

A SELF-RATING SCALE FOR HIGH
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION AND THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF THE KANSAS STATE
TEACHERS COLLEGE OF EMPORIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

EARL E. PHARES

May, 1934

.....

K. S. T. C.

.....

Received 11 5 '34
Earl E. Mares - g

73808

Approved for the Major Department

Earl E. Mares

Approved for the Graduate Council

Earl E. Mares

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to acknowledge his appreciation to Dr. Edwin J. Brown, Director of the Graduate Division of Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Kansas, whose interest in his students' work extends far beyond the confines of duty, and whose stimulating suggestions and constructive criticism aided materially in the preparation and the writing of this study.

To Mrs. Earl E. Phares, he wishes to acknowledge a huge indebtedness for the patient cooperation and assistance so generously given in the writing of the study.

CONTENTS

PART		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Nature of the Study	1
	Previous Studies	3
	The Scope of the Study	12
	Methods of Procedure	13
	Sources of Data	14
	Types of Data Collected	14
	The Problem	15
	Definition of Terms	16
	Presentation of Material	17
II.	THE SELF-RATING SCALE	19
	Making Use of the Scale	20
	The Scale	21
III.	ESTABLISHING THE SCALE	35
	Validity	36
	Tabulation Table of Frequencies	38
IV.	SUMMARY	43
	Conclusions	43
	Recommendations	45
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	46

PART I

INTRODUCTION

The Nature of the Study

The theme of this investigation has these two coterminous objectives, first, to analyze the personal and professional qualifications essential to the office of the administrator of the ordinary high school; second, to classify these items of qualification into related groups upon the basis of their related conjunction with the position. The next step will be the resolution of these items into a unified and coherently organized scale of measurement against which the principal may place himself for determinant comparison. The very nature of this analytical process will be a complete evaluation of the administrator's position and of the essential characteristics desirable in the person who would hold the position.

In short, it is to be a self-rating scale to which, it is hoped, the administrator may frequently repair for an illuminating, truth-telling confessional, and be able to come therefrom inspired, reassured, and invigorated. The frequently potential motives of one's ambitions, interests, or desires may be revived, or even liberated by the trigger of inspiration which may come from such a self-analysis or comparison. Too often the principal has had the thought

that he is capable of doing far more, that he is in a position for exerting great beneficial influences,--and here this casual thought ends. It has not been merged with action.

Actually the most sincere meaning of success may be that beneficial consequence of struggle, movement, change, and the subjective exhilaration that accompanies such when it is in the way of directed effort. Such expending of energy implies the improvement which can come only through one's own efforts.

In the principalship of the ordinary high school this energy can be directed for improvement along dual lines, such lines being so closely integrated with each other, however, as to be inseparable. One consists of the personality traits of both the individual and social type; the other enfolds the professional phases of the situation. Relative to the first be it said that a principal (or any other person) may develop attractive individual and social traits--if he will; with regard to the second, let it be emphasized that the position itself has two non-divergent fields of responsibility, the supervisory and the administrative. Possibly the various phases of the principal's traits and functions are in frequent juxtaposition. If so, such practice is far more commendable than the common attitude of principals in emphasizing the administrative duties to the subjection of the more educative aims of the job, as the supervisory.

Previous Studies

Harold O. Rugg¹ has made one of the most widely accepted of rating scales in the struggle to measure and compare teachers. This study emphasized the fact that there are two separate and distinct features of the ordinary rating form, and that the first function of his study was self-improvement through self-rating. The secondary use to be made of the scale was that of rating persons in numerical order, comparing them, in the process, with five other groups of individuals. Each of the latter groups are of different qualities: (1) the best that the rator has ever known, (2) the poorest he has ever seen or known, (3) a representative of the average, (4) a person midway between the best and the average, and (5) the person midway between the poorest and the average. Rugg's scale was first presented to the public in 1918.

Worth McClure² made a study in 1925 of the rating of principals and found that in analyzing the various rating scales of principals the score cards fell into three groups and that rating scales were improving in (1) organization, (2) reliability, and (3) weighting of standards.

¹Harold O. Rugg, "Self-Improvement through Self-Rating, A New Scale for Rating Teachers' Efficiency," *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL*, Volume 19, p. 670. 1918.

²Worth McClure, "The Rating of Elementary School Principals in Service," *FOURTH YEARBOOK*, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1925, p. 427.

Bertha Y. Hebb,³ in 1925, published a very comprehensive work consisting, illustratively, of self-rating cards in which long lists of qualifications were itemized. The organization was not good but the lists were quite complete in making contact with the field.

Ellsworth Lowry⁴ produced a novel card in 1923 in the form of giving it both weight and prepared answer arrangement. Although weighting a card apparently gives it an impression of more efficiency, such weighted scales have not proven to be of more value.

T. H. Schutte,⁵ also in 1925, produced a card containing the weighting device in the form of a percentage scale. The percentage idea added to a scale adds the connotation of relating efficiency to the scale, but supervisors and administrators in general have not favored weighting with the percentage scale in mind because of the tendency to press the field within the scope of the small numerical range.

Scott and Clothier,⁶ in 1923, published a very complete work, Personnel Management, giving refutation to the idea,

³Bertha Y. Hebb, "Samples of Teacher Self-Rating Cards," in City School Leaflet No. 18, February, 1925, U. S. Bureau of Education, pp. 4-5.

⁴Ellsworth Lowry, "Supervising and Self-Rating Score Card," (privately published). Indiana, Pennsylvania, 1923.

⁵T. H. Schutte, "Schutte Scale for Rating Teachers," (copyright, 1923, by World Book Co., Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York.)

⁶Scott, Walter D., and R. C. Clothier, Personnel Management, A. W. Shaw & Company, New York, 1923. 643 pages.

commonly accepted, that professional men are not rated. Members of professions are rated very strictly. Many corporations employing technically trained men use rating scales very similar to those used in educational systems.

The Duluth⁷ rating system for teachers was made during the school year of 1921-22. The system has a twofold purpose. It is organized to recognize and reward teacher merit, and it also pertains to the improvement of the work which the teacher is doing. It seeks to set up situations in which a frank, open appraisal of the situation's work may lead to its appreciative consideration and thence from this premise to a discussion of methods by which it may be improved.

William L. Connor,⁸ writing in the Journal of Educational Research, gives a scale study in which the gist of the whole list of interrogations is reduced to terms of pupil activity. The study gives a unique slant in thus using the work activity of the pupils themselves to measure the teacher.

H. T. Johnston,⁹ writing in School and Society in 1917, illustrates a brief scale rating card in which the points

⁷"The Duluth System for the Rating of Teachers," Board of Education publication, June 9, 1922, pp. 2-3. Duluth, Minnesota.

⁸William L. Connor, "A New Method of Rating Teachers," JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Vol. 1, May, 1920, pp.338-58.

⁹H. T. Johnston, "Scientific Supervision of Teaching," SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, Vol. 5, February 17, 1917, pp. 181-88.

are organized with a view of getting at the important features of the worker's efficiency as quickly as possible.

Arthur C. Boyce,¹⁰ in 1915, contrived a rating scale which received wide publicity upon its publication. This piece of work was done as a bit of experimental pioneering but it was immediately accepted and used. The scale was organized to measure or rate the teacher, and as such an instrument its organization is pertinent.

A recent and very searching rating scheme to come to the field is one developed by Edwin J. Brown¹¹ of the Kansas State Teachers' College. While this particular device is primarily intended for a supervisor's self-rating scale, its versatility in construction permits its use by a supervising principal or other official who is responsible for the organization and improvement of socialized procedures. The scheme lends itself to convenient use and ready diagnosis due to depicting, graphically, the status of the qualifications.

Almack and Bursch¹² made a very comprehensive survey of the administration of consolidated and village schools in which their analyses were based upon the laws of the state

¹⁰ Arthur C. Boyce, "Methods of Measuring Teachers' Efficiency," Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 62-74. Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, 1915.

¹¹ Edwin J. Brown, A Self-Rating Scale for Supervisors, Supervisory-Principals, and Helping Teachers, Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1929.

¹² John C. Almack and J. F. Bursch, The Administration of Consolidated and Village Schools, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1925.

and the regulations of school boards. Such a study would, in the opinion of this writer, tend to clarify and emphasize the duties and qualifications of the position, but it would make inadequate provision for the vital element of personality.

H. A. Bone¹³ formulated a scale for aiding the teacher to evaluate her own work. The scale is divided into main headings as follows: (1) relation of the classroom teacher to the pupils as judged by results, (2) relation as a member of the school faculty, (3) relation as a member of the community.

W. P. Burriss,¹⁴ in 1923, offered a rating scale for the high school principal which was constructed upon these bases: (1) personal, (2) social, (3) educational, and (4) professional qualifications. Each of these main items has a number of sub-topics, and the scale itself was devised to be scored by means of plus and minus signs.

Rose A. Carrigan¹⁵ has given to the profession a score card in which the following are the main headings: (1) evidence of adequate teacher-preparation, 140 points; (2) the atmosphere of the background or workshop, 250 points; (3) the work accomplished, 375 points; (4) the child, 375 points.

¹³H. A. Bone, "Criteria by which a Teacher May Measure Her Work," in HIGH SCHOOL QUARTERLY, Vol. 7, pp. 153-55, (April, 1919).

¹⁴W. P. Burriss, "Proposed Scale for Rating High School Principals," in Second Yearbook, Department of Secondary Principals, National Education Association, Vol. 11, pp. 462-464, (1923).

¹⁵Rose A. Carrigan, "Rating of Teachers on a Basis of

In a type of scale presented in 1924, E. W. Cober¹⁶ divided the duties of the head official into (1) those purely administrative (annual and semi-annual), (2) daily, (3) routine, and (4) miscellaneous. The bases of the grouping is somewhat vague, and the lack of the personal element is distinct.

W. A. Cook¹⁷ stated, in a history of the development of rating scales, that the first schemes were those originated by Boyce and Elliot. Cook's criticism of the rating process, even at the present, is that there is uncertainty as to what should be included in a rating scheme, and further, there is little agreement as to the number of points to be used in the scale.

J. W. Crabtree wrote a very good article in which he discussed the rating of teachers. He presented a rating-card to be utilized by both the supervisor and the teacher; his object, apparently, was to have the pertinent and common elements be the points of contact between the two individuals.¹⁸

Supervisory Visitation," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL METHOD, Vol. 2, pp. 48-55 (September, 1922).

¹⁶E. W. Cober, in the Third Yearbook, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Educational Association, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 219-32, (July, 1924).

¹⁷W. A. Cook, "Uniform Standards for Judging Teachers in South Dakota," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 7, pp. 1-11, (January, 1921).

¹⁸J. W. Crabtree, "Rating of Teachers," in Proceedings of the National Educational Association, Vol. 53, pp. 1165-67, (1915).

A scale in which the educational and social qualities are emphasized was placed in the field by Katherine Cranor as a device primarily to aid the supervisor. The main items proposed are: (1) educational preparation, (2) tact, (3) tolerance, (4) poise, (5) appearance, and (6) relationship with the teachers. This contribution is an important one in that the stress is laid upon the vital human element.¹⁹

In his well-known works concerning public school administration, Cubberly²⁰ analyzes the field of the executive as follows: (1) the principal as an organizer, (2) as an administrator, (3) as a supervisor, and (4) as a community leader. The authority of this educator is so widely recognized that many rating scheme contrivers would readily accept his judgment.²¹

A very good self-rating scale for the teacher was devised by Franklin B. Dyer. The scale primarily deals with the phases of personality and ability.²²

R. W. Fairchild made a score card for the measurement

¹⁹Katherine T. Cranor, "A Self-Rating Card for Supervisors as an Aid to Efficiency in School Work," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 7, pp. 91-120, (February, 1921).

²⁰Ellwood P. Cubberly, Public School Administration, chapters 15, 21, and 22. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929.

²¹E. P. Cubberly, The Principal and His School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1923.

²²Franklin B. Dyer, "Questions on Teaching To Help Teachers Make a Self-Examination to Find Ways of Improving," in ATLANTIC EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL, Vol. 11, pp. 343-44, (March 1916).

of administration. His work analyzed the fundamental requirements of a successful school administrator. The rating card is divided into the following headings: (1) temperament and tact, (2) appearance and professional preparation, (3) organization of the school, and (4) teacher problems.²³

Arthur S. Gist, in a detailed work, analyzed the qualifications and duties of the principal as (1) an administrator, (2) a community leader, (3) publicity man, and (4) his personal relation in the school and community.²⁴

W. S. Gray²⁵ pointed out the potentialities of the self-rating device in an article published in the SCHOOL REVIEW in 1921. His discussion pointed to the fact that self rating directs the teachers' attention to the significant problems of teaching, that the use of the scale aided the principal in securing an important background concerning the requirements of teachers.

In a rating card developed for the field of home economics Adah H. Hess contrived a clever scale, and its versatility is such that it need not be restricted to this specific area. The card was made with three main divisions: (1) techniques and results of instruction, (2) classroom

²³R. W. Fairchild, "The Measure of the Administrator," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 57, pp. 23-24. (January, 1921).

²⁴Arthur S. Gist, The Administration of an Elementary School, Charles Scribners and Sons, New York, 1928.

²⁵W. S. Gray, "Rating Scales, Self-Analysis, and the Improvement of Teaching," in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 29, pp. 49-53, (January, 1921).

management, and (3) educational, personal, and social qualifications.²⁶

Relative to rating scales in general R. E. Kent says "that all the teacher work, including every major factor in it, should be considered in making a self-rating scale, but these factors should be considered only with respect to what they contribute toward educational results in the children under her care." The scale which Kent presented was based upon these groupings: (1) pupil achievement, (2) merit in mechanics, (3) merit as a social worker, and (4) personality. In this device the emphasis is placed upon pupil activity and achievement.²⁷

S. G. Rich,²⁸ in his self-rating device, grouped his items upon effective methods of supplying physical needs, power of cooperation with the staff, and maintaining the prestige of the school and the profession. In discussing rating devices, Rich advocated that principals be rated by the teachers.

In the business world E. H. Schell published a book which is actually a very personal and pertinent group of

²⁶Adah H. Hess, "Teacher Rating as a Means of Improving Home Economics Teachers in Service," in JOURNAL OF HOME ECONOMICS, pp. 85-90, (February, 1922).

²⁷Raymond E. Kent, "What Should Teacher Rating Schemes Seek to Measure?" JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Vol. 2, pp. 802-807, (1920).

²⁸S. G. Rich, "Rating of Principals and Superintendents," in EDUCATION, Vol. 42, pp. 496-500, (April, 1922).

items for self-analysis. The book is a forcefully written one in which the personal points which are vital are the only ones presented.²⁹

P. R. Spencer³⁰ developed a self-rating scale for principals in which he included these standards: (1) relationship with pupils, (2) vocational guidance, and (3) use of standardized tests for measuring classroom instruction.

In an analysis of traits that he thought desirable in a supervisor, Joseph S. Taylor evolved a self-rating scheme for teachers. The main divisions of his rating are: (1) scholarship, (2) preparation for work, (3) knowledge of fundamentals of drill, (4) execution of work, and (5) pupil interest.³¹

The Scope of the Study

The range and area of the investigation includes the search for and the discovery of those qualifications essential to the job and the person of the principalship of the ordinary high school. The traits resolved in this refining process include all the characteristics pertinent to the position or necessary to the person who fills the position; the two factors are supplementary. The composition of these

²⁹Erwin H. Schell, The Technique of Executive Control, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, (1924).

³⁰P. R. Spencer, "A High School Principal's Self-Rating Card," in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 30, pp. 268-71, (April, 1922).

³¹Joseph S. Taylor, "Some Desirable Traits of the Supervisor," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 9, pp. 1-8, (January, 1923).

inter-related groups of pertinencies into a complete and concise unity, forms the rating scale itself.

The traits or characteristics listed consist of those mentioned as essentially desirable by authorities who have published works in the field of educational administration, as evidenced by publications in the field of business, and lastly, by officials heading school boards.

Method of Procedure

In general the lines of interrogation pursued in this analysis consist of the following:

1. What are the duties of an administering principal?
2. What professional qualifications should this official possess?
3. How able should the principal be as an organizer?
4. What qualifying traits are essential to an efficient executive?
5. What should be the supervisory qualifications of a principal of a high school?
6. To what extent should this officer be integrated into the activities of the community?
7. What personal traits and habits may be expected--even demanded--of the person filling this office?
8. What should be the attitude of this principal to his job and his profession?

Sources of Data

A great deal of the information presented herein comes from two general types of materials. The first type comes from the pen of authorities who have published accepted books in the field of administration, the other type of material comes from a similar class of experts (in some instances the same individuals) who have had their manuscripts accepted and published by professional periodical magazines.

The analyses of previously submitted rating scales of various kinds have been found to be sources of many items of determination especially those related to personal and executive characteristics.

A third source of selection has been discovered in the personnel publications of the allied field of business, wherein much study of an analytical nature relating to the rating of individuals for specific jobs has been carried on.

A further fund of applicable information has been found in the professional investigations carried through at various educational institutions by research workers. Many of these have been published by the institutions, or in part by the publishing companies.

The Types of Data Collected

The analysis of these various sources of informational material has brought to light the following types of data:

1. The amount of training desirable in the profession.
2. Personal characteristics of force and initiative

desirable in such leadership.

3. The attitude of mind assumed by leaders toward their professions.
4. Tendencies of responsible persons to extend their professional training in service.
5. The expression of willingness to cooperate with fellow workers in a congenial manner.
6. Initiative in assuming responsibility for actions in service.
7. Evidences of professional skill in executing the mechanics of organization.
8. Skill and tact exercised in the handling of supervisory techniques and problems.
9. Inspirational encouragement furnished by professional leaders to the faculty and the community.
10. The habits and practices of leaders of various professions in regard to personal cleanliness and appearance.
11. The social customs and manners of the individuals accepted as prominent in the professions.
12. Traits and qualities which communities desire that their school officials possess.

The Problem

The objective of the molding of this scale for self-analysis is to aid the principal to take inventory of his activity and personality in the position itself. The construction of the scale itself will be based upon the vital

groups of the desirable qualifications of the office and its occupant. Each of these divisions will in turn be composed of the subordinate points which are related to that heading and at the same time will retain coherence among themselves.

The compilation of the items which form the material for the scale construction will be attempted (1) by scanning the works of various authors in the field of administration, both educational and commercial, and (2) by analyzing the various rating scales. Authors of administrative books and articles have set themselves up as being more or less expert in the field; furthermore, as their works are accepted by workers in the field and by people in general, there is thus still greater regard of them as having an expert's knowledge.

Reference to these authorities and comparison with other rating scales will further tend toward the establishment of validity and reliability for the scale to the extent that the items mentioned are coincidental with various sources.

There will be attempt to strengthen still further the validity and reliability by comparison of the established qualifications with those desired by school boards.

Definition of Terms

The term "principal" as used applies to any official who is the authorized head of a secondary school. Under

present conditions many such persons devote a part of their time to the teaching process, and it has been invariably true even in the past that little has been actually accomplished in the way of active supervision in the ordinary high school.

"Secondary school" is a term which commonly is, and shall here be, taken to include all public high schools or private academies wherein the institution's chief function shall be the education of pupils of grades seven to twelve, inclusive. This will naturally include both the junior and senior high schools of any type of secondary organization. It will also include smaller high schools of the two-year or three-year organization.

Presentation of Material

The general plan of this study has been to give to the principal a definite and stimulating picture of (1) what the position really is, and (2) to give this official also a convenient device for checking upon his fulfillment of that position.

Part II, which is the rating scale itself, consists of the personal and professional items from the above mentioned materials. Synonyms and other terms with shades of the same allusion are condensed as much as possible.

To obtain validity and reliability in a study of this type is a very difficult problem, but the writer believes that a measure of success has been reached in this attempt as presented in Part III.

The concluding section of this work presents a summary, and some conclusions which have emphasized themselves in the making of this analysis.

It is not a self-evident truth that the world is to be analyzed and proceeded upon in a certain way that the effort of the great effort of the application of the theory of the world will be a great attempt to will to be the which has been in the world. The world is not a self-evident truth that the world is to be analyzed and proceeded upon in a certain way that the effort of the great effort of the application of the theory of the world will be a great attempt to will to be the which has been in the world.

PART II

THE SELF-RATING SCALE

It is again desirable to mention that the big aim of a self-rating scale is its capacity to cause the subject to be analytical of his own professional or personal traits and procedures. Mention should also be made of the fact that the efficiency of a self-rating device depends to a great extent upon the frequency and thoroughness of its application as a measuring stick.

The use of a self-rating scale implies an urge to improve, a prod that not only drives one to do as well but to attempt to do better. If one possesses no such traits there will be neither desire to nor reason for using any device which has for its main purpose the improvement of the worker in service.

Self-criticism is rarely stimulated by the personal exhortations of another person--a second party. An urge from within can do a great deal more to stimulate an individual. At this point a scheme or device by which the person may be made critically conscious not only of his weaknesses but also of his strengths, finds its most important function. A self-rating device probably satisfies this requirement more than any other scheme. It possesses the least amount of undesirable subjectivity, approaches the impersonal, and most important of all, is used for the very purpose for which it was intended, that of seeking improvement.

The self-rating scale presented herewith is an earnest and sincere attempt to provide such means of comparison and measurement for the principalship of the ordinary high school as the office is defined by the outstanding educational administrative authorities.

Making Use of the Scale

This self-rating scheme, when used, will consist actually of a series of graphs in that a particular portion of the parallel lines is to be checked for that section of the scale opposite it. Thus one gives consideration to each of the alphabetized sections as a unit. Give the attention to each question in its relation to the general head. Check upon each issue by placing a small cross-mark or a large dot between the desired lines at the right of the page. One can then easily connect these marks which will result in a vertical graph for the analysis of each section. If the graph line swings away from the central space "A" the rater should scrutinize the corresponding questions carefully, giving special heed when the tendency is toward the left.

One must use extreme caution in exercising judgment; be honest with your self. Perfect frankness is the key as the main aim is not a high first score, but a higher score upon each subsequent rating. Don't forget that improvement is the object.

The column symbols of the graph are significant in this way: P indicates an inferior grading; F, fair; A, average; G, very good; and S, superior.

3. Do I possess, without exception, pleasant mannerisms?
4. Am I sensitive to the social proprieties?
5. Do I aid in planning recreation?
6. Do my teachers and associates grow more friendly with the passage of time?

P.F.A.G.S.

D. Do I exercise tact in my social relations?

1. Are my suggestions readily taken?
2. Am I asked by teachers to suggest criticism of their work?
3. Am I readily invited to give judgment on problems or new work which is being tried?
4. Do I encourage initiative in both teachers and pupils?
5. Do I refuse credit not due me?
6. Am I sensitive to ethical procedure?

E. Do I persevere with planned work?

1. Am I working as hard as any of my teachers?
2. Do I retain my enthusiasm even after a week of heavy work?
3. Do I have pronounced force in either

work or play?

4. Do I conserve the time and energy of my teachers?
5. Do I summarize projects and make them professionally available?

P F A G S

II. Professional Growth and Attitudes

To what extent:

A. Am I keeping abreast of the times in my reading of professional literature?

1. Do I add several good books to my professional library each year?
2. Am I a subscriber to at least four professional magazines?
3. Am I purposefully suggesting these professional aids to my teachers?

B. Am I participating in community and state educational activity?

1. Do I get interested participation in the meetings of my own faculty?
2. Do I participate to my utmost in state or national educational meetings?

C. Do I strive to make contribution to

professional literature?

P F A G S

1. Do I experiment, analyze, and report my observations?
2. Am I a contributor to the professional literature of my locality, county or state?
3. Do I encourage my instructors to carry on experimental work during the school year?

D. Am I interested in the work of professional inquiry into the fields of teaching or supervision?

1. Do I attempt to adjust the recommendations of educational associations to fit local conditions?
2. Do I aid such organizations by reporting the results of my experience with their suggestions?
3. Do I encourage my teachers to be active members of professional organizations?
4. Do I lend interested cooperation to inter-school investigations?
5. Do I continuously extend my training by summer school or extension work?

E. Have I devised any new administrative schemes and checked their professional utility?

1. Do I experiment with new methods?
2. Have I satisfactorily integrated student organizations?
3. Am I continually analyzing my community to find additional curricular materials?
4. Do I readily try noteworthy aids of others?
5. Does the student organization finance scheme function efficiently?
6. Are the student organizations sponsored effectively?
7. Is there definite attempt to give personal and social pupil guidance?

P. F. A. G. S.

III. Cooperativeness and Teamwork

To what extent:

A. Do I obtain reciprocal cooperation with my teachers in school activities?

1. Are my teachers willingly interested in serving on committees?
2. Do I ask for teachers' suggestions upon a projected plan?

1. Do I try to escape censure relative to criticized plans in which I have participated?
2. Do I unhesitatingly pass credit along to other persons who participated?
3. Am I alert to "do a good turn" that will benefit instruction?

P.F.A.G.S.

E. Do I possess a definite educational philosophy of my own?

1. Do I know intimately the general needs of my community?
2. Am I able always to enlist the active aid of my teachers in adjusting the curriculum to the community?
3. Do I personally visit the general social and home environment of the pupils?
4. Do I invariably extend my self to benefit pupil conditions?
5. Do I form the center around which the school revolves as an integral part of the community?

F. Do I actually participate in desirable community activities?

1. Do I meet people on a level of friendliness?
2. Do I avoid taking part in local political squables?
3. Do I keep the school board and the community informed regarding school affairs?
4. Do I give public approval of the better phases of the school system?

P. F. A. G. S.

IV. Skill in Administrative Mechanics of the High School

To what extent:

A. Does the school unit function smoothly and vigorously?

1. Have the students been inspired to cooperate in running their school?
2. Do I delegate responsibility to instructors and sponsors?
3. Does such delegation reflect sound judgment on my part by its results?
4. Are intra-school regulations kept to the very minimum that is conducive to efficiency?

B. Do I facilitate class work and aid

teachers to proceed naturally and spontaneously?

P. F. A. G. S.

1. Is each course of study in line with the general policy of the school system?
2. Do the class organizations easily tend to cohere with the general school organization?
3. Does a spirit of friendliness permeate the intra-school competitions?
4. Does each of the intra-mural contests have a beneficial aim?

C. Is there developed and maintained a broad extra-curricular program?

1. Do I attempt to enfold every pupil into an extra-class activity?
2. Do I give proper emphasis to "activities" and to the regular subjects?
3. Is there sufficient stress concerning an avocation for each student?

D. Have I formulated a general organization which is conducive to order and discipline?

1. Do the teachers attempt to get pupils to govern themselves within the group?
2. Are the students permitted to participate to some extent in governing their school organizations?
3. In case of breach of discipline do I try to get the matter settled by bringing student influence and action upon it?

E. Are all routine matters efficiently organized?

1. Is the method of checking supplies and properties conservative of time and energy?
2. Is the hall way and inter-class traffic rapid but orderly?
3. Does the fire-drill system work efficiently?
4. Are the attendance records kept in a readily cumulative form?
5. Is the library adjusted for easy utility by pupils in study rooms?
6. Is there positive development in each of the home-rooms?

P. F. A. G. S.

V. Supervisory Ability and Skill

To what extent:

P F A G S

A. Do I utilize the principles of supervision and teaching?

1. Is the supervisory program adjusted so that the teachers are striving for pupil benefit?
2. Do I consistently report to the superintendent concerning phases of supervisory objective?

B. Do I have a program of visitation integrated into my general schedule?

1. Does the program call for frequent contact with the teacher at work?
2. Do I give most of my supervisory time and attention to those teachers having teaching difficulties?
3. Do I make memoranda in duplicate so that the instructor may thus possess a copy?
4. Am I definitely attempting to be democratically helpful and co-operative?

C. Do I make the aims of supervision apparent to my teachers?

1. Are the teachers conscious of the child as the unit of education?
2. Have I made it apparent that supervision is for the benefit of the pupil?
3. Have I inspired my teachers with a belief in supervision?
4. Do my teachers and I continually keep in mind the goal for the year?
5. Does my supervision formulate an educational philosophy for my teachers?
6. Are my procedures such that a teacher may emulate them with benefit?

P. F. A. G. S.

D. Do I assist teachers to utilize recognized class procedures?

1. Am I helpful to the teacher in analyzing the aims of instruction?
2. Do I encourage socialized class-room participation?
3. Do I aid the teacher in making lesson assignments?
4. Am I helpful to the teacher in making lesson outlines?
5. Have I inspired the teacher to utilize every device which will improve the teaching act?

6. Do I arrange that demonstration lessons of various types be taught and witnessed by the teachers? P.F.A.G.S.

E. Do I search for and make recognition to better teaching?

1. Do I give recognition to the teacher who has the scientific attitude?
2. Do I encourage and aid the teachers in securing publication of their work?
3. Do I use every opportunity to report to the community the good work of my teachers?
4. Do I encourage and facilitate teacher membership upon local, state, or other educational committees?
5. Have I developed an efficient record device for the recommending of teachers?

F. Do I distinctly feel that my teaching staff is united in purpose?

1. Have I been able to inculcate a wholesome democracy in supervision?
2. Have I inspired my teachers toward a solidarity of purpose?

PART III

ESTABLISHING THE SCALE

Analysis of the general supervisory and administrative fields on the secondary level brings one at once into abrupt contact with questions of objectives, aims, personality, methods, social traits, principles of administration, classroom procedures, principles of supervision, faculty meetings, community relations, and many other essential phases of the work of the principal.

In the general construction of the scale the arrangement is such that it predicates an affirmative answer as the optimum response. The restriction to a definite "no" or "yes" in answering mentally each of the main headings points specifically toward greater objectivity. Following up such a definite response one can the more easily isolate and criticize the strengths and weaknesses by means of the subordinate queries under that respective heading. Undoubtedly many desirable traits are not included, and it is unquestionably true that each of the mentioned qualities is not thoroughly and completely analyzed. The only valid excuse for this seeming inadequacy is from the viewpoint of utility. Fundamental principles with as much brevity as is consistent with careful work, has been the thought kept constantly in mind by the author.

Validity

A survey of the literature of the administrative and supervisory fields demonstrates a very emphatic trend toward unanimity of opinion in regard to objectives, aims, methods, principles and procedures as they relate to the secondary school principalship. In this scale the main qualities are entirely a part of the structure by reason of being possessed of the weight of frequency of occurrence on the part of authorities in each of the two fields of education. In addition, a survey of personnel investigations in the area of business practice lends from another angle weight to the claim of validity to these traits. Furthermore, in pursuing a worthy work of inquiry, one comes in contact with the compiled opinions of a large number of school board presidents. The opinions of these officials were not solicited with any such suggestive device as a questionnaire; they were merely asked to list qualifications which they desired and looked for in an administrative officer. Such procedure would, it is believed, make their combined opinion fairly reliable. In comparing the more heavily weighted opinions obtained with the two groups of authorities mentioned above, it is found that while the ranking according to weight of frequency differed in some respects, there was impressive unanimity regarding the character of these major traits. Especially was this true with respect to the field of administration.

The attempt to establish this scale as a valid one is based upon one premise that of frequency of mention in pub-

lished materials. Each author, upon publishing a work, automatically establishes himself as an authority in the field in which he has written, therefore his opinion is equal to that of any other author. This being so, then the greater the agreement found among such writers the greater the tendency toward validity. Thus, in Table I, the writer attempted to show in tabulated form the unanimity of opinion regarding the various items of qualifications.

TABLE I. TABULATED STATUS OF THE WEIGHT OF FREQUENCY OF AUTHORITIES WITH RELATION TO THE GENERAL HEADINGS OF THE SELF-RATING SCALE

Item Number	Tabulation	Frequency
I-A	2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 50, 53, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 68, 69, 74, 75, 76, 79, 89, 90, 96, 98, 102, 103, 112, 115, 117.	52
I-B	2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50, 53, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 68, 69, 75, 79, 89, 90, 96, 98, 102, 112, 115, 116, 117.	50
I-C	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 37, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 50, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 68, 69, 74, 75, 76, 79, 89, 90, 94, 96, 98, 102, 103, 104, 107, 112, 114, 115, 117.	60
I-D	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 84, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117.	75
I-E	2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 45, 50, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 74, 75, 76, 79, 90, 96, 98, 113.	49
II-A	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 84, 89, 90, 92, 94, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117.	76

TABLE I. (continued)

Item Number	Tabulation	Frequency
II-B	2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 43, 45, 48, 50, 51, 53, 57, 58, 60, 62, 64, 75, 98, 102, 114.	40
II-C	2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 53, 57, 58, 62, 64, 66, 68, 79, 80, 90, 94, 102, 103, 105, 112, 113, 114.	48
II-D	2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 84, 89, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117.	76
II-E	9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 38, 53, 54, 57, 62, 74, 94, 107, 113.	25
III-A	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 52, 53, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 84, 90, 92, 96, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107, 112, 114, 115, 117.	71
III-B	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 45, 47, 49, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 79, 90, 94, 96, 98, 99, 112, 114, 117.	58
III-C	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69,	

TABLE I. (continued)

Item Number	Tabulation	Frequency
III-C	(continued) 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 84, 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117.	82
III-D	1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 36, 41, 42, 48, 50, 53, 54, 56, 59, 64, 65, 67, 76, 90, 94, 96, 98, 104, 107, 114, 117.	40
III-E	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 84, 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 117.	82
III-F	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 75, 76, 79, 84, 89, 90, 94, 96, 102, 112, 114.	58
IV-A	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 76, 78, 79, 80, 84, 89, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 111, 112, 114.	77
IV-B	2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 52, 54, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 74, 75, 76, 79, 84, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 111, 112, 114.	67
IV-C	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 43, 45, 49, 53, 54, 57, 58, 62, 67, 74, 75, 94,	

TABLE I. (continued)

Item Number	Tabulation	Frequency
IV-C	(continued) 96, 99, 103, 107, 112, 114.	40
IV-D	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 75, 79, 94, 96, 98, 99, 102, 103, 107, 112, 114, 117.	68
IV-E	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 84, 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 111, 112, 113, 114, 117.	66
V-A	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 68, 75, 79, 90, 94, 96, 98, 99, 112, 114, 117.	60
V-B	2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 43, 49, 52, 53, 58, 62, 64, 67, 90, 94, 96, 112, 114.	32
V-C	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 84, 89, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117.	77
V-D	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 79, 80, 84, 89, 90, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107, 112, 114, 117.	64

TABLE I. (continued)

Item Number	Tabulation	Frequency
V-E	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 38, 43, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69, 75, 76, 79, 90, 94, 96, 99, 104, 107, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117.	60
V-F	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 79, 80, 84, 89, 90, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117.	78
V-G	1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 40, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 56, 58, 59, 62, 65, 66, 68, 70, 74, 76, 79, 90, 94, 96, 99, 112, 113, 116, 117.	53

PART IV

SUMMARY

Conclusions

While rating cards have long been used by administrators and supervisors, subjectively, for the purposes of determining merit with relation to promotion, or demotion, salary increase or decrease, tenure of office, etc., for persons other than the rater, analysis of the educational field discloses that there is distinct increase in the formulation and use of the self-rating scheme. The purposes just mentioned are valid, but the self-rating device tends to make them even more subservient (and justly so) to that greater object of instruction: the improvement in training of the educator, for the benefit of the child.

The principal purpose of a scale should be to stimulate the rater to meaningful self-criticism of his own work. A self-rating scheme cannot be abused, a criticism which is made of the subjective scales. Lack of improvement of motivation by any one person using such a self-rating scale cannot justifiably bring censure of the scale. It is rather a greater reflection upon the person using the device.

As previously stated, the scale should be used frequently and should be justly analytical and critical upon each occasion. Furthermore, cursory examination of the last-used scale is urged and recommended at frequent periods in the interval before again filling out the scale.

Knowledge gained from analysis of previous rating schemes, works of educational authorities, both administrative and supervisory, opinions of business experts as expressed in various personnel studies, and the expression of the lay-officials who are directly responsible for educating the youth, makes it apparent that the following features are worthy of stress:

Teachers and educational officials of the better type recognize the value and purpose of the self-rating scale.

The capacity for self-evaluation is a phase of judging skill, and being such, it grows and refines itself with practice.

Any rating scale, not merely a self-rating one, must be checked with an extremely objective attitude of mind.

Increasing interest and use of self-rating devices are the actual trend.

At present, at least a self-rating device must employ subjective procedure in a large part.

That supervision improves teaching is a generally accepted fact, but that self-judgment is much more effective has not been so clearly perceived.

The most essential purposes to which a principal's self-rating scale can be applied are supervision, administrative functions, and development of personality.

A self-rating scale undoubtedly possesses vast capacity for stimulation toward professional growth.

Recommendations

The three phases thus mentioned should be actively aimed at the educational betterment of the pupil as the unit.

The use of a self-rating scale for the purpose of stimulation by comparison is probably the most effective means of improving the principal and his functions of office.

Consecutive uses of the self-rating procedure by the principal should show similar (although it is hoped, improved) results.

The scale should contain a compact but comprehensive group of items.

The scale is primarily for use as a device for increasing the efficiency of the official, for the benefit of the child.

One should use the scheme to measure himself as he is, then strive earnestly to improve in the weakness or weaknesses noted before repeating the measurement.

A statement from H. O. Rugg¹ may be used to summarize aptly the whole situation relative to the use of rating scales in that

"if a rating scale is to be truly helpful, its chief element must be self-improvement through self-rating. Improvement of teachers in service rests directly upon the initial step of self-criticism.....It can be stimulated from within.... provided objective impersonal schemes can be developed by which teachers can be made critically conscious of their strengths and weaknesses."

¹Harold O. Rugg. "Self-Improvement Through Self-Rating, A New Scale for Rating Teachers' Efficiency," in *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL*, Vol. 19, pp. 670-684, (May, 1920).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Superintendent
 of
 Selected and Annotated References

1. Almack, John C. The School Board Member. Macmillan Company, New York, 1927. 281 pages. Discusses the duties of the member of the board of education and his attitude toward his job.
2. Almack, John C. "Duties and Training of a City Superintendent," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 62, pp. 31-32, (April, 1921). The title of this article suggests the nature of the content.
3. Almack, John C. and James F. Bursch. The Administration of Consolidated and Village Schools. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1925. 466 pages.
4. Almack, John C. and A. R. Lang. "Problems of the Teaching Profession," in JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Vol. 11, pp. 219-220, (June, 1922). The title is indicative of the nature of the content. It is, of course, somewhat limited.
5. Almy, H. C. and Herbert Sorenson. "A Teaching-Rating Scale of Determined Reliability and Validity," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 16, pp. 179-186, (March, 1929).
6. Arp, J. S. Rural Education and the Consolidated School. World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1920. 212 pages. Enumerates some qualities which the teacher looks for in the successful principal.
7. Baird, James and Guy Bates. "The Basis of Teacher-Rating," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 15, pp. 175-183, (March, 1929). The co-authors discuss the matter of validity in scales.
8. Bates, Guy. "Functions of the Elementary School Principal," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL METHOD, Vol. 4, pp. 178-184, (January, 1925).
9. Benson, A. F. "The Public School Principal," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 64, pp. 49-50, (March, 1922). Herein are listed the duties of the principal as a business executive.

10. Beveridge, F. H. "Qualifications of the Professional Superintendent of Schools," in PROCEEDINGS of Department of Superintendence, National Education Association, Vol. 11, pp. 88-95, (1898).
11. Bobbitt, Franklin. "The Building Principal in the Surveys," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 19, pp. 106-120, (October, 1920).
12. Bobbitt, Franklin. "Mistakes Often Made by Principals," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 22, pp. 337-434, (February, 1920).
13. Bobbitt, Franklin. "The Supervision of City Schools," in 12TH YEARBOOK, National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, pp. 62-74, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, 1913.
14. Boggs, J. "School Board Regulation Concerning the Elementary School Principal," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 20, pp. 730-742, (June, 1920). This contains the opinion of a large number of school board presidents as to the qualifications of a principal.
15. Bone, H. A. "Criteria by Which a Teacher May Measure His Work," in HIGH SCHOOL QUARTERLY, Vol. 7, pp. 153-155, (April, 1919). A discussion of means by which an instructor may check and analyze his techniques.
16. Boyce, Arthur C. "Methods of Measuring Teachers' Efficiency," in FOURTEENTH YEARBOOK of the National Society for the Study of Education, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, (1915). This is a criticism and discussion of the better known of the rating methods of that period.
17. Bradford, Mary C. C. "Report of the Committee of One Hundred Classroom Teachers' Problems," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Education Association, Vol. 62, pp. 265-268, (1924). Excellent summary on rating.
18. Brown, Edwin J. A Self-Rating Scale for Supervisors, Supervisory Principals, and Helping Teachers. Bruce Publishing Company, 1929. This is a complete rating scale on one page in large leaflet-form.
19. Burris, W. P. "Proposed Scale for Rating the School Principal," in the SECOND YEARBOOK, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, Vol. 11, pp. 462-464, (1924). The content is discursive concerning points for a proposed scale.

20. Burton, William H. Supervision and Improvement of Teaching. D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1923. This work presents procedures, principles, and problems of the educative process from the supervisor's standpoint.
21. Carrigan, Rose A. "Rating of Teachers on the Basis of Supervisory Visitation," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL METHOD, Vol. 2, pp. 48-55, (September, 1922). The title indicates the type of content.
22. Carroll, Charles. "Educating a Superintendent of Schools," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 76, pp. 41-43, 136, 138, (1928). Discusses the qualifications desired of an administrator.
23. Case, R. D. "Take Time to Be Human," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATION, Vol. 116, pp. 361-363, (September, 1933). Discusses the social qualifications from the standpoint of the community.
24. Chancellor, E. W. Our Schools, Their Administration and Supervision. D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, pp. 72-99, 1904. 434 pages. Although old, the general fundamentals in the indicated portion should be applicable.
25. Clark, R. C. "As Is the Principal," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 75, pp. 49-50, (September, 1927). Discusses the responsibility of the principal in keeping his faculty inspired and his school up in its standards.
26. Cober, E. W. "The Principal and His Professional Growth," in THIRD YEARBOOK of the Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, Vol. 3, pp. 219-232, (July, 1924).
27. Connor, W. L. "A New Method of Rating Teachers," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Vol. 1, pp. 338-358, (May, 1920). Set forth in this contribution is a pertinent group of questions relating to pupil activity.
28. Cook, W. A. "Uniform Standards for Judging Teachers in South Dakota," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 7, pp. 1-11, (January, 1921).
29. Crabtree, J. W. "Rating of Teachers," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Educational Association, Vol. 53, pp. 516-519, (1915). Contributed opinions of well known educators of the time are presented herein.
30. Cranor, Katherine T. "A Self-Rating Card for Supervisors as an Aid to Efficiency in School Work," in EDUCATIONAL

- ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 7, pp. 91-120, (February, 1921). A good self-rating card for the supervisor.
31. Cubberley, Ellwood P. The Principal and His School. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1923. 571 pages. This is a very comprehensive treatise; covers all the phases of the principal's work.
 32. Cubberley, Ellwood P. Public School Administration. Chapters 15, 21, and 22; Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929. 710 pages. Content in these chapters is very general.
 33. Cubberley, Ellwood P. Rural Life and Education. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1923. 377 pages. Enumerates in a clear manner the qualifications and functions of the rural school administrator.
 34. Davidson, Percy E. "The Professional Training of School Officers," in EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 473-491, (December, 1913). Discusses the kind and amount of training desirable in a school official.
 35. Davidson, W. M. "How to Measure the Efficiency of Teachers," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Educational Association, Vol. 51, pp. 286-290, (1913). Discussion of rating as an effective means of measuring teacher efficiency; a pioneering effort.
 36. Decker, W. N. "Relation of Business and Education in Local School Districts," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 72, p. 51, (April, 1926). Advocates business training but from an educational viewpoint.
 37. Deffenbaugh, W. S. "The Selection of the School Superintendent," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 68, pp. 36-104, (June, 1924). Lists the needed qualifications.
 38. Dutton, Samuel T. and David Snedden. The Administration of Public Education in the United States. 601 pages. A comprehensive discussion of improvement from the viewpoint of the chief executive.
 39. Dyer, Franklin. "Questions on Teaching to Help Teachers Make a Self-Examination to Find Ways of Improving," in ATLANTIC EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL, Vol. 11, pp. 343-344, (March, 1916). Lists a group of questions pertaining to personality and ability.

40. Elliot, E. E. "A Tentative Scale for the Measurement of Teachers' Efficiency," in TEACHERS' YEARBOOK OF EDUCATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS, Department of Reference and Research, New York City Schools, 1915.
41. Englehardt, N. S. and Fred Englehardt. Public School Administration. Chapter 22. Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, 1927. Emphasizes the business phase of school administration.
42. Farrington, Frederick E. "The Equipment of a School Principal," in EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, Vol. 35, pp. 41-51, (January, 1908).
43. Fairchild, R. W. "The Measure of the Administrator," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 57, pp. 23-24, (January, 1918). Gives the fundamental requirements of a successful administrator.
44. Fichandler, Alexander. "Studying Self-Appraisal," in SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, Vol. 4, pp. 1000-1002, (December, 1916). Content includes a very good self-rating scale.
45. Finney, Ross L. and Alfred L. Schafer. The Administration of Village and Consolidated Schools. 298 pages. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1924. Discusses the personal and professional characteristics needed for rural administration.
46. Fitzpatrick, Burke F. Supervision in Elementary Schools. F. A. Owens Publishing Company, Dansville, New York, 1923. Deals somewhat completely with the personal phases.
47. Flowers, Ida V. "Duties of Elementary School Principals," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 27, pp. 414-422, (February, 1927). Content indicated by the heading.
48. Forbes, M. G. "Ethics for Teachers," in JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Vol. 11, pp. 219-220, (June, 1922).
49. Foster, Herbert H. High School Administration. The Century Company, New York, pp. 47-69, 1928. In the indicated portion is found a good discussion of the qualifications desirable in a principal.
50. Freeman, F. N. "Tests of Personality Traits," in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 33, pp. 95-106, (February, 1926). Title indicates content.
51. Gates, Roy C. Management of Smaller Schools. Houghton

Mifflin Company, Boston, 1924. 173 pages. A very practical manual of the administrative and supervisory functions of such schools.

Gist, Arthur S. The Administration of an Elementary School. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1928. 308 pages. Entire work deals with the field of the principal and his work in the community.

Gist, Arthur S. and William A. King. "The Efficiency of the Principalship from the Standpoint of the Teacher," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 23, pp. 120-126, (October, 1922). Presents the rating of the principal from the teacher's viewpoint.

Gowin, Enoch B. The Executive and His Control of Men. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1918. 349 pages. Discusses in vivid manner the personal traits of leaders.

Gray, C. T. "The Training of Judgment in the Use of the Ayres Scale of Handwriting," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. 6, pp. 85-98, (February, 1915). Illustrates how judgment can be trained.

Gray, W. S. "Rating-Scales, Self-Analysis, and the Improvement of Teaching," in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 29, pp. 49-57, (January, 1921). Presents a good discussion of self-rating and points to the potentialities of the device.

Greer, F. E. and P. T. Rankin. "Experiment in Measuring the Principal's Work," in PROCEEDINGS of the Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, Vol. 10, pp. 564-570, (April, 1931).

Hebb, Bertha Y. "Samples of Teachers' Self-Rating Cards," in City School Leaflet. No. 18, Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., (February, 1925). This leaflet presents a number of rating cards samples, many of which are in use in the larger systems of the country.

Henry, Mrs. C. K. "What Do You Look for in a Superintendent?" in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 72, pp. 45-46, (June, 1926). A critical article giving the viewpoint of the lay person.

Hervey, H. P. "The Rating of Teachers," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Education Association, Vol. 59, pp. 825-829, (1921). Advocates that supervisors do not rate; that this be done by some other agency.

61. Hess, Adah H. "Teacher Rating as a Means of Improving Home Economics Teachers in Service," in JOURNAL OF HOME ECONOMICS, pp. 85-90, (February, 1922). The score card contained in this presentation is applicable to other fields.
62. Hines, Harlan C. "Merit Systems in Larger Cities," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 68, pp. 52 ff., (June, 1924). Comprehensive analysis of practices in larger cities.
63. Hines, Harlan C. "The Selection of Teachers for the City of Cincinnati, Ohio," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 59, pp. 41, (August, 1924). Discusses the traits for which the administrator seeks in the instructors.
64. Hudleson, Earl. "The Profession of Principal," in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 30, pp. 15-23, (January, 1922). Tabular results of questionnaire analyses regarding academic and professional phases.
65. Hughes, C. L. "Functions of a Superintendent," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 66, pp. 192-193, (September, 1923). Gives a pertinent list of duties of the head school officer.
66. Hughes, Hardin W. "General Principals, and the Results of Rating Characteristics," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL METHOD, Vol. 4, pp. 421-431, (June, 1925). A character rating scale.
67. Hunkins, R. V. "Technic of the Superintendent of Schools in Cooperation with the Board of Education," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 73, pp. 41-42, (May, 1927). Discusses the desirability of, and the techniques of cooperation.
68. Hunt, R. L. "The Superintendency in Small Schools," in SCHOOL EXECUTIVES MAGAZINE, Vol. 52, No. 11, pp. 370-371, 376, (July, 1933). A discussion of the qualifications of the school administrator as analyzed by educational authorities, and by school board members.
69. Jones, Olive M. "The Relations of the Principals to the Teacher, and the Standards of Judging the Effectiveness of Teaching," in SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, Vol. 14, pp. 469-477, (November, 1921). A description of the handbook and rating plan of New York.
70. Judd, Charles H. "The High School Principal, in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 26, pp. 641-653, (November, 1918).
71. Judd, Charles H. and Others. Rural School Survey of New

York State. G. A. Works, Director of the Survey, Ithaca, New York, 1923. Principles of organization, administration, and supervision.

72. Kent, Raymond E. "What Should Teacher Rating Schemes Seek to Measure?" in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Vol. 2, pp. 802-807, (1920). Places emphasis upon pupil activity and achievement.
73. King, LeRoy. "The Present Status of Teacher Rating in United States," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 70, pp. 44-46, (February, 1925). Presents a very broad view of the profession.
74. Knoepfel, Charles E. "Laws of Industrial Organization," in INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT, Vol. 58, p. 266, (1919). Discusses relations between executive and employees.
75. Koos, Leonard V. The High School Principal. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1924. 121 pages. Gives rather complete criteria of the principal traits.
76. Lansburgh, Richard H. Industrial Management. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1923. pp. 39 ff. Deals with the fundamentals of organization in human relations.
77. Lentz, Clarence. "Rating of Principals in Chicago," in TENTH YEARBOOK of the Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, pp. 571-575, (April, 1931). Treats of the Administrative problems of the school.
78. Loin, Nell E. "Teacher Rating," in JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Vol. 14, pp. 118-119, (April, 1925).
79. Lowry, Ellsworth. Supervision and the Self-Rating Card. State Normal School, Indiana, Pennsylvania. Card is detailed and applicable over a broad field.
80. McClure, Worth. "Functions of the Elementary School Principal," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 21, pp. 500-514, (March, 1921). Enumerates the duties and responsibilities of the office.
81. McClure, Worth. "The Rating of Elementary School Principals in Service," in FOURTH YEARBOOK of the Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, pp. 424-446, (1925). Inspection, instruction, discipline, methods, and administration are discussed.
82. Monroe, Walter and John A. Clark. "Measuring Teachers'

Efficiency," in BULLETIN of the University of Illinois, Department of Education, Vol. 21.

83. Morgan, Catherine. Manual of Directions for Making Efficiency Card Ratings. Detroit Public Schools, 1923.
84. Morrison, J. Cayce. "Analysis of the Principalship as a Basis for the Preparation of Elementary School Principals," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Education Association, Vol. 63, pp. 453-461.
85. Morrison, J. Cayce. "Supervision from the Teacher's Viewpoint," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL METHOD, Vol. 1, pp. 131-138, (December, 1921). Clear analysis of the administrative functions of the elementary school principal from the viewpoint of the teacher.
86. Morrison J. Cayce. "The Value of Carefully Defined Rules and Regulations Covering the Work of the Board of Education and the Superintendent," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 72, pp. 48-49, (February, 1926). Advocates rules and regulations for every district and gives advantages.
87. Parrot, Ava L. "Abolishing the Rating of Teachers," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Education Association, Vol. 53, pp. 1168-1173, (1915). Criticism which emphasizes the defects of the process.
88. Peters, C. C. "Improvement of Facilities for Professional Training of Superintendents," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 6, pp. 337-345, (September, 1920).
89. Phillips, E. D. "A Self-Rating Scale for Teachers," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 66, pp. 45-46, (September, 1923). Good discussion of teacher self-rating.
90. Pittenger, B. F. "Who May Be Superintendent of Our Schools?" in THE NATION'S SCHOOLS, Vol. 4, pp. 21-24, (November, 1929). Criticism of administrative qualifications.
91. Pollich, R. E. "Superintendents' Standards and Policies in the Selection, Appointment, and Promotion of Elementary School Principals," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 26, pp. 107-111, (October, 1925). Discusses advisability of principals succeeding to the office of superintendent.
92. Potter, M. C. "Qualifications and Functions of the Ward

- School Principal," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Education Association, Vol. 49, pp. 322-324, (1909). Discusses the functions and duties of the ward principal.
93. Public School Code of Hamtramch, Michigan Public Schools. The Board of Education, Hamtramch, Michigan, 1927. Presents school code in terms of functions of both the board and the employees.
 94. Reeder, Ward G. The Business Administration of a School System. Ginn and Company, Boston, 1929. 454 pages. A very good presentation of the indicated field.
 95. Reeder, Ward G. The Fundamentals of Public School Administration. Ginn and Company, Boston, (1929). Chapters I-VIII. In the indicated portion is a presentation of the personal and professional phases ably given.
 96. Rich, Stephen G. "Rating of Principals and Superintendents," in EDUCATION, Vol. 42, pp. 496-500. Advocates that teachers be asked to rate their principal and proposes a card.
 97. Riddle, Anna. "Teacher Rating, Report of the Committee of One Hundred on Classroom Teachers' Problems," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Education Association, Vol. 65, pp. 202-215, (1925).
 98. Ritter, Elmer J. "Ratings of Teachers in Indiana," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 18, pp. 740-756, (June, 1918). Gives practices used in teacher rating.
 99. Roberts, A. C. and E. M. Draper. The High School Principal as Administrator, Supervisor, and Director of Extracurricular Activities. D. C. Heath and Company, New York, 1923.
 100. Robinson, W. J. "The Small Town Principal and His Board," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 70, p. 53, (June, 1925). Recommends the single unit chief executive type of administration be used.
 101. Ruediger, W. C. "Rating Teachers," in SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, Vol. 20, pp. 263-268, (August, 1924). Good criticism.
 102. Rugg, Harold O. "Self-Improvement of Teachers Through Self-Rating," in ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL, Vol. 20, pp. 670-684, (May, 1920). Analysis of well known scales and an additional proposal.

103. Saunders, M. Olga. "What Teachers Want From the Principal in His Capacity as Supervisor," in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 33, pp. 610-615, (October, 1925).
104. Schell, Erwin H. The Technique of Executive Control. McGraw Hill Company, Inc., New York, 1924. Suggestive and stimulating thought regarding the personal equation.
105. Schutte, T. H. Schutte Rating Scale for Teachers. World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1923. Favors non-weighted card.
106. Scott, Charles E. "Educational Supervision," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 68, pp. 36, 131, (March, 1924). The purpose of the article is to clarify our thinking in regard to supervision and its relation to administration.
107. Scott, Walter D. and R. C. Clothier. Personnel Management. A. W. Shaw Company, New York, 1923. 643 pages. Comprehensive discussion of traits essential to an executive.
108. Sears, J. B. "The Measurement of Teacher Efficiency," in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Vol. 4, pp. 81-94, (September, 1921).
109. Showalter, N. D. Hand Book for Rural School Officers. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1920. Deals in practical way with problems of administration.
110. Skaaland, S. G. "Office System in the Small School," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 59, pp. 4, 136, (August, 1924).
111. Smith, H. P. The Business Administration of a City School System. Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, 1926.
112. Spencer, P. R. "A High School Principal's Self-Rating Card," in SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. 30, pp. 268-270, (April, 1922). Presents an administrative-supervisory rating card.
113. Stearling, J. G. "The Functions of the Business Manager in the Smaller Cities," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 65, p. 38, (July, 1922). Lists functions and emphasizes versatility of the position.
114. Stone, C. R. "What the Principalship Should Be," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 77, pp. 52, 157, (July, 1928).

115. Stoops, R. O. "Leadership in Education; in the Principal and Supervisor," in PROCEEDINGS of the National Education Association, Vol. 56, pp. 623-626, (1918). Discusses the phases of personality.
116. Stout, E. J. "Ethics of Teacher Selection," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 70, pp. 132, 134, (January, 1925). Very good.
117. Taylor, Joseph S. "Some Desirable Traits of the Supervisor," in EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, Vol. 9, pp. 1-8, (January, 1923). Traits of the supervising official.
118. Thorndike, E. L. "Fundamental Theorems in Judging Men," in JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. II, (March, 1918).
119. Toulon, G. C. "Score Card for the High School Principal's Annual Report," in AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, Vol. 67, pp. 52-53, (July, 1923).

7

73808