especially if it makes sense. If thinking is the auxiliary, logic and analysis are emphasized. If an executive, the type may have difficulty with people. With feeling as an auxiliary, loyalty and consideration are emphasized. The type has more tact and sympathy for people and their feelings.

Introverted intuitive types, INTJ and INFJ, also were found in the sampling. They are outstanding innovators in ideas and principles. They trust their own intuitive insight and drive others rather hard. They find problems stimulating. Outer personality is judging; ideas are worked out in practice.

While they feel so strongly about their goals they may fail to see the rights, feelings, and concerns of others. They are seen as effective researchers, but need more contact with reality. If thinking
is the auxiliary, this becomes the most independent of all types. With feelings as the auxiliary, there is less individuality, but greater likelihood to get cooperation. Introverted intuitive types can be good executives, good with ideas and handling affairs on a personal level.

**Findings of the Current Study and the Four Hypotheses**

Having briefly looked at the traits that make up an individual's personality, we turn our attention to the findings of the present study to see what has been found in relation to the hypotheses. Since three instruments were used to gather data, the findings must be included when considering acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. And inasmuch as the data interrelate to all of the hypotheses, its sum must be presented in total. The nature of the research lends itself naturally to a broad type format for the hypotheses while not overlooking the necessary specificities.

For convenience the hypotheses stated in Chapter I are again listed below:

1. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the function of improving educational opportunity and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.
2. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of providing and maintaining funds and facilities and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

3. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of developing and maintaining effective community relations and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

4. There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of obtaining and developing personnel and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

The findings of the scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as well as the importance attached to administrative functions are discussed in the following pages.

As might be expected there were found to be some varied types of personality traits among the 30 superintendents. The immediate study reflects a noted difference between the percentage found in previous studies, discussed earlier in this chapter, and the current one.
This study, limited to school superintendents, found two-thirds or 67% to be extroverts and only 33% to be introverts. This initially suggests that superintendents are more inclined to be extroverts than the general adult population with its 54% extroverts. As seen in Table III, 22 of the superintendents in the study were found to be extroverts and eight were found to be introverts. While the difference from high to low in the range of scores appears great, it must be remembered that it is the letter determination that is important, i.e., Extrovert or Introvert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extroverts</th>
<th>N = 22</th>
<th>Introverts</th>
<th>N = 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary functions-thinking, feeling, sensing, intuition—must be combined with the basic extrovert or introvert attitude. From the combination emerges the greatest part of the total individual's characteristics. In Table III it was noted that of the 30 superintendents
responding, 22 were extroverts and 8 were introverts. A combination correlation of the primary functions with the basic attitudes can be seen in Table IV. It is now possible to determine some general characteristics by the attitude-function combination that results. For each combination of four characteristics, the reader is referred again to Tables I and II.

A distribution of the primary functions of the 30 superintendents in this study can be seen in Figure 6. Comparing this to the normal population distribution for the Myers-Briggs seen in Figure 5, some obvious differences in percentages are evident. The present study reveals 32% as thinking compared to 20% in the normal distribution; 20% is feeling compared to 30%; 30% sensation as compared to 35%; and 18% intuition as compared to 15%.

From this study it becomes apparent also that superintendents as a group use thinking as a way of judging to a greater degree than the general population. Correspondingly they use feeling as a way of judging less than the rest of the population does. From the previous discussion it can be deduced then that there is a greater use by superintendents of the logical processes which reflects an impersonal approach, and less of a personal, appreciative, subjective type value.
### TABLE IV

**PRIMARY FUNCTIONS CORRELATED WITH ATTITUDES OF 30 SUPERINTENDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Those Tested</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Extrov. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Extrov. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Extrov. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Extrov. 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 6**

**DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMARY PERSONALITY FUNCTIONS OF THE 30 PERSONS TESTED FOR THIS STUDY**

![Pie chart showing the distribution of primary personality functions.](chart.png)
It has already been explained that there is a possibility of 16 combinations on the Myers-Briggs Indicator. Eight of the combinations include extroverts and eight include introverts. So also are there further breakdowns to include eight each for sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving. Table V shows the number of instances of superintendents in this study in each of the combination types.

Types ESTJ, meaning Extrovert-Sensing-Thinking-Judgmental, reveals a total of 11 respondents, well above the three each found to be ESFJ and ENTJ. Again it might be helpful for the reader to refer back to Tables I and II for a type summary. (A discussion on the types found in this study can be found on pages 65-73.)

While over half of the total sample can be categorized in three combinations, it is also interesting to note that there are five types with no instances of response. Five other combinations have only one response each.

The percents of the total responses can be seen in Table VI. It is quite easily determined that the ESTJ combination is equivalent to 37 percent of the sample, the ESFJ and ENTJ equivalent to 10 percent, and so on to those five with only one response, or 3 percent.
### TABLE V
PERSONALITY TYPE CHARACTERISTICS OF 30 SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VI
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF 30 SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having determined the number of introverts and extroverts in the study, as well as the primary and secondary personality functions, it is still not possible to indicate support for a hypothesis. Therefore the next step is to convert all of the computed preference scores of the 30 respondents into continuous scores. This conversion insures that all scores are on the positive poles of the Myers-Briggs indices. The following scoring formulas were used:

**Continuous EI Scores**
- Cont. Score = 100 - E Score
- Cont. Score = 100 + I Score

**Continuous TF Scores**
- Cont. Score = 100 - T Score
- Cont. Score = 100 + F Score

**Continuous SN Scores**
- Cont. Score = 100 - S Score
- Cont. Score = 100 + N Score

**Continuous JP Scores**
- Cont. Score = 100 - J Score
- Cont. Score = 100 + P Score

As a result of the conversion process continuous scores for each of the eight preferences were obtained. Table VII shows the range of each preference for the 30 superintendents in the sample. Each pairing represents the total of 30, i.e., E has 22 respondents and I has eight for a total of 30.
**TABLE VII**

Range of Continuous Scores

of 30 Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>N = 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>N = 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N = 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>N = 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>N = 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>N = 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>N = 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>N = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No particular significance should be attached to the range of the continuous scores other than it does show some variance among the superintendents. The main purpose of developing continuous scores was to enable the researcher to get at some statistically oriented concerns.

The information of the continuous scores was used to determine T-score values, means, and analysis of variance. An IBM 1403 computer was used, programmed with number BMPPIV, from Health Sciences Computing Facility, University of California, Los Angeles. The program was revised October 7, 1974, and the write-up was revised in April, 1974. Computer work for this was done at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater.

A total of 120 entries was used as input for this part of the analysis. They are the scores seen in Table VII. Mean scores were determined for the eight categories and are seen in Table VIII.

| TABLE VIII |
| Mean of Preference Scores for Each M-B Type |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>78.9090</td>
<td>63.777</td>
<td>84.0526</td>
<td>73.3199</td>
<td>114.7500</td>
<td>121.4999</td>
<td>115.1818</td>
<td>120.2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The program was also able to provide a T-Test matrix for the group means. The two-tailed T test data is shown in Table IX. Using the degree of freedom of 7, the level of significance at .05 is .666. The intercorrelation of all but 3 were therefore significant. The IF, IP, and NP were not.

**TABLE IX**

T-Test Matrix for Group Means of 30 Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-3.3619</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.4032</td>
<td>5.3284</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-1.3111</td>
<td>2.0939</td>
<td>-2.8062</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.9505</td>
<td>8.0718</td>
<td>6.6242</td>
<td>6.6699</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8.4848</td>
<td>10.9500</td>
<td>9.4859</td>
<td>9.3406</td>
<td>0.9995</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.7723</td>
<td>10.6523</td>
<td>9.6865</td>
<td>8.5397</td>
<td>0.0747*</td>
<td>-1.2808</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>6.0144</td>
<td>7.9473</td>
<td>7.8136</td>
<td>6.4885</td>
<td>0.6366*</td>
<td>-0.1793*</td>
<td>0.9072</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Found to be non-significant
There are some interesting inferences that should be acknowledged based on the T-test Matrix. Keeping in mind that this matrix reflects only the Myers-Briggs Instrument, it nevertheless gives insight on the characteristics of the superintendents, although not enough in itself to make a determination on the hypotheses.

A general description of the two basic types has already been extensively discussed. So have the auxiliary processes. On the matrix we can see the relationship of E to all of the auxiliaries and to I, and also the same for I. In any given setting there is a mutual usefulness of opposites. Table IX suggests this when it is remembered that each individual generally possesses some of each trait but prefers one over the other.

Those typed as ESTJ (See Table V) for example, also have some traits that might be typed INFP, but with lesser preference, of course. These less preferred or less developed traits are not the obvious ones we see readily but are more on the "shadow" side. Superintendents--like the rest of the population--also have these less preferred traits. An entire study could be made on this relationship and will therefore not be undertaken herein.
The Personal Preference Ranking List

The second instrument used was the Personal Preference Ranking List, seen in Appendix B. It was given to the same 30 superintendents that completed the Myers-Briggs. Designed to determine administrative areas superintendents feel are the most important, it closely follows the four areas of his job as described in Chapter I. Four broad parts, 1) improving educational opportunity, 2) providing and maintaining funds and facilities, 3) maintaining effective relations with the community, and 4) obtaining and developing personnel, were further broken down to include specific examples. Eleven examples of each were developed and combined so that each question contained one of each of the four job functions.

Each superintendent was asked to rank the specific examples developed for the Personal Preference Ranking List in order of importance as he saw them. Every question had four items, one each in the four areas mentioned above that represent broad area administrative functions. A total of 330 responses were generated through the instrument. This total represents 30 respondents making four choices each on 11 questions.
Table X shows a summary breakdown of the responses. It can be seen that items dealing with educational improvement received 147 responses of being most important, finance and facilities received 114, community relations items received 45, and personnel items received 24. This shows that six times as many selections were made for items dealing with educational improvement than with items relating to personnel. At the same time it shows twice as many selections for items that refer to community relations than to items referring to personnel.

**TABLE X**

Summary of Responses on Personal Preference Ranking List of 30 Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Dealing With</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Improvement</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Items contained in each question were designed to be compatible. For example, one question dealt with the four items through the area of special education. The items included, 1) developing a special education program, 2) developing a preservice teacher program in special education, 3) developing a long-range building plan for exceptional educational needs, and 4) creating citizens advisory committees for special education. Such choices elicit preferences within a common framework. It does not give the respondent the opportunity to indicate that he may see equal importance in more than one item.

The computer program was also able to generate the means of items on the Personal Preference Ranking List. This was based on the total of 120 cases for the four groups, or 30 respondents with four available choices. The computed means of the four areas can be seen in Table XI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Dealing With</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Educational Improvement</td>
<td>4.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Finance &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Community Relations</td>
<td>1.5667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Personnel</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 30
In analyzing the preferences it was discovered that none of the respondents selected all of the items dealing with educational improvement, although 13 selected it seven or more times. Only two respondents selected personnel seven or more times, and no respondents selected eight community relations or financing and facilities seven or more times. This can be seen in Table XII.

**TABLE XII**

Personal Preference Ranking List

Summary of Individual Item Responses of 30 School Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Superintendents' Selection of Items</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 1 = Educational Improvement
Item 2 = Finance & Facilities
Item 3 = Community Relations
Item 4 = Personnel
A matrix similar to the one developed for the Myers-Briggs (Table IX) was also printed by the computer for the items of the Personal Preference Ranking List. The computer program used developed groups means using the T-test to show the statistical significance of each of the four broad areas. The areas, educational improvement, finance and facilities, community relations, and personnel were all tested for significance. Based on a significance level for two tailed tests of .878, using the degree of freedom of three and the .05 level, significance was found for all areas. This matrix can be seen in Table XIII.

It was explained earlier that the Myers-Briggs alone could not determine acceptance or rejection of the four hypotheses; neither can the Personal Preference Ranking List. Therefore it was necessary to lift still additional data from the computer.

**Table XIII**

Matrix of Group Means

For Items on Personal Preference Ranking List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.8385</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5.3473</td>
<td>-5.0177</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7.4704</td>
<td>-8.6383</td>
<td>-2.0230</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently the researcher also used Chi Square from the computer program to determine what relationship, if any, would be found between preference scores on the primary E-I Scale of the Myers-Briggs Indicator and scores on the Personal Preference List. Twenty-two E preferences were compared to their corresponding four scores on the Personal Preference Ranking List; Eight I preferences were compared to their corresponding scores. This was done by the computer using the sums of the responses that each extrovert indicated in the four broad areas on the Personal Preference Ranking List, as well as the same process for each introvert. These sums can be seen in Table XIV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-B ITEM</th>
<th>P.P. ITEM</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the same data the computer was able to run a Chi Square test of independence for the extrovert and the four administrative functions and the introvert and the four administrative functions. This relationship can be seen in Table XV. The statistical analysis
of this relationship is based on a rejection of anything less than 7.81, using a df of 3. Seven of the eight relationships were therefore affirmed while the relationship between the introvert and the fourth function on the Personal Preference Ranking List, Personnel, was rejected.

**TABLE XV**

**Chi Square Tests of Independence**

of E-I and Personal Preference Sums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.P. ITEM</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>108.04</td>
<td>84.52</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>16.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>38.96</td>
<td>30.48</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations of Pairs**

A final run on the computer was made to determine the correlations between the preference scores of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Personal Preference Check List. This resultant data was necessary to accept or reject the hypotheses. The statistical model used was Pearson's product-moment coefficient of correlation.

Statistical correlation refers to the average amount of relationship between two variables that can be quantified. The situation in which statistical correlation is applicable is always one
in which there is a pair of measures for each subject, as is the case of this study, or one set of data for related subject.\textsuperscript{9}

The most widely used and best measure of correlation is the product-moment coefficient, developed by the English statistician Karl Pearson, about 1900.\textsuperscript{10}

Pearson's product-moment coefficient of correlation, designated by $r_{xy}$, between variables independent of size of the sample and the units of measurement, can be determined by dividing the mean product of the paired deviation scores by the standard deviations of the scores.\textsuperscript{11}

This procedure is summarized as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{N G_x G_y}$$

Since

$$G_x = \sqrt{\frac{X^2}{N}}$$
$$G_y = \sqrt{\frac{Y^2}{N}}$$

the basic formula may also be expressed


\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 129.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 134.
\[ r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2)(\sum y^2)}} \]

The value of \( r_{xy} \) varies between zero, for no correlation, and one, for perfect correlation. A positive or negative sign may be attached to \( r \) to indicate the existence of a positive or negative linear relationship.\(^\text{13}\) The larger the \(|r|\), the stronger the relationship.

The assumptions underlying \( r_{xy} \) are as follows:

1) rectrolinear regression
2) normality of distribution
3) homoscedasticity
4) continuous data

The Hypotheses and the Data

At this juncture it at long last becomes possible to begin the determination of the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. In Chapter I it was determined that such acceptance or rejection would be

\(^{12}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 134.}\)

\(^{13}\text{B. Parl, Basic Statistics, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1967.)}\)
based on the results of the Myers-Briggs, the Personal Preference Ranking List, and the personal interview. A great deal of space has already been devoted to the first two of these. They are the statistical portion of the research and as such are to be heavily relied upon. The results of the interviews, not heretofore discussed, will now be included in the acceptance/rejection process.

As established earlier in the discussion of the instruments, the basic indice is the extrovert or introvert preference. This then must also be the basic factor considered in the quantitative interpretation. Thus in the correlation matrix the auxiliary or secondary type preferences cannot stand alone, but must be part of the relationship the extrovert and introvert types have with the items found on the Personal Preference List matrix.

Again reliance for computation was placed on the computer for statistical determinations. The program was able to recall the basic matrix data presented herein in Tables IX and XIII. The researcher therefore had to determine the relationships of the calculations. Based on the correspondence of the number of scores that were used, a degree of freedom of 22 at the .05 level established a critical value of .404.
Analysis of Findings and Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the function of improving educational opportunity and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

The results of the Myers-Briggs have determined that twenty-two of the thirty superintendents in the study were found to be extroverts. This means that 67 percent of the sample are extroverts as compared to only 54 percent in the general adult population.

From the Personal Preference Ranking List it has been found that superintendents believe that improving educational opportunity is the most important function of administration. Of a total of 330 separate responses, 147 saw improving educational opportunity as the most important function.

Based on the results of the statistical correlation of the two instruments using the Pearson product moment coefficient, the first hypothesis was accepted with a correlation of .8428. Six of the eight potential extrovert type combinations, ESTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, ENTJ, ENTP, and ENFP were included in the correlation. Types ESTP and ESFP had no respondents. Introvert types were found in the study too, but
reflected only the preference of eight superintendents or 26 percent of the sample.

A Chi-Square test was used to determine the relationship between the primary extrovert-introvert scores of the Myers-Briggs and the administrative functions found on the Personal Preference Ranking List. The Myers-Briggs preference scores were then compared to each function. A relationship was found between the preference types and the function of improving educational opportunity. This finding supports the hypothesis and together with the aforementioned data, hypothesis one was accepted.

Perhaps the heart of the study is the meaning and implications for the practicing, as well as the potential, school superintendent. Since the greatest strength of preference on the Personal Preference Ranking List dealt with educational improvement, it is evident that extrovert type superintendents feel strongly about the importance of this area of administrative function.

For the extrovert type superintendent who is at ease working with people in an organizational type setting, the many facets involved in improving educational opportunity would seem to be possible to accomplish. The introvert type who is not at ease with people but is aware of ideas and occurrences might have trouble accomplishing the
function of improving educational opportunity. The individual behavior of a superintendent is directly determined by the way he comes to a conclusion about something. The extrovert will see one way of improving educational opportunity and proceed with doing something about it. The introvert, on the other hand, may think a great deal about what is needed, but would have trouble talking about it, sharing the idea with others, and setting a course of action.

If a superintendent was unable to work at the function of improving educational opportunity because of his personality type there would appear to be a number of options available. The most obvious alternative would be for the superintendent to leave the district and either find a district where he would be more compatible, or to leave the area of administration. This is a drastic measure, however, and neglects the other possible alternatives. An assistant could be hired whose primary assignment would be to work in the area of improving educational opportunity. His personality type could be such that he could complement the superintendent. Such an arrangement is workable and can be seen in numerous school districts.

Another possible solution is available to the school district that has a superintendent who has difficulty with the function of improving educational opportunity because of his personality type. The district can hire a consultant. The consultant could be retained to do the necessary
tasks including advising the superintendent, the staff, the school board, and even the community at large of the state of the school district and the measures necessary to improve educational opportunity. There are always some inherent risks with using consultants such as opening an entirely new set of problems; nevertheless the use of a consultant is an option and one can always weigh the advice carefully without necessarily agreeing with all it purports.

A fourth alternative for a superintendent having difficulty with the function of improving educational opportunity because of his personality type involves the concept of retraining or inservice. New perspectives are sometimes gained by persons going back to a training or retraining program. It is not suggested that more of the same kinds of traditional approaches be used; rather, it is suggested that some of the newer and more progressive experiences being made available by such agencies as the American Association of School Administrators be considered. Through its National Academy of School Executives, NASE offers superintendents an opportunity to undergo an indepth study and analysis of problems or functions they select. Superintendents who have participated in these sessions testified during the interview that they are better able to cope with the difficult functions of operating a school district.

A superintendent unwilling to acknowledge that little educational
improvement is evident, such as lower than average pupil performance, for example, will find that his credibility will be questioned. Such denial would be particularly damaging if the staff and others were also aware of poor pupil performance. The practicing superintendent would do well to continually evaluate himself--others are continually evaluating him--and try to determine just what would be necessary to keep him aware of his job functions. The superintendent who uses his judgment as a logical process, called thinking on the Myers-Briggs, will probably be able to anticipate the complexities of potential problems and thereby will be able to carry out the function of improving educational opportunity.

Improving educational opportunity according to Griffiths,\(^\text{14}\) is a major function of the school superintendent and a part of the job requiring necessary administrative skills. The present study revealed that most superintendents considered curriculum to be the area through which educational improvement must take place. Involvement with the area of curriculum is being carried out in a number of different ways by superintendents as both the Personal Preference Ranking List and the personal interview have revealed. The former determined that superintendents place great importance on curriculum studies, curriculum

committees, community review groups, needs assessment studies, program planning and developing sessions, and other similar approaches.

A great deal of insight was gathered through the personal interviews conducted as part of the research for this study. Fifteen superintendents were interviewed, using prepared questions that were aimed at verifying the Personal Preference Ranking List and providing other supplemental data. All but one superintendent in the interview sample were deeply involved in curriculum work of some sort. They all saw involvement in curriculum as a direct way of improving educational opportunity.

As an example, one superintendent interviewed, from a large district, was found to be working closely with a community-wide committee composed of citizen members from labor, industry, education, religion, and students whose purpose was to establish long range goals for community education. Beyond that the committee was to set priorities from among the listed goals that the schools should pursue. The superintendent involved had a somewhat lesser role than he might have desired since he was a committee member used more as a resource than as a leader. The final citizens' committee report was to be made directly to the school board rather than to the administration for study or for recommendations.
A procedure of this nature has some clear implications to a superintendent. He is circumvented in a sense because he has little chance for determining the practicability of the recommendations or to give his professional opinion on the merits of them. On the other hand the procedure illustrated in the example does involve the community in making decisions about its schools in a direct manner. It would probably be difficult for a strong superintendent to operate a school system where he is charged with meeting educational needs of students while at the same time being told how to meet these needs. The situation may not be as difficult if it is simply a matter of being told what the community thinks its needs are.

This situation is similar to the comments that another superintendent in the sample made regarding community determination of ways to improve educational opportunity through changes in curriculum. In a small school district a group of citizens including several school board members felt that the utilization of the McGuffey Reader would solve the reading problems as well as the teaching of values. Against the recommendation of the superintendent, the board voted that the McGuffey Reader be adopted for grades K-8, which subsequently occurred.

In both of the examples cited above the superintendents felt that bitterness was created in the community as a result of board implementation.
of committee recommendations. The bitterness, according to the superintendents interviewed, came mostly from citizens who were opposed to the decisions finally made by the school boards. Such bitterness could well be attributed to a variety of reasons including philosophic differences, failure of boards to consider all of the citizens' feelings, or a dislike by citizens for the school decision makers.

For a superintendent involved in a circumstance such as the one just cited, a unique conflict can be noted. On the one hand, citizens of the community had direct input into the school on a matter they apparently believed would improve educational opportunity. On the other hand, the superintendent's judgment on a way to improve educational opportunity was not accepted by the school board. If a superintendent was an extrovert in such a circumstance, he would probably dislike the fact that his recommendation was not used; if he was an introvert, he might not like the fact that his recommendation was not accepted, but would be more interested in the underlying reasons of the proponents' beliefs. The extrovert would carry out the decision efficiently unless he was so philosophically at odds with the decision that he would prefer leaving rather than implementing the decision. A judging type would not be pleased with accepting others' views. The perceptive type would be able to accept the decision but would be likely to seek a compromise.
Some variations in reactions would be evident in each specific type of personality combination. Additional indepth study would be necessary to determine fully the feelings and attitudes of the communities at large.

Superintendents will be hard pressed to direct any efforts toward improving educational opportunity if they do not have a direct role in planning and using their professional training. For the extrovert type of superintendent it will be particularly difficult to be left out of major decision making plans because he likes to decide what ought to be done and to give the requisite orders. An extrovert generally puts a great deal of himself into his job; he dislikes anything that is aimless or ineffective in its purpose. He would be distraught, therefore, to be circumvented, ignored, or otherwise overruled on a decision of the magnitude that superintendents perceive the function of improving educational opportunity holds.

During personal interviews, superintendents were asked for examples of recent involvement in the area of curriculum. The most common answer was through meetings and discussions with staff. Two respondents said "the selection of textbooks", one respondent said he had "no direct involvement". All respondents said they either reported directly to the school board or arranged for a subordinate to make the report on curriculum
matters. The responses to the personal interview tend to confirm the importance that superintendents ascribe to the area of educational improvement as revealed on the Personal Preference Ranking List.

One extrovert school superintendent, working in a small district, agreed that improving educational opportunity was the primary function of his job and as such it was up to him to actually see that improvement was accomplished. Therefore, he had to do many things personally, not through committees or with the advice and consent of other staff members. So through administrative edict he attempted to improve educational opportunity. Few superintendents were found with this administrative style, which seems to be rather autocratic in nature and one which may not work in most school districts today.

An introvert superintendent who was interviewed reflected quite a contrasting example to the previous one. This particular individual worked in a very quiet manner. It appeared that he was a very mild mannered individual and that his appearance was far from threatening to anyone. He related that his assistant often took the lead in working with staff in the area of curriculum and follow-up reporting to the board. He expressed a great comfort in working with younger elementary children and teachers. The personality type of the assistant was not determined and no attempt was made to find out why the assistant
was selected for his role.

Because there were only two introverts included in the interview, the data were not substantial enough to warrant any definite conclusions; there was, however, general agreement with the statistical data which suggested that introverted superintendents attach less importance to improving educational opportunity than do extrovert superintendents. The data, it might be recalled, revealed that the twenty-two extrovert superintendents on the sample selected the function of improving educational opportunity as being most important 134 times out of a possible 244 selections, representing a 55 percent selection ratio; introvert superintendents selected the function of improving educational opportunity thirteen times out of a possible eighty-eight times, representing a 15 percent selection ratio.

While questions are answered from research projects, other questions are raised. From the discussion above one might wonder if school superintendents need to be extroverts to function on their jobs, or if persons become superintendents because they are extroverts. While another study would be necessary to fully answer this question, the research did determine that a majority of the superintendents in the study were extroverts and did function somewhat differently on the job than did the introverts.

Knowing that there are differences, one can look at the general
job of the superintendent and think of what he does that would require an extrovert type. Superintendents are in a prominent position in their community and are well known by citizens as well as students and teachers. As a result it is difficult not to be noticed, not to be involved, and not to be a leader. As an extrovert, the school superintendent will be comfortable in meeting people, will enjoy working with people and is interested in the results of the job and in getting the job done. The introvert, in the same work situation, is more likely to be interested in the idea behind the job. It would seem, therefore, the extrovert type is well suited to the functions of administration and to the task of improving education. This apparent suitability, however, does not necessarily suggest that an introvert would find little or no value in getting the job done; an introvert might complete the task at hand but still be more interested in the reasons for completing the job.
Hypothesis II

There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of providing and maintaining funds and facilities and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

The personality types determined by the Myers-Briggs for the first hypothesis also apply to the second one. A major difference in hypothesis two, however, involves the findings of the second administrative function, that of providing and maintaining funds and facilities. On the Personal Preference Ranking List it was found that 114 responses out of 330 believed finance and facilities to be the most important function of administration. This finding compares to 147 responses for the function of educational improvement.

A statistical correlation of .7906 using the Pearson product-moment coefficient, was found between MB types ESTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, ENTJ, ENTP, and ENFP and the function of maintaining funds and facilities. This correlation resulted in the statistical acceptance of hypothesis two.

Using the Chi-Square Test of independence it was found that a positive relationship of 84.52 existed between the general extrovert type and the function of providing and maintaining funds and facilities.
This finding provides further statistical support to the hypothesis. As in the first hypothesis, introvert types were included but reflect a very small part of the total sample.

Funds for operating schools seem to be of a high priority in all school districts. It is a job function for the school superintendent, according to Griffiths, to look after the details of funds and facilities. Accordingly the superintendent has to plan a budget for the operation of a school district and to see that it is properly spent. He may even have to recommend a new school building if the need exists.

The public is in effect the banker and the stockholder of the school district and must pay for the costs of operation. If costs are more than he feels he wants to pay—or is able to pay—he may rebel and say no. The result might be simply a reduced budget or no new building. Another result might be a conflict with the superintendent, who is often blamed for school district spending. And although the decisions for spending are not those of the superintendent, the blame may result in the superintendent's demise. Losing a job is, of course, a significant circumstance for a superintendent.

Financing public education is a continuing concern for school superintendents. The function of providing and maintaining funds and facilities was ranked second in importance by superintendents on the
Personal Preference Ranking List. A previous discussion revealed that two personality types, namely the ESTJ and ESFJ types, are practical and realistic and like to openly express themselves. Almost half of the sample of the present research was found to be of these two types.

Since the extrovert type does like to express himself openly, speaking to the issues of funding public education will give him considerable opportunity. For example, budget hearings are quite common in many Wisconsin school districts. Hearings are held to give the public ample opportunity to find out what the budget is going to be and what kinds of items are going to be included. Usually the school superintendent is called upon to explain why he thinks the budget should be accepted. Often times a lively discussion takes place between the superintendent and a school board member or members of the community.

Superintendents also are called upon to explain school district funding to public service clubs and organizations. Once again the superintendent is given an opportunity to express his views and concerns on school finance and school facilities.

During the entire process of dealing with school finance the superintendent will have to be practical and realistic. The extrovert would like to get to the practical application of the area of school finance.
Recommending costly expenditures at a time of high unemployment, for example, might not be practical. Neither would it be realistic to attempt to expand school facilities during a time of student decline. An introvert might be inclined to see reasons why facility improvement should take place, even if enrollment does decline because he might see it as an opportunity to improve and update a facility. Such an idea is not without logic either as one considers the history of building and becomes aware of the cost and difficulty of playing catch-up. Indeed it is a lesson that might be remembered from the past when building delays and improvements were delayed for one of any number of reasons.

The task of budget preparation is awesome and overwhelming in terms of man hours and actual study and computation. A certain amount of staff assistance is helpful but the final form and the presentation of the budget itself almost always falls on the shoulders of the superintendent. The countless hours of time spent in development are not often realized by the public or sometimes even by the school board. As part of functions of administration, preparation of the school district budget involves the ability of concentration, work with details, long term planning, and communicating the results. The first three characteristics are associated by Myers-Briggs with an introvert; the fourth quality is associated with an extrovert. Since the whole process of the
preparation and communication of a school district budget is absolutely essential for a superintendent to either do himself or to have done, both the extrovert and the introvert will necessarily have to see it through, like it or not. It is also to be expected that a careful and thorough job of the process will be necessary by either type of superintendent if he is to remain efficient. Being either extrovert or introvert does not imply the inability to carry out various functions; it does mean, however, that there is a preference on what one likes to do most.

A problem could result if the extrovert superintendent so strongly disliked detail type work that an inaccurate budget was produced. In such a circumstance it would be a preferable alternative to have someone else take care of the detail-type work. While certainly not the only reason, it would be one good reason to have a business manager. However, no evidence was determined from the research data that would indicate extroverts are either negligent in dealing with budgets or finance or are incapable of handling them.

Both extroverts and introverts recognized the function of maintaining funds and facilities as being important. Extroverts rated it second with a sum of 83 out of 244; introverts ranked it third in importance with a sum of 31 out of 88.
Since the second hypothesis deals with Griffiths' job function of not only funds but also of facilities, separate attention should be given to the second area as well. Question five of the personal interview asked superintendents what recent decisions they had made affecting school facilities. The following summary of responses was provided: a) Five have had bond referenda on either new buildings or major additions. Their involvement was participation in planning and selling the issue; b) Six have recommended major remodeling in present buildings; c) two have recommended closing of small schools because of the high expense of running them; and d) Two felt their only recent decisions involved changing colors of paint in the hallways.

Because of the inclusion of both funds and facilities in the first function category listed by Griffiths and included in the Personal Preference Ranking List, responses to question number five can be only partially accepted as corroborating data. The question was purposely written this way to see if the earlier interview response was limited solely to areas of finance--separate from facilities--as a function preference. Answers to question five tend to corroborate the preference findings to the extent that those of the interview sample were actively involved in the facilities function. The results show that their involvement signifies recognition of importance of the function, though its exact degree is undetermined.
An administrative decision must be made by every superintendent on just how hard he wants to fight for a budget item or on a total budget or funding proposal. Part of the decision will lie in his commitment to areas such as improving educational opportunity, or to other community projects funded through the district budget. Strong commitments to improve educational opportunity were discussed in the analysis of hypothesis one from a philosophic point. The funding commitment is from a pragmatic point and may or may not be the same depending on the individual.

Support for a program in the budget by a superintendent may be just a matter of going through the motions if he knows that it cannot possibly be funded. An example given by one superintendent was a program for bilingual education. Strong pressure was brought for starting such a program in a large school district. The proponents were not as concerned with the funding as they were in actually acquiring the program. The superintendent had some sympathy for their cause but was aware that the cost would be prohibitive. He supported the plan only to have the school board remove the funding from its budget. The result was that the community group was unhappy with the outcome but did not blame the superintendent. The risk for the superintendent was the possible wrath of the board, which fortunately did not happen.
The implication is not only administrative strategy or technique, but the relative importance of functions. This above example shows a priority for funding rather than for improving education. It also shows an action by a certain type of individual. An introvert may well have taken a different course of action with such a recommendation.

A somewhat different outcome from the Personal Preference Ranking List was found in interview question six. Superintendents were asked to rank order the four functions of finance and facilities, curriculum, personnel, and public relations in terms of importance as the superintendent saw them. Finance and facilities received 12 of 15 choices as being the most important. These results contradict the Personal Preference Ranking List that found curriculum to be the most important function.

However, the difference does not disturb the Ranking List finding since the interview is representative of only half of the total sample, and the change in choice involves priorities one and two having exchanged.

The interview responses do lend support to the second hypothesis because they verify that superintendents, particularly ESTJ and ESFJ types, attach a high priority to the function of providing and maintaining funds and facilities.
Hypothesis III

There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of developing and maintaining effective community relations and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

From the instruments used for gathering information on the thirty school superintendents in the research, it was found that twenty-two were extroverts with varied combinations of other traits and eight were introverts with varied trait combinations. Six separate combinations of extroverts were determined by the Myers-Briggs and included ESTJ, ESPF, ENTJ, ENTP, ENFJ, and ENFP.

A second instrument, the Personal Preference Ranking List, was used to ascertain the importance superintendents ascribed to four administrative functions. The function of developing and maintaining effective community relations received forty-five out of 330 responses as a choice for being the most important function. This function ranked third behind the functions of educational improvement and funds and facilities described in hypotheses one and two.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of the two instruments was found to be .1090, less than the necessary .404 level and was therefore statistically rejected. The rejection of this hypothesis causes reason for concern and therefore for further analysis.
The entire function of community relations is a difficult one for many superintendents. Positive community relations appear to require more than the ability to smile, shake hands, and speak well before local community service clubs although those activities may well help. Good community relations do not just happen, they must be developed and nurtured. They may be far from routine and sometimes lack the glamour and glitter that extrovert type superintendents might crave.

There has been a trend in recent years for school superintendents to request the use of public relations experts in their school districts. In some instances the PR people, as they are known, work full time for the district and handle such daily tasks as press releases, public school tours and publications and reports. In other instances PR persons have been used by superintendents to handle only specific areas such as negotiations or building programs.

There seems to exist some degree of question, however, in the actual truth of the matter of importance of public relations. It is one thing for superintendents to rank it low as a function but quite another to see what takes place in actual practice. Through personal familiarity with the school districts where interviews took place, it was evident that specialists were employed for the sole purpose of
maintaining community relations. That being the case, it can logically be reasoned that the superintendent must actually attach some degree of importance to such a function, but many do so through delegation.

Certain qualitative factors associated with the personality types will have a bearing on not only getting the job done, but on how it will be done. That is, the entire function might be done directly or might be delegated. An extrovert would seem to have the qualities commonly associated with an effective community relations program. An extrovert type usually communicates well, is usually good at greeting people, likes to be among people, and would not mind an interruption. The introvert, on the other hand, has some problems communicating, has trouble remembering names and faces, works contentedly alone, and dislikes intrusion and interruptions.

These facts are all the more interesting when viewed with the research data which determined that extroverts considered the function of community relations to be of relatively lesser importance than did introverts. Extroverts cited the function thirteen out of a possible 244 times as being most important while introverts selected the same function thirty-four out of a possible eighty-eight times.

The real issue then, if it is an accepted fact that in practice the function of community relations is being done, is how the function
is being done. It might be possible that extrovert superintendents are doing more in the way of community relations than they realize or than they want to realize. For some practicing superintendents the function might be a second nature, a type of involuntary action that is automatically carried out. Examples might include press conferences, meetings with community groups, and interviews. Both the extrovert and the introvert might logically be subject to such actions.

Another closely related approach would be to delegate the function or certain parts of the function. Both personality types might utilize delegation to effect a community relations program, but might select different areas to delegate. For example, an extrovert might delegate written or documentary releases and personally see to the direct verbal encounters; an introvert might delegate the conferences and write releases and articles himself. It is evident that varied combinations of direct or delegated approaches are being used to carry out the functions, which is definitely being given consideration. The way it is done appears to be influenced by personality type and by the nature of the district including but not totally related to the financial capability of the districts to hire a specialist.

Another factor is perceived in the superintendent's function of community relations and that has to do with credibility. Superintendents
often times are not believed in their pronouncements about such functions as pupil achievement scores, amount of district expenditures, or about teacher negotiation factors. News media frequently call attention to students' inability to read or to do arithmetic while at the same time superintendents are reporting great progress.

An example of a superintendent's credibility gap, which weakens maintenance of effective community relations, frequently is seen in the collective bargaining setting. Public release of information that is challenged or labeled as inaccurate by an organized labor group or by any citizen group causes the public to question what is truth and what is not. Doubt in the minds of the community is counter to effective and ongoing community relations, a matter of concern expressed by superintendents during the personal interview.

In the review of literature on administrative functions, discussed in Chapter II, reference to community relations as part of administration was made by at least five prominent authors in addition to Griffiths, whose administrative functions were used as part of the research data base. Each of the citations to community or public relations indicated an importance for the school superintendent.

In the same literature general concurrence exists that there were matters of communication with the community that the superintendent would have
to work very hard to achieve. Campbell\textsuperscript{15} in particular related the importance of communications in a community to the success of a superintendent. The implications for a superintendent clearly necessitate that continual attention be paid to developing and maintaining community relations.

Community relations in a school district generally involve some degree of writing. As mentioned earlier, press releases, newsletters, and reports are all part of effective community relations programs. While there has been a trend to employ experts or consultants to handle community relations programs for school districts, most school districts do not go this route because of the additional expense involved. The responsibility then is with the superintendent.

From the research data it has been determined that a number of superintendents in the sample showed strong scores for the process of intuition on the Myers-Briggs. Superintendents possessing this type of perception process would be expected to be expressive but would not particularly care for writing. An example of what the intuitive factor might mean is that a superintendent could do a good job of community

\textsuperscript{15}Roald Campbell, "Research and the Selection and Preparation of School Administrators," pp. 23-33.
relations if he limited the approach to speaking or verbal encounters rather than to the written or report type of encounter with the public. In certain types of communities it may be possible to use one type of communication rather than the other, but the ability to use both would be advantageous. If the extrovert was also a sensing type rather than intuitive, he may not be greatly inspired about community relations, but would tend to be precise and would seldom make errors of fact. Almost half of the superintendents in the sample were extroverts with sensing characteristics. Less than half of the introverts in the sample were determined to be sensing types.

Additional information on superintendents' feelings of administrative functions was gained from the personal interviews. Question six of the personal interview asked for a rank order of administrative functions according to importance. Of the fifteen responses, one ranked developing and maintaining community relations of second importance, four ranked it of third importance, and ten ranked it of fourth importance. The low rating of this administrative function tends to support the rejection of the hypothesis.

Further analysis was gained from interview question seven which asked the superintendent which administrative function examples he considered least important, or if he had to eliminate a function in his
daily routine, which function would be skipped. The response most often mentioned was the area of personal and public relations.

From the personal interview it was further determined that nine of the fifteen superintendents felt that attending functions within the community of a ceremonial nature was of little importance. Such meetings as those of the local P.T.A., dedication ceremonies, and "small talk sessions" were of common concern. At least five of the nine obviously resented the infringement on their time but expressed the fear of other problems if they did not attend.

An interesting and appropriate comment was offered by a very successful superintendent. He felt that a good community relations program could be very positive in helping to carry out the other administrative functions discussed earlier. He believed good community relations could help explain curricular changes and needs, could help explain an increased budget, and support good personnel policies. The extrovert, who according to Myers-Briggs\textsuperscript{16} usually communicates well, will have an advantage in carrying out other administrative functions that depend on effective community relations as well as carrying out the function of

\textsuperscript{16}Isabel Briggs Myers, \textit{The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Manual}, p. 80.
developing and maintaining effective community relations itself. An introvert who has trouble communicating well would be at a disadvantage in carrying out other administrative functions that depend on the communication skill, which is seen as an important factor in developing and maintaining effective community relations.

Griffiths used developing and maintaining effective community relations as a function of the superintendents' job equal to other functions. It might however, also be viewed as a means or a skill to get the other functions done. Viewed this way a superintendent could rate it low as a function while still believing strongly in its utilization. The same personality traits of superintendents would still be involved, however. The extrovert who communicates well will surely be able to develop and maintain effective community relations with outside groups easier than the introvert. For purposes of explaining school programs, school costs, and school needs, the communication ability is seen as important. Communicating internally is also important, particularly with district employees. Some introverts will be able to do this communicating well with small groups. If auxiliary processes such as feeling and sensing are strong, the ability to relate to people and the ability to pay attention to detail would be of benefit to either an extrovert or introvert in small group or large group communication settings.
From the interview it was established that superintendents were doing what they said was least important; therefore it can only be concluded that there is reason enough to carry out the function of community relations. The low priority rating may have been the simple result of the design whereby one item had to be least important, or as has been suggested earlier, it could be a function effected through delegation, or carried out in close relationship to other administrative functions.

The implications to the superintendent have been discussed to the extent that based on personality type, it has been determined that some superintendents prefer one part of the function and some prefer another. Some superintendents rated the function relatively low in importance but carried it out anyway.

Implications also exist for school boards. One of a school board's major functions is to select and hire a superintendent. Once hired, the superintendent assumes much of the function of community relations. However, a school board continues to evaluate the effectiveness of the community relations program established by the superintendent. Depending on the feedback or the perception of the school board members, the superintendent may or may not be credited with being effective in the area of communication and community relations.
Since individual school board members have varying reasons for being on the board, their liaison to the community will vary. Some board members have been known to take an active part in community relations and become advocates for the school district. A superintendent, either extrovert or introvert, would find supportive members of the school board helpful in positive community relations. School board members whose purpose it is to relate the weaknesses of a district to the community at large or to other special interest groups will make the superintendent's function of effective community relations more difficult.

A further study could well be made on the personality type of school board members and their relationship to both the school superintendent and various functions such as community relations. It is apparent that school board members are involved in the communication process of the school district. School boards and superintendents will necessarily have to work together if they are going to develop and maintain effective community relations. Effective community relations may be considered a function of the superintendent, but it cannot be denied that the school board members also have an important part to play in the function as well. It is entirely conceivable that the combination of personalities of school board members and of a superintendent could be such that the entire function of community relations is affected. Depending on the combinations and composition of the board, a superintendent's priority
 ranking of the function may be influenced, a consideration which would also lend itself to further study.

Hypothesis IV

There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the function of obtaining and developing personnel and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Findings on the final hypothesis are based on the data used to consider the first three hypotheses. These data include the personality type characteristics found by the Myers-Briggs of a sample of thirty school superintendents. Twenty-two of the sample were found to be a combination of extroverts while only eight were found to be an introvert combination.

The sample group was also asked to respond to the Personal Preference Ranking List by indicating the importance each attached to four administrative functions associated by Griffiths with the superintendency. The function of obtaining and developing personnel was indicated in twenty-four of 330 possible responses as being most important. It was chosen the least number of times, well behind the three functions discussed in the first three hypotheses.
From the results of the two instruments a statistical correlation of .4392, using the Pearson product-moment coefficient was determined, thereby statistically accepting the hypothesis.

Use of a Chi-Square test determined the relationships between the primary extrovert-introvert scores of the Myers-Briggs and the four administrative functions found on the Personal Preference Ranking List. A relationship was found between the preference types and the function of obtaining and developing personnel. The Chi-Square information tends to support the other statistical data in the acceptance of the fourth hypothesis.

The extrovert superintendent would find the function of obtaining and developing personnel to be consistent with his personality preferences because it would involve meeting new people and new situations. For the extrovert superintendent it would also be an opportunity to be the authority in control, especially during the initial interviewing and pre-service stages where the new staff person would not generally be a challenge or a threat. An introvert superintendent, on the other hand, might find the function as less preferable, particularly if he has a strong preference for working alone. Certain parts of the function, specifically that part which deals with detailed planning such as for inservice, would be more consistent with an introvert's
personality preference. An introvert superintendent, however, could very well strengthen the function of developing personnel if he could adequately work with groups of teachers or other staff persons in various areas.

An analysis of the research data reveals that extroverts rated the function of obtaining and developing personnel to be most important thirteen out of a possible 244 times; introverts rated it most important eleven out of eighty-eight times. Extroverts found the function equal in importance to developing and maintaining effective community relations; introverts found it to be least important of the four functions.

Obtaining personnel has been a part of the function of the superintendent's job for many years. It involves not only teachers but custodians, secretaries, cooks, bus drivers, teacher aides, and others as well. A superintendent who is able to work with the details associated with recruiting as well as with the respective persons involved is likely to be an extrovert with an auxiliary trait of feeling. The feeling characteristic would cause a superintendent to seek harmony, to be sympathetic, to relate well to people, and to make decisions based on either their own or other people's likes or dislikes. Seven superintendents were found to be extroverts with feelings as an auxiliary. The combination of extroversion and feeling
as personality blends in a superintendent would be likely to result in a friendly and warm type of person. Developing personnel by a superintendent with this combination of personality traits would probably be a preferable task because it would involve not only working with people, but cooperating with and leading people as well. The extrovert-feeling superintendent would probably not choose to delegate the function relating to personnel if he had time to handle it and if the district is so structured to allow this because he would want to work with people. He may delegate part or all of the function if other priorities use up his time or if the labor activities in the district mandate additional administrative persons to direct the labor relations part of the personnel function.

The data revealed that fifteen extrovert superintendents indicated preferences that classified them as having an auxiliary process of thinking. Thinking types, according to the Myers-Briggs\textsuperscript{17}, are not inclined to be considerate of other people's feelings, are relatively unemotional, and tend to be impersonal. Depending on the situation these traits may or may not be helpful in obtaining and developing personnel. Four introvert superintendents also were found to be

\textsuperscript{17}Isabel Briggs Myers, \textit{The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Manual} p. 80.
thinking type.

If developing personnel, be it through inservice or simply through supervision, required a great amount of tolerance, patience, and understanding, the thinking type described above would not be the appropriate type for the job. If firmness, decision without regard to feelings, and impersonal relationships were called for, the thinking type would seem very appropriate.

There appears to have been a trend in recent years for superintendents and other personnel in a school district to be further and further removed from each other. Part of the cause can be attributed to labor activities which polarize labor and management. School boards have sought out superintendents whom they have felt could stand up to pressure and not be emotionally affected by personal differences. Without knowing it, school boards may have been seeking sensing types of superintendents who operate as thinking and judging types.

Additional information about superintendents was also gathered through personal interviews. One of the questions asked was the role of the superintendent in staff evaluation, which was considered to be part of the function of developing personnel. All of the respondents indicated they had to play a direct role in evaluation. Most important,
however, was the fact that not all of the superintendents enjoyed the function. Failure to enjoy doing this important function was attributed generally to the problems and grief that it caused as a result of negative evaluations. As a result, personnel evaluation can become such an unpleasant chore that it is carried out only in a superficial way. Rather than being put through the strain of defending a negative evaluation, superintendents are inclined to modify their true evaluation upward so as to preclude serious challenge. This fact, revealed a number of times during the interview process, could be considered a reason for rating the function relatively low.

For many years the whole area of personnel management in public education was low key. It was difficult to hire teachers, but there was little pressure in union type activities. As an administrative function, many superintendents saw personnel work as one of the more interesting and rewarding parts of the job. Several superintendents recalled in the interview that there was a time when they personally knew every employee of the district and even knew their families. This situation remains somewhat true in small districts, but not so in larger districts. Several implications, therefore, can be drawn for the superintendent. If working directly with people in a close relationship is a high personal priority to a superintendent he may
do well to seek employment in a smaller district where such a relationship is still possible. Pursuing the goal might result in disappointment however because of changing times and circumstances. A second implication is the need for superintendents to realistically accept the possibility that the function of obtaining and developing personnel may no longer be the most rewarding part of the job but will still be an interesting factor.

The advent of collective bargaining brought an entirely new role to superintendents, many of whom were not prepared to handle it. A great deal of trauma was felt by superintendents when heated discussions on salary and conditions of work replaced a more tranquil approach that had long prevailed. Strikes by teachers, almost unheard of in Wisconsin twenty years ago, are now commonplace. For the superintendent who cannot cope with such a setting, the position would not offer much reward.

Since the entire function of personnel was rated relatively low on the Personal Preference Ranking List, it is not surprising that little enthusiasm for the function was observed in the interview. Strong concerns for the area of personnel were evident among some superintendents, especially those that had recently experienced a labor dispute or were in the process of current negotiations.
It was noted, however, that ESTJ types interviewed preferred other functions of administration to that of evaluating staff. It would be expected that an ISFJ type would prefer staff evaluation considerably more.

School superintendents gave some varied responses during the interview that also lends insight to the whole function of personnel. One feeling was that the whole structure was so highly sophisticated that the district needed a specialist to handle personnel matters and another to handle negotiations. In many districts across the state--and the nation--this approach is being taken. Smaller districts cannot afford this additional staff and therefore the superintendent must perform many of the functions for the board. In so doing he has to wear several hats that often conflict. He must evaluate as well as negotiate as well as hire and fire.

An alternative for the smaller districts would be to consolidate, thereby providing more administrative resource. School board members tend to oppose this concept, however, as do some of the small district superintendents who fear their jobs would be lost.

The fact was also noted, however, that superintendents in the interview as well as in other settings, strongly believed and stated
that the quality of instruction was in large part dependent upon good teachers. This indication does not conflict with the comments in hypothesis one because they dealt more with the content and what should be presented rather than who should present it and how it should be presented.

There are more facets to the function of obtaining and developing personnel than negotiations and conflict, however. Fortunately for the superintendent that does not find evaluation and negotiations high on his priority list of preferences, other tasks also need doing. Included on the Personal Preference Ranking List were such examples as analyzing teacher work load, improving teacher inservice programs, developing grievance procedures, selecting and supervising special staff members, counseling staff members, and working with costs and salaries for special programs. A superintendent could rank the entire function of obtaining and developing personnel low in performance preference if he thought only of conflict situations. If he thought of some of the other functions, such as mentioned above, he could conceivably show a different preference to the area of personnel.

The implications are varied when it comes to a superintendent's function with personnel. Whether or not he likes the function or
whether he thinks it highly important, it is not going to go away. Personnel has always been and will always be an important part of the superintendent's job. The modern superintendent will have to accept that fact and develop skills and tolerance to deal with the problems while at the same time appreciate the other areas of personnel that are more consistent with his role preference.

With teacher organizations and other employee organizations demanding and receiving a greater role in school operations, the priority of personnel may change. The change would be of great significance to the school superintendent who then might find it necessary to respond differently. Other changes such as finding priorities could cause the superintendent to look at personnel development in still another light.

He may soon determine the personnel function by economic dictates. If that would be the case the personality preferences of the superintendent would be reflected in a different framework. A future study could consider personality preferences in view of changing functions and in view of fiscal mandates and influences.
Summary

The personality type an individual possesses affects many spheres of human activity. Personality traits determine the way a person goes at things, how he habitually behaves or how he prefers to behave in activities that determine whether he should consider one career over another. There is room for flexibility in most careers including that of school superintendents. Not all types of personalities, however, fit into any given community.

Certain characteristics were noted about the superintendents in the study. Over one third of the sample clearly fell into one category type, ESTJ. Some of the related qualities were discussed earlier, but these judging types are not prone to take advice from others. The superintendent unable to take advice might have trouble working with his subordinates in any kind of team effort towards administration. Since many of the sample group also were classed as a thinking type, little development in the area of feeling, the opposite function could be expected to be found, since the indices must point one way or the other.

As a result of the research it was determined that there are relationships between the importance superintendents attach to various
administrative functions, and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The function of improving educational opportunity was found to have a greater relationship to extrovert superintendents than to introvert superintendents. Extroverts rated the function of maintaining funds and facilities relatively higher than did introverts; a closer relationship was found between the function and extroverts than introverts. The function of developing and maintaining effective community relations as related to the scores on the Myers-Briggs was statistically rejected. An analysis showed that extroverts considered the function of community relations to be of relatively lesser importance than introverts did. The function of obtaining and developing personnel was found to be of an equal importance to developing and maintaining effective community relations by extroverts; introverts found the function to be least important. An analysis of the possible reasons was included previously.

Alternatives were suggested for superintendents who because of their personality type could not work effectively at the functions of administration. The alternatives included: 1) leaving the school district; 2) hiring an assistant with strengths in the area that the superintendent has a weakness; 3) hire a special consultant to work on a specific administrative function; and 4) the superintendent could
seek retraining or inservice to learn to deal more effectively with a specific function.

Superintendents in the study indicated their feelings that great expectations of the school systems are held by the public. The superintendent often has difficulty leading the district to the goals held by the public.

It is extremely difficult to try to determine which of a number of essential functions of administration are the most important. All are essential to school district operation. It is analogous to the vital organs of the human body; survival is dependent on them all. So the superintendent must see to the processes that operate toward the areas of functional responsibility. Preferences may exist as seen on Table XVI, but priority of importance may be forever changing and quite elusive.

Perhaps the best of all combinations between the personality type and the preference comes from the flexibility factor that some superintendents are able to draw upon. Being flexible, as some types are, will get a superintendent through many otherwise difficult situations. A question in the interview sought to determine just where superintendents stood relative to the community in the
area of priorities. The responses quite clearly showed administrative need for flexibility.

**TABLE XVI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extroverts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Educational Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finance &amp; Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Relations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introverts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Community Relations and Personnel were ranked equal by extroverts.

As seen on Table XVI, extroverts ranked the function dealing with educational improvement as most important while introverts ranked the same function third in importance. Both extrovert and introvert groups ranked the function dealing with finance and facilities as second in importance. Introverts ranked the function of community relations as first in importance while extroverts considered community relations and personnel equal. Extroverts ranked the function dealing with personnel as fourth in importance.

A wide variety of administrative styles were evidenced along with varied types of personality traits. No specific combination
guarantees success for the superintendent or the district. On the other hand some strong trends of positive combinations have been identified. Their strengths and weaknesses have been noted.

It must be remembered that the Myers-Briggs instrument deals with a theory of personality and that the information the Indicator provides about a given person must be used with informed and critical judgment. Since it is a self-report instrument, it could be wrong in any given case even if a score was very high. For that reason—and others too—no analysis of a single administrator should be made solely as a result of the Myers-Briggs Instrument.

Further indepth study and analysis will help in a more scientific understanding of the implications that personality plays on the importance superintendents attach to administrative functions and how they respond to specific situations.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the importance that superintendents attach to common administrative functions and their relationships to basic personality preferences. To get at this type of information, four hypotheses were developed together with appropriate instruments to gather the needed data. Analysis of the data was provided in Chapter III. Following is an evaluation of the hypotheses to confirm their acceptance or rejection, to explore and speculate on the reasons why or why not, and to consider the results of all other data of the research.

Hypothesis 1

There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the function of providing educational opportunity and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

This hypothesis was accepted at the .05 significance level since the correlation coefficient of .8428 was above the .404 level. The finding of significance involved formulation and computation that was previously discussed in Chapter III.
The acceptance of the first hypothesis seems to suggest that superintendents that are extraverts are also most concerned with the areas involving educational improvement. It is not necessarily apparent that the superintendents in the sample think the other functions are not important; they were instructed to list the order of importance. None could be equal on the instrument. It is also possible that a superintendent might feel a function of administration was very important, but might dislike doing it so much that he might either shade its relative importance or delegate it to a subordinate.

Since only eight of the thirty superintendents in the sample were classed with an introvert type their responses could easily be overlooked. However when the total percent of introvert type is seen as approaching 27%, it merits at least some consideration. It also might suggest that over 100 superintendents in Wisconsin are various types of introverts. From the data it cannot be concluded that the I combination type rejects one function or another as being important generally. Indeed the data show they have a strong preference for the functions of maintaining funds and facilities, and even for the functions of administration that deal with community relations, which involved hypothesis 3, which was rejected.
Hypothesis 2

There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of providing and maintaining funds and facilities and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

This hypothesis was accepted at the .05 significance level since the correlation coefficient of .7906 was above the .404 level. It was the second highest correlation found.

Acceptance of the second hypothesis tends to suggest that superintendents who are extroverts - plus some other previously discussed combinations of traits - consider the administrative functions of providing and maintaining funds and facilities very important. In fact the personal preference ranking list showed it to be the second most important function. The writer believes that response could have gone either way, i.e., it could have received a stronger indication of preference than did the one dealing with educational opportunity.

Responses to question number 6 on the personal interview corroborates the closeness of choice between the area of finance and facilities and curriculum. It also seems to show the difficulty
that superintendents have in determining their most important function. Other discussion on this can be found in Chapter III.

**Hypothesis 3**

There is a significant relationship between the importance superintendents attach to the functions of developing and maintaining effective community relations and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Because the coefficient for this hypothesis was .1090, less than the necessary .404 level, this hypothesis was rejected. It was the only hypothesis of the four tested to be rejected.

The rejection of this hypothesis, the only one of the four to be rejected, also was corroborated in part through the interview. It was found that community relations was the lowest priority in the rankings listed by superintendents. Some of the reasons for this have been discussed in the previous chapter. Curiously enough, the writer feels that community pressure, more than any other single factor, leads to the downfall of many superintendents. It cannot be overemphasized that good public relations with the community are an extremely valuable asset.

**Hypothesis 4**

There is a significant relationship between the importance
superintendents attach to the functions of obtaining and developing personnel and their scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

This hypothesis was accepted since the .4392 score is above the necessary .404.

There could well be other reasons for personality types showing preferences to one or another type of administrative function. The first possibility involves the nature of the personality itself. All kinds of factors enter in including basic misunderstanding by others. This is particularly evident when one looks at the extrovert and then the introvert. The best of the extrovert is immediately apparent, but not so with the introvert. The latter type may never permit outsiders to see his inner world. All that is seen is what he presents. The auxiliary processes may be so influential to the dominant process that an actual I would take on some E characteristics. But this is not likely to happen with the E since he stands out as dominant all the time.

Over one-third of the sample was typed as ESTJ. A general summary for each preference can be made. This common type is E, at ease with his environment; S, is practical, observes, and relies on experience; T, is logical, decisive, and executive type, and demanding of efficiency; and J, good at organization.
The second possibility of the preference variability involves decisions made for political reasons. Simply for survival, a superintend­dent may feel that he must see educational opportunity as first and foremost. Since most administrators are former teachers, this may actually be rather easy to do. Good education is also the sole purpose for schools to exist, a fact often forgotten.

One could agree, however, that this well intended and needed purpose could not exist without the necessary funds to make it happen. The superintendent that sees things this way may well be one to delegate, if possible, the actual curricular functions and handle the financial matters himself.

A third consideration one might make involves the atmosphere of the community at or about the time that the instrument was being com­pleted. To be sure, finance is a high priority at budget time--or at tax time. When concerned citizens are actively holding meetings pro­testing school costs, a superintendent's natural response is to make the general area of finance a high priority. It is at that time at least, the most pressing and nerve-racking issue.

The whole area of community relations is difficult to accurately evaluate. Administrators must surely be aware of the importance a positive community relations program plays, yet there appears to be
little emphasis in their own handling of it. Larger school districts have taken the route of employing a specialist to handle just such an area; smaller districts cannot afford such a luxury so the superintendent inherits the task. It is also frequently argued that a good and effective community relations program will prevent a lot of problems in other areas including but not limited to funds, finance and curriculum.

This study has considered and explored various possible relationships between personality types and how the types might relate to administrative functions. Common as well as unique circumstances found in school district were also posed. However, the elusive nature of the research precludes any definitive conclusions.

Recommendations

It is not always possible to make viable recommendations based on a study such as this. On the other hand there are times when some very significant recommendations are made and lead to further studies or even direct action.

Although this study focused on the superintendent, clear implications exist as well for school board members and institutions of high education that train superintendents. For school board
members a careful reading of this study could impress on them the importance of matching a superintendent to the specific job and community. Clearly it has been shown that different traits of an individual are related to various functions of administration. Stress and strife that develop between a superintendent and a school board following the "honeymoon" might well be reduced, some even prevented.

That is not to say that an ideal match will reduce differences of opinion. Indeed the writer firmly believes that the professional educator will find a citizens board of education to be on a different frequency particularly in the area of innovations. It is quite commonly accepted that the administrative leader must work also to educate his board. This in no way is a negative reflection on boards; they cannot be expected to know all the comings and goings in today's fast moving educational scene. If such a situation ever existed with the board of education leading its superintendents, the superintendent would surely deserve an F for failure. He for sure could not last long in that type of setting.

Some classic examples exist of situations where boards of education and superintendents were of far different persuasions. Within the last decade a Wisconsin school district, concerned with students'
reading abilities, reverted to the use of the McGuffy Reader. Aside from the merits of the text itself, the board and the administrator were at odds over the adoption of its use. The board as proponents of using the McGuffy passed for its adoption. When pressure built up in opposition, the superintendent was the fall guy and quietly left his job.

A second case, this being in a large Wisconsin school district, saw the president of the board of education acting as the superintendent. He would appear at different schools daily, meeting with staff and parents and otherwise making what were clearly administrative decision. Fortunately the president did not run for reelection. But the damage was done, the superintendent had been so undermined that his credibility as a leader was questioned and he too soon left.

A third example, also factual, involves a superintendent who came to Wisconsin to reorganize what had previously been a number of small single school districts into a common, medium sized district. No easy task at best. The individual might be considered an extrovert and was surely a judgment type. He wanted to job done as expeditiously as possible. It is quite clear that his own personal qualities did not fit with those of the community. Neither did they complement the staff or the school board; he was not rehired after his three year contract expired.
Examples such as these are frequently seen by educators as they watch their colleagues come and go. So are the other extremes, those superintendents that have been at the same location for ten, fifteen or even more numbers of years. It is these groups that the researcher discovered are compatible with their districts because they are in possession of the personality type needed for the specific job, and are able to utilize administrative functions as needed. This factor was also noted in the interview discussion.

Regrettably there are many communities where education is used by politicians for their own needs and advantages. In these settings a great deal of energy is expended for survival by the superintendent and even by school board members. Here a certain personality type is a must. Here also the importance of administrative functions will understandably be pushed and pulled by the turbulence of a sea of politics. The researcher suggests that some rather different findings would result if all of those in the sample would have been from politically active communities. The lesson for the superintendent is to seek employment in a community that fits his personality type and where he can utilize his administrative abilities to their greatest capacity.
Traditionally the institutions of higher education have sought to provide the academic background necessary for potential superintendents to assume leadership positions. Such educational training also meets the legal requirements set by the states. More recently programs have begun to provide some on the job experiences through such means as internships. To the knowledge of the researcher, however, no program has been developed that attempts to analyze the type of personality a prospective superintendent possesses or whether he is even potentially suited for such a position. Such an approach is not without difficulty, but in the long run it could strengthen the profession.

For example, a pretesting type program could be given to a graduate school candidate before he is accepted. Unlike the traditional Miller Analogy Test or the Graduate Record Examination, a test of personality type would be an indicator to help guide a student to an appropriate career. Based on a test indication result a student might be counselled to go into curriculum work rather than administration, or into business management. A lot of heartache could be avoided. More important, school systems could benefit because they would not have to be a proving ground for a superintendent that really
should not be one. And for those that possess traits that fit an administrative type model, an assurance or reinforcement would benefit them when the going gets rough. They could be fairly sure they were in the field they are qualified for by virtue of the personality traits they possess.

To be sure this approach would not be a panacea for the graduate schools in accepting and preparing school superintendents. It could, however, be another barometer in determining success and might be a fresh approach to an old problem.

Conclusions

The entire purpose of this study was to determine what relationships exist between superintendents' personality preferences and the importance they attach to certain common administrative functions. To do this, a procedure of research was developed including the use of several instruments. Chapter III dealt in depth with analyzing the resulting data. The first part of Chapter IV was spent discussing the results of and some of the conclusions that might be drawn. From the entire research and subsequent analysis and evaluation, it can reasonably be concluded that there is a relationship between the importance superintendents attach to common administrative functions and their personality preferences.
It must be remembered that this research was limited to a sample of Wisconsin school superintendents and does not necessarily reflect a picture of the nation's superintendents at large. Another mitigating factor, though unavoidable, was the state of the economy at the time of the research. Not only was the nation witnessing an economic recession, but the state of Wisconsin had just concluded a stormy legislative session that set cost controls on the spending that school districts could make. It was noted that the area of finance--funds and facilities--was frequently referred to in the research as most important to superintendents. The legislative mandate and its resultant impact may well be the reason why.

Perhaps if the research had been done during a time when there was less fiscal stress the results would be different. It is pure speculation, however, and may make no difference at all. One wonders if the state were embroiled in a textbook issue or an issue on school curriculum if the superintendents would see the function of curriculum as their first priority on the interview questions.

A replication of the study could be done nationwide, thus providing a broader sample from which to draw conclusions. Such a study would have potential value for educators at the university level, for employing school boards, for counselors, and surely for the superintendent
or potential superintendent. It was initially stated in this paper that there were very few studies on superintendents such as this one. The review of the literature confirmed that initial statement.

The role of the superintendent continues to be a changing one and an important one. New and relevant studies can only help to enlighten those who are interested in the profession. To this end the information contained in this study is offered.
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APPENDIX A

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR
| Occupation | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| Myers-Briggs Type Indicator - Form F |

- Make your marks heavy and black.
- Erase stray marks completely.

**Note:** The document contains a table with various entries, possibly related to personality or psychological assessment, but the specific details or context are not clearly visible due to the image quality.
Does following a schedule
(A) appeal to you
(B) cramp you

Do you usually get on better with
(A) imaginative people
(B) realistic people

If strangers are staring at you in a crowd, do you
(A) often become aware of it
(B) seldom notice it

Are you more careful about
(A) people's feelings
(B) their rights

Are you
(A) inclined to enjoy deciding things
(B) just as glad to have circumstances decide a matter for you

As a guest, do you more enjoy
(A) joining in the talk of the group
(B) talking separately with people you know well

When you have more knowledge or skill in something than the people around you, is it more satisfying
(A) to guard your superior knowledge
(B) to share it with those who want to learn

8. When you have done all you can to remedy a troublesome situation, are you
(A) able to stop worrying about it
(B) still more or less haunted by it

9. If you were asked on a Saturday morning what you were going to do that day, would you
(A) be able to tell pretty well
(B) list twice as many things to do as any day can hold
(C) have to wait and see

10. Do you think on the whole that
(A) children have the best of it
(B) life is more interesting for grown-ups

11. In doing something which many other people do, does it appeal more to you
(A) to do it in the accepted way
(B) to invent a way of your own

12. When you were small, did you
(A) feel sure of your parents' love and devotion to you
(B) feel that they admired and approved of some other child more than they did of you

13. Do you
(A) rather prefer to do things at the last minute
(B) find it hard on the nerves
168

20. Is it harder for you to adapt to
(A) routine
(B) constant change

21. Would you be more willing to take
on a heavy load of extra work for
the sake of
(A) additional comforts and
luxuries
(B) the chance of becoming famous
through your work

22. Are the things you plan or undertake
(A) almost always things you
can finish
(B) frequently things that prove
too difficult to carry through

23. Are you more attracted
(A) to a person with a quick and
brilliant mind
(B) to a practical person with a
lot of horse sense

24. Do you find people in general
(A) slow to appreciate and accept
ideas not their own
(B) reasonably open-minded

25. When you have to meet strangers, do
you find it
(A) pleasant, or at least easy
(B) something that takes a good
deal of effort

26. Are you inclined
(A) to value sentiment above logic
(E) to value logic above sentiment
Do you like

(A) to arrange your dates and parties some distance ahead
(B) to be free to do whatever looks like fun at the time

In making plans which concern other people, do you prefer

(A) to take them into your confidence
(B) to keep them in the dark till the last possible moment

Which of these two is the higher compliment

(A) he is a person of real feeling
(B) he is consistently reasonable

When you have to make up your mind about something, do you like to

(A) do it right away
(B) postpone the decision as long as you reasonable can

When you run into an unexpected difficulty in something you are doing, do you feel it to be

(A) a piece of bad luck
(B) a nuisance
(C) all in the day's work

Do you almost always

(A) enjoy the present moment and make the most of it
(B) feel that something just ahead is more important

33. Are you

(A) easy to get to know
(B) hard to get to know

34. With most of the people you know do you

(A) feel that they mean what they say
(B) feel you must watch for a hidden meaning

35. When you start a big project that is due in a week, do you

(A) take time to list the separate things to be done and the order of doing them
(B) plunge in

36. In solving a personal problem, do you

(A) feel more confident about it if you have asked other people's advice
(B) feel that nobody else is in as good a position to judge as you are

37. Do you admire more the person who is

(A) conventional enough never to make himself conspicuous
(B) to original and individual to care whether he is conspicuous or not

38. Which mistake would be more natural for you

(A) to drift from one thing to another all your life
(B) to stay in a rut that didn't suit you
45. At the time in your life when things piled up on you the worst, did you find
(A) that you had got into an impossible situation
(B) that by doing only the necessary things you could work your way out

46. Do most of the people you know
(A) take their fair share of praise and blame
(B) grab all the credit they can but shift any blame on to someone else

47. When you are in an embarrassing spot, do you usually
(A) change the subject
(B) turn it into a joke
(C) days later, think of what you should have said

48. Are such emotional "ups and downs" as you may feel
(A) very marked
(B) rather moderate

49. Do you think that having a daily routine is
(A) a comfortable way of getting things done
(B) painful even when necessary

50. Are you naturally
(A) a "good mixer"
(B) rather quiet and reserved in company.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
In your early childhood (at six or eight), did you

(A) feel your parents were very wise people who should be obeyed
(B) find their authority irksome and escape it when possible

When you have a suggestion that ought to be made at a meeting, do you

(A) stand up and make it as a matter of course
(B) hesitate to do so

Do you get more annoyed at

(A) fancy theories
(B) people who don't like theories

When helping in a group undertaking, are you more often struck by

(A) the inspiring quality of shoulder to shoulder cooperation
(B) the annoying inefficiency of loosely organized group work
(C) or don't you get involved in group undertakings

When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather

(A) plan what you will do and when
(B) just go

Are the things you worry about

(A) often really not worth it
(B) always more or less serious

57. In making an important decision on a given set of facts, do you

(A) find you can trust your feeling judgments
(B) need to set feeling aside and rely on analysis and cold logic

58. In the matter of friends, do you tend to seek

(A) deep friendship with a very few people
(B) broad friendship with many different people

59. Do you think your friends

(A) feel you are open to suggestions
(B) know better than to try to talk you out of anything you've decided to do

60. Does the idea of making a list of what you should get done over a week-end

(A) appeal to you
(B) leave you cold
(C) positively depress you

61. In traveling, would you rather go

(A) with a companion who had made the trip before and "knew the ropes"
(B) alone or with someone greener at it than yourself

62. Which of these two reasons for doing a thing sounds more attractive to you

(A) this is an opportunity that may lead to bigger things
(B) this is an experience that you are sure to enjoy
In your personal beliefs, do you

(A) cherish faith in things which cannot be proved
(B) believe only those things which can be proved

Would you rather

(A) support the established methods of doing good
(B) analyze what is still wrong and attack unsolved problems

Has it been your experience that you

(A) frequently fall in love with a notion or project which turns out to be a disappointment so that you "go up like a rocket and come down like the stick"
(B) use enough judgment on your enthusiasms so that they do not let you down

Would you judge yourself to be

(A) more enthusiastic than the average person
(B) less excitable than the average person

If you divided all the people you know into those you like, those you dislike, and those toward whom you feel indifferent, would there be more of

(A) those you like
(B) those you dislike

68. In your daily work, do you (for this item only, if two are true mark both)

(A) rather enjoy and emergency that takes you work against time
(B) hate to work under pressure
(C) usually plan your work so you won't need to

69. Are you more likely to speak up in

(A) praise
(B) blame

70. Is it higher praise to call someone

(A) a man of vision
(B) a man of common sense

71. When playing cards, do you enjoy most

(A) the sociability
(B) the excitement of winning
(C) the problem of getting the most out of each hand
(D) the risk of playing for stakes
(E) or don't you enjoy playing cards

GO ON TO PART II
SAMPLE QUESTION

Are your interests
(A) few and lasting
(B) varied

If your interests are varied, you would mark answer box "B" as it is marked on the sample above. If they are few and lasting you would mark "A".

Which word in each pair appeals to you more?

| (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  | (A)  | (B)  |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| firm-minded | warm-hearted | imaginative | matter-of-fact | systematic | spontaneous | congenial | effective | theory | certainty | party | theater | build | invent | analyze | sympathize | popular | intimate | benefits | blessings | casual | correct | active | intellectual | uncritical | critical | scheduled | unplanned | convincing | touching |
| reserved | talkative | statement | concept | soft | hard | production | design | forgive | tolerate | hearty | quiet | who | what | impulse | decision | speak | write | affection | tenderness | punctual | leisurely | sensible | fascinating | changing | permanent | determined | devoted | system | zest |
Which word in each pair appeals to you more?

(A) facts     ideas     (B)
(A) compassion foresight (B)
(A) concrete    abstract   (B)
(A) justice     mercy     (B)
(A) calm        lively     (B)
(A) make        create     (B)
(A) wary        trustful  (B)
(A) orderly     easy-going (B)
(A) approve     question  (B)
(A) gentle      firm      (B)
(A) foundation  spire     (B)

113. (A) quick  careful  (B)
114. (A) thinking feeling  (B)
115. (A) theory    experience  (B)
116. (A) sociable detached  (B)
117. (A) sign      symbol    (B)
118. (A) systematic casual  (B)
119. (A) literal    figurative  (B)
120. (A) peacemaker judge    (B)
121. (A) accept    alter     (B)
122. (A) agree     discuss   (B)
123. (A) executive scholar  (B)

Go on to Part III
PART III

ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS USING THE DIRECTIONS FOR PART I, ON THE FRONT COVER

14. Do you find more routine parts of your day
   (A) restful
   (B) boring

15. If you think you are not getting a square deal in a club or team to which you belong, is it better
   (A) to shut up and take it
   (B) to use the threat of resigning if necessary to get your rights

16. Can you
   (A) talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to
   (B) find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain conditions

17. When strangers notice you does it
   (A) make you uncomfortable
   (B) not bother you at all

18. If you were a teacher, would you rather teach
   (A) fact courses
   (B) courses involving theory

19. In your crowd, are you usually
   (A) one of the first to try a new thing
   (B) one of the last to fall into line

20. In solving a difficult personal problem, do you
   (A) tend to do more worrying than is useful in reaching a decision
   (B) feel no more anxiety than the situation requires

21. If people seem to slight you, do you
   (A) tell yourself they didn't mean anything by it
   (B) distrust their good will and stay on guard with them thereafter

22. When there is a special job to be done, do you like
   (A) to organize it carefully before you start
   (B) to find out what is necessary as you go along

23. Do you think it is a worse fault
   (A) to show too much warmth
   (B) not to have warmth enough

24. At a party, do you like
   (A) to help get things going
   (B) to let the others have fun in their own way

25. When a new opportunity comes up, do you
   (A) decide about it fairly quickly
   (B) sometimes miss out through taking too long to make up your mind
6. In managing your life, do you tend
   (A) to undertake too much and get into a tight spot
   (B) to hold yourself down to what you can comfortably swing

7. When you find yourself definitely in the wrong, would you rather
   (A) admit you are wrong
   (B) not admit it, though everyone knows it
   (C) or don't you ever find yourself in the wrong

8. Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in
   (A) right away
   (B) only after they really get to know you

9. In your home life, when you come to the end of some undertaking, are you
   (A) clear as to what comes next and ready to tackle it
   (B) glad to relax until the next inspiration hits you

10. Do you think it more important to be able
    (A) to see the possibilities in a situation
    (B) to adjust to the facts as they are

11. Would you say that the people you know personally owe their successes more to
    (A) ability and hard work
    (B) luck
    (C) bluff, pull and shoving themselves ahead of others

12. In getting a job done, do you depend on
    (A) starting early, so as to finish with time to spare
    (B) the extra speed you develop at the last minute

13. After associating with superstitious people, have you
    (A) found yourself slightly affected by their superstitions
    (B) remained entirely unaffected

14. When you don't agree with what has just been said, do you usually
    (A) let it go
    (B) put up an argument

15. Would you rather be considered
    (A) a practical person
    (B) an ingenious person

16. Out of all the good resolutions you may have made, are there
    (A) some you have kept to this day
    (B) none that have really lasted

17. Would you rather work under someone who is
    (A) always kind
    (B) always fair

18. In a large group, do you more often
    (A) introduce others
    (B) get introduced

Go on to next page
154. Do you more often let
   (A) your heart rule your head
   (B) your head rule your heart

155. In listening to a new idea, are you more anxious to
   (A) find out all about it
   (B) judge whether it is right or wrong

156. Are you oppressed by
   (A) many different worries
   (B) comparatively few

157. When you don't approve of the way a friend is acting, do you
   (A) wait and see what happens
   (B) do or say something about it

158. Do you think it is a worse fault to be
   (A) unsympathetic
   (B) unreasonable

159. When a new situation comes up which conflicts with your plan, do you try first
   (A) to change your plans
   (B) to change the situation

160. Do you think the people close to you know how you feel
   (A) about most things
   (B) only when you have had some special reason to tell them
164. When you have a serious choice to make, do you
   (A) almost always come to a clear-cut decision
   (B) sometimes find it so hard to decide that you do not whole-heartedly follow up either choice

   On most matters, do you
   (A) have a pretty definite opinion
   (B) like to keep an open mind

   As you get to know a person better, do you more often find
   (A) that he lets you down or disappoints you in some way
   (B) that, taken all in all, he improves upon acquaintance

165. When the truth would not be polite, are you more likely to tell
   (A) a polite lie
   (B) the impolite truth

166. In your scheme of living, do you prefer to be
   (A) original
   (B) conventional

END OF TEST
APPENDIX A

Reliability

To investigate reliability on various levels, use has been made of a logically-split-half procedure. Each index has been split into halves, taking all available item statistics into consideration and pairing items that most resemble each other and correlate most highly. The resulting X and Y halves should, therefore, "represent faithfully the total test in all significant respect," as Guilford (1954, p. 373) recommends.

Split-half reliabilities were obtained by applying the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula to obtain correlations between halves. These correlations range from .88 to .70 with a single correlation of .44 for the TF scale with underachieving eighth graders.

These reliabilities appear creditable for an instrument of this sort, representing in general the upper range of coefficients found in self-report instruments of similar length. It may be noted that while a wide range of age, intellectual ability and socio-economic status is included, the only coefficients below .75 are for the underachieving eighth grade and the non-prep twelfth and that much of the lowest values for these groups are on TF. The possibility would seem to exist that the
relative uncertainty on TF may reflect a lesser development of the Judging process, which may prove to be a significant characteristic of such samples (Myers, 1962, p. 20).

Two aspects are worth noting. One is the systematic way in which reliabilities vary with the character of the sample. The clearly superior twelfth grade and college samples, comprising boys who were National Merit finalists, girls in advanced twelfth grade courses, and random sample of 100 each from the highly-selected freshman classes of Brown and Pembroke, have reliabilities from .80 to .94 with the median at .85. The regular academic twelfth grade samples have reliabilities from .76 to .88, with the median at .81. The boys in the non-prep twelfth grade and in the intelligent but low-achieving eighth grade sample have reliabilities from .80 down to .44, with the median at .73. The contrasts may be due to differences in understanding, vocabulary, motivation, etc., or to actual differences in type development, or to all of these factors in combination.

A second point concerns the TF index, which, in the least able sample, has a strikingly lower reliability than any other index. Since TF pulls up to parity with other indices in the sample from Brown and Pembroke, the unreliability would not seem to lie in the TF index itself. More probably the low coefficients reflects the fact
that the development of judgment (whether T or F) is one of the slowest and most reluctant achievements in the process of growing up (Myers, 1962, pp. 20-21).

In addition, the Gray-Wheelwright Psychological Type Questionnaire was constructed by two Jungian analysts on the west coast, at about the same time as the Type Indicator was being constructed on the east coast, quite independently and with no intercommunication. It has the same purpose as the Indicator, to identify the Jungian types, and proceeds by inquiring to the subject's preferences as between extraversion and introversion, sensation and intuition, and thinking and feeling. It has no scale for JP and thus does not reflect the important differences in behavior that result from using judgment rather than perception (or perception rather than judgment) in the extraverted part of one's life. On its scales corresponding to EI, SN and TF, split-half reliabilities are markedly lower than any computed for the Indicator. But the true variance of these scales can be assumed to reflect, as faithfully as the difficulties of test construction permit, Gray's and Wheelwright's conception of the essential nature of the Jungian opposites.

A study in which the Type Indicator and the 14th edition of the Gray-Wheelwright were both administered to 47 male students at Golden
Gate College is reported by Stricker & Ross (1962). The observed inter-correlations reported in the test manual range from .84 for EI and JP, .81 for TF, and .62 for SN (Myers, 1962, p. 21).

Reliability was further established by correlating the Type Indicator with the Strong Vocational Blank, the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and the Personality Research Inventory.

Validity

In addition the Type Indicator was shown to be concurrently valid by being positively correlated with non-test variables such as faculty ratings, job turn-over, creativity, and scholastic achievement. The figures for all the categories are given in the manual and indicate the test to be adequate in all categories. The manual for the rest reports all figures for reliability and validity completely and is complete in analysis of performance of the various types and should be consulted prior to interpretation of the specific scores (Myers, 1962, p. 27-34).
The manual's reports on validity rest mainly on concurrent studies, which are expected relationships to other tests and ratings and differences between groups. Relationships to a large number of scales on tests of interest, values, and personality are mostly in the expected directions. For example, Edwards Personal Preference Scale scores for need for nurturance correlate with a feeling preference; and Strong Vocational Interest Blank scores for interest in sales correlates significantly with extroversion; interest in psychology with intuition. The manual also has considerable discussion relating to requirements of various jobs as well as several case studies.

The M-B Type Indicator and the Gray-Wheelwright were both administered to a group of 47 male students at Golden Gate College. The correlations of EI, SN, and TF with the corresponding Gray-Wheelwright scales are .79, .58, and .60 respectively. (The Gray-Wheelwright has no JP scale.)

Twenty correlations were made with the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. Eighteen of these correlations were found to be significant at the .01 level. Correlations with interests as shown by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank were also made. Interest scores and group types were compared. The correlations involved 45 occupational scales; of the 180 correlations, 103 were significant beyond the .01 level.
On the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, "needs" were compared to Indicator scores. Of the 60 correlations of needs and preferences made, 24 are significant at the .01 level. Correlations with all 25 scales of the Personality Research Inventory were significant with one or more of the Indicator indices. Forty-nine of the 100 r's were significant at the .01 level.

A number of correlations were made with non-test variables. One such correlation was with ratings of the College Student Characteristics Study and items on the Indicator. Significance was found with 12 of the 20 correlations. Another correlation was made involving frequency of certain Indicator factors and creativity. Five out of six correlations were found to be significant. Finally, grade point averages of students were compared to continuous scores from the Indicator. Thirty-two of 60 correlations were found to be significant.
APPENDIX B

PERSONAL PREFERENCE RANKING LIST
Superintendent Personal Preference Ranking List

Directions: Each of the following parts contains four items generally considered as administrative functions. Please rank them in order of importance as they apply to your position, with 1 indicating the highest order of importance, 2 the next highest, and so on through number 4.

1. _____ curriculum development
   _____ developing and implementing a budget
   _____ analyzing teacher workload
   _____ developing report for parents

2. _____ working with community and parent groups
   _____ financial planning
   _____ administration of personnel
   _____ curriculum evaluation

3. _____ planning and developing an early childhood educational program
   _____ improving teacher inservice programs in early childhood education
   _____ relating information on early childhood education with the community
   _____ designing appropriate facilities for early childhood education

4. _____ administering insurance plans for the district
   _____ developing grievance procedures for the district
   _____ providing information to local service clubs in the district
   _____ directing a needs assessment program for the district

5. _____ developing a special education program
   _____ developing a preservice teacher program in special education
   _____ developing a long-range building plan for exceptional educational needs
   _____ creating citizens' advisory committees for special education
Continued...

6.  ____ studying facility for teaching environmental education
    ____ developing community support for environmental education
    ____ selecting and supervising staff members in environmental education
    ____ planning programs in environmental education

7.  ____ planning for improvement of students reading ability
    ____ evaluating costs for reading program
    ____ involving community in volunteer activities in reading
    ____ evaluating reading teachers and staff

8.  ____ institute public relations program on mathematics being taught in school
    ____ assess cost and facilities for implementing a computerized math program
    ____ improving students' performance in mathematics
    ____ selecting personnel for mathematics department

9.  ____ providing programs in career education
    ____ recruiting staff in career education
    ____ interpreting and handling parent comments and complaints about
        career education program
    ____ planning for revenue to develop a comprehensive career education program

10. ____ using the community as an educational resource
    ____ determining cost implication of community resource program
    ____ analyzing educational value of using the community as a resource
    ____ counseling staff members to use community resources.
Continued...

11. _______, evaluating building use for community nutritional needs
    _______, utilizing school for outreach food program
    _______, developing a health and nutritional program
    _______, working with costs and salaries for community nutritional program
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

1. What do you find most important in your role as superintendent? Least important? Could you give some examples of each?

2. Do you feel you could delegate one area of administration easier than another? Which area? Is the reason because of lesser importance?

3. What role do you play in staff evaluation? Do you enjoy that role?

4. In what ways were you recently involved in the area of curriculum?

5. What recent decisions have you made affecting school facilities? Cite some examples.

6. Rank the following in order of importance as you see them.
   ____ Finance & Facilities
   ____ Curriculum
   ____ Personnel
   ____ Public Relations

   Give an example of what you actually do in the most important area.

7. Which of those listed in number 6 do you consider the least important.
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

8. What area do you think your community believes is most important for your role as superintendent? Educational Improvement, School Personnel, School-Community Relations, or School Costs? Do you think the community's priority list influences your own professional thoughts on the same list? If so, how much and how do you respond?
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LETTERS
May 29, 1975

I am in the process of researching information for a doctoral dissertation on school superintendents in Wisconsin. As you are aware, a certain amount of research response is necessary for any type of sampling. Your help in completing the enclosed Myers-Briggs Type Indicator would be greatly appreciated.

There is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions; the choice merely reflects your preference. Only statistical information is being sought and your name will remain anonymous to anyone reading the study.

Thank you very much for helping me in this project. A postage paid envelope is enclosed for convenience in returning the instrument.

Sincerely,

Dale Jensen
Coordinator

Enclosure
I am writing to request your cooperation in filling in the enclosed evaluation form. The form is part of a doctoral research project being done by Dale Jensen, Coordinator of CESA 18. The results will be part of the total data used in his dissertation. No individual names or districts will be used, and professional confidence and discreteness will be observed at all times.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Lyle Jasperson, Chairman
CESA #18 Board of Control

LJ:pd
Encl.
The dissertation submitted by Dale Jensen has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max Bailey
Assistant Professor, School of Education, Loyola

Dr. Melvin Heller, Dept. Chairman & Professor,
Dept. of Supervision & Administration, Loyola

Dr. Jasper Valenti, Associate Dean
School of Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the chairman of the dissertation committee and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.
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Chairman's Signature