



University of Tennessee, Knoxville

## TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

---

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

---

12-1959

### Role Playing as a Means of Selecting Administrators

Charles Warren Hartsell

*University of Tennessee - Knoxville*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_graddiss](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss)



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Hartsell, Charles Warren, "Role Playing as a Means of Selecting Administrators. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 1959.

[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_graddiss/2912](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/2912)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Charles Warren Hartsell entitled "Role Playing as a Means of Selecting Administrators." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration.

Galen N. Downy, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

A. H. Johnston, Charles Moffett, P. M. DeRidder, John W. Gilliland, Chris B. Graff

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

December 3, 1959

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Charles Warren Hartsell entitled "Role Playing as a Means of Selecting Administrators." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Walter M. Denny  
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and  
recommend its acceptance:

A. M. Johnston

Charles K. Moffett

P. D. DeRudder

John W. Gililand

Gene B. Lacy

Accepted for the Council:

John W. Gililand  
Dean of the Graduate School

ROLE PLAYING AS A MEANS OF SELECTING ADMINISTRATORS

---

A THESIS

Submitted to  
The Graduate Council  
of  
The University of Tennessee  
in  
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the degree of  
Doctor of Education

---

by  
Charles Warren Hartsell

December 1959

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
	Introduction . . . . .	1
	Statement of the problem . . . . .	3
	Need for the study . . . . .	4
	Assumptions . . . . .	6
	Definitions . . . . .	6
	Hypotheses . . . . .	7
	Limitations . . . . .	7
	The background, development, and use of the Tennessee Rating Guide . . . . .	8
	Organization of the study . . . . .	17
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES. . . . .	18
	Role playing in the selection process . . . . .	29
	Chapter summary . . . . .	30
III.	PROCEDURES . . . . .	31
	Introduction . . . . .	31
	Development of role situations. . . . .	31
	Relation of the Guide to the situations . . . . .	37

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. (continued)	
Description of the role sessions . . . . .	42
Field ratings of subjects . . . . .	45
Statistical techniques. . . . .	46
Chapter summary . . . . .	47
IV. CORRELATIONS OF ROLE-PLAYING AND	
FIELD RATINGS . . . . .	48
Introduction . . . . .	48
Interreliability of the instrument . . . . .	48
Comparison and analysis . . . . .	52
Chapter summary . . . . .	64
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND	
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	67
Summary . . . . .	67
Findings . . . . .	68
Recommendations . . . . .	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	74
APPENDIXES . . . . .	78

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Position and Experience of Subjects . . . . .	43
II.	Correlation of Odd and Even Item Tennessee Rating Guide Scores of Twenty-five Subjects in Role-Playing Situations . . . . .	50
III.	Correlation of Odd and Even Item Tennessee Rating Guide Scores of Twenty-five Subjects in Field Ratings . . . . .	51
IV.	Correlation of Total Scores and Ranks of Twenty- five Subjects Rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide in Role-Playing Situations and in the Field . . . . .	53
V.	Correlation of Section I Scores and Ranks of Twenty-five Subjects Rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide in Role-Playing Situations and in the Field . . . . .	56
VI.	Correlation of Section II Scores and Ranks of Twenty-five Subjects Rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide in Role-Playing Situations and in the Field . . . . .	58

## TABLE

## PAGE

VII.	Correlation of Section III Scores and Ranks of Twenty-five Subjects Rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide in Role-Playing Situations and in the Field . . . . .	60
VIII.	Correlation of Section IV Scores and Ranks of Twenty-five Subjects Rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide in Role-Playing Situations and in the Field . . . . .	61
IX.	Correlation of Section V Scores and Ranks of Twenty-five Subjects Rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide in Role-Playing Situations and in the Field . . . . .	63
X.	Correlation of Section VI Scores and Ranks of Twenty-five Subjects Rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide in Role-Playing Situations and in the Field . . . . .	65



## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

In view of the constant search for competent administrators on all levels of school administration, there is a need for defining the personal and operational characteristics which will indicate to an employer how a person will react in a given set of circumstances, particularly those which are related to the specific position involved. For example, how would a principal go about dealing with a parent whose child has been suspended from school for disciplinary reasons? How can we know, beforehand, whether an individual will be a good or a poor administrator? Industry has developed time and motion studies for better production in plants by observing their personnel. It seems feasible, then, that some method can be developed which will enable educational administrators to select more efficient personnel.

In studies completed at the University of Tennessee, Luton,<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>James Norfleet Luton, "A Study of the Use of Certain Standardized Tests in the Selection of Potential Educational Administrators" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, March 1955), pp. 8-19.

Moffett,<sup>2</sup> and Nunnery<sup>3</sup> have found that psychological tests alone do not predict success to a high degree in job performance. If these studies are indicative, they suggest that something else, along with the psychological tests, is needed in selection.

It would seem, then, that some method of analysis could be developed which would utilize and supplement these psychological tests in the selection process. The method of role playing seemed to offer a potential approach. While role playing has been used almost exclusively for training purposes, it may well be an effective procedure for selection. The technique of role playing is one of simulating a life situation, usually one involving conflicts between people, and then having individuals play the roles of specific personalities. Role playing might enable administrators, through an evaluation of a person's behavior in the role playing situation, to select the right person for the right job. Since only

---

<sup>2</sup>Charles R. Moffett, "Operational Characteristics of Beginning Master's Students in Educational Administration and Supervision" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1954), p. 222.

<sup>3</sup>Michael Yates Nunnery, "A Study in the Use of Psychological Tests in Determining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness in School Administrators" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1958), p. 105.

the situation is given, the dialogue must spontaneously grow out of the situation created, and the end product is fluid in that it will depend upon the way different persons play their roles.<sup>4</sup>

### Statement of the Problem

The specific purpose of the present study was to determine the extent to which role playing provided data similar to that obtained through field ratings of school administrators or potential school administrators. Field ratings must be made while an individual concerned is actually on the job. Role playing can be accomplished during the training period before the person actually begins work. Thus, if role playing can be shown to be as effective for selection as are field ratings, a tremendous saving of time, energy, and expense can be brought about.

The sub-problems that were essential to this study were:

1. To review other materials which have been written relative to the problem;
2. To develop appropriate role playing situations and means

---

<sup>4</sup>Norman R. F. Maier, Principles of Human Relations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1952), p. 87.

for their use in the research;

3. To rate subjects in both role playing and field situations;

4. To analyze the data obtained from role playing ratings and field ratings.

### Need for the Study

Taylor found in a study at the University of Tennessee that the role playing technique was helpful in revealing certain personality characteristics of master's students involved in an experimental program conducted by the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision. A member of the group would take a position at the front of the total group. Another member of the group would, in effect, "hit him in the face" with a touchy administrative problem. She states:

Following each situation the person in the task situation was critiqued by the total group. Emphasis in these critique sessions was placed on how the simulated administrator handled the problem, consistency of his assumptions, relations of his characterized actions to behavior of effective school administrators, and knowledge or lack of knowledge of school administration employed. These situations pointed up conspicuous places where members of the group needed to improve

their operational characteristics.<sup>5</sup>

The research in the present study was designed as an effort to provide a basis for more intelligent selection of effective school administrators: first, in the selection of personnel for positions in the field of school administration; second, in the selection of students for training in school administration.

The instrument to be used in rating these individuals would be the Tennessee Rating Guide (in Appendix A). The Tennessee Rating Guide was used for rating administrative personnel by Greever,<sup>6</sup> Coker,<sup>7</sup> and Gentry.<sup>8</sup> Attacking the problem through the use of role playing would be using the guide in an entirely different way than it had been used before, because, as explained above,

---

<sup>5</sup>Gem Kate Taylor, "The Development of Effective Characteristics in Students of School Administration" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Tennessee, June 1957), p. 35.

<sup>6</sup>Clarence E. Greever, "A Study of the Characteristics of Selected, Effective Superintendencies in East Tennessee" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Tennessee, June 1956).

<sup>7</sup>Phyllis U. Coker, "A Study of the Use of the Tennessee Rating Guide as a Means of Differentiating Between Effective and Ineffective School Administrators" (Unpublished Master's thesis, College of Education, University of Tennessee, August 1956).

<sup>8</sup>Harold Wayne Gentry, "Patterns of Behavior Exhibited by School Administrators" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Tennessee, June 1957).

the ratings could be made prior to the time that administrative personnel actually begin their work. The findings would provide some information as to whether the Guide could be used in this manner.

### Assumptions

Basic assumptions underlying the study were:

1. The Tennessee Rating Guide, 1958, is a valid instrument for determining characteristics of school administrators.
2. Field ratings, using the Tennessee Rating Guide, accurately reflect the degree to which the individuals rated possess the behavioral characteristics covered in the Tennessee Rating Guide.

### Definitions

The following terms and their definitions were used in this study:

Role playing is acting the part of a character in a simulated situation.

Central role is the part the major character plays in the simulated situation.

Panel refers to a group of observers who rate a subject's

performance in a role playing situation using the Tennessee Rating Guide .

Subordinate roles are minor parts assumed by members of the panel to confuse or perplex the major character in the role playing situation .

The Tennessee Rating Guide is an instrument used to measure the behavioral characteristics of educational administrators or potential educational administrators .

### Hypotheses

There were two major hypotheses for the study:

1. Role playing situations can be developed which will reveal behavioral characteristics possessed by school administrators or potential school administrators .
2. There will be no significant differences between role situation ratings and field ratings .

### Limitations

This study was limited to twenty-five male graduate students and/or persons holding graduate degrees from the College of Education, University of Tennessee .

The study was limited to two composite ratings, the panel rating and the field rating.

### The Background, Development, and Use of the Tennessee Rating Guide

Since this study involved the use of the Tennessee Rating Guide in both role playing ratings and field ratings, a brief sketch about the development and the use of this instrument was necessary. A decade ago administrators in the Southern Region felt that some instrument might be developed for the purpose of measuring characteristics pertinent to effective educational leadership.

A work conference attended by educational leaders of the Southern Region met at George Peabody College in Nashville during the month of May, 1951. It was during this Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (SSCPEA) conference that much thought was given to the development of competency patterns which would attempt to describe behavioral characteristics.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>"Tentative Report of the Work Conference on Planning for the Study of Preparation Programs in Educational Administration" (Report prepared by the Program Center Staff, Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, May 10-12, 1951), p. 13.



As a result of this and later SSCPEA conferences, a decision was made by the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Tennessee to undertake the development of an instrument for defining the behavior of educational administrators. It was believed that the construction of such an instrument would provide some insights into the formulation of a preparatory program, which would provide some behavioral characteristics desirable in school administrators.<sup>10</sup>

Reflecting on their experiences at the SSCPEA conferences, all of the staff in educational administration and supervision at the University of Tennessee decided to design a rating guide. The guide in its finished form "housed" the characteristics which the staff felt could be identified and which, according to Moffett,<sup>11</sup> most clearly portrayed those traits necessary for administrators. (See Appendix B.)

Moffett made the first formal study involving the use of this instrument. The guide in his study consisted of six major divisions. These were: (a) Democratic Operation, (b) Intelligent Operation,

---

<sup>10</sup>Gentry, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>11</sup>Moffett, op. cit., p. 45.

(c) Condition of Health, (d) Ethical and Moral Strength, (e) Adequacy of Communication, and (f) Operation as a Citizen. The rating guide in its earliest form was constructed in such a way that there was a continuum or scale from one to five, attempting to reflect the degree of competence on each characteristic. It should be noted that there were 180 items included in this first guide.

Moffett states that the first attempt at such a scale revealed many weaknesses.<sup>12</sup> Since its inception, the Tennessee Rating Guide has been revised practically every year. In the present study the 1958 form, which consisted of six major divisions and 125 items, was used. The revised 1958 divisions are as follows: (a) Interpersonal Relations, (b) Intelligent Operation, (c) Emotional Stability, (d) Ethical and Moral Strength, (e) Adequacy of Communication, and (f) Operation as a Citizen. (Appendix A shows this form.)

#### Validity of the Tennessee Rating Guide

The validity of a test or an instrument has been defined as the degree to which the test or instrument measures what it is meant to measure. It would be reasonable to define the validity of the

---

<sup>12</sup>Loc. cit.

Tennessee Rating Guide as the degree to which it measures the behavior which it is used to measure. Validity is in terms of the use made of the instrument, not in terms of the intended use of it.<sup>13</sup>

One of the basic aims of the educational administration staff at the University of Tennessee was that of establishing validity of the Tennessee Rating Guide. There have been ten studies completed by researchers at the University of Tennessee toward this end. A brief sketch of a few of these will give some indication as to the completeness of this validation.

In June 1956, Greever completed a study identifying operational characteristics of central school staffs. He states:

The hypothesis was to the effect that the behavioral characteristics of selected school superintendents would be the ones as identified and described in the rating guide. These specific conclusions which seemed to emerge, emphasized that eighty-two of 137 statements of behavioral characteristics abstracted from 178 critical incidents, related to the rating guide, while fifty-five did not. . . .

The specific findings emphasized that the purposes and philosophy which seem to underlie the rating guide provided a definite scope and limitation, and that all

---

<sup>13</sup>Jacob S. Orleans, Measure in Education (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937), p. 390.

abstracted statements which seemed to lie within this framework appeared to relate to the rating guide. Conversely, those characteristics which seemed to lie outside this framework did not seem applicable. In view of these findings, this study would seem to have substantiated the hypothesis to a considerable degree.<sup>14</sup>

Another study was completed by Coker in August 1956 using the Tennessee Rating Guide to differentiate between effective and ineffective school principals. She says:

The problem was that of determining, in a measure, the validity of the rating guide as a means of differentiating between effective and ineffective school administrators. It was concluded that the guide clearly differentiated among the principals involved in this study. In final conclusion, this means that on the basis of this study, the Tennessee Rating Guide does differentiate between "effective" and "ineffective" school administrators.<sup>15</sup>

The coefficient of correlation in all sections and categories of the guide, except one category in the section concerning condition of health, has a significance at the .01 level of confidence.<sup>16</sup>

Gentry submitted a study in June 1957 which further validated the instrument. He asked twenty-five school administrators from all parts of the United States to identify patterns of behavioral

---

<sup>14</sup>Greever, op. cit., pp. 187-88.

<sup>15</sup>Coker, op. cit., p. 52.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

characteristics of selected administrators. He hypothesized:

. . . that an analysis of the ratings of school administrators will reveal important patterns of behavioral characteristics.

In these patterns:

A. Selected effective administrators will have certain characteristics which tend to differentiate them from selected ineffective school administrators.

B. Selected ineffective administrators will have certain common characteristics which tend to differentiate them from selected effective school administrators.

C. The ratings of both effective and ineffective administrators will vary widely on certain characteristics.<sup>17</sup>

Gentry concluded that:

1. The effective administrators rated had common characteristics which tend to differentiate them from the ineffective administrators rated.

2. A rating of four or better characterized the effective administrator.

3. While the effective administrator possessed a core of common characteristics, they varied in some instances in the possession of characteristics which were not considered desirable for effective administration.

4. The ineffective administrators rated had common characteristics which tend to differentiate them from effective administrators rated.

5. A rating of three or less characterized the ineffective administrator.

6. The ineffective administrators' ratings varied widely, especially within a one to three range.

7. The preceding conclusions, when viewed as a

---

<sup>17</sup>Gentry, op. cit., p. 6.

whole, suggest the general conclusion that the hypothesis which gave direction to this study has been substantiated to a relatively high degree.<sup>18</sup>

His final conclusion was "that a significant difference existed between the mean scores of effective and ineffective administrators, with respect to all items and all divisions."<sup>19</sup>

Schmitt further validated the Tennessee Rating Guide in his study completed in June 1958. His study dealt with behavior of twenty-four selected principals. He hypothesized:

. . . that the behavioral characteristics of the principals judged to be effective would show a high correlation with most statements of effective characteristics found in the Tennessee Rating Guide, and that the characteristics found in the group of ineffective principals studied would show a high correlation with most statements of ineffective behavioral characteristics found in the same instrument.<sup>20</sup>

He concluded "that, in general, the hypothesis in the study was sustained to a fairly high degree."<sup>21</sup>

The four studies cited strongly suggest that the Tennessee

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., pp. 94-95.

<sup>19</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>20</sup>Leonard R. Schmitt, "The Behavioral Characteristics of School Principals" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1958), p. 5.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., pp. 117-18.

Rating Guide does distinguish between effective and ineffective administrators. The validity of the guide has been tested locally, regionally, and nationally.

#### Reliability of the Tennessee Rating Guide

Establishing the reliability of the Tennessee Rating Guide was of vital importance to the designers of this instrument, the staff of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Tennessee. If this instrument was reliable, it meant that it would be accurate in measurement. In other words, the instrument could be used over and over with the same persons and each time the results would be practically the same.

Nunnery reported in his study a partial reliability check. He found through a rate-rerate that there was not less than 88 per cent agreement in the item judgments on the first and second ratings in twenty-five out of twenty-six cases.<sup>22</sup>

Evernden, in his study to determine the degree of statistical reliability of the Tennessee Rating Guide, gave some indication as to what studies completed have reported. He states:

---

<sup>22</sup>Nunnery, op. cit., pp. 44-49.

After six years of developmental study, research, and revision, the Tennessee Rating Guide had reached that point of refinement where it gave great promise of being the simple, convenient and practical instrument its original designers had hoped it would become.

The Tennessee Rating Guide had been accepted and used on an experimental basis, in several colleges and universities comprising the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. The most obvious drawback to putting the rating guide into general use as a practical instrument for the selection of potential educational leaders was the question of its reliability.<sup>23</sup>

Evernden concluded that the reliability coefficients of the Tennessee Rating Guide using the Pearson Product Moment statistical method varied from 0.76 to 0.95 on various sections of the rating guide, all significant at the 0.01 level of confidence.<sup>24</sup>

Nunnery reported a personal interview with Spears of the University of Florida, where thirty-four principals were in an experimental program. The Tennessee Rating Guide was used to determine educational leadership. Four teachers acted as raters for each of the principals. Tentative results indicated that there was a high degree of consistency among the ratings of the four teachers.

---

<sup>23</sup>William Lyle Evernden, "The Reliability of the Tennessee Rating Guide for School Administrators" (Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1958), p. 4.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 39.



Furthermore, using the total score on the rating guide, it was found to discriminate between "good" and "poor" principals.<sup>25</sup>

### Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes a discussion of the problem, need for the study, assumptions, definitions, hypotheses, limitations, and the Tennessee Rating Guide.

Chapter II reviews related literature and how role playing might be used in the selection process.

Chapter III consists of a detailed outline of the experimental procedures and the statistical techniques applied to the data.

The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV.

Chapter V gives a summary, findings, and recommendations.

---

<sup>25</sup>Nunnery, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

The purpose of this chapter is to review related literature and to point out how role playing could be used in the selection process .

There has been much research conducted in the area of role playing for training purposes by business and industry . An attempt to present a review of all available research in the area of role playing is impractical . Thus , the review reported here is limited to those research studies which have some relation to the problem in question . Actually there have been no studies that deal with the specific problem treated in this paper .

#### Role Analysis of School Superintendencies

A study completed at Harvard University in 1952 presented an empirical analysis of the job of the model superintendent in terms of the social structures in which it is involved.<sup>1</sup>

The Harvard study first examined problem areas which had

---

<sup>1</sup>Neal Gross et al. , Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. , 1958), p. 17 .

definite interest to students of social behavior. Two of these areas were role and role-conflict analysis. Most authors use the role concept to embrace the normative element of social behavior. A basic idea that appears in this study is that in a social situation individuals behave with reference to expectations.

Some concluding observations of the Harvard study were:

(a) the role playing concept focuses attention on ideas of central importance to several social sciences; (b) human behavior is influenced to some degree by the expectations which we hold for ourselves and others hold for us; and (c) a person's location or position in the social structure influences the kind of social relationships in which he is involved and the evaluative standards he or others apply to his behavior.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, the inquiries reported in this study suggest that a family of role concepts may be useful for the analysis of problems at several different levels: the level of individual behaviors, levels of group behavior, and a level of culture. These might also be used to cut across different levels; for example, the group's expectations

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 319.

of the individual, and the individual's expectation of the group.<sup>3</sup>

### Research in Industry

Experience with human relations training and executive development programs has shown that merely learning the principles of human behavior has little value unless supplemented with practice. A study by Maier and others of supervisory and executive development provided for supplementing the learning of principles with practice through role playing.<sup>4</sup> First, the manual developed by the authors offered challenging, realistic material for role playing. Second, the study involved using carefully planned cases in human relations. In addition to these essential means, it was a study which stimulated discussion and an analysis of critical issues on the part of the personnel who used it.

This study proposed to avoid giving answers. Some principles and facts were introduced, but basically the aid that was supplied was through raising questions and exploring issues. With these aids, groups or individuals should come up with good answers,

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 326.

<sup>4</sup>Norman R. F. Maier et al., Supervisory and Executive Development (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957).

and as training proceeds the answers should become better. In conclusion, this study had as its goal improvement, not perfection.<sup>5</sup>

Since management involves the coordinated functioning of a group, it is clear that effective training at any level of management implies adjustments throughout the group. Otherwise, training directed at a specific group in management can only be as effective as the adequacy of the entire management group permits it to be.<sup>6</sup>

Bavelas states that the use of role playing in management training seems to indicate that an effective procedure for teaching specific social skills requires: (1) the use of carefully planned "stereotype" situations as basic training material; and (2) rather close controls of all roles being played, with the exception of the role primarily under consideration, that one being left entirely free to be played as the individual sees fit.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., chap. VIII.

<sup>6</sup>Alex Bavelas, "Role Playing and Management Training," quoted in Pigors and Myers (eds.), Readings in Personnel Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952), p. 281.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

### Role Playing in the Classroom

Children as well as adults need to solve their own problems. They need to experience a situation, to "step into another's shoes and feel what the other feels";<sup>8</sup> by doing this they may understand somewhat the effect of their actions upon others. A person needs to work through a problem before he arrives at a solution which is satisfactory to him.

George and Fannie Shaftel have used a role playing technique in the classroom. They suggest that if real learning is to take place the situations used must be crucial life situations in which persons are participating. Individuals can solve their problems more easily if they can observe others who have somewhat the same difficulty they are having. Frankness and spontaneous feelings are important aspects in role playing. They provide great impetus for serious thinking and discussion. Role playing not only permits mistakes, but it provides opportunity for persons to experiment with better ways of dealing with situations. Some of the ways are criticisms, suggestions, re-enactments, differences of opinions, and principles

---

<sup>8</sup>George and Fannie Shaftel, Role Playing in the Problem Story (New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1952), p. 5.

of conduct that can be developed.<sup>9</sup>

Benne and Muntyan at the University of Illinois found that the development of an educational role-playing situation usually follows a definite sequence of steps: (a) sensitizing the need for training; (b) the warm-up, role-taking, and definition of the situation; (c) helping the audience group to observe intelligently; (d) evaluating the role playing; and (e) replaying the situation. In the classroom the methods used in fulfilling each of the stages may vary with the topic, group, and teacher.<sup>10</sup>

Johnson and Rau, in their article entitled "Sociodrama," suggest the following points pertaining to role playing in the classroom: (a) since there is an indirect impact rather than an authoritarian one, all the group can see their mutual problems mirrored; (b) it is realistic reality practice; (c) it adds creativity and variety to the teaching approach; (d) because the problems treated are actual ones, this method is more digestible to observers; and (e) as a democratic process, it is positive and introduces a

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>10</sup>Kenneth D. Benne and B. Muntyan, Human Relations in Curriculum Change (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), pp. 233-34.

permissive climate which results in group sharing.<sup>11</sup>

#### Air Force Leadership Training Through Role Playing

Through the leadership training carried on by the Air Force in role playing, the instructor can observe and diagnose shortcomings of trainees. All members of the class profit by seeing others solve problems. Training of this type creates an atmosphere of trial and error, and the student is not on the defensive. Students may actually practice methods of leadership to discover their effectiveness.

The Air Force suggests that role playing should be kept spontaneous. Interruptions should be avoided. The action, once started, should not be allowed to drag. Important points must be brought out by the action; and, above all, overemphasis of exceptions to sound principles should be avoided. The leader of role playing must know "what should be done" and "how to do it" in a given situation.<sup>12</sup>

It should be cautioned that the tendency for a classroom

---

<sup>11</sup>M. R. Johnson and Gilbert Rau, "Sociodrama," Peabody Journal of Education, 38:93-96, 1957.

<sup>12</sup>Air University Student Handbook, Role Playing Technique in Military Leadership Instruction (Montgomery, Alabama: Maxwell Air Force Base, 1955), pp. 85-98.



teacher to interrupt may be more frequent than is wise, according to Benne and Muntyan.<sup>13</sup> The spontaneity of the situation must be protected. It is from spontaneity of reaction that the "reality" arises.

#### Personnel Selection by the Office of Strategic Services

The Office of Strategic Services undertook during World War II to assess the leadership potential of 5,391 recruits. This was done during a one- to three-day period. An attempt was made to evaluate the general usefulness of men and women according to the projects the OSS needed done. To do this assessment, the OSS devised tests of a number of special aptitudes. These were: (1) the ability to observe, remember, and report; (2) the ability to analyze news; (3) the ability to improvise subversive propaganda; (4) the ability to instruct; and (5) the ability to recruit.<sup>14</sup>

The part of this assessment procedure which related most to the present study was that of the stress interview. This interview was designed primarily to test the candidate's capacity to tolerate

---

<sup>13</sup>Benne and Muntyan, op. cit., pp. 233-34.

<sup>14</sup>Office of Strategic Services, Assessment of Staff, Assessment of Men (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1948), p. 16.

severe emotional and intellectual strain. The strain was created by rapid and merciless crossquestioning under disagreeable conditions with the aim of detecting flaws in a cover story which the candidate had been given only a few minutes to invent.<sup>15</sup> (An example of a cover story would be the following: you are caught with secret government papers. Your cover story would of necessity justify why these papers were in your possession.)

The OSS staff suggested the following to support their assessment procedures:

1. This system of examination and diagnosis was better than any with which they had previously been familiar.
2. The staff felt that the series of procedures gave members a surer sense of "knowing a man."
3. The staff felt that assessees would behave in the field as they did when first assessed.
4. The utilization in the future of this assessment system to develop it into an instrument for the purpose of:
  - (a) selection of the most suitable persons for important jobs, and
  - (b) for the advancement of our understanding of personality.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 133.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

Criteria of Success Study

Columbia University and the Educational Testing Service, with funds from the United States Office of Education, have cooperated in a three-year project, the purpose of which was to develop criteria of success for school administrators.<sup>17</sup> Over two hundred principals have participated in the project, each principal having gone through a standard five-day test period. A realistic school situation was presented in which each of the principals was given the opportunity to show how he would handle the same set of administrative problems.

A day and a half was given to orienting the principals to the fictional school and city. This orientation presented the materials relevant to the school and community in such a way that the principals should know enough to take administrative action with an adequate fund of information to support their decisions. Situational tests were then presented--tests which involved problems typical of those which normally come to the attention of a school administrator. Each principal's performance on these tests was scored according to

---

<sup>17</sup>"Gain Insight into Principal's Job Through Use of Situational Tests," ETS Developments, VIII:1:3, October 1959.

the types of behavior exhibited, sixty-seven different kinds of behavior having been tabulated in the original analysis. These involved such behaviors as the kind of decisions made, type of planning done, consideration toward subordinates, and concern for human values.

To evaluate the relationship between performance on the tests and actual performance on the job, confidential ratings were obtained from each principal's superior as well as the teachers in his school. In addition, a battery of tests was administered for use in the final evaluation. The results are still in the analysis stage, but it is felt that the study will provide a better understanding of what school administrators do and what abilities are necessary to carry on effective work. A second outcome of the study, it is hoped, will be suggestions for revision of the present curriculum for school administrators in order to provide future administrators with better preparation for their jobs.

The studies cited had as their basic purpose training individuals to do a more competent job and finding out the various aspects of role-playing situations. Therefore, in purpose and procedures, all studies cited differ from the present study. The present study sought a better and shorter means of selection through role playing.

### Role Playing in the Selection Process

The basic idea the writer of this study had was to use situations that were practical and ones which every person in the study could comprehend. In addition, having a subject play a particular role would give some indication as to how that person viewed the position he was playing. Playing this role would also give some indications as to how he would react to others, especially if enough stress could be placed upon him. In this kind of situation, the person would have nothing to draw upon except the experiences he might have had in the past in dealing with a similar situation. Probing into a problem with panelists constantly waiting, putting stress on the subject, and attempting to trip him would, it was hoped, give some indication as to how a subject would handle this and other situations where he would be exposed to stress.

Through evaluating the responses made by each subject, an attempt was made to determine how effective each individual might be. The individual was rated on the Tennessee Rating Guide according to his performance in the role situations. Then, using the same instrument, he was rated on the job. It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the two ratings. If

no significant differences were found, role playing might be used in the selection process, especially for those who were interested in advanced graduate work in educational administration. If this proved to be successful, it might be possible to develop and refine role playing so that it would prove to be more successful than in the present study.

Role playing had other possibilities, such as attempting to predict how a person who had had no previous experience in a specific position would react if he occupied it. Role playing could be used to help employers, school boards, and others determine whether they might want to risk employing such a person.

## Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented a review of research which focused on the use of role playing in the superintendency, in industry, in the classroom, and in various other leadership activities. From an analysis of the research there was no evidence of the use of role playing as a selective device, although it has been used for training purposes, not only in industry, but in the classroom as well. The present study was designed to give some clue as to the extent role playing can be used in the selection process.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURES

#### Introduction

The related literature provided examples of situations and principles for their use which served as guides in the development of the situations actually used in this study. The situations needed had to be of a practical nature. These situations needed to be types of activities a practicing principal, supervisor, or other leader in school administration would encounter during a typical day in his work.

#### Development of Role Situations

In developing situations it was necessary to consider the six sections of the Tennessee Rating Guide. Since this Guide was to be used not only in the role ratings but in the field ratings as well, it was imperative to cover each section of the Guide with a situation so that each person assuming the roles could be rated adequately.

The problem of selecting situations which covered the Guide

was seriously considered. Members of the staff of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision and doctoral candidates suggested different types of situations. Another source drawn upon was the critical incidents which Schmitt reported in his study.<sup>1</sup> Using these resources, several situations were designed for experimental use.

Trial runs were made on each situation, using members of the educational administration staff, graduate students, and staff members of other universities in the regional Kellogg project. This practice was continued and a sample analysis was made of promising situations. In these trial runs a correlation of several situations indicated that four situations which had correlations of 0.70 to 0.82 between role-playing ratings and field ratings would be satisfactory for general use in the study. The correlations of all four of these situations was significant at the 0.01 level of confidence.

The decision as to which situations were to be used was based on the above data and on the judgment of those individuals

---

<sup>1</sup>Leonard R. Schmitt, "The Behavioral Characteristics of School Principals" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1958), p. 28.



involved in the pre-experimental trial. It was felt that these individuals, being qualified on the basis of training and experience, could function as competent judges of these situations which would meet the needs of this study.

One may question the use of four role-playing situations rather than three, five, or even ten. Four situations were chosen on an arbitrary basis in order to meet the limitations imposed by the willingness, time, and availability of the subjects and the raters. It was felt that if this experiment were to prove the usefulness of role playing for selection of administrative personnel, practical requirements demanded that the use of the role-playing situations take as little time as possible.

It is not possible, in the evaluation of role playing, to assign definitive scores such as one would obtain on an objective test; therefore, it was necessary to depend on the opinions of judges. Much the same type of method is used in the initial preparation of other forms of individual evaluation.<sup>2</sup> The judges rate the individual on his performance along a scale running

---

<sup>2</sup>J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1936), pp. 263-81.

roughly from "excellent" to "poor." The scale may be divided into anywhere from three to eight or nine different rating points, depending upon the use to be made of the ratings and the accuracy required. The Tennessee Rating Guide has five points along each characteristic to be rated.

The following four role situations were finally adopted for use. A discussion of how the situations were related to the sections of the Rating Guide follows the presentation of the situations themselves.

Situation A: You are a principal in the following situation.

Nine seniors out of a class of twenty-seven have failed American History, one of the required courses for graduation. The grades have been recorded on their permanent records by the history instructor. The chairman of the board of education, the superintendent, and the history instructor are in your office. The chairman of the board has requested the history instructor to give the final examination again. The history instructor has refused to do so.

The role of the board chairman will be played by

\_\_\_\_\_.

The role of the superintendent will be played by

\_\_\_\_\_.

The history instructor will be played by \_\_\_\_\_.

The chairman of the board is speaking.

Situation B: Members of several civic organizations have formed a Committee for School Improvement in your community. You are principal of the school in this community. The committee has not consulted you or any of the professional educational leaders about the recommendations they are going to make to you. These leaders are in your office: the President of the Lions Club; the Chairman of the Education Committee of the Junior Chamber of Commerce; and the Secretary of the Rotary Club, who is also the County Judge. They are going to tell you what improvements need to be made in their school.

The President of the Lions Club is \_\_\_\_\_.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce committee member is \_\_\_\_\_.

The County Judge and Secretary of the Rotary Club is \_\_\_\_\_.

The President of the Lions Club is speaking.

Situation C: You are a principal of an elementary school. There was a double group of students in the fourth grade. This group required two teachers. A division of the fourth grade was made by placing all children's names in a hat and each teacher drawing one name at a time. The situation of some of the children has not been satisfactory for many parents. It is the third week of school, and two fathers are in your office complaining. They want their son and daughter moved to the other section of the fourth grade from the section they are in now. The fourth grade teacher of the other section is a personal friend of theirs.

\_\_\_\_\_ will play the role of one of the fathers.

\_\_\_\_\_ will play the role of the other.

Mr. Jones, the father of the boy, is speaking.

Situation D: You are a principal of a school which has a large number of children in the lower economic bracket. Gambling at school has gone on for a number of years. You were assigned to this school for the first time this year. On the previous day you caught two boys in the boys' restroom shooting dice. You sent them home,

telling them to return with their parents if they want back in school. The boys are in the sixth grade. The fathers of each of the boys are in your office. \_\_\_\_\_ will play the role of one of the fathers. \_\_\_\_\_ will play the role of the other. Mr. Wadell, one of the fathers, is speaking.

#### Relation of the Guide to the Situations

The situations developed were designed to cover all sections of the Rating Guide. However, some sections were covered more adequately than others because of the large number of items in those particular sections.

#### Interpersonal Relations, Section I

Each situation used gave some data for rating a subject on Section I. The subject's reaction toward panel members gave an indication of his interaction with others in a stress situation. The role situations suggested data for other items in this section of the Guide, such as whether the subject utilized information received from each panel member. The subject involved in a situation might give some indication as to the degree of cooperation one might

expect in an actual school situation. Through the subject's behavior he demonstrated to a great extent his consistency of action, not only in democratic processes, but his behavior suggested whether he was capable of working with people. Section I was covered in all situations.

### Intelligent Operation, Section II

During the role sessions the subject's answers to questions involving Section II seemed to be covered extremely well. In answering leading questions posed by subordinate role players, the subject used whatever available facts he had in proposing solutions. An essential part of this section was to see if the subject sought additional information other than was given in the introductory situation. The situations used gave additional data about the attitude toward experimentation of each subject. These situations also suggested possibilities for rating each subject on the basis of consistent action. That is, did the subject follow a rigid pattern in his reactions, or did he display flexibility, an ability to adjust to the requirements of the different situations? An attempt was made to determine different types of biases that the subjects might have. In summing up Section II, it appeared that in almost any situation used some indication of intelligent operation would be

evident.

### Emotional Stability, Section III

The basic aim of Section III was to try to determine, through the use of role playing, if the subject was emotionally stable. The subordinate role players using the situations made frequent attempts to disturb the equilibrium of each subject and to keep him in this state if possible. Through these means, some evidence became available about the emotional stability of each individual. All situations covered this section.

### Ethical and Moral Strength, Section IV

All situations were used to evaluate this section. In using the situations during the role sessions, there was an attempt to determine the amount of courage a person had. Would a subject stand up for the things he believed? For example, when the subject was experiencing difficulty holding on to his convictions in the face of problems posed by the panel, one panel member would casually suggest an "easy way out." It was felt that in this manner his integrity would be put to the test.

### Adequacy of Communication, Section V

Naturally all situations would cover this section if there

were communication at all. The panel was vitally interested in seeing how well each subject expressed himself orally. Through the role session, the panel tried to determine if the subject was a good listener and whether he was interested in examining ideas of others. The panel gave each subject opportunity to expand on any idea he might have.

#### Operation as a Citizen, Section VI

Situation B was especially designed for coverage of this section. In this situation the subject actually dealt with community leaders in regard to some of the educational problems of their school. The items in this section determine how well a subject knows his community, the events that are taking place in his surroundings, and his competence in dealing verbally with contemporary events.

Data for the other sections of the guide were also obtained through this situation. Section VI was the only section for which a specific situation was devised.

#### Selection of a Panel

Careful consideration was given to the selection of a panel to rate the subjects in the role situations. Care was taken to see



that panel raters for the role situations did not participate in the field ratings in order to avoid contamination of the ratings due to any possible "halo" effect or preconceived prejudices. The panel was composed of doctoral students and members of the educational administration staff who had had experience in using the Rating Guide. The panel was interchangeable and at no time consisted of less than three members who played subordinate roles and made ratings. The subordinate roles directly involved the panel members as participants in each situation.

Different panel members started the role playing with each subject. The framework of the situation was always the same, but in most instances the manner of beginning with the subject was different. An intentional effort was made to place the subjects under stress similar to those faced in actual life situations. The tone or inflection of the voice seemed to disturb some of the subjects, and they reflected this in their voices and behavior. Many of the others could not be shaken, moved, or disturbed from their calm and easy approach to these stress situations.

### Selection of Subjects

In a number of the previously cited studies, restricted or selected samples were used. That is, the experimenters used

homogeneous groups insofar as positions in the school systems were concerned. In this study it was felt that a heterogeneous group, composed of potential as well as active administrators, would make it possible, if the findings were positive, to apply the results to any level of school administration.

Twenty-five subjects, an adequate number for the particular statistical technique applied,<sup>3</sup> were used. The subjects were graduate students in education at the University of Tennessee. Some of these subjects were planning to go into public school administration, some were full-time administrators who were completing their education, a number were teaching, and several were coaching. (See Table I.) The subjects came from both city and county systems; no subject had less than five years of experience in the field of education. All subjects were male.

#### Description of the Role Sessions

Role situations A and B were used with all twenty-five subjects in the role playing, while situations C and D were

---

<sup>3</sup>Quinn McNemar, Psychological Statistics (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1955), p. 210.

TABLE I  
POSITION AND EXPERIENCE OF SUBJECTS

Position	Number	County System	City System	Average Years of Professional Experience
Elementary teachers	5	3	2	6.6
Secondary teachers	6	4	2	8.3
Elementary principals	8	5	3	8.7
Secondary principals	1	1		5.0
Coaches	2	1	1	7.0
Supervisors	2	2		6.5
Superintendents	1 <sup>a</sup>	1		9.0
Total	25	17	8	

<sup>a</sup>This superintendent was a secondary principal at the time of the role-playing rating.

alternated. Thus, each of the subjects was subjected to a series of three role-playing situations. A member of the panel read a situation to him. The subject was then allowed to read the situation for himself. He was then told the subordinate role that each member of the panel would play. The panel attempted to clarify all questions the subject had before beginning the role-playing session.

The role-playing session began by one of the members of the panel, who assumed a subordinate role questioning the subject. This was done to probe for more information than the subject would have to supply. All of the sessions and various situations that were dealt with were purely spontaneous, the only similarity being that the beginning by the various panel members was somewhat the same for each subject. Panel members had some general idea as to the direction but not as to the approach used by other panelists. This technique allowed flexibility on the part of the panelists in the role-playing situation in order to bring out the maximum amount of information. That is, after the situation was presented, the panelists did not follow a rigid, structured procedure in their questions and comments. The session with each subject continued until panel members felt that all the data possible had been obtained, at which point the panel called a halt to the session.

Immediately after the session, the three members of the panel did an individual rating of the subject. This was done alone, each panelist completing a rating without any discussion; then the panelists discussed the ratings item by item and completed a composite rating for each subject. In practically all of the ratings there was never more than a one-point variation on the scale from an individual panelist's rating to that of the composite rating. The composite rating was not completed until all members of the panel came to an agreement as to the point on the Guide's rating scale that they felt best rated the subject.

The average time of the sessions was approximately forty minutes. The individual rating of each subject was done in about fifteen minutes. The session where composite ratings were done lasted much longer because of discussions and disagreements of the panelists, and the over-all average amount of time spent on one individual was approximately one and one-half hours.

### Field Ratings of Subjects

Each subject was rated while he was actually carrying out the job he held during the regular school year. The ratings were made by a panel of two or more judges who had been trained at the

College of Education of the University of Tennessee. These judges, doctoral candidates and staff members in the College of Education, went into the field and visited each subject. The evaluations were made after a two- to three-hour session with each subject, each session involving an interview and observation of the subject while he was meeting some of the various requirements of his job. Each judge made his own evaluation, after which all the judges together agreed upon a single, over-all evaluation on the Tennessee Rating Guide.

### Statistical Techniques

A comparison of the data obtained from role-playing situations and from field ratings were made. Tables were prepared to show how each subject compared with the others, and correlations were run through the use of the Pearson Product Moment<sup>4</sup> and the Spearman-rank difference<sup>5</sup> coefficients of correlation.

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 115-21.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 208-10.

## Chapter Summary

The development of the role situations used in this study was outlined in detail, and the reasons for the selection of the situations were given. The four role situations were presented, and the relationship between the situations and each of the six sections of the Tennessee Rating Guide was explained. The selection of panel members and subjects was outlined, and a detailed description of the actual use of the role-playing sessions and ratings was given. The statistical techniques to be used in the evaluation of the study was briefly summarized.

## CHAPTER IV

### CORRELATIONS OF ROLE-PLAYING AND FIELD RATINGS

#### Introduction

An analysis of data included in this study is presented in this chapter. The data were analyzed by running correlations of ratings obtained from role-playing situations with ratings obtained from field observations. In making this comparison, it should be pointed out that this study was the first attempt to use the Tennessee Rating Guide to evaluate role-playing situations. Field ratings were used as the criterion against which to measure role-playing ratings. This study attempted to determine whether similar data would be obtained through these two different types of ratings. The methods and techniques of data analysis will also be discussed.

#### Interreliability of the Instrument

The basic hypothesis of this study was that there would be no significant difference between the data obtained from role situations and the data obtained from field ratings. A check was made to determine the internal consistency of the ratings on the Tennessee



Rating Guide to avoid the possibility that lack of internal reliability might cause unreliable data. In comparing the two sets of data, the interreliability of the instrument was checked by comparing the odd against the even items. Table II shows the interreliability of items on the Guide in role-playing situations, and Table III presents the data on field ratings. Correlations were run using the data from both types of situations, and it was found to be .926 in the role situations and .874 on the field data. Both correlations are significant at the 0.01 level of confidence.

The greatest discrepancy in ranking between odd and even ratings in the role-playing situations for any one individual, individual I, was seven. Individuals A, B, and C all had the same rank for total scores on odd and even items for the role situations.

The widest variance in ranking for any one individual on field ratings was for individual V. There was a difference of ten and one-half between the odd and even ratings. Individuals C, G, H, U, and W all had the same rank for total scores on odd and even items for field ratings.

These data seemed to warrant the conclusion that lack of interreliability in the instrument used was not likely to affect adversely the use of the Guide as a device for correlating role-playing

TABLE II

CORRELATION OF ODD AND EVEN ITEM TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE  
SCORES OF TWENTY-FIVE SUBJECTS RATED IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS

Subject	Rank	Odds X	Rank	Evens Y	D	D <sup>2</sup>
A	1	37	1	33	0	----
B	2	38	2	38	0	----
C	3	42	3	40	0	----
D	6	47	4	42	2	4
E	4	46	6.5	45	2.5	6.25
F	6	47	6.5	45	.5	.25
G	6	47	9.5	46	3.5	12.25
H	8	49	6.5	45	1.5	2.25
I	13.5	51	6.5	45	7	49
J	10	50	9.5	46	.5	.25
K	10	50	11.5	47	1.5	2.25
L	10	50	11.5	47	1.5	2.25
M	13.5	51	14	48	.5	.25
N	13.5	51	14	48	.5	.25
O	13.5	51	14	48	.5	.25
P	18	53	16	50	2	4
Q	16.5	52	19	52	2.5	6.25
R	20	54	17.5	51	2.5	6.25
S	20	54	17.5	51	2.5	6.25
T	16.5	52	23	54	6.5	42.25
U	22	56	20.5	53	1.5	2.25
V	20	54	25	56	5	25
W	23.5	59	23	54	.5	.25
X	23.5	59	23	54	.5	.25
Y	25	61	20.5	53	4.5	20.25
		1261		1191		

$$\text{Formula: } r = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)} = .926$$

Source: C. C. Ross, Measurement in Today's Schools (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945), p. 246.

TABLE III

CORRELATION OF ODD AND EVEN ITEM TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE  
SCORES OF TWENTY-FIVE SUBJECTS RATED IN FIELD RATINGS

Subject	Rank	Odds X	Rank	Evens Y	D	D <sup>2</sup>
A	17.5	50	13	43	4.5	20.25
B	17.5	50	13	43	4.5	20.25
C	17.5	50	18.5	47	1	1
D	8.5	43	13	43	4.5	20.25
E	2	39	6.5	39	4.5	20.25
F	1	34	4	35	3	9
G	17.5	50	16.5	45	1	1
H	5	41	4	35	1	1
I	14.5	47	9	41	5.5	30.25
J	20.5	54	21	50	.5	.25
K	3	40	1	33	2	4
L	22.5	55	18.5	47	4	16
M	10.5	45	9	41	1.5	2.25
N	5	41	6.5	39	1.5	2.25
O	20.5	54	22	52	1.5	2.25
P	7	42	4	35	3	9
Q	12.5	46	9	41	3.5	12.25
R	22.5	55	20	48	2.5	6.25
S	5	41	2	34	3	9
T	10.5	45	15	44	4.5	20.25
U	24	58	25	57	1	1
V	12.5	46	23	53	10.5	110.25
W	25	64	24	54	1	1
X	14.5	47	16.5	45	2	4
Y	8.5	43	11	42	2.5	6.25
		1180		1086		

$$\text{Formula: } r = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)} = .874$$

Source: C. C. Ross, Measurement in Today's Schools (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945), p. 246.

situation ratings with field ratings .

### Comparison and Analysis

#### Total Guide

The data were set up so that a correlation of role situation ratings and field ratings would be presented for the total Guide and all sections . Table IV lists each individual's total score in role situations and in field ratings . The ratings in both cases are for the entire Guide , with the total score possible for any individual being 125 . The highest possible score on any item was 5 and the lowest, 1 . The lowest possible total score was 25 .

Various methods are used in making comparisons . However , to simplify the presentation of the data in this study , the median , range , and correlations will be reported . In order to give a clear , concise picture of the data these interpretations will be presented for the total Guide and then for each section .

The median score over the total Guide for role playing was 99.3 . This meant that half of the twenty-five cases were above this figure and the other half below it . The median for field ratings was 92 (7.3 points lower than the role rating) .

The range of scores for the total Guide in role playing ran from 70 to 114 . This was a range of 44 points . Field ratings ran

TABLE IV

CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FIVE  
SUBJECTS RATED ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS AND IN THE FIELD

Subject	Role Playing		Field Rating		D	D <sup>2</sup>
	Total Guide	Rank	Total Guide	Rank		
A	70	1	93	15.5	14.5	210.25
B	76	2	93	15.5	13.5	182.25
C	82	3	97	18	15	225
D	89	4	86	9.5	5.5	30.25
E	91	5	78	6	1	1
F	92	6	69	1	5	25
G	93	7	95	17	10	100
H	94	8	76	4	4	16
I	96	9.5	88	12	2.5	6.25
J	96	9.5	104	22	12.5	156.25
K	97	11.5	73	2	9.5	90.25
L	97	11.5	102	20	8.5	72.25
M	99	14	86	9.5	4.5	20.25
N	99	14	80	7	7	49
O	99	14	106	23	9	81
P	103	16	77	5	11	121
Q	104	17	87	11	6	36
R	105	18.5	103	21	2.5	6.25
S	105	18.5	75	3	15.5	240.25
T	106	20	89	13	7	49
U	109	21	115	24	4	9
V	110	22	99	19	3	9
W	113	23.5	118	25	1.5	2.25
X	113	23.5	92	14	9.5	90.25
Y	114	25	85	8	17	289
						2,117.00

Spearman Rank: .186

Pearson Product Moment: .187

Median - RP 99.3

Range - RP 70 - 114

Median - FR 92

Range - FR 69 - 118

from 69 to 118, a range of 49 points. This range for field ratings was 5 points greater than for role ratings.

It is striking to note that subject Y ranked highest in role playing, yet in field ratings he ranked eighth from the lowest ranking. Subject C, on the other hand, ranked third, very near the lowest, in role playing and eighteenth, or near the top, in the field ratings.

It should be pointed out that interpretations of the data need to take into account the fact that the lowest rating using either rating method was 69. This meant that practically every subject averaged a score of 3 or better per item. This could mean that the subjects in the study were all average or above. There is also the possibility that raters used only the top three-fifths of the scale in attempting to rate subjects. Whatever the reason, the limited use of the lower portion of the measuring instrument would indicate a problem in trying to use it to discriminate through rankings among people who scored largely on the upper points of the Guide.

Correlations for the total Guide were run, using the Pearson Product Moment and the Spearman rank order coefficients of correlation. These correlated at .187 and .186, neither being significant.

A correlation of .381 was needed to be significant at the 0.05 level.<sup>1</sup>

### Interpersonal Relations , Section I

Table V depicts the ratings for Section I having to do with interpersonal relations. Sample items in this section are:

(a) utilizing the opinions of others , (b) seeing that policies are formulated cooperatively, and (c) using democratic processes in all phases of work.

The median score for role playing was 27. The median for field ratings was 25, a difference of only 2 points. Subject Y showed the greatest difference in rankings. He had the highest ranking in role playing, but was ranked only eighth in field ratings. Subject R showed the same ranking in both ratings.

The range in scores for this section was identical. These ran from 18 to 34. This was a difference of 16 points in both ratings. The highest possible score for the section was 35, the lowest being 7.

Correlations for Section I were .261 and .180. Neither

---

<sup>1</sup>J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 539, adapted from H. A. Wallace and G. W. Snedecor, Correlation in Machine Calculation.

TABLE V

CORRELATION OF SECTION I SCORES AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FIVE  
SUBJECTS RATED ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS AND IN THE FIELD

Subject	Role Playing		Field Rating		D	D <sup>2</sup>
	Section I	Rank	Section I	Rank		
A	18	1	25	12.5	11.5	132.25
B	20	2	26	16.5	14.5	210.25
C	23	5	25	12.5	7.5	56.25
D	22	3	25	12.5	9.5	90.25
E	23	5	22	6	1	1
F	25	8	18	1	7	49
G	23	5	27	19.5	14.5	210.25
H	26	9.5	21	3	6.5	42.25
I	28	16	24	9	7	49
J	26	9.5	29	22.5	13	169
K	28	16	21	3	13	169
L	24	7	27	19.5	12.5	156.25
M	27	11.5	22	6	5.5	30.25
N	28	16	26	16.5	.5	.25
O	27	11.5	29	22.5	11	121
P	28	16	22	6	10	100
Q	28	16	24	9	7	49
R	30	21	28	21	0	0
S	28	16	21	3	13	169
T	28	16	25	12.5	3.5	12.25
U	33	24	34	25	1	1
V	29	20	26	16.5	4.5	20.25
W	31	22.5	33	24	1.5	2.25
X	31	22.5	26	16.5	6	36
Y	34	25	24	9	16	256
						2,132.00

Spearman Rank: .180

Pearson Product Moment: .261

Median - RP 27

Range - RP 18 - 34

Median - FR 25

Range - FR 18 - 34



was significant at the 0.05 level.

### Intelligent Operation, Section II

Table VI lists the statistical data for Section II. Items covered were: (a) consideration of new data in problem solving, (b) recognition and definition of a problem, (c) consistency, (d) experimentation, (e) the use of previous experiences, and (f) wise acceptance of responsibility.

The median score for role playing was 32.5 and for field ratings, 29.3, a difference between the two ratings of 3.2. The greatest discrepancy was that of subjects B and C. Subject B ranked lowest in role playing and eighteenth in field ratings. Subject C ranked third from the lowest in role playing and eighteenth in field ratings. The highest possible score was 35; the lowest, 7.

The range of scores for role playing was 22 to 36; this was a range of 14 points in role situations. Field ratings ranged from 20 to 38, a spread of 18 points.

Correlations utilizing the data were run and found to be .292 and .300. These were not significant.

### Emotional Stability, Section III

The main concern of Section III was to try to determine if the

TABLE VI

CORRELATION OF SECTION II SCORES AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FIVE  
SUBJECTS RATED ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS AND IN THE FIELD

Subject	Role Playing		Field Rating		D	D <sup>2</sup>
	Section II	Rank	Section II	Rank		
A	24	2	29	14	12	144
B	22	1	30	18	17	289
C	26	3	30	18	15	225
D	29	5	26	9.5	4.5	20.25
E	31	10.5	23	5	5.5	30.25
F	28	4	23	5	1	1
G	30	7.5	29	14	6.5	42.25
H	30	7.5	23	5	2.5	6.25
I	31	10.5	28	11.5	1	1
J	30	7.5	34	21	13.5	182.25
K	30	7.5	21	2.5	5	25
L	32	14.5	34	21	6.5	42.25
M	32	14.5	29	14	.5	.25
N	32	14.5	21	2.5	12	144
O	32	14.5	34	21	6.5	42.25
P	33	18.5	25	7.5	11	121
Q	33	18.5	28	11.5	7	49
R	35	21	35	23.5	2.5	6.25
S	32	14.5	20	1	13.5	182.25
T	35	21	25	7.5	13.5	182.25
U	35	21	35	23.5	2.5	6.25
V	36	24	33	20	4	16
W	36	24	38	25	1	1
X	36	24	30	18	6	36
Y	32	14.5	26	9.5	5	25
						1,820.00

Spearman Rank: .300

Pearson Product Moment: .292

Median - RP 32.5

Range - RP 22 - 36

Median - FR 29.3

Range - FR 20 - 38

individual was emotionally stable. There was only one item in this section. Table VII shows the data obtained.

The median scores were 4.8 for role playing and 4.5 for field ratings, a difference of only 0.3 between the medians. Subject N was rated as high as anyone in role playing and as low as anyone in field ratings.

The range in scores from role playing was from 3 to 5 and for field ratings, 2 to 5. The greatest amount of difference for either field ratings or role playing was 3 points.

Correlations were run for Section III. These were .196 and .398. Neither of the correlations for this section was significant.

#### Ethical and Moral Strength, Section IV

Table VIII presents the data compiled for Section IV. In this section an attempt was made to determine: (a) the subject's integrity, (b) consideration of agreements made with others, and (c) the placing of principle above personal advantage.

The median scores were practically the same, being 8.7 and 8.6 respectively. Subjects D, G, I, J, L, and M each had a difference of 1 in the rankings of role playing and field ratings. Subject X showed the greatest difference in ranking. He was twenty-first, or highest, in role playing and first, or lowest, in

TABLE VII

CORRELATION OF SECTION III SCORES AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FIVE  
SUBJECTS RATED ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS AND IN THE FIELD

Subject	Role Playing		Field Rating		D	D <sup>2</sup>
	Section III	Rank	Section III	Rank		
A	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
B	3	1.5	4	13	11.5	132.25
C	4	9.5	5	22.5	13	169
D	3	1.5	3	4	2.5	6.25
E	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
F	4	9.5	3	4	5.5	30.25
G	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
H	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
I	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
J	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
K	4	9.5	3	4	5.5	30.25
L	4	9.5	5	22.5	13	169
M	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
N	5	21	2	1	20	400
O	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
P	4	9.5	3	4	5.5	30.25
Q	5	21	4	13	8	64
R	4	9.5	4	13	3.5	12.25
S	5	21	4	13	8	64
T	5	21	5	22.5	1.5	2.25
U	5	21	5	22.5	1.5	2.25
V	5	21	5	22.5	1.5	2.25
W	5	21	5	22.5	1.5	2.25
X	5	21	3	4	17	289
Y	5	21	4	13	8	64
						<u>1,567.50</u>

Spearman Rank: .398

Pearson Product Moment: .196

Median - RP 4.8

Range - RP 2 - 5

Median - FR 4.5

Range - FR 3 - 5

TABLE VIII

CORRELATION OF SECTION IV SCORES AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FIVE  
SUBJECTS RATED ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS AND IN THE FIELD

Subject	Role Playing		Field Rating		D	D <sup>2</sup>
	Section IV	Rank	Section IV	Rank		
A	5	1	9	19.5	18.5	342.25
B	7	2.5	8	11	8.5	72.25
C	7	2.5	9	19.5	17	289
D	8	10	8	11	1	1
E	10	21	8	11	10	100
F	8	10	7	3.5	6.5	42.25
G	8	10	8	11	1	1
H	8	10	7	3.5	6.5	42.25
I	8	10	8	11	1	1
J	8	10	8	11	1	1
K	8	10	7	3.5	6.5	42.25
L	8	10	8	11	1	1
M	8	10	8	11	1	1
N	8	10	9	19.5	9.5	90.25
O	8	10	10	24	14	196
P	10	21	7	3.5	17.5	306.25
Q	10	21	8	11	10	100
R	8	10	9	19.5	9.5	90.25
S	10	21	8	11	10	100
T	8	10	9	19.5	9.5	90.25
U	10	21	10	24	13	169
V	10	21	9	19.5	1.5	2.25
W	10	21	10	24	13	169
X	10	21	5	1	30	400
Y	10	21	8	11	10	100
						2,749.50

Spearman Rank:  $-.005$ Pearson Product Moment:  $-.209$ 

Median - RP 8.7

Range - RP 5 - 10

Median - FR 8.6

Range - FR 5 - 10

field ratings.

The range of scores in both role playing and field ratings ran from 5 to 10, a range of only 5 points. There were only two items in Section IV; therefore, the highest possible score for this section was 10 and the lowest possible was 2.

Correlations for this section were  $-.209$  and  $-.005$ .

Neither of these is significant.

#### Adequacy of Communication, Section V

Table IX lists the data for Section V. Each subject was rated according to: (a) his skill in oral expression, (b) his attentiveness as a listener, (c) his skill in leading groups, and (d) his communication with others.

The median for Section V was 16.4 for role playing and 14 for field ratings, a difference of 2.4 points. Subject C showed the greatest difference in rankings. He was next to the lowest in role playing and ranked highest in field ratings. Subject G had a difference of only 1 point in both rankings. Two other subjects, W and X, had a difference of only 2 points in both ratings.

There was a range of 7 in role playing, from 11 to 18. Field ratings ranged from 9 to 18, a difference of 9 points. The highest possible score for this section was 20; the lowest possible was 4.

TABLE IX

CORRELATION OF SECTION V SCORES AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FIVE  
SUBJECTS RATED ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS AND IN THE FIELD

Subject	Role Playing		Field Rating		D	D <sup>2</sup>
	Section V	Rank	Section V	Rank		
A	11	1	13	9	8	64
B	13	4	15	14.5	10.5	110.25
C	12	2	18	24.5	22.5	506.25
D	16	13	16	17.5	4.5	20.25
E	13	4	13	9	5	25
F	16	13	9	1	12	144
G	16	13	14	12	1	1
H	15	8.5	12	5	3.5	12.25
I	13	4	15	14.5	10.5	110.25
J	17	19	17	21.5	2.5	6.25
K	15	8.5	12	5	3.5	12.25
L	17	19	17	21.5	2.5	6.25
M	16	13	13	9	4	16
N	14	6.5	14	12	5.5	30.25
O	17	19	16	17.5	1.5	2.25
P	16	13	10	2	11	121
Q	16	13	12	5	8	64
R	16	13	16	17.5	4.5	20.25
S	17	19	12	5	14	196
T	18	23.5	16	17.5	6	36
U	14	6.5	18	24.5	18	324
V	17	19	14	12	7	49
W	18	23.5	17	21.5	2	4
X	18	23.5	17	21.5	2	4
Y	18	23.5	12	5	18.5	342.25
						<u>2,227.00</u>

Spearman Rank: .144

Pearson Product Moment: .029

Median - RP 16.4

Range - RP 11 - 18

Median - FR 14

Range - FR 9 - 18

The correlations for this section were .144 and .029. Neither was significant.

#### Operation as a Citizen, Section VI

Table X indicates data for Section VI. In this section the subject was rated according to: (a) his interpretation of contemporary trends and events, (b) his cooperation with non-educational groups, and (c) the extent of his consideration for minority groups in the school community.

The median for role playing was 12.3 and for field ratings, 10. This was a difference of 2.3 points. Subjects E, L, Q, and R were ranked at a difference of only 1 point for both ratings. Subject A showed the greatest variance in rank. He was the lowest in role playing but ranked next to the top in field ratings.

The range from 8 to 15 was identical for both role playing and field ratings. The highest possible score was 15 and the lowest was 3.

Correlations were run, and these were .107 and .278. They were not significant.

#### Chapter Summary

Chapter IV consists of a comparison between the role playing



TABLE X

CORRELATION OF SECTION VI SCORES AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FIVE  
SUBJECTS RATED ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE IN  
ROLE-PLAYING SITUATIONS AND IN THE FIELD

Subject	Role Playing		Field Rating		D	D <sup>2</sup>
	Section VI	Rank	Section VI	Rank		
A	8	1	13	22.5	21.5	462.25
B	10	3	10	11.5	8.5	72.25
C	10	3	10	11.5	8.5	72.25
D	11	7	8	2	5	25
E	10	3	8	2	1	1
F	11	7	9	6.5	1.5	2.25
G	12	15	13	22.5	7.5	56.25
H	11	7	9	6.5	1.5	2.25
I	12	15	9	6.5	8.5	72.25
J	11	7	12	19.5	12.5	156.25
K	12	15	9	6.5	8.5	72.25
L	12	15	11	16	1	1
M	12	15	10	11.5	3.5	12.25
N	12	15	8	2	13	169
O	11	7	13	22.5	15.5	240.25
P	12	15	9	6.5	8.5	72.25
Q	12	15	11	16	1	1
R	12	15	11	16	1	1
S	13	22.5	10	11.5	11	121
T	12	15	9	6.5	8.5	72.25
U	12	15	13	22.5	7.5	56.25
V	13	22.5	12	19.5	3	9
W	13	22.5	15	25	2.5	6.25
X	13	22.5	11	16	6.5	42.25
Y	15	25	11	16	9	81
						1,879.00

Spearman Rank: .278

Pearson Product Moment: .107

Median - RP 12.3

Range - RP 8 - 15

Median - FR 10

Range - FR 8 - 15

stress situation ratings and field ratings. An analysis of the total Guide was reported, as well as a comparison of each section contained in the Guide. Tables were presented to show the median, the range, and the correlation of role playing ratings and field ratings.

Analysis of the data suggests that the interreliability of the instrument used for rating purposes did not affect adversely the correlations. These correlations were .926 in the role situations and .874 on the field data. Both correlations are significant at the 0.01 level of confidence. However, the fact that no individual rated below an absolute average on the total Guide may cause one to question the extent to which discriminating rankings resulted from the ratings. Individual scores were not, therefore, widely different. It was pointed out in the body of the chapter that some individuals had wide differences in their rankings on the two different scores, both for the total Guide and for the individual sections. None of the correlations reported in the study were significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis of the study was not sustained.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

Before presenting the findings and conclusions of the study, it might be well to recapitulate what was attempted in this study. The basic aim was to find a shorter, more effective means of selecting school administrative personnel through the use of role playing. In order that this might be done, it was necessary to determine how role playing could be evaluated. The staff of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Tennessee had at its disposal an instrument known as the Tennessee Rating Guide. This device had been developed and tested in eleven previous studies at the University of Tennessee. In addition to these studies, the instrument had been used at other colleges and universities throughout the Southern Region. Therefore, it was decided to see if this instrument would give similar results when used in rating people from role-playing situations as it did when used in rating people on the job.

Making the assumption that the instrument was valid, the

next step was to design and develop situations that would measure the types of items included in the Guide. This was done on a trial basis and, when there was some assurance that the situations to be used were valid, the collection of data began.

The limitations of the study were set up and the selection of subjects to participate was accomplished. A panel composed of members of the educational administration staff and doctoral candidates was selected and the role playing sessions were held. After the completion of the role playing sessions, some five months elapsed. A complete new team of raters went into the field to assess again the characteristics of the individuals who had been rated.

### Findings

The first hypothesis was that role-playing situations could be developed which would reveal behavioral characteristics possessed by school administrators. The role situations were developed, and the scores obtained from the role-playing situations were correlated with field ratings. It was found that four of the situations correlated between 0.70 and 0.82. The correlations were significant at the 0.01 level of confidence. On the basis of

these correlations, these situations were used in the study.

The other hypothesis set forth in the study was that there would be no significant difference in ratings made in role situations and those made in the field. This hypothesis was not sustained. The following evidence presented pertaining to the total Guide and each section of the Guide substantiate the conclusion drawn.

The correlations for the total Guide were not significant. These were .187 and .186 using the Pearson Product Moment and the Spearman rank order coefficients of correlation. It should be stated that to be significant at the 0.05 level of confidence a correlation on the total Guide of .395 was needed. The various sections of the Guide correlated in the following manner: (a) Section I at .261 and .180; (b) Section II at .292 and .300; (c) Section III at .196 and .398; (d) Section IV at  $-.209$  and  $-.005$ ; (e) Section V at .144 and .029; and (f) Section VI at .278 and .107. None of the correlations for any section of the Guide was significant.

### Recommendations

None of the correlations between scores obtained on the role-playing ratings and the field ratings was statistically significant. Therefore, it would seem that role playing as a selection instrument

in this situation is not a useful technique. However, an examination of the data precludes any definite decision ruling out role playing as a selection technique. The failure of this study to bear out the given hypothesis does not necessarily mean that future studies using the same techniques would also be failures.

All of the subjects except three received ratings of "average" (a score of 75) or better on the total ratings in both the field and role-playing situations. That is, out of twenty-five pairs of ratings, only three fell below average, and none of these three was rated below average in both ratings. These findings suggest a possible lack of discrimination on the part of the Tennessee Rating Guide, the raters, or on the adequacy of the role-playing situations to provide enough information for fine discrimination. Of course, it is also possible that all of the subjects were above average on the characteristics measured. Therefore, there are four possible factors which may well have given spurious results.

The Tennessee Rating Guide may not be a fine enough instrument to provide adequate discrimination between subjects who are average or above insofar as administrative behavior is concerned. Using these subjects to develop a scale for finer discrimination might help to obtain a guide which would tell more than whether an

individual is or would be an effective administrator; it would tell how effective he would be.

It is a well-known fact that many raters tend to rate others as being average or somewhat above, not wishing to give a person what, in effect, would amount to a poor recommendation. A standardized, comprehensive training session for the raters might help to eliminate this problem wherever it exists.

While great care was used in the final selection of the role-playing situations used in this study, it is possible that other, better situations could be developed which would provide enough information to lead to positive findings.

Finally, an over-all evaluation of the study suggests a further study which might provide data on which fairly definite conclusions could be reached. Since none of the subjects received poor ratings, the study may have included individuals between whom there was comparatively little difference insofar as effectiveness was concerned. It is therefore recommended that another pilot study be carried out, using the following outline as a preliminary guide:

1. For purposes of a pilot study, thirty subjects would provide an adequate number on which to draw general conclusions.

2. School superintendents in perhaps five areas could be contacted and asked to pick out six of their administrative personnel, three of whom would be selected on this basis: "If you, as a superintendent, had no choice but to fire three administrators, which three would you choose?" The other three would be selected using this question: "If you had to fire all of your administrators but three, which three would you retain?"

3. After these people were selected, each superintendent would then rate them on the Tennessee Rating Guide. This would automatically give field ratings as well as provide a check on the reliability of the superintendents' initial selections.

4. The thirty people finally selected would then be exposed to the role-playing situations from which ratings by a panel would be obtained. None of the panel members would know the people being rated or know how they were rated by their superintendents.

5. The same procedures as already used in this study would then be applied.

It is felt that a study of the above type would determine more effectively the usefulness of the role-playing technique in selection. However, regardless of the results of the present or possible future studies, it is recommended that the use of role playing as a training



procedure for administrators be seriously considered. Its use in the area of training has already been well established.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benne, Kenneth D., and Bozidar Muntyan. Human Relations in Curriculum Change. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
- Coker, Phyllis U. "A Study of the Use of the Tennessee Rating Guide as a Means of Differentiating Between Effective and Ineffective School Administrators." Unpublished Master's thesis, College of Education, The University of Tennessee, August 1956.
- Evernden, William Lyle. "The Reliability of the Tennessee Rating Guide for School Administrators." Unpublished Master's thesis, College of Education, The University of Tennessee, June 1958.
- "Gain Insight into Principal's Job Through Use of Situational Tests," ETS Developments, VIII: 1, October 1959.
- Gentry, Harold Wayne. "Patterns of Behavioral Characteristics Exhibited by School Administrators." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, March 1957.
- Greever, Clarence E. "A Study of the Characteristics of Selected Effective Superintendencies in East Tennessee." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1956.
- Gross, Neal C., Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1936.
- Johnson, M. R., and Gilbert Rau. "Sociodrama," Peabody Journal of Education, 38:93-96, 1957.

- Luton, James N. "A Study of the Use of Certain Standardized Tests in the Selection of Potential Educational Administrators." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, March 1955.
- Maier, Norman R. F. Principles of Human Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1952.
- Maier, Norman R. F., Allen R. Solem, and Ayesha A. Maier. Supervisory and Executive Development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
- McNemar, Quinn. Psychological Statistics. Second edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1955.
- Moffett, Charles R. "Operational Characteristics of Beginning Master's Students in Educational Administration and Supervision." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1954.
- Nunnery, Michael Yates. "A Study in the Use of Psychological Tests in Determining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness Among Practicing School Administrators." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1958.
- Office of Strategic Services. Assessment of Staff; Assessment of Men. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1948.
- Orleans, Jacob S. Measurement in Education. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937.
- Ross, C. C. Measurement in Today's Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945.
- Schmitt, Leonard R. "The Behavioral Characteristics of School Principals." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1958.
- Shaftel, George, and Fannie Shaftel. Role Playing: The Problem Story. New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1952.

Taylor, Gem Kate. "The Development of Effective Characteristics in Students of School Administration." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of Tennessee, June 1957.

"Tentative Report of the Work Conference on Planning for the Study of Preparation Programs in Educational Administration," prepared by the Program Center Staff, Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, May 10-12, 1951.

United States Air Force. Role Playing Technique in Military Leadership Instruction. Student Handbook: Principles of Leadership and Management. Montgomery, Alabama: Maxwell Air Force Base, 1955.

## APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

### University of Tennessee Rating Guide

#### Characteristics of School Administrators (as Revised January 8, 1958)

##### Interpersonal Relations

##### A. How does he relate to others?

- \_\_\_ 1. Tends to be a lone wolf
- \_\_\_ 2. Has a few friends but tends to ignore others
- \_\_\_ 3. Friendly when approached by others
- \_\_\_ 4. Popular; has many casual acquaintances
- \_\_\_ 5. Steadily warm and appealing in relationship with others

##### B. Does he utilize the opinion of others?

- \_\_\_ 1. Generally ignores the viewpoints of others
- \_\_\_ 2. Uses opinions if they agree with his own
- \_\_\_ 3. Values opinions of those who volunteer suggestions but fails to seek opinions of others
- \_\_\_ 4. Highly selective in utilizing opinions; sometimes values ideas that differ from his own
- \_\_\_ 5. Consistently seeks and considers the opinions of others

##### C. Is he skillful in developing an organization in which each can do his best?

- \_\_\_ 1. Most people with whom he works have important responsibilities in which they are genuinely interested
- \_\_\_ 2. Sometimes delegates responsibilities with regard to special interests and abilities of associates
- \_\_\_ 3. Delegates tasks largely mechanically; fails to recognize special abilities of others
- \_\_\_ 4. Plays favorites in delegating responsibility
- \_\_\_ 5. Runs the whole show himself

D. Is he skillful in getting policies formulated cooperatively?

- ☐ 1. Involves general public, staff members and students in major policy formulation
- ☐ 2. Attempts to involve general public, staff members and students in policy formulation but has difficulty in setting up necessary machinery
- ☐ 3. Involves only key people in policy formulation
- ☐ 4. Discusses policies with others, but decisions are usually made prior to the discussion
- ☐ 5. Formulates policies himself; rarely discusses them with others

E. Is he skillful in continuous implementation of policies?

- ☐ 1. Tends to ignore or defer action on policies
- ☐ 2. Vacillates in implementing policies
- ☐ 3. Tends to force policies without sufficient planning
- ☐ 4. Cautious in effecting policies
- ☐ 5. Moves surely and judiciously in effecting policies

F. Does he help the group arrive at a working consensus?

- ☐ 1. Contributes little to help group arrive at a working consensus
- ☐ 2. Tries to force group to quick agreements without really considering problems
- ☐ 3. Tends to force action without careful group consideration
- ☐ 4. Strives for consensus but sometimes encourages group action on insufficient data
- ☐ 5. Continually strives for careful group problem analysis; helps group recognize points of agreement

G. Does he believe that democratic processes are essential?

- ☐ 1. Urges the use of processes consistent with best democratic practice
- ☐ 2. Is cognizant of responsibility to use democratic procedures; is sometimes unsure of how to employ them
- ☐ 3. Attempts to use democratic processes; however, usually resorts to expediency in pressing situations



- \_\_\_\_ 4. Gives lip service to democratic processes which are not evident in his behavior
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Uses any expedient method available to attain a pre-determined end

### Intelligent Operation

#### A. Does he give sufficient consideration to new data in problem solving?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Disregards new data that challenge the status quo
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Uses new data only when they support his position
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Will consider new data when presented to him
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Seeks new data along lines of special interests
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Consistently seeks and employs new data

#### B. Does he recognize and define problems?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Tends not to recognize existence of problems
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Tends to consider symptoms instead of problems
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Sometimes confuses symptoms with problems in his efforts to improve
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Recognizes problems but has difficulty in analyzing them
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Recognizes and analyzes problems

#### C. Is he consistent in terms of his basic assumptions?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Supports conflicting ideas; action characterized by inconsistency
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Has tendency to discuss important problems in terms of his likes and dislikes
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Frequently uncertain of his position on controversial subjects
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Is certain of his position and consistent in his behavior in areas which he considers important
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Is dependable and predictable in word and action

D. Does he experiment?

- ☐ 1. Tends to try out new ideas after careful study and follows through on basis of experimental evidence
- ☐ 2. Undertakes various new projects for improvement but fails to interpret their significance
- ☐ 3. May be premature in trying out ideas for improvement; fails to fully incorporate accepted principles of experimentation
- ☐ 4. Action tends to be based on subjective evidence
- ☐ 5. Tends to operate within traditional practices or on basis of hunches

E. Does he try to recognize and deal with his own biases?

- ☐ 1. Consistently examines his own position and attempts to understand the positions of others
- ☐ 2. Tends to evaluate his position but will resort to biases under pressure
- ☐ 3. Feels uneasy about his position at times; can be stimulated to examine his opinions
- ☐ 4. Assumes that his position is generally right; does not know how to identify his own biases
- ☐ 5. Refuses to examine his position

F. Does he appear to have profited by previous experience?

- ☐ 1. Frequently makes the same mistake but seldom admits it
- ☐ 2. Usually attempts to justify mistakes
- ☐ 3. Recognizes that some mistakes are inevitable but has difficulty in making readjustments
- ☐ 4. Makes some improvement as a result of past mistakes
- ☐ 5. Recognizes his mistakes and seeks to avoid repeating them

G. Does he have the ability to size up people?

- ☐ 1. Judges potentialities of people in terms of their race, religion, nationality, or other such concepts
- ☐ 2. Makes judgments about people in terms of hunches
- ☐ 3. Tends to base judgments of people on past experiences without rethinking in terms of present situations

- \_\_\_\_ 4. Judges people on basis of personal experiences , using additional resources when problem situations arise
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Consciously endeavors to understand the basic potentialities of each person through objective procedures

H. Does he accept responsibility wisely?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Budgets the assuming of responsibilities wisely in terms of own limitations in present situation
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Carries out pressing responsibilities well but neglects less urgent duties
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Concentrates on school routing; supports non-school endeavors on a highly selective basis
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Attends strictly to school routine without participating in community enterprises
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Accepts too many responsibilities or refuses to assume responsibilities normally expected of him

Emotional Stability

A. Is he emotionally stable?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Tends to be upset by everyday occurrences and keeps staff in continuous uproar
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Attempts to exemplify outward calmness but explodes about trivial matters
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Is upset in novel situations and has a tendency to upset others
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Meets novel situations well but lets some problems involve him in distracting entanglements
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Appears to meet crises with a contagious calmness; others feel at ease in his presence

Ethical and Moral Strength

A. Does he have the courage of his convictions?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Tends to weasel out of situations
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Usually follows most popular viewpoint

- \_\_\_ 3. Has a tendency to accept some viewpoints which he realizes are in conflict with his own
- \_\_\_ 4. Has well-tempered convictions which he tries to follow but is sometimes unsure of their soundness
- \_\_\_ 5. Places principle above his own personal advantage

B. Does he exhibit integrity in dealing with others?

- \_\_\_ 1. Considers agreements with others as promissory notes to which he is committed
- \_\_\_ 2. Exhibits integrity in important agreements, but in less important agreements is somewhat careless
- \_\_\_ 3. Tends to rationalize inadvertent breaches of agreements
- \_\_\_ 4. Through indirect methods leads people to believe in false situations
- \_\_\_ 5. Tends to be unscrupulous in accomplishing his purposes

Adequacy of Communication

A. How well does he express himself orally?

- \_\_\_ 1. Chooses words which clearly convey thoughts; is able to express abstract ideas
- \_\_\_ 2. Expresses practical thoughts fairly well, but has difficulty with abstractions
- \_\_\_ 3. Is unimpressive in oral communication
- \_\_\_ 4. Expresses himself in a fuzzy, incomprehensible manner and tends to puzzle listeners concerning what he means
- \_\_\_ 5. Is either unable or does not desire to convey thoughts to others

B. Is he a good listener?

- \_\_\_ 1. Is attentive in trying to grasp ideas expressed by others
- \_\_\_ 2. Listens carefully to ideas in which he is interested
- \_\_\_ 3. Appears to listen but has difficulty in concentration
- \_\_\_ 4. Tends to disrupt oral communication by inattentiveness or by introduction of irrelevant ideas
- \_\_\_ 5. Tends to listen only to himself

C. Does he interest people in examining ideas?

- \_\_\_ 1. Stimulates people to seek solutions through critical analyses of ideas
- \_\_\_ 2. Encourages examination of ideas that he thinks are important
- \_\_\_ 3. Waxes hot and cold in stimulating examination of ideas
- \_\_\_ 4. Appears to consider intellectual curiosity unimportant
- \_\_\_ 5. Discourages examination of ideas

D. How skillfully does he lead group discussions?

- \_\_\_ 1. Is either at a loss or monopolizes discussion when appointed official leader of a group
- \_\_\_ 2. Permits everyone to talk without achieving a group decision
- \_\_\_ 3. Tends to rely on key persons in group discussions
- \_\_\_ 4. Operates well within a structured agenda
- \_\_\_ 5. Facilitates a stimulating and well-ordered climate conducive to reaching group decisions

Operation as a Citizen

A. Does he help people interpret significant contemporary trends and events?

- \_\_\_ 1. Does not seem to be informed about or interested in contemporary events
- \_\_\_ 2. Discusses current affairs in terms of stock phrases and generalities
- \_\_\_ 3. Knows about current affairs but shows prejudice in discussing them
- \_\_\_ 4. Is well informed in the socioeconomic problems in which he is interested
- \_\_\_ 5. Discusses intelligently major social, political, and economic issues

B. Is he cooperative with non-educational groups working for community betterment?

- \_\_\_ 1. Is aware of and actively concerned with desires and interests of community groups, agencies and organizations
- \_\_\_ 2. Is interested in cooperating with community groups but spreads his efforts too thinly
- \_\_\_ 3. Is selective in cooperating with groups in proportion to pressure applied
- \_\_\_ 4. Becomes so involved with activities of non-educational groups that he neglects proper administration of the school program
- \_\_\_ 5. Considers the school an island that is competitive with non-educational groups

C. What is his attitude toward minority groups in the school community?

- \_\_\_ 1. Insists that minority points of view be appropriately represented in community-school decisions
- \_\_\_ 2. Upholds right of most minority viewpoints to be represented but neglects consideration of those that are extreme
- \_\_\_ 3. Follows a hands-off policy in regard to minority groups in the community
- \_\_\_ 4. Tends to ignore the existence of minority groups in the community
- \_\_\_ 5. Indicates that minority groups have no right to representation in community-school affairs

## APPENDIX B

### Revised Rating Guide

April 14, 1953

#### Democratic Operation

##### A. How does he relate to others?

- ☐ 1. Seldom associates with others.
- ☐ 2. Forms few close friendships and tends to neglect others.
- ☐ 3. Tends to make friends with some.
- ☐ 4. Quiet and less overt in expressing affection for others.
- ☐ 5. Steadily warm, appealing in relationship with others.

Remarks:

##### B. Does he value the opinion of others?

- ☐ 1. Tends to ignore the viewpoints of others.
- ☐ 2. Respects opinion if they agree with his own; plays down opinions that conflict with his.
- ☐ 3. Values opinion of persons considered intellectual superiors or peers; highly selective in considering opinions.
- ☐ 4. Usually seeks the opinion of others on problems; usually examines ideas fairly; and is usually willing to alter personal opinions when idea has merit.
- ☐ 5. Consistently seeks the opinion of others on problems; examines all ideas fairly; and is willing to alter personal opinions when idea has merit.

Remarks:

##### C. Is he skillful in developing an organization in which each can do his best?

- \_\_\_ 1. Each person clearly understands his responsibility in relation to others; little confusion exists.
- \_\_\_ 2. Most persons clearly understand their responsibility in relation to others; some confusion exists which is generally recognized and remedied.
- \_\_\_ 3. Most persons clearly understand their responsibility in relation to others; some confusion exists.
- \_\_\_ 4. Most persons understand their responsibility in relation to others; some confusion exists which is not recognized.
- \_\_\_ 5. Few understand their proper place in relation to others; considerable unrecognized confusion exists.

Remarks:

D. Is he skillful in getting policies formulated cooperatively?

- \_\_\_ 1. Involves lay public, staff members, and students in major policy decisions.
- \_\_\_ 2. Involves lay public, staff members and students in policy formulation; sometimes neglects machinery for full group participation.
- \_\_\_ 3. Involves only key people in policy formulation; sometimes neglects machinery for group participation.
- \_\_\_ 4. Discusses policies with associates but decisions are usually made prior to the discussion.
- \_\_\_ 5. Usually makes decisions on policy matters himself; frequently discusses decisions with associates.

Remarks:

E. Is he skillful in continuous implementation of policies?

- \_\_\_ 1. Infrequently fails to act on new policies, operates successfully on older policies.
- \_\_\_ 2. Slow to move on new policy; operates satisfactorily on old policies.
- \_\_\_ 3. Usually acts to carry out new policies; operates well on old policies.
- \_\_\_ 4. Generally acts quickly to carry out policy; is sometimes hesitant to revise procedure with respect to new



situations.

- \_\_\_\_ 5. Acts quickly to carry out policy; constantly revises procedures as new situations arise.

Remarks:

F. Does he help the group to arrive at a true consensus?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Disregards group suggestions in conflict with his own; acts when majority accepts his view; personally makes major decisions.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Operates on majority opinion; often disregards minority viewpoints; seldom concerned with true consensus.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Sometimes operates on basis of majority decisions; not too concerned with true consensus; sympathetic with minority viewpoints.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Strives for consensus; seldom tries to force rapid decisions; skillful in getting group to recognize points of agreement.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Continually strives for consensus; never tries to force rapid decisions; very skillful in getting group to recognize points of agreement.

Remarks:

G. Does he recognize that democratic means are essential to attainment of democratic ends?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Gives equal attention to means and end; action indicates belief that the means used determine the end.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Change and growth in participants considered important; the ends are not clearly determined but are considered more important.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Ends are sometimes predetermined but effort is made to use democratic methods to achieve them.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Recognizes that means are important but seldom lets them interfere with the end when a choice is involved.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. His action indicates that accomplishment of a well defined goal is of major importance; means of reaching the goal are unimportant.

Remarks:

Intelligent OperationA. Does he give sufficient consideration to data even when they challenge a belief?

- \_\_\_ 1. Ignores new facts that challenge his position. Acts in terms of previous beliefs.
- \_\_\_ 2. Uses data which supports his position; insecure when data challenges his beliefs; avoids investigations which would weaken his position or challenge beliefs.
- \_\_\_ 3. Will sometimes consider new data if made available to him and will sometimes act in terms of the data.
- \_\_\_ 4. Sometimes seeks new data on problems; sometimes acts in terms of data instead of previous beliefs.
- \_\_\_ 5. Consistently seeks new data on problems; acts in terms of data instead of previous beliefs.

Remarks:

B. Does he recognize and define problems?

- \_\_\_ 1. Is unaware that problems exist or cannot analyze problem when recognized; treats symptoms as problems.
- \_\_\_ 2. Disturbed by any unusual situation; cannot understand causal relationships; permits prejudice and/or emotions to influence problem analysis.
- \_\_\_ 3. Usually recognizes problems, but has some difficulty in analyzing and defining them.
- \_\_\_ 4. Usually recognizes relationships; has ability to detect problems; skill in analyzing a problem.
- \_\_\_ 5. Consistently recognizes cause and effect; grasps problems quickly; can analyze problem clearly.

Remarks:

C. Is he logical in argument?

- \_\_\_ 1. Argues in terms of personal likes and dislikes; continually contradicts himself.
- \_\_\_ 2. Emotionally inclined; has some ability to carry on logical

discussion but can be easily side tracked.

- \_\_\_ 3. Often uncertain of position; sometimes not consistent in argument.
- \_\_\_ 4. Can analyze a proposition and see the relationships but sometimes has difficulty in remaining consistent.
- \_\_\_ 5. Analyzes underlying assumptions; sees points in proper relationship; can follow point to ultimate conclusion.

Remarks:

D. Does he experiment and test results in terms of group objectives?

- \_\_\_ 1. Accepts objectives as stated; experiments or tests results not usually related to group goals.
- \_\_\_ 2. Seldom experiments in terms of group goals. Experiments are usually in terms of statistical and mechanical data.
- \_\_\_ 3. Does some experimentation in terms of group goals; some experimentation purely mechanical and unrelated.
- \_\_\_ 4. Most experiments are purposeful in terms of group goals; carries on considerable experimentation.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has well determined group goals; develops related, meaningful, and purposeful experiments concerning goals.

Remarks:

E. Is he ultimately concerned with the welfare of people in the selection of experiments and use of their outcomes?

- \_\_\_ 1. Most experimentation is concerned with the welfare of people.
- \_\_\_ 2. Usually experimentation is concerned with the welfare of people.
- \_\_\_ 3. Some experimentation is carried out that is concerned with welfare of people; some unrelated experimentation.
- \_\_\_ 4. Sees little relationship between welfare of people and experimentation.
- \_\_\_ 5. Does not relate experiments to the welfare of the people and/or sees little value in experimenting.

Remarks:

F. Does he consistently seek to understand his own bias and limitations?

- \_\_\_ 1. Consistently examines positions with others; recognizes that all persons have biases and limitations.
- \_\_\_ 2. Usually examines position with others; recognizes that all persons have biases and limitations.
- \_\_\_ 3. Usually examines position with others; he recognizes that all persons have biases but fails to see his own on some occasions.
- \_\_\_ 4. Biases color his evaluation of position of others; does not often examine his position with others.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has strong biases; refuses to examine position; not aware of own limitations.

Remarks:

G. How intelligently does he manage his own personal affairs?

- \_\_\_ 1. Manages personal finances well; stable moral codes; wholesome family relationships; others recognize "good judgment" on personal matters.
- \_\_\_ 2. Is recognized as a man of "good judgment" in personal affairs; above average family relationships, financial management and other personal community obligations.
- \_\_\_ 3. Sometimes fails to manage personal finances well; good family relationships; average of community on management of personal affairs.
- \_\_\_ 4. Makes many errors in personal finances; family relationships and other operations as a citizen in community are sometimes questionable.
- \_\_\_ 5. Considered a poor financial risk; impractical or "bookish"; many people consider him a "joke" in management of his personal affairs.

Remarks:

H. Does he profit by previous mistakes?

- \_\_\_ 1. Makes the same mistake frequently and will seldom admit

- he has made mistakes; shows little improvement.
- \_\_\_ 2. Has difficulty recognizing mistakes; symptoms of same problems repeat from year to year; hesitates to question own action; shows some general improvement.
  - \_\_\_ 3. Usually recognizes mistakes but sometimes tries to justify them.
  - \_\_\_ 4. Usually recognizes mistakes and rarely repeats a mistake recognized.
  - \_\_\_ 5. Recognizes mistakes and never repeats the same mistakes.

Remarks:

I. Does he have the ability to size up people in relation to jobs?

- \_\_\_ 1. Little ability to analyze the important characteristics of people; seldom considers these characteristics in relation to the job.
- \_\_\_ 2. Often fails to see important characteristics of people in relation to the job; makes personnel selections which sometimes result in inefficiency.
- \_\_\_ 3. Has some ability to perceive the basic potentialities of people in relation to job; makes some mistakes.
- \_\_\_ 4. Able to perceive the basic potentialities of people but occasionally does not relate this to the job.
- \_\_\_ 5. Able to perceive basic qualities or potentialities in relation to the requirements of the job.

Remarks:

Condition of Health

A. His physical condition:

- \_\_\_ 1. Frequently lacking in physical drive; suffers chronic ailment; is in poor physical condition for age.
- \_\_\_ 2. Does not always have proper energy to do the job; sometimes has illnesses which keep him from his job; sometimes appears to be in poor physical condition.
- \_\_\_ 3. Has necessary strength and vitality; sometimes misses work because of illness; appears to be properly

- conditioned and balanced physically.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Possesses strength and energy necessary for job; rarely misses work because of illness; appears to be properly conditioned and balanced physically.
  - \_\_\_\_ 5. Has abundance of energy; rarely misses work because of illness; no obvious physical handicap.

Remarks:

B. His emotional condition: How well is he adjusted to others?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Frequently in difficulty with associates; moody; little control of emotions; cannot maintain personal friendships very long.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Sometimes irritates associates; sometimes has difficulty controlling emotions; reactions sometimes not predictable.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Usually gets along well with associates; on some occasions lets emotions get out of control; reactions usually predictable.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Gets along well with most associates; rarely loses emotional control; emotionally stable.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Gets along well with associates; doesn't lose emotional control; not upset by unusual conditions.

Remarks:

C. Is he responsible but not overburdened with responsibility?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Accepts responsibilities without undue worry or indications of emotional tensions.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Accepts responsibility but sometimes permits responsibility to worry him.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Accepts responsibilities that sometimes he is unable to carry out; sometimes lets work interfere with proper recreation and home life.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Sometimes avoids responsibility or becomes overburdened with responsibility; often builds up emotional stress because of responsibility.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Avoids responsibility; or he assumes responsibility to the

degree that he is in a continual state of tension (worries a great deal).

Remarks:

D. How well does he use recreational devices?

- \_\_\_ 1. Has little apparent recreational interests; seldom sheds burdens of professional activities; continually thinks and talks shop.
- \_\_\_ 2. Has minor recreational interests but tends to let work responsibility crowd recreation out of program.
- \_\_\_ 3. Engages in recreational activities when urged by friends but does not consciously plan for recreation.
- \_\_\_ 4. Has a number of recreational interests; usually manages to get some recreation in his program.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has widespread recreational interests; maintains a whole-some balance with professional activities.

Remarks:

Ethical and Moral Strength

A. Does he have the courage of his convictions?

- \_\_\_ 1. Does not manifest strong convictions or is afraid to express convictions.
- \_\_\_ 2. Has some definite convictions but usually follows the most popular viewpoint.
- \_\_\_ 3. Has fairly strong convictions (not always sure of belief) but hesitant to express views.
- \_\_\_ 4. Has strong convictions but doesn't always express his views.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has strong convictions; defends and expresses convictions; not dogmatic but places principle above personal welfare.

Remarks:

B. Does he deal honestly in personal and professional matters?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Has defined honesty; consistently honest in personal and professional matters; associates see him as being consistently honest.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Honest in personal affairs but does not see professional honesty in the same light; motivations are honest but actions not entirely consistent.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Strives for honesty but has conflicts when personal welfare is at stake; does not always see personal and professional honesty as the same thing.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Gives lip service to honesty but sometimes fails to manifest honesty when it is not expedient to do so.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Little regard for honesty; associates question his motives.

Remarks:

C. Does he deal in terms of central ideas and beliefs rather than people?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Guided by the personal factor and tends to neglect central ideas and beliefs.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Believes people are more important than central ideas and beliefs; tries to reconcile the two but if forced to choose will decide on basis of personal factor.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Has central ideas and beliefs but will sometimes sacrifice them in interest of the welfare of people he likes and admires.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Is guided by central ideas and beliefs but personal factors influence his decisions.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Follows central ideas and beliefs in action; respects people but not to the extent that he places them above principle.

Remarks:

D. Is he intellectually honest?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Intellectual honesty is not important in his thinking.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Does not realize importance of intellectual honesty.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Is struggling with a concept of intellectual honesty; tries



to act in terms of this concept.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Is intellectually honest but ideas sometimes not well thought out.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Consistently acts in terms of what he believes is right; has well thought out ideas of what makes up intellectual honesty.

Remarks:

### Adequacy of Communication

#### A. Can he read well?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Reading speed and interpretation considerably below average of college graduates.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Reading speed and interpretation slightly below average of college graduates.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Reading speed and interpretation about average of college graduates.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Reading speed and interpretation above average of college graduates.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Reading speed and interpretation well above average (exceptional) of college graduates.

Remarks:

#### B. Can he write well?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Excellent ability to organize and portray thoughts through written expression.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Above average (of college graduates) ability to organize and portray thoughts through written expression.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. About average (of college graduates) ability to portray thoughts through written expression.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Below average (of college graduates) ability to portray thoughts through written expression.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Poor (far below average) ability to portray thoughts through written expression.

Remarks:

C. Does he speak well?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Excellent ability to express himself orally; pronunciation excellent; decisive in organizing and building on central ideas.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Above average ability to express himself orally; pronunciation good; is decisive in portraying ideas.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Average ability to express himself orally; pronunciation acceptable to groups; is generally decisive in making points.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Is awkward at times in organizing and portraying central ideas; some hesitation and sometimes unclear pronunciation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Halting and hesitant in presenting ideas; sometimes unclear pronunciation; and seldom clinches vital ideas.

Remarks:

D. How well does he listen to others?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Always intent on understanding points others make; doesn't monopolize conversation; and seeks clarification of ideas presented by others.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Generally intent on understanding points others make; doesn't monopolize conversation; shows interest in what others have to say.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Generally listens to what others say but is sometimes unable to follow certain ideas; doesn't always seek clarification of points.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Sometimes does not listen attentively to what people say; unable to recall vital points made by speaker; at times has a tendency to talk too much.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Is not attentive when others talk; cannot recall points made; disrupts conversation with irrelevant ideas.

Remarks:

E. Can he communicate well with laymen?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Little ability to communicate with lay groups; is often misunderstood and misquoted; tries to clarify points to lay

people but is sometimes accused of statements which he has not intended to make.

- \_\_\_\_ 2. Sometimes misunderstood by lay groups because of technical vocabulary, rambling organization, and misunderstanding of lay language.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Occasionally uses technical expressions which confuse lay groups; usually makes his ideas understandable.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Adjusts communication to terms understood by each lay group; laymen usually understand his position.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Skillfully adjusts communication to that of each particular lay group; makes ideas clear to lay persons; can and does use lay language.

Remarks:

F. Can he interest people in examination of ideas?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Has unusual ability to interest people in fundamental problems; stimulates people to seek solutions through critical analysis of problems.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Has ability to interest people in fundamental problems; can usually stimulate them to seek solutions through critical analysis of problems.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. Has some ability to interest people in fundamental problems; some skill in stimulating them to seek solutions through critical analysis of problems.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. Not skillful in interesting people in the critical analysis of problems.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. Has little ability in interesting people in critical analysis of problems; rarely stimulates people to examine ideas.

Remarks:

G. How skillful is he in leading discussions?

- \_\_\_\_ 1. Has trouble leading group discussions; sometimes loses the trend of central ideas; does not always grasp group problems; lets group drag and does not always help reach conclusions.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Sometimes lacks ability to lead certain group discussions; sometimes not skillful in stimulating thought; sometimes

fails to secure full participation; sometimes closes meetings without having reached conclusions.

- \_\_\_ 3. Has ability to lead group discussions; secures good participation; discerns central trend of ideas; some skill in getting agreement.
- \_\_\_ 4. Has superior ability to lead group discussions; secures participation of most members; discerns trend of central ideas; guides group toward agreement.
- \_\_\_ 5. Has outstanding ability to lead group discussions; secures participation of members; discerns central trend of ideas; guides group toward agreement.

Remarks:

#### Operation as a Citizen

##### A. How well can he help people interpret the significance of what is happening today?

- \_\_\_ 1. Is not informed and not interested in current affairs; infrequently discusses current big news items.
- \_\_\_ 2. Is not too well informed on current affairs; discusses in terms of stock phrases and ideas.
- \_\_\_ 3. Is informed on current affairs but occasionally influenced by prejudice in discussing them.
- \_\_\_ 4. Is informed on current affairs and can intelligently discuss them.
- \_\_\_ 5. Is well informed on current affairs; intelligently discusses major social, economic, and political issues with people.

Remarks:

##### B. How well does he cooperate with non-educational groups?

- \_\_\_ 1. Maintains excellent working relationship with non-educational groups; is active member of civic community groups.
- \_\_\_ 2. Attempts to work with non-educational groups; is member of civic community groups.
- \_\_\_ 3. Usually cooperates with non-educational groups but does not always appear to be interested in their problems.
- \_\_\_ 4. Says he would like to work with non-educational groups, but

not willing or able to spare time.

- \_\_\_ 5. Does not appear interested in non-educational groups; infrequent contact with other groups.

Remarks:

C. Does he accept a proper share of responsibility for community betterment on the local and other levels?

- \_\_\_ 1. Active participation in community affairs; maintaining good balance between own work and community affairs; has ready recollection and knowledge of community problems.
- \_\_\_ 2. Too active in community affairs; spreads work too thin to be effective; easily recalls and discusses current community problems.
- \_\_\_ 3. Accepts some responsibility but feels professional work largely meets this obligation.
- \_\_\_ 4. Participates in community affairs when some pressure is felt; not too interested in existing community problems.
- \_\_\_ 5. Takes little part in community affairs; little interest in community problems.

Remarks:

D. Does he help to bring about a spirit of cooperation despite his personal views after a group has made a decision?

- \_\_\_ 1. Sometimes sabotages decisions with which he is not in complete agreement.
- \_\_\_ 2. Is indifferent toward decision; tends to ignore group if views were not accepted.
- \_\_\_ 3. Tries to cooperate but sometimes criticizes agreement against his personal wishes.
- \_\_\_ 4. Cooperative but does not always hide his personal wishes.
- \_\_\_ 5. Believes a democratic group decision is a contract to which he is obligated.

Remarks:

E. Does he help to develop a respect for rights of minorities?

- ☐ 1. Points out minority view and insists that it be considered.
- ☐ 2. Recognizes minority view and is willing to give some consideration to it.
- ☐ 3. Believes that minority view should be recognized, but doesn't always suggest consideration of it.
- ☐ 4. Gives some recognition to minority rights; but actions show little concern for them.
- ☐ 5. Tends to ignore rights of minority groups.

Remarks: