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The purpose of this study was to determine what were the relationships, if any, that existed between the most common personality types of selected elementary school principals, as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), and the most effective leadership styles as measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD), a measure of leadership effectiveness. The focus was to determine whether these two instruments possessed sufficient discriminative powers to effect a distinction between effective and ineffective administrators prior to their appointment as administrators.

The findings are summarized as follows: (1) The difference between the scores that was used to determine temperament and effectiveness was significant. Forty five percent of the subjects preferring the Sensing/Thinking Type regardless of the leadership effectiveness when compared to general norms. (2) The difference between the scores for the different personality characteristics of effective/ineffective administrators was statistically significant in the Perception and Judgement characteristics regardless of their overall leadership style. (3) The difference between the scores for determining personality types of effective or ineffective administrators was significant. The principals selected Sensing/Thinking/Judgement and Intuitive/Thinking/Judgement Type, indicating that seventy percent are Thinking/Judging Type. (4) The difference between the scores for determining the dominant processes was not significantly different from the general norms established by Myers-Briggs sampling. In essence the proportion of principals selecting between extravert and introvert was not greater or less than expected. (5) The difference between the scores for determining the relationship between the personality type scores, and the scores used to determine effectiveness was not significant. Indicating that one can be effective in a leadership position regardless of personality type.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Two of the most critical elements in the leadership situation were the personality of the leader and leadership style. Based upon their experience, education, and training leaders develop a specific style of leadership. Leadership style and personality are not what the leader perceives their behavior to be, but rather what others perceive as leadership depending on the situation. Many psychologists contended that basic personality structures developed very early in life. They suggested that few personality changes could be made after the age of seven or eight. Therefore, only the elements of leadership were pliable during our adult life. (Hersey, Blanchard, 1977) For a diagrammed illustration see Appendix Fig. 1.

Hersey and Blanchard indicated:

As individuals mature, they developed habit patterns, or condition responses, to various stimuli. The sum of these habit patterns as perceived by others determined their personality.

habit a, habit b, habit n = personality
As individuals begin to behave in a similar fashion under similar conditions, this behavior was what others learned to recognize as personality. They expected and could even predict certain kinds of behavior from these people. (Hersey, Blanchard, 1981)

Hersey and Blanchard continued:

Early in life, this behavior represented a larger portion of the total past experience of a young person that the same behavior input will in later life. In addition, the longer behavior is reinforced, the more patterned it becomes and the more difficult it is to change. That is why it is easier to make personality changes early in life. The older a person gets, the more time and new experiences are necessary to effect a change in behavior. (Hersey, Blanchard 1977)

Because of these factors, more emphasis would be placed upon the possibility of training individuals in adapting leadership behaviors which are more congruent with their already existing personality patterns.

Several investigators including Myers and Briggs (1962) and Keirsey and Bates (1978) came to the conclusion that prediction would be improved if subjects were clustered into personality groups for they should share common response patterns based on their personality types.

Many of the new "typologists" used clusters derived from empirical data, while the Myers-Briggs Research
based its groupings on Jungian Theory. Jung's Theory of Psychological Types was only one small part of his Personality Theory. It was concerned mainly with conscious elements of personality. It assumed that to function well, an individual must have a well-developed system for perceiving (either Sensing or Intuitive) and have a well-developed system for making decisions or judgments (either by Thinking or Feeling). There must be a way to perceive the stimuli and to make the response. (McCaulley, 1974)

In dealing with the leadership styles of principals, extensive leadership studies had been done; such as the one at Ohio State University in the 1950's. (Shartle, 1956)

A major conclusion drawn from this study indicated that leadership behavior could be classified into two independent factors called "initiating structures" and "consideration". (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). Additional studies conducted at the University of Michigan suggested that leadership behavior could be viewed as moving from an employee-centered extreme to a production-centered extreme (Guetzkow, 1951). In recent years the Michigan view was modified to see production-centered and employee-centered more as independent variables rather than as a continuum.
The essential similarity in these studies was the identification and emphasis on the task and relationship variables. These represent two different kinds of behavior which a manager exhibited at any time and in any combination or degree of the two. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) concluded that the successful leader was one who was keenly aware of those forces which were most relevant to his behavior at any given time. When considering these forces the leadership style changed from situation to situation. In changing from one leadership style to another, the person to whom the leadership role fell was influenced by his or her own personality which Keirsey and Bates suggested was basically a constant. The question then arose, do leaders have a common personality type which leads them to seek out the leadership role. (Keirsey & Bates, 1978)

Statement of The Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine what were the relationships, if any, that existed between the most common personality types of selected elementary school principals, as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), and the most effective leadership
styles as measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD), a measure of leadership effectiveness. The focus will be to determine whether these two instruments possessed sufficient discriminative power to effect a distinction between effective and ineffective administrators prior to their appointment as administrators.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Questions and Hypotheses Investigated

The following questions were investigated in this study:

1. Do effective administrators in CCSD demonstrate different temperament dimensions, from ineffective administrators?
2. Do effective administrators in CCSD demonstrate different personality characteristics from ineffective administrators?
3. Do effective administrators in CCSD demonstrate different personality types from ineffective administrators?
4. Do effective administrators in CCSD demonstrate different dominant processes from ineffective administrators?
5. Is there a relationship between these personality type scores and those scores which identify an administrator as effective or ineffective?

Hypotheses tested in this study included:

1. There is no significant relationship between the different temperament dimensions as measured by the MBTI (extraversion vs intraversion), and ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD at the .05 level of confidence.

2. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in personality characteristics, as measured by the MBTI, and effective or ineffective administrators as measured by the LEAD.

3. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in personality types, as measured by the MBTI and effective or ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD.

4. There is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence on the different dominant processes, as measured by the MBTI, and effective or ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD.
5. There is no relationship between these personality type scores and those scores which identify an administrator as effective or ineffective on the LEAD.

There is a significant relationship to the .05 confidence level between the personality scores obtained on the MBTI and principal effectiveness as measured by the LEAD.

Null Hypotheses

There will be no significant relationship between personality scores on the MBTI and effective leadership as measured by the LEAD.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were implicit in this investigation:

1. Leadership style and its adaptation to particular situations constitutes a major component of an effective leader.
2. Leadership styles postulated in the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) could be amenable to training and thus subject to developmental change (Halpin, 1957)
3. Certain personality types will correlate more effectively with certain types of leaders.

Delimitations

The following delimitations may affect the extent to which the results can be generalized:

1. The study will be delimited to selected elementary school principals in the Clark County School District; therefore, the results may not apply to other school districts.

2. The principals used in this study must have had two or more years of effective (successful) administration, as based upon their evaluations by their superiors. Perception of supervision regarding their leadership effectiveness could be biased.

3. The two factors of personality type and leadership style do not account for all the variance in observable leadership management style.

4. Statistical treatment using correlation techniques will indicate a covariation between the cause and effect there by reducing the probability of other causality.
Limitations of the Study

The following limitations may have affected the extent to which the results might be generalized:

1. To the degree that any of the assumptions set forth were not met, the internal and external validity of the investigation would be limited.

2. Preceptions of principals regarding their leadership management style may be biased according to their value perceptions of the statements on the LEAD.

3. Perceptions of principals regarding their personality type may be biased according to their value perceptions of the statements on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

4. The two factors of personality and leadership style do not account for all the variance in observed leadership management effectiveness.
Definition of Terms

Terms or words as used in this study were defined below:

1. **Equality**: People, despite all their individual differences, have equal claim to dignity and respect.

2. **Extraversion**: People who consider themselves as social beings; they enjoy people, are warm and open.

3. **Feeling**: Bestowing on things a personal, subjective value.

4. **Introversion**: People who prefer solitary activities; they have few close friends. They are detached and reserved. They tend to hide their feelings from others.

5. **Intuition**: The process of perception by way of the unconscious.

6. **Judging**: The process of coming to a conclusion once perception is made.

7. **Leadership Management Style**: The manner in which a leader behaves as measured by the amount of task orientation and relationship orientations he/she uses.

8. **Perceiving**: The process of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, and ideas.

9. **Relationship Orientations**: The extent to which a leader has personal job relationships, characterized by listening, trusting, and encouraging.

10. **Sensing**: The process by which we become aware of things directly through our five senses.

11. **Task Orientation**: The extent to which a leader directs his own and his subordinate's efforts, characterized by initiating, organizing, and directing.

12. **Thinking**: A logical process, aimed at an impersonal finding.
Organization of the Study

Chapter I presented the background of the problem and a statement of the problem including the purposes of the study, questions to be answered, assumptions, delimitations, limitations, and the definition of terms to be used. Chapter II contained a review of related literature to acquaint the reader with existing studies relative to leadership styles and personality types, including a review of the literature. Situational leadership style and organizational climate were discussed as they pertain to the overall personality type and leadership style of school administrators. Chapter III included the research design, a description of the subjects, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and statistical treatment. Chapter IV contained a presentation, analysis and discussion of the data, and a listing of the findings. Chapter V summarized the findings and present conclusions and recommendations. The study concluded with the references and appendices.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT STYLE

The purpose of this chapter was to review literature in the areas of effective leadership styles, personality types, and the selection procedures used in identifying and selecting school principals. Extensive and rigorous leadership studies were conducted under Shartle's direction at Ohio State University in the late 1940's and early 1950's. (Shartle, 1956) The major emphasis of those studies centered on leadership behavior. Shartle classified leadership behavior into two independent factors called initiating structure and consideration. These terms were used synonymously with task orientation and relations orientation. (Stodgill & Coons, 1957) Initiating structure concerned planning as well as organizing work and tasks. Consideration dealt with maintaining relationships of people. These two types of behavior were important in the understanding of leadership management style. In a study of aircrew commanders, during World War II, Halpin and Winer (1957) found that the structure and consideration behavior variables could account for eighty-three (83%) percent of the differences observed in leader behavior. These two
factors were described as independent because the extent to which a manager used one of them does not help predict the amount of the other that he was utilizing. A manager may be using much of both, little of both, or little of one or the other, or any combination in varying degrees of these two factors.

The University of Michigan's Survey Research Center conducted extensive leadership studies over a great variety of organizations beginning in 1947 (Guetzkow, 1951). In addition further studies were conducted at the center by Kahn & Katz in the 1960's. The central idea they developed for the Michigan Studies was the Michigan style continuum. This continuum suggested that leader behavior could be viewed as moving from an employee-centered (consideration) extreme to a production-centered (task) extreme. However, in recent years the Michigan view was modified to see production-centered and employee-centered more as independent variables rather than on a continuum (Kahn, 1960).

Bales and his associates from Harvard University, have done much work in the study of small group behavior. Most groups studied were experimental groups of college students, and no manager, as defined, was included in the experiment. Despite limitations on the applicability of
his findings, his work produced some results similar to the studies in Ohio and Michigan. (Bales, 1933) Bales and others found that in small groups two quite different kinds of leaders would emerge. One kind they called "the task leader" and the other, they called "the socioemotional leader". These studies and research findings have been the underpinning for other such studies in leadership behavior. While the studies differed on several points, the essential similarity in the majority of them was the identification and emphasis on what is now termed the task and relationships variables.

As a result of the series of studies carried out at Ohio State, Fleishman and Harris (1962) summarized the following two primary dimensions of leadership behavior:

Consideration includes behavior indicating mutual trust, respect and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This does not mean that this dimension reflects a superficial "pat-on-the-back" first name calling kind of human relations behavior. This dimension appeared to emphasize a deeper concern for members needs and included such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision-making and encouraging more two-way communication. Structure includes behavior in which the supervisor organized and defined group activities and his relation to the group. Thus, he defined the role he expected each member to assume, assigned tasks, planned ahead, established ways of getting things done,
and pushed for production. This dimension seemed to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organizational goals. (Fleishman & Harris, 1962).

Bowers and Seashore (1966) reviewed several factor-analytic studies of leadership behavior and discovered a great deal of common conceptual content. From their studies emerged the following four dimensions of leadership behavior:

**Support**: behavior that enhances someone's feelings of personal worth and importance.

**Interaction facilitation**: behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships.

**Goal Emphasis**: behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goal or achieving excellent performance.

**Work Facilitation**: behavior that helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning, and knowledge.

The concepts implied by these four dimensions appeared, sometimes in combination, sometimes separately, in all but two of the eight investigations analyzed, thus lending substantial confidence to the leadership structure reflected by them. The support dimension corresponded essentially with the consideration dimension, and the work facilitation dimension corresponded with the structure dimension. (Bowers & Seashore, 1966)
The major emphasis discussed in the Ohio State, Michigan, and Group Dynamics Leadership Studies centered around the two theoretical concepts: one that emphasized task accomplishment, and the other stressed the development of interpersonal relationships. Robert P. Blake and Jane S. Mouton have popularized these concepts in the Managerial Grid and have used them extensively in organization and management development programs. In the Managerial Grid, five different types of leadership based on concern for production (task) and concern for people (relationship) are located in four quadrants similar to those identified by the Ohio State Studies. See figure 2.1 (Blake & Mouton, 1981).

The Academic Administrator Grid was a systematic frame work for ordering and compressing into usable form behavioral science theory and research which is significant for understanding and improving leadership in higher education (Blake, Mouton & Williams, 1981). Concern for production was illustrated on the horizontal axis. Production became more important to the leader as his/her rating advanced on the horizontal scale. A leader with a rating of nine on the horizontal axis had a maximum concern for production.
Concern for people was illustrated on the vertical axis. People became more important to the leader as his/her rating progresses up the vertical axis. A leader with a rating of nine on the vertical axis had maximum concern for people.

The two fundamental aspects of the exercises of leadership were emphasized whenever an academic administrator thinks about his or her responsibilities: (1) concern for institutional performance and (2) concern for people.

The administrator must be concerned with the institutional goals and outcomes. He/She is concerned with getting results, either directly or through others. On the other hand, an administrator must be concerned with people (i.e. other administrators, faculty members, students, the general public and parents). Blake, Mouton, and Williams stated that these two concerns were not always present in the same amount and/or at the same time.

The variety of ways in which administrative authority was exercised can be illustrated by using the Academic Administrator Grid. Blake and Mouton had conceived eighty-one possible combinations of concerns which can describe how the administrator views himself, or how others view him/her. However, Blake and Mouton
found the grid most useful when the administrators are grouped into five major administrative styles out of the possible eighty-one. The five were represented on figure 2.1 in the extreme four corners: 1,1; 9,1; 1,9; 9,9 and in the very middle 5,5 of the grid. Thus, the authors utilized the five main Grid styles as broadly descriptive of the most distinctive approaches to administration. (Blake, Mouton, & Williams, 1981)

The five major Grid styles were described as follows:

1,1 Caretaker Administration: Little concern for institutional performance is the defining characteristic of a 1,1-oriented administrator, and low involvement in exercising power and authority is typical of this administrative style. Such an administrator desires little, strives for little, gives little, gets little and cares little, one way or the other. The concern or involvement of the administrators' associates or subordinates is also likely to be low because of the lack of leadership. The exception is the eager subordinate who either misinterprets the administrators' indifference and accepts it as delegation or seeing it as indifference, seizes the "delegation" anyway--a tactic particularly characteristic of 9,1-oriented subordinates.

9,1 Authority-Obedience Administration: The lower right corner of the Grid, represented by 9,1, is where a high concern for institutional performance comes together with a low concern for the people with whom one is dealing. An administrator acting under these assumptions concentrates on getting results by exercising power and authority in a unilateral way and by
extracting obedience from those with whom he/she deals. A person with 9,1 orientation thus is deeply involved and committed to an institutional mission and drives himself and others in the interest of results. But this kind of administrator views subordinates as little more than agents whose job it is to carry out the dictates of the administrator. The effect of the administrator’s 9,1 orientation on the involvement of subordinates is likely to be adverse because they see the administrator’s behavior as thoughtless and arbitrary; foot dragging, and other work hinderances, if not out-and-out antiorganization tactics might be indulged in as a means of discharging their resentment.

1,9: Comfortable and Pleasant Administration: This orientation occurs where concern for institutional performance is low and concern for people is all-important. The administrator working according to these assumptions believes that when people are happy, results will take care of themselves and that there will be little or no need for supervision. The 1,9 oriented administrator sees "togetherness" as a way of getting approval and wants subordinates to feel themselves to be part of the one big happy family. Such an administrator goes all out to see that subordinates are satisfied with working conditions in order to avoid being rejected by them. Low concern for production and high concern for acceptance help generate subordinate identification with the work group and enjoyment of its social activities, both on the job and beyond. Administrative focus is on the human dimension, with performance deemphasized. This situation is found when high concern for morale is coupled with low concern for productivity.

5,5: Constituency-Centered Administration: The 5,5 orientation
occurs when a moderate concern for institutional performance is coupled with a moderate concern for people. The 5,5 oriented administrator maintains a balance between results and people, so that neither concern dominates the other. He/She goes along with the majority, hoping to avoid being seen as unreasonable in the exercise of power and authority. The 5,5 oriented administrator attempts to gain acceptable results by doing whatever is expected by his or her superiors, while simultaneously avoiding actions that might upset the applecart and lead to criticism. He or she tries to be a constituency builder, and this attempt may reflect a personal need to be popular and "in". This kind of administrator is unlikely to be deeply committed to institutional performance and thus runs the risk of being censured. To avoid embarrassing the administrator, subordinates are expected to put forth appropriate effort and to conform.

9,9: Team Administrator: A 9,9 orientation involves an integration of concerns: a high concern for institutional performance combined with a high concern for people. This integration is carried out in ways that encourage subordinates to achieve the highest possible satisfaction. The consequences of 9,9 oriented administration are that subordinates also develop a personal commitment to organizational achievement. Involvement is generated in people who are able to mesh their individual efforts for the accomplishment of meaningful goals that are both sound and creative.

All but a very few administrators had styles that were characteristic or typical of them. This was their dominant style (Blake, Mouton, 1981).
In essence, the Managerial Grid has provided a popular use of terminology to five points within the four quadrants of the Ohio State Studies. However, there was one significant difference between the two frameworks: "concern for" was a predisposition about something or an attitudinal dimension. Therefore, the Managerial Grid tends to be an attitudinal model that measured the predisposition of a manager or leader, while the Ohio State framework tended to be a behavioral model that examined how leader actions were perceived by others. The Managerial Grid also implied that the most desirable leader behavior was "team management" or most commonly known as "team administration" (maximum concern for production and people). In fact, Blake and Mouton (1968) have developed training programs that attempt to change managers toward a 9,9 management style which places an emphasis on both the concern for production, and a concern for people.

Halpin (1959), used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in a study of school administrators, found that the administrators he interviewed had a tendency to view Consideration and Initiating Structure as either/or forms of leader behavior at the expense of the other. Halpin stressed that this conflict between Initiating Structure and Consideration should not necessarily exist.
He felt that effective or desirable leadership behavior was characterized by high scores on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. Thus, the Ohio State Leadership Studies seemed to conclude that the high Initiating Structure and high Consideration Style was theoretically the best leader behavior, while the style low on both dimensions was theoretically the worst.

Gilligan (1980) used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as a measure of perceived leader effectiveness to determine if elementary school principals scoring high on both the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions would also score higher on an analytic leadership style. The analytic style, as measured by Edward's Situational Preference Inventory (SPI) was characterized by flexibility, accuracy of perception, and ability to see alternatives (Edwards, 1973). The results reported by Edward's study indicated a significantly higher level of analytic style for principals scoring high on both dimensions of the LBDQ.

Leadership styles have emerged and have been developed by the Ohio State Studies which identified the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions of leader behavior. Most authors implied that the most desirable leader behavior was characterized by high scores on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.
Some felt that leader behavior high in Initiating Structure was more authoritarian; where leader behavior high in Consideration was more democratic. Additional factors of leadership style were subsequently identified, and research began to include a broader range of leader behaviors including personality (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977).

PERSONALITY TYPE

Hersey and Blanchard (1977) indicated that one of the most difficult changes to make is a complete change in the style of a person, and that is precisely what industry and educational institutions have attempted, spending millions of dollars annually for training and development programs that concentrate on changing the style of its leaders. As Fiedler suggested:

A person's leadership style reflects the individual's basic motivational and need structure. At best it takes one, two, or three years intensive psychotherapy to effect lasting changes in personality structure. It is difficult to see how we can change, in more than a few cases, an equally important set of core values in a few hours of lectures and role playing or even in the course of a more intensive training program of one or two weeks.

Changes in leadership styles of managers is a slow and deliberate process. Changes in leadership styles
require creative planning and patience. Likert (1962) found that it takes from three to seven years, depending on the size and complexity of the organization, to implement a new management theory effectively. He stated:

Haste is self-defeating because of the anxieties and stresses it creates. There is no substitute for ample time to enable the members of an organization to reach the level of skillful and easy habitual use of the new leadership.

The search for effective school administrators by the various school districts throughout the country concentrates on finding the right person for the job. Aside from possessing the necessary skills of organizing, communicating, etc., the districts and state agencies have begun to reexamine their criteria for certifying, selecting, and evaluating principals. They are developing a wide range of new preservice and inservice training approaches. (Manasse, NASSP, 1982)

Keirsey and Bates (1978) indicated that people are different from each other and that no amount of persuasion for them to change can effect a lasting change. They pointed out that:

People are different in fundamental ways. They want different things; they have different motives, purpose, aims, values, needs, drives, impulses, urges. Nothing is more fundamental than that.
They believe differently; they think, cognize, conceptualize, perceive, understand, comprehend, and cogitate differently. And of course, manners of acting and emoting, governed as they are by wants and beliefs, follow suit and differ radically among people.

The variable of personality is being considered of greater importance when selecting individuals for a leadership role. The ability to work with and the manner in which a leader relates to others when handling conflicts and ambiguity, as well as the ability to work closely with others on a face-to-face basis, related directly to one's temperament and personality. (Keirsey & Bates, 1978)

Jung (1923) believed that people are different in fundamental ways even though they all have the same multitude of instincts (archetypes) to drive them from within. He believed that one instinct was no more important than another. What was important was our preference for how we "function" and that our preference for a given "function" was characteristic, and so we may be "typed" by this preference. Thus Jung invented the "function types" or "Psychological Types".

Another psychiatrist, Kretschmer (1925) believed that there were very basic differences in temperament. We were divided into two opposed temperamental camps, the
"schizoid" and the "cycloid". In saying this Kretschmer was basically restating the same points that Jung had made a couple of years earlier.

Jung's work has been conceptualized into an easy and very functional framework by Isabel Myers. Myers, in conjunction with her mother, Kathrine C. Briggs provided a structure for the understanding of Jung's Theory of Personality. Jung's theory once mastered, provided a clear and concise understanding of both similarities and differences among individual people. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was one of the simplest and most reliable methods of determining a person's Jungian type. Many of the insights into the role of personality in influencing human behavior has been developed from research utilizing the Type Indicator. A major emphasis placed on the theory developed by Myers-Briggs was that it enables one to expect specific personality differences in particular people and to cope with the people and the differences in a constructive manner. An important aspect of the theory, that much seemingly chance variation in human behavior, was not due to chance at all; it was in fact the logical result of a few basic, observable differences in the mental functioning of individuals (Myers, Myers, 1980).

These basic differences concerned the way people
"prefer" to use their minds, specifically the way they perceive and the way they made judgments. Perceiving as defined by Jung includes the processes of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, and ideas. Judging included the processes of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived. Jung believed that, together, perception and judgment made up a large portion of people's total mental activity, which governed much of their overt behavior. This is predicated by the belief that perception, by definition, determines what people see in a situation and their judgment determines what they decide to do about it. Thus, it was reasonable to believe that basic differences in perception or judgment should result in corresponding differences in behavior. (Myers-Myers, 1980)

Jung emphasized in his Psychological Types, that mankind was equipped with two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of perceiving. (Fordham, 1966) One means of perception was the familiar process of "sensing". Sensing was the way we became directly aware of things through our five senses. The other was the process of "intuition", which was indirect perception by way of the unconscious, which incorporates ideas and associations that the unconscious contributes. It may range from a masculine "hunch" to what was commonly
called "woman's intuition". The existence of distinct ways of perceiving was self evident; people perceived through their senses, and they also perceived things that could only be imagined. Jung's theory added the suggestions that the two kinds of perception competed for a persons attention and that most people, from infancy, enjoyed one more than the other. When people preferred sensing, they were so interested in the actuality around them that they had little time to spare for imaginary ideas. Those people who preferred intuition were so engrossed in pursuing the possibilities that intuition presented, that they seldom have attention for the realities around them.

As soon as children begin to exercise a preference between the two ways of perceiving, a basic difference in development began. Thus, a natural sequence of events occurred and a distinction was made throughout the life of the child. The child who prefers sensing and the child who prefers intuition developed along divergent lines. Each became relatively adult in an area where the other remains relatively child-like. Both channelled their interests and energy into activities that give them a chance to use their mind the way they prefer. Both acquire a set of surface traits that grow out of the
basic preferences beneath. This is the SN preference: S for sensing and N for intuition. (Myers, Myers, 1980)

Jungian Theory also pointed out that there was a basic difference in judgment which arises from the existence of two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of coming to conclusions. One way was by the use of "thinking" which is a logical process, aimed at an impersonal finding. The other was by "feeling" which was by appreciation, equally reasonable in its fashion, bestowing on things a personal subjective value. People used both means of making decisions; some by thinking and others by feeling. These two methods did not always reach the same results from a given set of facts. The theory suggested that a person was almost certain to enjoy and trust one way of judging more than the other. Whichever judging process a child prefers he or she will use it more often, and trust it more implicitly. When a child prefers thinking, that child develops along divergent lines from the child who preferred feelings, even if both start with the same perceptions and use the same perceptive process. Both are happier and more effective in activities that call for the sort of judgments that they are better equipped to make. The child who prefers feeling becomes more adult in the handling of human relationships. The child who prefers
thinking grew more adept in the organization of facts and ideas. Their basic preference for distinguishing surface traits was the TF preference: T for thinking and F for feeling. (Myers, Myers, 1980)

The TF preference (thinking or feeling) was independent of the SN (sensing or intuition). Either kind of judgment can team up with either kind of perception. This created the four combinations:

- ST Sensing plus Thinking
- SF Sensing plus Feeling
- NF Intuition plus Feeling
- NT Intuition plus Thinking

Each of these combinations produces a different kind of personality which was characterized by the interests, values, needs, habits of mind, and surface traits that naturally result from the combination.

The following paragraphs have been used by Myers-Briggs to sketch the contrasting personalities that were expected in theory and found in practice to result from each of the four possible combinations of perception and judgment:

_Sensing and Thinking:_
The ST people rely primarily on sensing for purposes of perception and on thinking for purposes of judgment. Thus
their main interest focuses upon facts, because facts can be collected and verified directly by the senses: seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, and feeling. ST people approach their decisions regarding these facts by impersonal analysis, because of their trust in thinking, with impersonal analysis, because of their trust in thinking with its step-by-step logical process of reasoning from cause to effect: from premise to conclusion. In consequence, their personalities tend to be practical and matter-of-fact, and their best chances of success and satisfaction lie in fields that demand impersonal analysis of concrete facts, such as economics, law, surgery, business, accounting production, and the handling of machines and materials.

Sensing and Feeling:
The SF people, also rely primarily on sensing for purposes of perception, but they prefer feeling for purposes of judgment. They approach their decisions with personal warmth, because their feeling weighs how much things matter to themselves and others. They are more interested in facts about people than in facts about things and, therefore, they tend to be sociable and friendly. They are most likely to succeed and be satisfied in work where their personal warmth can be applied effectively to the immediate situation, as in pediatrics, nursing, teaching (especially elementary), social work, selling of tangibles, and other service-with-a-smile jobs.

Intuition plus Feeling:
The NF (intuition plus feeling) people possess the same personal warmth as SF people because of their shared use of feeling for purposes of judgment, but because the NF's prefer intuition to sensing, they do not center their attention upon the concrete situation. Instead they focus on possibilities, such as new projects (things that are
not yet known but might be found out). The new project or the new truth is imagined by the unconscious processes and then intuitively perceived as an idea that feels like an inspiration. The personal warmth and commitment with which the NF people seek and follow up a possibility are impressive. They are both enthusiastic and insightful. Often they have a marked gift of language and can communicate both the possibility they see and the value they attach to it. They are most likely to find success and satisfaction in work that calls for creativity to meet a human need. They may excel in teaching (particularly college and high school), preaching, advertising, selling of intangibles, counseling, clinical psychology, psychiatry, writing and most fields of research.

**Intuition plus Thinking:**
The NT people also use intuition but team it with thinking. Although they focus on a possibility, they approach it with impersonal analysis. Often they choose a theoretical or executive possibility and subordinate the human element. NT's tend to be logical and ingenious and are most successful in solving problems in a field of special interest, whether scientific research, electronic computing, mathematics, and the more complex aspects of finance, or any sort of development or pioneering in technical areas.

Most people come in contact with each of the four kinds of people: ST people, who are practical and matter-of-fact; the sympathetic and friendly SF people; NF people who are characterized by their enthusiasm and insight; and the NT people who are logical and ingenious. It is reasonable to be skeptical about the four
apparently basic categories, but people may ask why these categories have gone unnoticed in the past? As Keirsey and Bates pointed out, researchers such as Vernon (1938) cited three systems for classification derived by different methods but strikingly parallel to the four categories described above; each reflected the combinations of perception and judgment. Thurstone (1931), by factor analysis of vocational interest scores, found four main factors corresponding to interest in business, in people, in language, and in science. Gundlach and Gerum (1931), from inspection of interest intercorrelations, deduced five main "types of abilities" namely: technical, social, creative, and intellectual, plus physical skill. (Keirsey, Bates, 1978)

**EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP**

The fields of management and educational administration shared an interest in discovering the components of effective leadership. The process of directing, influencing and motivating subordinates was important whether the leader was a manager in business or the principal of an elementary or secondary school.
Leadership effectiveness continued to be the major focus of studies and there have been numerous empirical studies completed on leadership effectiveness (Yukl, 1982). Although there have not been quite as many studies on principal effectiveness, some of those done have been of the highest quality. In the past, there have not been enough cross references between the two disciplines so that there was a need to share insights, compare findings, and develop integrative models encompassing both types of leadership (Yukl, 1982).

The study of effective leadership utilizing business and/or educational models was a fashionable manner by which leadership could be judged. It was also fashionable to consider each individual as unique, each the product of his or her own heredity and environment. Thus Myers and Briggs have made the assumption that all people are not alike; they do not function or think in the same manner. Their theory in part stated that expected personality differences were present in people. Briefly, the theory was that much seemingly chance variation in human behavior was not due to chance; it was in fact the logical results of a few basic observable differences in mental functioning. This conceptual framework was the typology of Carl Jung. (Myers & Briggs, 1982). Myers and Briggs proposed as their reasons for
personality differences the manner in which people perceive and the manner in which they make judgments. Personality affects the manner in which leaders made decisions, and the types and qualities of these decisions, and these affected a leader's effectiveness. Clark County School District is interested in the effective leader and his or her personality as stated in the following letter from Dr. Orci, Associate Superintendent, Clark County School District.

"The Clark County School District would be most interested in the results of your study concerning the relationship between personality styles and effective leadership. We are always trying to ascertain what makes the most effective administrator before the fact."

Research on effective schools continued to verify the common sense observation that schools were rarely effective, in any sense of the word, unless the principal was a "good" leader. Most of the effectiveness criteria used thus far had been based on test scores in reading and mathematics. However, a more relevant and broader conception of effectiveness is currently taking new meaning and direction (Cawelti, 1984)

Sergiovanni in a lecture to school administrators in San Antonio, Texas pointed out that:

Important differences exist among incompetent, competent, and excellent schools and their leaders. Schools
managed by incompetent leaders simply do not get the job done. Typically such schools are characterized by confusion and inefficiency in operation and malaise in human climate. Student achievement is low in such schools. Teachers may not be giving a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. Student absenteeism, discipline, and violence may be a problem. Conflict may characterize interpersonal relationships among faculty members or between faculty and supervisors. Parents may feel isolated from the school. Schools lead by competent leaders by contrast measure up to standards of effectiveness. They get the job done in a satisfactory manner. Excellent schools exceed the expectations necessary to be considered satisfactory. Students in such schools accomplish far more and teachers work much harder than can ordinarily be expected.

Leadership contained several aspects, each of which contributes uniquely to school competence and to school excellence. The current focus in leadership theory and practice provides a somewhat limited view, that dwells excessively on some aspects of leadership to the virtual exclusion of others. These neglected aspects of leadership can be described as forces available to administrators and supervisors as they influence the events of schooling. Force was the strength or energy brought to bear on a situation to start or stop motion or change. Leadership forces could be thought of as the means available to administrators and the supervisors to bring about or preserve needed changes to improve schools (Sergiovanni, 1984)
Sergiovanni along with the ASCD's National Curriculum Study Institutes have identified at least five leadership forces. These forces had dominated the leadership literature in recent years and were used in training programs which were offered through the ASCD's National Curriculum Study Institutes. The five forces were:

1. The technical leader assumes the role of "management engineer" by emphasizing such concepts as planning and time management technologies, contingency leadership theories, and organizational structures. The leader provides planning, organizing, coordinating, and scheduling to the life of the school. An accomplished management engineer is skilled at manipulating strategies and situations to ensure optimum effectiveness.

2. The human leader assumes the role of "human engineer" by emphasizing such concepts as human relations, interpersonal competence, and instrumental motivational technologies. She or he provides support, encouragement, and growth opportunities to the school's human organization. The skilled engineer is adept at building and maintaining morale and using such processes as participatory decision making.

3. The educational leader assumes the role of "clinical practitioner", bringing expert professional knowledge and bearings they relate to teaching effectiveness, educational program development, and clinical supervision. The clinical practitioner is adept at diagnosing educational problems; counseling teachers; providing for supervision, evaluation, and staff development; and developing curriculum.
One wonders how such essential concerns of school leadership could, for so long, have been neglected in the literature of educational administration.

4. The symbolic leader assumes the role of "chief" and by emphasizing selective attention (the modeling of important goals and behaviors) signals to others what is of importance and value. Touring the school; visiting classrooms; seeking out and visibly spending time with students; downplaying management concerns in favor of educational ones; presiding over ceremonies, rituals, and other important occasions; and providing a unified vision of the school through proper use of words and actions are examples of leader activities associated with this fourth force.

Purposing is a major concern to the symbolic force. Peter Vaill defines purposing as "that continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal leadership which has the effect of inducing clarity, consensus, and commitment regarding the organization's basic purposes". Students and teachers alike want to know what is of value to the school and its leadership.

5. The cultural leader assumes the role of "high priest", seeking to define strengths, and articulate those enduring values, beliefs, and cultural strands that give the school its unique identity. As high priest the leader is engaged in legacy building, and in creating, nurturing and teaching an organizational sage, which defines the school as a distinct entity within an identifiable culture. The words, clan or tribe, come to mind. Leader activities associated with the cultural force include articulating school purposes and missions; socializing new members to the culture; telling stories and maintaining or reinforcing myths, traditions, and beliefs; explaining "the way things operate around here".
developing and displaying a system of symbols over time; and rewarding those who reflect this culture.

In an earlier generation of thought among educational leaders, the "educational aspects" of leadership were considered center stage. Principals were considered to be instructional leaders, and an emphasis on schooling characterized University training programs for educational administrators. However, advances of management and social science theory in educational administration and supervision soon brought to center stage technical and human aspects.

(Educational Leadership, Feb, 84)

John Goodlad had been a persistent critic of the displacement of educational aspects of leadership in favor of technical and human aspects. He stated:

But to put these matters at the center, often for understandable reasons of survival and expedience, is to commit a fundamental error which ultimately, will have a negative impact on both education and one's own career. Our work, for which we will be held accountable, is to maintain, justify, and articulate sound, comprehensive programs of instruction for children and youth. It is time to put the right things at the center again. And the right things have to do with assuring comprehensive, quality educational programs in each and every school under our jurisdiction." (Goodlad 78)

Chester E. Finn the assistant secretary for research and improvement at the Department of Education, wrote:
If we really want to strengthen American schools, then our current focus on teachers is not the most efficient way to begin. He warns that we must not ignore teacher quality, but for greater leverage on the schools, the emphasis must be placed on the school’s principals. He believes that a great school almost always boasts a "crackerjack principal"; indeed, his leadership is often the crucial element in the school’s chemistry.

Finn also believed that the selection of principals, and the manner in which they are trained and certified was grossly ill-suited to the production of savvy risk-taking, entrepreneurial education which the job now demanded. A new vehicle was needed to select, train, and promote quality leaders for our schools. Finn described nine specifications, the designers of principal selectors might want to use to begin the selection:

First, let’s properly define the principal’s role as that of an executive, not a building manager, civil servant, or expert in curriculum and pedagogy. The principal leads a school team that consists primarily of instructional specialists. While he must surely possess clear educational goals and priorities and know about teaching, testing, and curriculum, he need not be an expert in classroom matters provided that he has such experts on the team.

Second, we should radically decentralize educational governance so that the school executive—the principal—is the primary maker of such crucial decisions as who shall be hired and retained on staff; how financial and human resources will be deployed; what rules and
procedures students will follow; even in consultation with teachers, what textbooks will be used.

Third, along with this bold increase in authority must come commensurate changes in accountability. That means more precise mechanisms for appraising the school’s performance, particularly in terms of student achievement. The only way to confer professional sovereignty on the school staff is for policy makers to be able to set standards and prescribe ends for schools in full confidence that they will get the information by which to know how well their objectives are being met. Only then can governors and legislators leave the choice of means to the principal and his team. Otherwise, distant officials will forever be regulating what book should be read, how teachers must spend their time, and how much homework ought to be assigned. Denying authority to the principal and professionalism to teachers, will make it harder to recruit creative and energetic people.

Fourth, the principal should be held personally accountable for the performance of his school, as if he were head of the corporate profit center, the pilot of the plane, the captain of the ship, or president of a college. In him should be vested both the authority and the responsibility for successfully wielding it.

Fifth, it follows that we will need in the principal’s office a person who is capable of bearing a heavy burden of leadership, a risk-taker, a true executive. To this end, we shall enlarge the pool of potential principals to include more than experienced teachers and coaches. (In most states, you must have taught for at least three years to be eligible for certification as a principal). Fine teachers don’t necessarily make good executives or vice versa, and we could surely find some
outstanding principals among leaders in other fields: business executives, college deans, even public officials. Private schools occasionally select non-teachers as principals; public schools could, also.

Sixth, we should jettison "paper credentials" as the means of determining whether an individual is qualified to lead a school, both because abolishing them is the only way to attract more conventional people and because the paper credentials have little to do with the requisites of the job itself. Today, the only route into the principalship in most states is to endure a bunch of graduate courses in an approved program at a college of education. Instead, we should turn to a competency-and-performance standard, such that we can get a "learners permit" based on what you've studied, and a fullfledged license only on the basis of solid performance on the job.

Seventh, principals need a well-structured "career ladder" as much as teachers do, with ascending levels of responsibility and pay, with performance evaluations including peer review at every level, and with clear standards by which success is gauged. A big high school may have fledgling administrators serving internships with a top-notched senior principal; a master principal may be in charge of several buildings in a cluster. No one should get sole responsibility for a school until he has demonstrated executive abilities and leadership prowess.

Eighth, the principals term of employment must be those of an executive. His needs to be a full-time, year around job, with salary linked both to the nature of the responsibility and to the performance of the individual—no tenure, with ample opportunities for advanced leadership training and intellectual renewal, and the right to
be found by a "headhunter" and lured to a better job in another school, and all the rest.

Ninth, the school, system or state, needs to take decisive action when a principal falters badly or his school declines. Educational bankruptcy is serious. The principal may need to be replaced fast. The authority that had been conferred on the school to run itself may need to be suspended. Some of the best school executives may need to serve as "trouble-shooters" who can be dispatched to a stricken school.

Finn also believed that parents should assume a larger role in the selection of the school principal that served any particular community. He also believed that parents should have the right to choose the public school that their children attended. He stated that by allowing parents the flexibility to choose their child's school, we will ultimately increase accountability of both the school and the principal. Such choices would in turn encourage schools to distinguish themselves one from another. This would also effect and reinforce the doctrine of school-level sovereignty, the authority of the school's professional team, and the rewards and risks of dynamic leadership on the principal's part. (Finn, The Wall Street Journal, Feb. 18, 1986).

Authority and responsibility of individual schools must rest with the principal of that school. Goodlad (1984) stated that the guiding principle being put forth
was that the school must become largely self-directing. The people connected with the school must develop a capacity for effecting renewal and establishing mechanisms for creating and monitoring change. If, for example, children's reading scores appear to be declining, improved reading would become a top priority item on the school's agenda. The principal's responsibility would be to set the course for the renewal of the priority to improve the declining reading scores.

But this capacity was lacking in most schools, largely because the principal lacked the requisite skills of group leadership to effectively make these changes happen. Goodlad believed that few beginning principals know how to prepare a year long agenda for school improvement. Goodlad stated:

Current on-the-job training for principals emphasizes their role in instructional improvement. Whatever merit this training may have, it does not usually include provision for developing the principals capacity to lead in the solution of school wide problems. Consequently, I recommend that each district superintendent take as their first order of business, the responsibility for selecting promising prospective principals and developing in them, and in present principals, the ability to lead and manage. In fulfilling this role, it may be necessary for the superintendent to draw upon expert assistance to provide the necessary training. There should be,
waiting in the wings, a sufficient number of qualified persons to take over each principalship as it is vacated.

Goodlad further stated that due to the key role that the principal plays in the effective school, that the superintendent and the school board should go beyond local personnel for candidates to fill principals positions. He stated that the selection committee should include other responsible persons connected with the school for which the principal was being selected. (Goodlad, 1984)

The process of identifying the determinants of principal effectiveness was an ongoing endeavor, however, some implications for improving effectiveness can be identified. Yukl has identified three general strategies for improving leadership in an organization. He has determined that selection, training and situational engineering were some key aspects in effective leaders.

Yukl stated:

Trait research findings suggest that it is possible to use systematic assessment and selection procedures to identify persons who are more likely to be successful as principals. Assessment centers, which are now widely used in industry, are useful for selecting principals and assistant principals. In these centers, relevant traits and skills are assessed by written tests, projective
tests, situational tests, and interviews. School principals known to be effective could serve as assessors in these centers, just as managers now serve on the staff of assessment centers in large corporations. Assessment centers are an expensive selection device, but costs can be reduced by using regional centers and rotating staffs.

Training and development of school principals is another promising approach for improving principal effectiveness.

The least obvious of the strategies for improving principal effectiveness was situational engineering. This strategy consists of changing the leadership situation to make it more favorable for a manager or administrator. Some types of situational changes applicable to school principals include making more resources available, cutting red tape and solving local problems, thus insulating the principal from disruptive outside interference and giving the principal more control over rewards and punishments applicable to both teachers and pupils. Given the political realities of public schools and the problems of decreasing enrollment, diminishing budgets, declining test scores, union militancy and other difficulties, it was doubtful that much can be done to improve the principal's situation or reduce the role stress. Thus, training and development in combination with better selection appeared to be the
most promising approach for applying leadership findings to the improvement of principal effectiveness.

Yukl also believed that there is a much greater need for Schools of Administration, at the various colleges and universities to look for and develop better leadership training programs. (Yukl, 1981)

Studies conducted on the leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals during the last five years, at the University of Texas at Austin, indicate some clear and easily detectable distinctions between more-effective and less-effective principals. William L. Rutherford, a senior research associate of the University of Texas, reports the data indicated that effective principals have five distinct qualities:

1. Effective principals have clear, informed visions of what they want their schools to become; visions that focus on students and their needs. When effective principals were asked "What is your vision for this school: your long range goals and expectations?" Without hesitation, effective principals would begin to list their goals for their schools. The principals responded with an enthusiasm that reflected their personal belief in and active support of these goals. These goals also focused primarily on students. Whereas, less effective principals, when asked the same question paused and gave nonspecific responses, such as "we have a good school and a good faculty, and I want to keep it that way."
2. Translating the vision so that teachers were aware of and could express their principal's visions for the school, resulted in these teachers identifying their principal as the individual most influential in determining what happened in the school. Teachers working under less-effective principals seldomly spoke of their schools or their own work with enthusiasm and excitement. They lacked a common understanding of schoolwide goals and expectations. Students showed little pride in their school. These administrators may keep the train on the track, but they do not generate momentum, nor do they have direction.

3. Effective principals developed and maintained a supportive environment. It was rare, if not impossible, to find a principal who does not deem a good school environment a priority. But effective principals differ significantly from less-effective principals in the way they interpret and implement this concept. Effective principals allocate funding and materials in ways that maximize teaching effectiveness and thus student achievement. In addition, they selectively and systematically apply such other support mechanisms, such as advantageous scheduling, careful assignments of teachers, and the dispensing of recognition to achieve these ends. To them, a good school environment is one that enhances students, learning, and development.

In regard to school environment, less effective principals were primarily concerned with not "rocking the boat". The environment created by these principals were generally placid and nonthreatening. It placed few demands on teachers, but it was also ambiguous and without rewards. Because teachers did not know what was expected of them they tended to chart their own courses. Not surprisingly, teachers in these
schools were less satisfied with the school climate than were teachers in schools with effective principals who had clearly focused goals and who rewarded teachers for attaining these goals.

4. Monitoring used by less effective principals frequently indicate that they do not intend to "rock the boat". They often say "My teachers are all professionals, so I leave them alone to do their work. If they need something they know that they can come to me". The very general way in which these principals described teacher performance suggested that they lacked insight into the daily behaviors of teachers. Monitoring was an activity they carried on in a limited and superficial way, only to the extent required by the school district.

Effective principals provided not only specific details about performance of their teachers but also insights into why the teachers performed as they did. Effective principals provide feedback after every observation. They provide insights and talk about areas that need improvement. The more-effective principals took time to discover what was going on in the classrooms, while their less effective counterparts spend most of their working day handling management or administrative tasks. The more-effective principals gathered information through formal classroom observations, as well as informal methods which included walking in the hallways, ducking in and out of classrooms, attending grade-level meetings, and holding spontaneous conversations with individual teachers.

5. Intervening: the effective principals in the study did more than monitor the happenings in their schools. They looked for positive features and then directly and sincerely recognized and praised the teachers responsible for
them. Such actions made the teachers feel good about themselves and their work. Such actions also supported the goals and expectations that these principals had established for their school.

Although they tended to focus on the positive aspects of their schools, the effective principals also spotted problems and took necessary corrective actions. When a problem involved the performance of a teacher, the effective principals tried to provide the kinds of support and assistance that would yield improvement.

Because the less-effective principals monitored in a limited and superficial way, they lacked specific information about what was happening in their school. Thus they were not able to offer teachers much praise and support. Nor could they readily identify and deal with problems, unless these problems were obvious and pressing.

Rutherford, believed that effective principals differ from less-effective ones in five areas. He asked, "What about effective leaders? Are they all alike?" The answer was both yes and no. Yes, effective school leaders will demonstrate the five essential qualities of leadership in their work. However, they will not demonstrate these qualities through identical day-by-day behaviors. Each principal will determine what needs to be done and then will go about doing what it is that needs
doing. Each will do it in his own "style" yet he will demonstrate the five qualities.

The fact that effective leaders behave in varying ways was positive and encouraging for two reasons identified by Rutherford. He believes that first, this means that the individuals who wish to be effective leaders need not undergo a personality change or take part in therapy aimed at changing their behaviors to fit some predetermined pattern. Second, it means that, as situations change, leaders can modify their behaviors accordingly and still retain their commitment to the five essential qualities-- not the daily behaviors, were the variables that truly determine a leaders' effectiveness." (Phi Delta Kappen, 1985)

SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

The selection process was probably the most critical step in obtaining capable principals. By selecting the right people for the job, superintendents and school boards would obviously eliminate much of the effort that
goes into improving the on-the-job performance of principals and the ill effects that resulted from inadequate leadership. (McCurdy, 1983)

Recognition of the importance of the principalship and the selection process prompted widespread sentiment in favor of reforming the manner in which principals were selected. Principals, themselves, were the first to admit that a more realistic and modern system of selecting the leaders of our nation's public schools was needed. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) found in a survey for its report The Senior High Principalship, that "the most frequent response (of principals) to the question about how the principalship might become a more effective leadership position was to select better people for the position."

Researchers, D. Catherine Baltzell and Robert A Dentler, discovered that the literature on the subject "was thin at best." They interviewed more than 300 school board members, superintendents, and others; they concluded that people who talk about "the way we selected principals here" usually described what was done informally with very little of that committed to paper. Baltzell and Dentler investigated a cross-section of school districts to find out how the selection process worked. They produced Selecting American School
Principals, which they described as the first national study of the principal selection process. Their study confirmed what was often heard about the process: "that the old-boy network" was responsible for selection in many of our nation's public schools. The report also contained some eye-openers about the dissatisfaction of many principals and superintendents with prevailing practices; as well as, the recent significant improvements to the selection procedures. (McCurdy, 1983)

Baltzell and Dentler confirmed that the need for the selection process must remain of vital importance in an effective school system. The research team pointed out that the selection process took on a powerful and widespread symbolic value in the eyes of the public and the profession. They looked to see whether the process reflected the vows of the school leaders to pursue educational excellence. They pointed out that the process directly affected the principals themselves. They noted "without clearly articulated criteria for basing final employment decisions, principals were left wondering why they had been appointed, and subsequently this undercut their leadership roles."

The Southern Regional Education Board noted in a 1983 report, The Preparation and Selection of School Principals, that districts can no longer afford the
chance or political type of selection process. School districts must exercise greater care to identify strong potential administrators and be willing to invest in those persons over a long term. The report strongly urged the use of "objective means" in selecting principals.

In the past, there has been a "traditional method" of selecting principals throughout the nation. Baltzell and Dentler described the recent history of the selection processes this way:

"Since at least the era of the Great Depression, principals in big urban public schools tended to be selected in a fashion that was a mixture of intramural patronage and grooming for the position through the early identification of classroom teachers and athletic coaches by school administrators, with some procedures for certifying, rating and ranking candidates through a combination of state certification and local examination procedures."

The situation began to change in the last decade; however, it has not changed sufficiently to make merit the overriding factor in the selection of principals.

Baltzell and Dentler described the selection process in the ten districts studied in depth. They said, seventy-five percent (75%) of the principalship vacancies were filled with candidates from within the district or from districts within a thirty-mile radius. Vacancy
announcements did not describe the job in detail, and the distribution of the announcements was limited. In effect, the researchers concluded the procedures did not suggest a vigorous search. The basic criteria used by the districts to determine eligibility of candidates for selection were usually vague and minimal. The local requirements for education and experience of candidates were usually the same as those for state certification. But little was demanded concerning skills or accomplishments that were thought to translate into effective administration. (McCurdy, 1983) Typical requirements and criteria for selecting a principal were certification, advanced graduate work, an excellent teaching reputation, and a personable and likable manner. Arthur Blumberg and William Greenfield pointed out in their book, The Effective Principal, that these criteria were not guarantees of effectiveness as a principal.

In a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Baltzell and Dentler stated:

"In spite of the pervasive rhetoric to the contrary, educational leadership is generally not a very well specified or widely applied criterion for selecting principals. Top decision makers all speak with sincere intensity about the primacy of finding the best educational leaders, yet, when pressed, none could specify precisely what basic training or experience requirements this need generated for (principals) candidates."
Fewer than twenty percent (20%) of the top decision makers interviewed by the researchers described specific skills as selection criteria, such as training in curriculum, abilities in teacher evaluation/observation, or accomplishments in raising student academic achievement. Even when they did, such criteria were not specified in writing as job qualifications. Commonly used selection criteria in the districts studied were ambiguous and almost never written down or even expressly stated, but they had to do with one’s image or "fit" with local notions of what a "good" principal should be. Baltzell and Dentler stated:

"The issue of "fit" emerged as centrally important in terms of selection criteria. Every district had a deeply held, almost subconscious image of a "good" principal or a "top" candidate or "just what we’re looking for." However, time and time again, this "fit" seemed to rest in interpersonal perceptions of a candidate’s physical presence, projection of a certain self-confidence and assertiveness, and embodiment of community values and methods of operation."

These findings indicated that personal characteristics, appearance, mannerisms, social reputation, and the like typically comprised the criteria used to select school principals. The need to measure up to this image, moreover, produced a certain kind of principal who was fairly representative over the years.
(i.e. white, male, and often with a coaching background in athletics). (McCurdy, 1983)

The final selection of a candidate to fill the vacant job of a principal was nearly always made by the superintendent, who picked from a list of finalists compiled by a screening committee. That act sometimes represented only the most visible sign of the superintendent's influence, which was exerted throughout the process. The committee was centered in the hands of the top administrators that had been appointed by the superintendent, and they usually knew or were made aware of the type of person being sought. The superintendent took into account the views of others, such as the top staff, the school board, and interested community parties. However, choice was clearly made by the top executive. (Baltzell, Dentler, 1983)

Based upon their findings of selection practices, Baltzel and Dentler drew the conclusions that what was needed and what districts themselves wanted in order to improve their procedures were:

1. knowledge about how to sharpen statements of selection criteria, especially those pertaining to leadership skills.
2. Methods to assess the performance records of candidates.

Baltzell and Dentler noted that the roles of school principals and middle management in private industry were similar. While the state of the art in principal selection was "rather primitive, managerial selection processes were more advanced and could be used to improve principal selection procedures. Managerial programs develop selection criteria and eliminate unqualified candidates through a review of applications and a background and reference check. However, the key was the "employment exams". In private industry, these included selection tests, interviews, and most important assessment centers. (Baltzel & Dentler, 1983)

Tests have been found to be an ineffective method of predicting how effective higher level managers will be: the personal interview can be highly subjective unless interviewers are extremely well trained. At assessment centers, candidates were given tests and interviews to evaluate their abilities, potentials, strengths and weaknesses, and motivation. The testing took from one day to a week, and could include management games, group discussions, simulated activities, "in-basket" exercises, written tests, and personality tests, etc. School districts were using a combination of these two
approaches. Baltzell and Dentler identified the following phases of the selection process in which improvement had been evident:

Superintendent's control: Authority and control over the selection process are more widely shared among top-level administrators instead of being confined to a small echelon of advisers.

Selection criteria: These have been spelled out in greater detail and linked directly to merit standards. One district had wanted to recruit principals capable of school-based management, for example, required courses in school law, finance, budgeting, curriculum, or personnel management for candidates. Another district established the position of curriculum coordinator as a prerequisite step for elementary principal reflecting its desire to obtain principals who are curriculum leaders.

Applicant pool: More time and energy are devoted to developing and maintaining a ready pool of tested and assessed applicants. One district periodically rates perspective candidates and separates this step from the screening process. Another keeps a current file on potential candidates who have had entry screening and have been apprentices in required positions. In two other districts, the pool is made up of the candidates who have completed required internships.

Screening: Screening committees are used but they are often multiple and much time and efforts go into scrutinizing candidates. More candidates wash out at this point. In one district, all candidates were rated on the basis of a complex and lengthy application form and also on references, work history, and interviews. In another candidates for
Internships were subjected to "administrative competence sessions," which are mini-assessment centers. Screening in these districts became a two- or three-layer process.

Selection decisions: Superintendents still make the choices but they rely heavily on the evidence from the selection process instead of primarily on personal judgement or that of trusted assistants. In such districts, "sponsorship" and connections simply do not matter; an applicant who cannot get by these gates is not a candidate.

Sex and ethnic equity: Some districts plan ahead to appoint women and minorities and do so without abandoning merit. One way they do it is by making certain that candidate pools were larger and contained women and minorities. This is accomplished through advertising and using networks for women and minority applicants. One district uses an external monitor to supplement the checking of various stages of the process to make certain that considerations of equity are applied.

These elaborate selection procedure were costly compared to less systematic practices. However, the researchers pointed out that "much more time and money were expended per applicant, but the benefits were so great as to justify the high costs. (Baltzell, & Dentler, 1983)

Baltzell and Dentler pointed out the advantages of having a successful selection system: one of which was that it was an open system. Anyone who meets clearly stated and widely circulated criteria may apply and it is
understood that all qualified candidates have an equal chance at appointment. Preparation in terms of experience and competencies was the basis for appointment, which allows everyone equal opportunity to work to meet eligibility criteria based on merit. Selection procedures were vigorous. These included exacting standards during training and interviewing, challenging written work, demanding evaluation, and the like. Finally, appointment outcomes were the real test. Superior candidates and appointees should result from the process.

The most important and most significant progress made in incorporating essential features of successful selection systems has been credited to assessment centers. In recent years, they became a burgeoning movement in education for the selection of elementary and secondary principals. The most comprehensive, systematic, and potentially important effort in this area was the National Association of Secondary School Principal's Assessment Center Project. According to Judy Aldrich, the Director of the Clark County Assessment Center, the Clark County School District began using the National Association of Secondary School Principal's Assessment Center in 1985. Candidates for selection into the administrative ranks in the district were not all
required to attend the assessment center; however, more and more emphasis was being placed on the center.

Baltzell and Dentler, who did the most thorough outside analysis of the NASSP'S Project, described an assessment center as "a rigorous psychometric tool that involved a group of trained observers in the behavioral evaluation of aspiring educational administrators as they performed tasks designed to empirically measure their skills." They pointed out that the success of the center was the result of:

1) using simulations that tapped a wide variety of behaviors demanded of school administrators, and (2) rigorously training assessors who conduct the center in the requisite observational and scoring techniques. The assessment center was conducted by a group of six highly trained assessors (both principals and district administrators) who observed, measured, and evaluated, at one time, twelve candidates while performing in the exercises and simulations. Assessors participated in three-day training sessions prior to their first center event and were monitored for at least the first two times that they conducted sessions. The six assessors evaluated each of the twelve participants on these twelve skill dimensions:

i. Problem analysis: Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex
information to determine the important elements of a problem.

2. **Judgment**: Skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to reach logical conclusions and make high-quality decisions based on available information; ability to critically evaluate written communication.

3. **Organizational ability**: Ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.

4. **Decisiveness**: Ability to recognize when a decision is required and to act quickly.

5. **Leadership**: Ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to get others involved in solving problems, to effectively interact with and guide a group.

6. **Sensitivity**: Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; tact; skill in resolving conflicts; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.

7. **Range of interests**: Competence to discuss a variety of subjects (e.g., educational, political, economic); desire to actively participate in events.

8. **Personal motivation**: Showing that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.

9. **Educational values**: Possession of well reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to change and new ideas.
10. **Stress tolerance**: Ability to perform under pressure and opposition.

11. **Oral communication skills**.

12. **Written communication skills**.

Districts using assessment centers may choose to weigh all skill dimensions equally or differently in evaluating the performance of candidates. During the two days at the center, candidates were put through six exercises, each designed to measure at least six of the twelve dimensions. Included were five simulations taken from the daily experiences of principals, as well as a semi-structured personal interview.

The simulations included leaderless group activities, two "in-basket" exercises and one fact-finding and decision-making simulation. One group activity required the analysis and group discussion of a case study concerning the problems faced by a fictitious school and the community in which it was located.

The in-basket exercises required participants to play the role of a newly appointed administrator in a fictitious school. Background information was furnished and a package of mail, reports and similar information were presented for handling.

In the fact-finding and decision-making simulations, candidates were given a small amount of information about an
incident or problem. The task was to ask questions of a
resource person in order to develop an understanding of the
situation and recommend a course of action leading to a
solution.

Assessors spend five days at a center preparing; they
observe candidates and hold post-event group meetings to
discuss candidate ratings. The final rating reports, which
covered areas of strengths and weaknesses, needs for
improvements, and training recommendations, were given to
the individual candidates and discussed in confidential
interviews with designated persons. (Baltzell & Dentler,
1983) According to P. Hersey, the over-all evaluation of
the centers indicated that the assessment centers were
working to produce good principals. Three years of
evaluation by a research team from Michigan State University
indicated that the performance measures of the centers were
all positive, showing high correlations between assessment
ratings and job performance of candidates selected as
principals and assistant principals. Hersey added that the
three - year evaluation shows:

1. that assessors reached agreement on
   ratings and candidates, demonstrating
   consistency in the use of objective
   measures to evaluate their behavior.

2. that the assessors' recommendations
   for placement of candidates were based
   on information derived from the center
activities and not on extraneous or subjective criteria.

3. that the exercises in the assessment center program reflected the tasks that principals were required to perform on the job and that mastery of these tasks was essential to successful performance.

4. that a strong relationship was found between assessment scores of candidates and measures of subsequently appointed principals. Candidates who received high ratings in the assessment centers turned out to be top performers on the job. Ratings of on-the-job performance using the criteria incidented were made by teachers, support staff, and supervisors working with the principals who had gone through the centers.

The evaluation team included that the assessment center "represents a valuable, job-relevant instrument for the selection of school administrators." (Hersey, 1983)
METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the relationship, if any, between the personality types and effective leadership styles that may exist between elementary school principal groups in the Clark County School District. The study further sought to determine what relationship, if any, exists between the most common personality types of selected elementary school principals as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the most effective leadership styles as measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD), a measure of leadership effectiveness. The focus was to determine whether these two instruments possessed sufficient discriminative power to effect a distinction between effective and ineffective administrator's personality types and effective leadership style which could be used to determine these qualities prior to their appointment as administrators.
SUBJECTS

The subjects for this investigation were 66 elementary school principals who were selected on the basis of their completion of one year of service as a principal in the Clark County School District. Of the 66 principals, 11 were females, and 55 were males. Ethnic background of the subjects was not considered in this investigation. Age of the subjects was not considered a factor for the purpose of this investigation.

INSTRUMENTATION

The instrument used to measure the personality types of the principals was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). (Myers-Briggs, 1962) The MBTI tested the various combinations possible that individuals possessed as their own distinct personality type. The conceptual framework by which Myers and Briggs organized their observations was based upon the conceptual work of Karl Jung's Theory of Personality Types. Jung's theory, once mastered, could provide a structure for understanding both similarities and differences among human beings.

The MBTI was designed to measure preferences in four broad areas:

a. extroversion, liking social situations and being with large groups of people
vs. introversion, liking individual and limited social interactions.

b. sensing, a liking for facts, experiences and present realities vs. intuition, preferring theories, implications, and future possibilities.

c. thinking vs. feeling, choices and relationships.

d. a preference for orderly, scheduled, planned situations and events, vs. those which are spontaneous, unplanned and unstructured.

The subjects were provided instructions for completing the MBTI. They were asked to answer the indicator to reflect their own perceptions and preferences as they related to effectiveness in their current position of elementary school principal.

The MBTI was designed to provide an understandable, as well as, a workable method of determining one’s personality type. The test takes approximately 20 minutes to administer. The test contains 80 questions and the subjects were asked to circle the letter “A” or “B” of the choice they “value” the most. Their choice to reflect what seemed preferable, appealing and/or best fit their lifestyle.

The purpose of the MBTI as defined by Myers and Briggs was to implement Jung’s Theory of Type. (1923) The major emphasis of the theory was that much apparently random variation in human behavior was actually quite orderly and consistent due to certain basic differences
in the way people preferred to use perception and judgment. The MBTI aimed to ascertain, from self-report of easily reported reactions, people's basic preferences in regard to perception and judgment, so that the effects of the preference and their combinations may be established by research and put to practical use. Myers and Briggs have identified the four preferences and describes them to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Affects Indiv. Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Extraversion/Introversion</td>
<td>Whether to direct perception and judgment upon environment or world of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Sensing/Intuition</td>
<td>Which of these two kinds of perception to rely on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Thinking/Feeling</td>
<td>Which of these two kinds of judgment to rely on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>Judgment/Perception</td>
<td>Whether to use judging or perceptive attitude for dealing with environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EI index was designed to reflect whether the person was an extravert or an introvert in the sense intended by Jung, who coined the terms. The extravert was oriented primarily to the outer world, and thus tended to focus his perception and judgment upon people and things. The introvert was oriented primarily to the inner world postulated in Jungian theory, and thus tended
to focus his perception and judgment upon concepts and ideas.

The SN index was designed to reflect the person's preference as between two opposite ways of perceiving, (i.e. whether he relied primarily on the familiar process of sensing, by which he was made aware of things directly through one or another of the five senses, or primarily on the less obvious process of intuition, which is understood as indirect perception by way of the unconscious, with emphasis on ideas or associations which the unconscious tacks on to the outside things perceived.)

The TF index was designed to reflect the person's preference as between two opposite ways of judging (i.e. whether he relied primarily upon thinking, which discriminated impersonally between true and false, or primarily on feeling, which discriminated between valued and not-valued.)

The JP index was designed to reflect whether the person relied primarily upon a judging process (T or F) or upon a perceptive process (S or N) in his dealings with the outer world. That is, the extraverted part of his life. (Myers, Briggs, 1983)
The purpose of the MBTI was to ascertain a person's basic preferences. EI, SN, TF, and JP were therefore indices designed to point one way or the other, rather than scales designed to measure traits. What each was intended to reflect was a habitual choice between opposites, analogous to right or left handedness. Thus EI means E or I, rather than E to I. The items of each index offered "forced" choices involving the preference at issue. Responses pointing to the opposite direction 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. (Manual for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, 1962)

The Type Tables in the following examples indicate the meanings of the letter combinations and they also illustrate the use of frequencies in making discoveries about the individual types.

Figure 3 was based on data from Miller's study (1967) of students from seven law schools including the dropouts. The number of dropouts from each type was indicated, preceded by a minus sign, on the same line with the frequency from that type. The Drop Out Ratio
(DOR), which was the type's percentage dropout divided by the percentage dropout for the sample as a whole.

The results were clearly cut. The essential for law school was T, preferably TJ. All four types had positive self-selection and a lower-than-average dropout rate. The conclusion therefore, was that law school was best tackled by the tough-minded.

The sample of Rhodes Scholars, shown in Figure 3.2 was the result of stringent competition. The findings indicated that a majority of the Rhodes Scholars were feeling types, probably because in defining the scholar Rhodes desired, his will stressed kindness and interest in others. (Myers-Briggs, 1983)

The Type Table in Figure 3.3 which portrays Von Fange's Canadian School Administrators (1961) was unique. It was all top and bottom which translated into Thinking and Feeling types on the MBTI. However, in dealing with the world around them, 86% of these personalities used a Judgment approach. It probably was this ability, to make endless decisions without growing weary, that was a necessity for keeping the educational system on an even keel.

Effective leadership style was measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD).
The LEAD instrument was developed at the Center for Leadership Studies, Ohio University, and is currently being used for gaining insight into personal feedback on individual leadership styles. The LEAD consists of twelve (12) items with four possible choices for each item. Subjects are asked to respond in a manner which assumes that they are directly involved in each of the twelve situations. They were asked not to respond to the items as if they were a part of a test or in terms of what they thought a leader or manager ought to do. They were asked to respond to the items in terms of the way they thought they would behave in the past when they were faced with situations that might have been similar to those described or in terms of the way they thought they would behave if they were faced with each of these situations. The subjects were asked to interpret key concepts in terms of the environment or situation in which they most often thought of themselves assuming a leadership role. They were to respond to the items sequentially, beginning with the item number one and proceeding all the way through item number twelve. They were asked not to go back over each item, but rather stay with their original response.
The LEAD was developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1974) and was designed to measure three aspects of behavior:

1. **Style**
2. **Style range**
3. **Style adaptability**

Each of these three aspects were briefly described:

1. Your basic leadership style was defined as the style or styles for which you have the most responses on the twelve-item LEAD instrument, (i.e. Style 1 high task/low relationship; Style 1 high task/low relationship—referred to as "Selling" because this style was characterized by one-way communication in which the leader defined the role of the followers and told them what, how, when and where to do various tasks.)

2. Style 2 was defined as high task/high relationship and was referred to as "selling" because with this style most of the direction was still provided by the leader. He/She also attempted through two-way communication and socioemotional support to get the follower(s) psychologically to buy into decisions that have to be made.

3. Style 3 was defined as high relationship/low behavior and was called "participating" because with this style the leaders and follower(s) now share in decision making through two-way communication with much facilitating behavior from the leader since the followers have the ability and knowledge to do the task.

4. Style 4 was referred to as low relationship/low task behavior and was labeled "delegating" because the style involved letting follower(s) "run their own show" through delegation and general supervision since the follower(s) were in both task and psychological maturity. See fig. 3.4.
When working with the four basic styles, Hersey and Blanchard suggested that "situational theories of leadership behavior were almost an automatic result of years of theorizing and searching for traits and the more theories that appear, the more obvious it became that no single trait (or even pair of traits) could adequately identify leadership capability or paths of training." They stated the "situational theory, in effect, that leadership ability was dependent upon the individual's adaptive ability; the feeling he/she had for sensing, interpreting and relating to the specific situation." Symbolically, the situational approach to leadership was expressed as $L = (LP, GP, S)$; that meant, leadership equals the function of the leader's personality, the group's personality, and the situation. (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977)

Hersey and Blanchard identified the four basic components of situational leadership that can be measured by the LEAD.

1. Diagnosis: The importance of a leader's diagnostic ability cannot be overemphasized. The authors have identified three steps in the diagnostic process:
   (a) Point of View: before beginning diagnosis in an organization, determine through whose eyes you will be observing the situation (your own, those of your boss, your associates, your subordinates, an outside consultant, etc.) Ideally, to get the full picture
you should look at the situation from the points of view of as many as possible of the people who will be affected by any change.

(b) Identification of The Problem(s): any change effort begins with the identification of the problem. A problem in a situation exists when there is a discrepancy between what is actually happening and what you or someone who hired you (point of view) would like to be happening. Until you can explain precisely what you would like to be occurring and unless that set of conditions is different from the present situation, no problem exists.

(c) Analysis: (an outgrowth of problem identification); problem identification flows almost immediately into analysis. Once a discrepancy (problem) has been identified, the goal of analysis is to determine why the problem exists. Once a problem has been identified in the end result variable or intervening variable, the most natural strategy is to begin to examine what Likert called "causal variables"—the independent variables that can be altered by the organization and its management, such as leadership or management style, organizational structure, organizational objectives.

Maturity as defined by Hersey and Blanchard (1977) in Leadership Theory is "...the capacity to set high but attainable goals (achievement-motivation), willingness and ability to take responsibility, and education and/or experience of an individual or a group." These variables of maturity, according to Hersey and Blanchard:

2. "Should be considered only in relation to a specific task to be performed. That is to say, an
individual or group is not mature or immature in any total sense. All persons tend to be more or less mature in "relations" to a specific task, function, or objective that a leader is attempting to accomplish through their efforts."

Task behavior and relationship behavior: In the leadership model, the four basic leader behavior quadrants are labeled as high task and low relationship, high task and high relationship, high relationship and low task, and low relationship and low task as illustrated in fig. 3.4. The two types of behavior, task and relationship, which are central to the concept of leadership style, were defined by Hersey and Blanchard:

3. Task behavior— the extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks were to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job accomplished.

Relationship behavior— the extent to which leaders were likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, "psychological strokes," and facilitating behaviors.

4. Determining Appropriate Leadership Style: to determine what leadership style was appropriate in a given situation, a leader must first determine the maturity level of the individual or group in relation to the specific task that the leader identified. The appropriate leadership style was
determined by constructing a right (90 degree) angle for the point on the continuum that represents the maturity level of the follower(s) to a point where it intersects on the curvilinear function in the style-of-leader portion of the model.

Figure 3.5 is used to illustrate appropriate leadership style.

Hersey and Blanchard used the Tri Dimensional Model to determine which of the four basic styles depicted the "best" style of leadership, that is the one which would be the most successful in most situations. At one point, it was assumed by the authors that high task/high relationship (Quadrant 2) was the "best style"; while low task/low relationship (Quadrant 4) was the "worst style." However, the authors point out that research in the last decade "clearly indicates that there is no single all-purpose leadership style." Successful leaders were those who could adapt their behavior to meet the demands of their own unique environment. (Hersey, Blanchard, 1974)

If the effectiveness of a leader behavior style depended on the situation in which it is used, it was logical that any of the four basic styles would be effective or ineffective depending on the situation. Hersey and Blanchard stated "The difference between the effective and the ineffective styles were often not the actual behavior of the leader, but the appropriateness of this
behavior to the situation in which it was used. (Hersey, Blanchard, 1974)

The Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model presented in Figure 3.6 was developed to assist practitioners more accurately diagnose the appropriateness of their leadership style(s) to specific situations.

DATA COLLECTION AND TREATMENT

A total of 66 elementary school principals responded from a group of 72 principals who represented most of the elementary schools in the Clark County, Nevada, School District during the 1985-1986 school year. The principals were asked to complete two instruments:

(1) The Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description

(2) The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

The two instruments were used to determine whether a significant relationship existed between an effective principal and their personality type. Responses were analyzed to determine the correlation between personality and effectiveness. The Chi Square Test of Independence was used to determine if administrative responses differed on these two variables. Tables of Correlation
were developed to determine an analysis of these factors that were related to one another and which may be the factors for effective leadership.

The nature of this research was quasi-experimental; therefore, a survey approach utilizing 100% of the available sample of the accessible population were included in the research. A one group, post-test only, research design was used.

The following procedures were used for data collection and treatment:

1. CCSD principals name and address were obtained from CCSD. Principals received a packet containing the following materials.

2. A cover letter, briefly explaining the purpose of the study and requesting prompt participation.

3. The two instruments: LEAD and MBTI.

4. A post card which could be returned to the investigator requesting the results of the study.

Subject participation was on a volunteer basis. Code numbers, written on each envelope, were used to determine the necessity of following up according to set procedures. Coded envelopes were destroyed once the respondent was identified as having returned their packet of materials. From that point on, participants were identified by their code number only.
Non-respondents were sent a follow-up post card and encouraged to respond. The response rate was 92%, which exceeded the 75% target set by the researcher.
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the results were reported in relation to each of the five research questions and then interpreted and discussed within the context of the research questions and the purpose of this study. Some alternative explanations were suggested to account for specific findings.

The purpose of this study was to determine what were the relationships, if any, that existed between the most common personality types of selected elementary school principals, as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), and the most effective leadership styles as measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD), a measure of leadership effectiveness. The focus was to determine whether these two instruments possessed sufficient discriminative power to effect a distinction between effective and ineffective administrators before the fact.
The data was organized as tabular presentations to facilitate analysis in relation to each research question.

1. Do effective administrators in Clark County School District (CCSD) demonstrate different temperament dimensions on the MBTI from ineffective administrators?

The Null Hypothesis was there was no significant relationship between the different temperament dimensions as measured by the MBTI (extraversion vs intraversion), and ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD at the .05 level of confidence.

The hypothesis was rejected based upon the following analysis as indicated on Table 4.

Table 4 represented observed frequencies (O) and expected frequencies (E), and the differences between the two. The Chi Square compared the dichotomized groups of elementary school principals on the Temperament/Effectiveness question as measured by the MBTI, and the LEAD. These data were relevant to the first research question regarding the different temperament dimensions of effective vs ineffective principals.
The purpose of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was to ascertain a person's basic preference. It was intended to reflect a habitual choice between opposites. Whereas, the LEAD was designed to provide some personal feedback on one's own leadership style.

An inspection of Table 4 entries pertinent to the first research question indicated an overall Chi Square value of 28.39. This exceeds the Chi Square value of 19.67 which would indicate significance at the .05 level of confidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>fe</th>
<th>O-E dif</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>+.55</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>+1.45</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>+1.33</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>+.44</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>+1.68</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>+.79</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df=11) = 28.39
* p > .05

The findings indicated that there was a significant difference in a person's basic temperament dimension as reflected by the principals in the study when compared to the Myers-Briggs sampling of general norms. Further analysis of the collapsed data indicated that forty-five percent (45%) of the subjects (30 principals) preferred
the ST type regardless of their leadership effectiveness as indicated by Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do effective administrators in Clark County School District (CCSD) demonstrate different personality characteristics on the MBTI from ineffective administrators?

The Null Hypothesis was there was no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in personality characteristics, as measured by the MBTI, and effective or ineffective administrators as measured by the LEAD.

The hypothesis was rejected based on the following analysis of Table 5.

Table 5 represented the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies, along with the differences between these two. The Chi Square represented a comparison of the
characteristics of Perception and Judgment as it pertains to the principal's personality as measured by the MBTI. These data were relevant to the second research question regarding the different personality characteristics possible in the effective and ineffective principals. An inspection of Table 5 entries pertinent to the second research question indicated a Chi Square value of 28.78. A Chi Square value of 7.81 was required to indicate significance at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 5: Temperament/Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>fe</th>
<th>O-E dif</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>+ .36</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>+ .82</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>+2.55</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df=11) = 28.78
* p > .05

There was a significant difference in the characteristics of Perception and Judgment as it pertains to the principals in this study as compared to the Myers-Briggs sampling of general norms. Further analysis of the collapsed data indicated that forty-five percent (45%) of the subjects (30 principals) preferred
the ST type regardless of their leadership style as indicated in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do effective administrators in Clark County School District demonstrate different personality types on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from ineffective administrators?

The Null Hypothesis was there was no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in personality types, as measured by the MBTI and effective or ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD.

The hypothesis was rejected based upon the following analysis of Table 6.

Table 6 showed the Chi Square values that compare the total distribution of principal's preferences on personality characteristics. The distribution of principals' preferences on personality was intended to
represent the perceptions of personality style as measured by the MBTI. These data were pertinent to the third research question regarding the differences between the various types of personality selected by individual principals, and their effectiveness.

Table 6 indicated a total Chi Square of 136.87. This Chi Square was more than the 24.99 required for significance at the .05 confidence level.

Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Distribution of Principals Preferences on Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df = 15) = 136.87
* p > .05
There was a significant difference in personality types of the principals in this study as compared to the Myers-Briggs sampling of general norms. The findings indicated that seventy percent (70%) of the principals selected STJ and NTJ as their preferred type which indicates that the majority of the principals are Thinking and Judging. This correlates closely with the findings of Van Frange (1967) and Morrison (1980) which indicates that these types work very hard to win approval but may need further training in managerial activities; in addition these types are considered good organizers, good administrators, but tend to push people away by ignoring their view points. Therefore they need training in interpersonal relationships.

4. Do effective administrators in Clark County School District demonstrate different dominant processes as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator than do ineffective administrators?

The Null Hypothesis was there was no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence on the different dominant processes, as measured by the MBTI, and effective or ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD.
The hypothesis was accepted based upon the following analysis represented in Table 7.

Table 7 represented the range of observed frequencies and the expected frequencies, with the differences between these two sums. The Chi Square was presented to compare the groups Dominant Process as selected by the principals, on an individual basis, and measured by the MBTI. These data were relevant to the fourth research question regarding the Dominant Process of the participants.

An inspection of Table 7 indicated that in the E-I sub-group the overall Chi Square was 1.82. This does not exceed the Chi Square value of 3.84 required to demonstrate significance at the .05 level of confidence. These data indicate that the principals did not differ significantly from the general norms established by the Myers and Briggs sampling. In the subgroups SN, TF, and JP the overall Chi Squares were 12.18; 36.02; and 90.76 respectively, which surpassed the 3.84 required for significance at the .05 level. Within these subgroups there was a significant difference from the general population norms as established by the Myers-Briggs sampling.
Table 7: The Dominant Process of Each Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fe</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>E-O</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>+5.4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df =1) = 1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>+12.4</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>-12.4</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df =1) = 12.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>-21.9</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>+21.9</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df = 1) = 36.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>-34.3</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>+34.3</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df = 1) = 90.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Is there a relationship between these personality type scores and those scores which identify an administrator as effective on the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description?

The Null Hypothesis was there was no relationship between these personality type scores and those scores which identify an administrator as effective or ineffective on the LEAD.
The hypothesis was accepted based upon the following analysis of Table 8.

Table 8 represented the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies, and the differences between these two sums. The Chi Square was also represented. The preferred style of leadership and its effectiveness was indicated, as measured by the LEAD. These data were relevant to the fifth research question regarding personality and effectiveness. The overall Chi Square value was 13.99, which does not exceed the Chi Square of 15.50 required for significance at the .05 confidence level.

Table 8: Effectiveness/Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>fe</th>
<th>0-E dif</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>+5.80</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>+1.95</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>+1.33</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>-3.89</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>+.18</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df = 8) = 13.99
*p < .05
The data indicate that there was no significant difference between the leader's style and personality types when dealing with effectiveness. Further analysis of the data indicates that the majority of the Highly Effective Principal utilized Style 3 (S3) and other as measured by the LEAD. Those principals scoring at the lower and medium range in effectiveness utilized Style 2 as I indicated in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers-Briggs</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

An evaluation of the data relating to the first research question indicated that elementary school principals in this study displayed a significant degree of difference in relation to the Temperament/Effectiveness dimension. The difference between scores for dichotomized groups of principals on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and the Leader Effectiveness and
Adaptability Description were statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence using the Chi Square Test.

Data relative to the second research question indicated that there was a significance in the combinations of perception and judgment characteristics of personality in the principals involved in this study. Specifically, the Sensing/Feeling (SF), and the Intuitive/Thinking (NT) data indicated a moderate to high correlation between the perception and judgement dimension. Sensing/Thinking, and Intuitive/Feeling data tended to indicate there was no significance in these two dimensions.

In regard to the third research question, the data indicated that there was a significance in the distribution of principals personality preference. Specifically, the Introvert/Sensing/Thinking/Judging (ISTJ) type of principal demonstrated a high degree of difference between the expected and the observed. In addition, the Extrovert/Intuitive/Thinking/Judging (ENTJ) and the Introvert/Intuitive/Thinking/Judging (INTJ) also demonstrated a moderate degree of difference in their personality preferences. The remainder of the thirteen types did not demonstrate any significance in their personality preferences. It would appear that of the three types that did show significance, two of these
types INTJ and ISTJ were principals who preferred an introverted type of personality. Twenty-four out of the sixty-six principals selected these two types.

An inspection of the data relative to the fourth research question indicated that elementary school principals in this study varied significantly on the dominant process of personality. The data indicated that the Extravert (E) and the Introvert (I) do not differ significantly. However, the Sensing (S) and Intuitive (I) types did show a moderate degree of significance. The Thinking (T) and the Feeling (F) demonstrated a high degree of significance, as do Judging (J) and Perception (P). It appears that the principals in this study prefer to be "Thinking" and "Judging" types. They also tend to be more "Sensing" in nature, and they were basically evenly distributed in terms of being either an extravert or an introvert.

Data concerning the fifth research question indicated that there was no significant difference in the study dealing with the effectiveness of principals and their leadership styles. The over-all Chi Square was 13.99; this did not exceed the 15.50 required for significance at the .05 level. Thus it suggested that leadership did not rely on being a certain type of personality.
DISCUSSION

The significant difference between elementary principals participating in this study suggested that there were several personality types that are predominant. The most predominant was the number of participants who selected the Introvert/Sensing/Thinking/Judging (ISTJ) as their major type. This was significant in that the expected frequency was at eight percent. Von Fange (1969), Wright (1966) and Morrison (1980) found that the most predominant type appeared to be the Extrovert/Sensing/Thinking/Judging (ESTJ). Von Fange's sample of sixty-three principals in Canada showed ESTJ to be the most common type pattern, with ninety-two percent (92%) being Judging types. Wright's study included personality types for 39 elementary school principals from a school district in California. The results reported by Wright indicated that her sample contained types that were Extrovert/Thinking/Judging (E-TJ) primarily. Morrison (1980) indicated in his findings that judging (83%) and sensing (79%) were the predominant types. It appeared that in this study, the most common types of personality of principals in the Clark County School District were Introverted, Sensing, Thinking and Judging.
Keirsey (1979) reported that the ESTJ type "to be the epitome of an administrator, that is, one who is concerned with preserving the establishment." He also stated that the ESTJ principal, "was practical, realistic, matter-of-fact and concerned with the present state of affairs. Problems were analyzed with impersonal logic; he was unlikely to be convinced by anything but reasoning. This type of principal enjoyed being an executive, deciding what ought to be done, and giving the necessary orders. However, employees beware, as he has little patience with inefficiency and knows how to be tough when the situation calls for it."

It is now well established that leadership management style must be adapted to a given situation to be effective. The manner and the type of situational leadership training that currently exists, may mask the manifestation of a redisposition of a leader. In addition, since the behavior of the leader at the very top echelon exerted the greatest influence on organizational climate (Likert, 1976), the influence of middle managers might be masked.

In this study the major two styles of management selected by the participants were S2 (high task/high relationship) and S3 (high relationship/low task), as measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability
Description. (Morrison, 1980) Morrison concluded in her study that: The majority of principals (60%) perceived their leadership as Style 2 (High task-High relationship) which was characterized by selling.

The level of significance and the degree of correlation of the personality dimension of leadership style tend to attest to the validity of the instruments used. By definition the leader behaviors measured by the LEAD for consideration and identification of leadership style were similar to the indices that measured maturity, which was a prerequisite in obtaining achievement-motivation. (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977)

It would appear that the personality dimension may have an effect on the manner in which human resources are utilized, how communication flows, and affects motivational conditions and decision-making practices within the organizational climate. It is suggested that leaders be aware of the findings, and correlations of these indices of organizational management. In addition the factors included in the personality dimension of one's leadership style should be considered when assessing leadership situations.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

Problem

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if any relationships existed between the personality types as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the leadership styles as measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) of the sixty-six principals in Clark County, Nevada School District who responded.

The focus of the study was to determine whether these two instruments possessed sufficient power to effect a distinction between effective and ineffective administrators prior to their appointment as administrator. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Do effective administrators in the Clark County School District demonstrate different temperament dimensions from ineffective administrators, as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator?
2. Do effective administrators in Clark County School District demonstrate different personality characteristics on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from ineffective administrators?

3. Do effective administrators in Clark County School District demonstrate different personality types on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from ineffective administrators?

4. Do effective administrators in Clark County School District demonstrate different dominant processes as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator than do ineffective administrators?

5. Is there a relationship between these personality type scores and those scores which identify an administrator as effective on the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description?

Methodology

Principals in the Clark County School District who had completed their first year as an elementary principal were selected for inclusion in this investigation. Each
participant was asked to complete the following instruments: (1) The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and (2) The Lead Effectiveness and Adaptability Description.

Frequency responses for the questions on each instrument were tabulated. Tables were developed and presented indicating the results of the findings. Chi Square tables were run to determine if there were any significant factors that could be used at the .05 level of confidence which would suggest that a specific personality might be identified with a more effective administrator.

The Chi Square test of significance was utilized to determine the correlations which existed between the instruments. The Yates' correction for continuity was utilized to assist in the correlations when the degrees of freedom were equal to one.

**Selected Findings**

The findings were as follows:

1. The difference between the scores that were used to determine temperament and effectiveness were statistically significant at the .05 level using the Chi Square Test. The Chi Square test for factorial designs tests the null
hypothesis that two variables are independent of one another. In other words, according to the data there was a significant difference between temperament and effectiveness between the subjects in this study and those in the general population.

2. The difference between the scores for the different personality characteristics of effective/ineffective administrators were statistically significant at the .05 level using the Chi Square Test. According to the data analyzed from the Chi Square test there was a significant difference between personality characteristics of effective/ineffective administrators in this study and the general population.

3. The difference between the scores for determining personality types of effective or ineffective administrators was significant at the .05 level using the Chi Square Test. The Chi Square test for one-way designs was called a goodness-of-fit test because it tested how closely observed frequencies from a
sample fit theoretically expected frequencies based on the null hypothesis. According to the data there was a significant difference between the subjects in this study and that of the general population determining personality types of effective or ineffective administrators.

4. The difference between the scores for determining the dominant processes was not significantly different at the .05 level for subgroups E-I. The difference between the scores for the remaining subgroups S-N, T-F, and J-P was significant at the .05 level using the Chi Square Test. Utilizing the goodness-of-fit design the data indicated there was no significant difference for the sub-group extravert/introvert in the subjects in this study. However, the data indicated that there was a significant difference in the sub-groups sensing/intuitive, thinking/feeling, judging/perceiving in the subjects in this study.
5. The difference between the scores for determining a relationship between the personality type scores, and the scores used to determine effectiveness was not significant at the .05 level using the Chi Square Test. Utilizing the Chi Square test for two-way design, the data indicated that there was no difference between the personality types and effectiveness. In essence any personality type can be effective.

CONCLUSIONS

The null hypothesis stated that there will be no significant relationship between personality scores on the MBTI and effective leadership as measured by the LEAD.

The following conclusions were drawn in relation to each question as it pertained to the null hypothesis:

1. The elementary school principals in this study displayed different temperament dimensions in relation to effective/ineffective administrators. The null hypothesis was rejected because there was a significant
relationship between the different temperament dimensions as measured by the MBTI between effective and ineffective administrators as measured by the LEAD.

2. Principals demonstrated different combinations of perception and judgment in their individual personality characteristics with a strong tendency for the Sensing/Thinking types. The null hypothesis was rejected because there was a significant relationship between the personality characteristics as measured by the MBTI of effective and ineffective administrators as measured by the LEAD.

3. There were three distinct types of personality indicated in this study. The most predominant was the Introvert-Sensing-Thinking-Judging, followed by the Extravert-Sensing-Thinking-Judging, and the Extravert-Feeling-Thinking-Judging types of personality. The remainder of the types were significantly different from what was expected. The null
hypothesis was rejected because there was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between personality types, as measured by the MBTI in effective and ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD.

4. The participants in this study selected their dominant process of personality. Out of the four major types of dominance there were extremes in three areas. There were significant differences in the Sensing/Intuitive, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perception. There was no significance between what was expected in the Extravert-Introvert. The null hypothesis was accepted as there was no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence on the Chi Square Table for different dominant processes, as measured by the MBTI and effective or ineffective administrators, as measured by the LEAD.

5. The null hypothesis was accepted as there was no significant difference between personality type scores and
those scores which identified an administrator as effective or ineffective on the LEAD.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made:

Recommendations for Action

On the basis of the findings in this study, the following action was recommended:

1. Leadership training and research programs should focus on personality traits as part of leadership behavior.

2. Leaders should include an accurate assessment of their most dominant leadership management style as elements in assessing leadership situations.

3. Leadership management styles should be coupled with the personality of the leader when assessing the organizational climate of their schools.

Recommendations for Further Study
It is recommended that further investigation be conducted in the following areas:

1. Further study should be conducted to determine the effect, if any, on the secondary school principals of their personality types and leadership styles.

2. Further study should be conducted to determine the effects, if any, on the leadership management style of all levels of the central office administrators, and their personality types, and their relationship to their subordinates (principals) in the schools.

3. There is a need to investigate the specific personality types of principals and their management style, and what effect, if any, these indices have on the teachers on their staff.

4. There is a need to examine how personal characteristics of elementary school principals might be related to the manner in which they evaluate teachers. The intent would be to ascertain whether those teachers as a
group could be categorized as high, middle, or low, and what personality characteristics, if any they might have in common.
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APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER
Dear Clark County School Principal:

As a doctoral candidate at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Department of Educational Administration, I am currently conducting a research project with the help and approval of the Clark County School District on leadership effectiveness and its relationship to personality types.

Enclosed are two instruments, the BMTI and the LEAD, which I am using to identify leadership styles and personality types. You have been selected for inclusion in this study because of your administrative background in the Clark County School District. Please let me assure you that your answers will be grouped with numerous others, that they will be used for research purposes only, that no names will be used, and that the information you give us will be kept strictly confidential. Your careful response to these instruments are vital to the success of the study.

After completing the instruments, please insert them in the attached envelope (postage prepaid) and return it no later than one week after receipt. If you have any questions, please call me at the number listed below (8:00 A.M. -4:00 P.M., Monday through Friday).

Sincerely,

Maurice Flores
799-8940
SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES ON TESTS
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

- MYERS BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR INSTRUCTIONS; pp. 120-121
- The Myers-Briggs Test: Form GH (abridged); pp. 122-128
- LEAD QUESTIONNAIRE; pp. 130-132
- FIGURE 3.5 DETERMINING AN APPROPRIATE LEADERSHIP STYLE; p. 140
- FIGURE 3.6 TRI-DIMENSIONAL LEADER EFFECTIVENESS MODEL; p. 141
Directions for completing
the LEAD Questionnaire

Assume you are involved in each of the following twelve situations. Read each item carefully. Think about what YOU would do in each circumstance. Then circle the letter of the alternative action choice that YOU think would most closely describe your behavior in the situation presented. Circle only one choice.

Do not respond to the items as if they were part of a test or in terms of what you think a leader or manager ought to do. Respond to the items in terms of the way you think you have behaved in the past when you were faced with situations similar to those described or in terms of the way you think you would behave if you were faced with each of the situations described. In reading each situation, interpret key concepts in terms of the environment or situation in which you most often think of yourself as assuming a leadership role. For example, when an item mentions subordinates, if you think that you engage in leader behavior most often as an industrial manager, then think about your staff as subordinates. As a teacher, think about your students as your subordinates. DO NOT change your situational frame of reference from one item to another. Respond to the items sequentially; that is, do item 1 before you do item 2, and so on. Do not spend too much time; respond to each item as if you were responding to a real life situation. Do not go back over each; stay with your original response.

After the test is completed return it via the enclosed envelope included in this mailing. If you desire a scoring breakdown and description of your test results, let me know by writing such a request on your test. My address is cited below for any correspondence. Thank you for taking the time to read and complete this test.

Maurice Flores
C. T. Sewell Elem.
700 E. Lake Mead Dr.
Henderson, Nevada 89105
FEEDBACK MODEL

(feedback loop)

Figure 1. Feedback Model

By using this model, it can be demonstrated that it becomes more difficult to make changes in personality as people grow older. (Hersey, Blanchard, 1977)
FIGURE 2.1 THE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR GRID (COPY)

**High**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>1.8 COMFORTABLE AND PLEASANT ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable friendly university atmosphere and work tempo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>TEAM ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quality achievement is from committed people; interdependence through a &quot;common stake&quot; in university purpose leads to mission of trust and respect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>CONSTITUENCY-CENTRED ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>CARETAKER ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exertion of minimum effort to get required work done is appropriate to sustain university membership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>AUTHORITY-OBEEDIENCE ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Efficiency in operations results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low

| 1.1 | |

Low | | High

Concern for Institutional Performance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 Law Students (N = 2,248—374 of Whom Dropped Out)

Source: Miller (1965, 1967)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR=0.0</td>
<td>SSR=0.35</td>
<td>SSR=3.33</td>
<td>SSR=2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
<th>INFP</th>
<th>INTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=15</td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR=0.27</td>
<td>SSR=0.32</td>
<td>SSR=5.07</td>
<td>SSR=2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>ESFP</th>
<th>ENFP</th>
<th>ENTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=9</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR=0.0</td>
<td>SSR=0.22</td>
<td>SSR=1.78</td>
<td>SSR=1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
<th>ENFJ</th>
<th>ENTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR=0.0</td>
<td>SSR=0.22</td>
<td>SSR=2.39</td>
<td>SSR=1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2 Rhodes Scholars (N = 71 Males)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
<th>INFP</th>
<th>INTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>ESFP</th>
<th>ENFP</th>
<th>ENTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
<th>ENFJ</th>
<th>ENTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.3** School Administrators (N=124)

Source: von Fange (1961)
Determining an Appropriate Leadership Style

Figure 3.4
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Low Task and Low Relationship
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TABLES, GRAPHS AND CHARTS
Table 4: Temperment/Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>fe</th>
<th>O-E dif</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>+.55</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>+1.45</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>+1.33</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>+.44</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>+1.68</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>- .33</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>- .45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>+ .79</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df=11) = 28.39
* p. .05
Table 5: Temperament/Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>fe</th>
<th>O-E dif</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>+ .36</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>+ .82</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>- .45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>- .82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>- .24</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>+1.06</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>+2.55</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>- .82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>+1.15</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>+ .21</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df=11) = 28.78

* p .05
Table 6: Total Distribution of Principals Preferences on Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>O-E dif</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>+6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>+6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>+8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>+3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>- .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>+ 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>+ 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>- 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>+ 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>+ 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>+ 3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df = 15) = 136.87
* p .05
Table 7: The Dominant Process of Each Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fe</th>
<th>fo</th>
<th>E-O</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>+5.4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df = 1) = 1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>+12.4</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>-12.4</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df = 1) = 12.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>-21.9</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>+21.9</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df = 1) = 36.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>-34.3</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>+34.3</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Chi Square (df = 1) = 90.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>fo</td>
<td>fe</td>
<td>O-E dif</td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>+5.80</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>+1.95</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>+1.33</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>-3.89</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>+.18</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Chi Square (df = 8) = 13.99
*p .05