Social Behavior and the Administrative Process

Perhaps the most vigorous movement in administration in recent years has been directed toward the development of a comprehensive theory capable of generating both hypotheses for guiding research and principles for guiding practice. Despite many specific advances in special areas, such as hospital administration, public administration, business administration, and educational administration, there still is no general conceptual framework for systematizing and interrelating our knowledge within and among these areas. It is still impossible to speak of administration in terms that would be acceptable to, or for that matter even readily understandable by, students and practitioners in the several special fields. This failure to conceptualize administration on a general theoretical level has been a major obstacle to the development of administration as a rigorous discipline, and the elaboration of theory is accordingly receiving increased attention both in "research" and "applied" administrative settings.

The purpose of the present paper is twofold: (a) to describe a socio-psychological theory of social behavior having broad application to the area of administration and (b) to illustrate the application of the theory to major issues in administration. The four major issues considered here are: the problem of institutional and individual conflict; the problem of staff effectiveness, efficiency, and satisf-
faction; the nature of various leadership-followership styles; and the problem of morale.

The process of administration deals essentially with the conduct of social behavior in a hierarchical setting (1). Structurally, we may conceive of administration as a series of superordinate-subordinate relationships within a social system. Functionally, this hierarchy of relationships is the locus for allocating and integrating roles, personnel, and facilities to achieve the goals of the system.

The term "social system" here is conceptual rather than descriptive; it must not be confused with "society" or "state" or as somehow applicable only to large aggregates of human interaction. Thus, within our framework, for one purpose a given community may be considered a social system, with the school a particular organization within the more general social system; for another purpose the school itself, or even a single class within the school, may be considered a social system in its own right. The theoretical model that we are proposing is applicable regardless of the level or the size of the unit under consideration.

We conceive of the social system as involving two major classes of phenomena, which are at once conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive. There are, first, the institutions with certain roles and expectations that will fulfil the goals of the system. Second, inhabiting the system there are the individuals with certain personalities and need-dispositions, whose interactions comprise what we generally call "social behavior." Social behavior may be apprehended as a function of the following major elements: institution, role, and expectation, which together constitute the nomothetic, or normative, dimension of activity in a social system; and individual, personality, and need-disposition, which together constitute the idiographic, or personal, dimension of activity in a social system.

To understand the nature of the observed behavior and to be able to predict and control it, we must understand the nature and relationships of those elements. The term "institution" has received a
variety of definitions, but for our purposes it is sufficient to point out that all social systems have certain imperative functions that come in time to be carried out in certain routinized patterns. These functions—governing, educating, policing, for example—may be said to have become “institutionalized,” and the agencies established to carry out these institutionalized functions for the social system as a whole may be termed “institutions.” These institutions have certain noteworthy characteristics.

a) Institutions are \textit{purposive}. They are established to carry out certain ends, and these ends serve as the criteria against which institutional practices are ultimately evaluated.

b) Institutions are \textit{peopled}. If institutions are to carry out their prescribed goals, human agents are required. It should be noted, however, that here we are concerned with people, not in the person-alistic sense, but in the actuarial sense. To avoid the possibility of confusion, we may adopt the term “actor” instead of “person” for this level of analysis.

c) Institutions are \textit{structural}. To carry out a specific purpose requires an organization, and organization implies component parts and some rules about how these parts should be interrelated. If the goals and purposes of the institution are known, the tasks to achieve the goals may be specified, and these may be organized into \textit{roles}. Each role is assigned certain responsibilities and concomitant resources, including authority and facilities for implementing the given tasks. A significant feature of such a blueprint or “table of organization” of roles is that it is most frequently set up \textit{before} the selection of any real incumbents for the roles; it is set up in terms of \textit{actors}, in the sense previously defined. And if we may anticipate ourselves a little here, the real person may or may not exactly fit the given roles. As we shall see, this question of fitness poses, in many ways, one of the critical dilemmas of administration.

d) Institutions are \textit{normative}. The fact that tasks for achieving the institutional goals are organized into roles implies that the roles serve as “norms” for the behavior of the role incumbents or actors. The
role expectations are obligatory upon the actor if he is to retain his legitimate place in the institution.

e) Institutions are sanction-bearing. The existence of norms is of no consequence unless there is adherence to them. Accordingly institutions must have at their disposal appropriate positive and negative sanctions for insuring compliance with the norms, at least within broad limits.

The most important subunit of the institution is the role. Roles are the structural elements defining the behavior of the role incumbents or actors. The following generalizations may be made about the nature of roles.

a) Roles represent positions, offices, or statuses within the institution. The role itself may be described, in the words of Linton, as the “dynamic aspect” (2:14) of such positions, offices, or statuses.

b) Roles are defined in terms of role expectations. A role has certain normative rights and duties, which may be termed “role expectations.” When the role incumbent puts these rights and duties into effect, he is said to be performing his role. The expectations define for the actor, whoever he may be, what he should do under various circumstances as long as he is the incumbent of the particular role.

c) Roles are institutional givens. Since the role expectations may be formulated without reference to the particular individuals who will serve as the role incumbents, it is clear that the prescriptions do not depend on individual perception or even on typical behavior. Although the expectations may be misperceived or even serve as points of departure for the actual role incumbents, their crucial significance as blueprints for what should be done is not thereby nullified.

d) The behaviors associated with a role may be thought of as lying along a continuum from “required” to “prohibited.” Certain expectations are held to be crucial to the role, and the appropriate behaviors are absolutely required of the incumbent. Other behaviors are absolutely forbidden. Between these extremes lie certain other behaviors, some of which would be recommended and others perhaps mildly disapproved, but all of which would be considered per-
missible, at least in the ordinary case. It is this flexible feature of roles that makes it possible for role incumbents with different personalities to fulfill the same role and give it the stamp of their individual styles of behavior.

e) Roles are complementary. Roles are interdependent in that each role derives its meaning from other related roles in the institution. In a sense, a role is not only a prescription for the role incumbent but also for incumbents of other roles within the organization, so that in a hierarchical setting the expectations for one role may, to some extent, form the sanctions for a second interlocking role. For example, the role of sergeant and the role of private in the army cannot really be defined or implemented except in relation to each other. This quality of complementariness fuses two or more roles into a coherent, interactive unit and makes it possible for us to conceive of an institution as having a characteristic structure.

So far in our analysis it has been sufficient to conceive of the role incumbents as only "actors," devoid of personal or other individualizing characteristics, as if all incumbents of the same role were exactly alike and implemented the given role in exactly the same way. But roles are filled by real, flesh-and-blood persons, and no two persons are exactly alike. An individual stamps the particular role he fills with the unique style of his own characteristic pattern of expressive behavior. Even in the case of the relatively inflexible roles of sergeant and of private, no two individual sergeants or privates fulfill the roles in exactly the same way. To understand the observed behavior of a specific sergeant and a specific private, it is not enough to know only the nature of the roles and of the expectations (although their behavior cannot be understood apart from these), but we must know the nature of the individuals inhabiting the roles and reacting to the expectations as well. That is, in addition to the nomothetic, or normative, aspects, we must also consider the idiographic, or individualizing, aspects of social behavior. Now, just as we were able to analyze the institutional dimension into the component ele-
ments of role and expectation, so we may analyze the individual dimension into the component elements of personality and need-disposition.

The term "personality," like that of "institution," has been given a variety of meanings. For our purposes, "personality" may be defined as the dynamic organization within the individual of those need-dispositions that govern his unique reactions to the environment. The central analytic elements of personality are the need-dispositions, which we may well define, with Parsons and Shils, as individual "tendencies to orient and act with respect to objects in certain manners and to expect certain consequences from these actions" (3:114). Or, as the same authors go on to say: "The conjoined word 'need-disposition' itself has a double connotation; on the one hand, it refers to a tendency to accomplish some end state; on the other, it refers to a disposition to do something with an object designed to accomplish the end state" (3:115).

Returning to the example of the sergeant and the private, we may now make an essential distinction between the behavior of two individuals with a need-disposition for "submission" in the roles of sergeant and private and the behavior of two individuals with a need-disposition for "ascendance" in the same roles. In short, to understand the behavior of specific role incumbents in an institution, we must know both the role expectations and the need-dispositions. Indeed, needs and expectations may both be thought of as motives for behavior, the one deriving from personal propensities, the other from institutional requirements. What we call social behavior may be conceived as ultimately deriving from the interaction between the two sets of motives.

The general model we have been describing may be represented pictorially as indicated in Figure 1. The nomothetic axis is shown at the top of the diagram and consists of institution, role, and role expectations, each term being the analytic unit for the term next preceding it. Thus the social system is defined by its institutions; each institution, by its constituent roles; each role, by the expectations at-
taching to it. Similarly, the idiographic axis, shown at the lower portion of the diagram, consists of individual, personality, and need-dispositions, each term again serving as the analytic unit for the term next preceding it. A given act is conceived as deriving simultaneously from both the nomothetic and the idiographic dimensions. That is to say, social behavior results as the individual attempts to cope with an environment composed of patterns of expectations for his behavior in ways consistent with his own independent pattern of needs. Thus we may write the general equation: \( B = f(R \times P) \), where \( B \) is observed behavior, \( R \) is a given institutional role defined by the expectations attaching to it, and \( P \) is the personality of the particular role incumbent defined by its need-dispositions.

The portions of role and personality factors determining behavior vary with the specific act, the specific role, and the specific personality involved. The nature of the interaction can be understood from another graphic representation shown as Figure 2. The factors entering into a given behavioral act may be conceived as occurring at a line cutting through the role and personality possibilities represented by the rectangle. At the left, the proportion of the act dictated by considerations of role expectations is relatively large, while the proportion of the act dictated by considerations of personality is relatively small. At the right, these proportions are reversed, and considerations of personality become greater than considerations of role expectations. In these terms, for example, the behavior of our army
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private may be said to conform almost entirely to role demands (Line A), while the behavior of a free-lance artist derives almost entirely from personality dispositions (Line B). In either case, behavior, insofar as it is “social,” remains a function of both role and personality although in different degrees. When role is maximized, behavior still retains some personal aspects because no role is ever so closely defined as to eliminate all individual latitude. When personality is maximized, social behavior still cannot be free from some role prescription. The individual who divorces himself entirely from such prescription ceases to communicate with his fellows and is said to be autistic.

The relevance of this general model for administrative theory and practice becomes apparent when it is seen that the administrative process inevitably deals with the fulfilment of both nomothetic role expectations and idiographic need-dispositions while the goals of a particular social system are being achieved. The unique task of administration, at least with respect to staff relations, is just this: to integrate the demands of the institution and the demands of the staff members in a way that is at once organizationally productive and individually fulfilling.
In the framework outlined here, we may proceed to a reformulation of certain recurring administrative problems and to a clarification of the issues involved.

1. Individual and institutional conflict

When an individual performs up to role expectations, we may say that he is adjusted to the role. Conversely, when an individual fulfills all his needs, we may speak of him as integrated. Ideally, the individual should be both adjusted and integrated, so that he may by one act fulfill both the nomothetic, or institutional, requirements and the idiographic, or personal, requirements. This would obviously be the case if institutional expectations and personal needs were absolutely congruent, for the individual would always will what was mandatory, and both his adjustment and his integration would be maximized. But absolute congruence of expectations and needs is seldom, if ever, found in practice, and as a consequence there is inevitably a greater or lesser amount of strain or conflict for the individual and the institution. In the present context this strain or conflict may be defined simply as the “mutual interference of adjustive and integrative reactions.” The model points to three primary sources of conflict in the administrative setting (4).

a) Role-personality conflicts occur as a function of discrepancies between the pattern of expectations attaching to a given role and the pattern of need-dispositions characteristic of the incumbent of the role. Recall again our example of the individual with high need-dispositions for “ascendance” who is placed in the role of private. There is mutual interference between nomothetic expectations and idiographic dispositions, and the individual must choose whether he will fulfill individual needs or institutional requirements. If he chooses the latter, he is liable to unsatisfactory personal integration. If he chooses the former, he is liable to unsatisfactory role adjustment. In practice there is usually compromise, but, in any event, the nature of the forthcoming behavior is quite different when the expectations and the dispositions are discrepant than when they are congruent.
b) Role conflicts occur whenever a role incumbent is required to conform simultaneously to a number of expectations which are mutually exclusive, contradictory, or inconsistent, so that adjustment to one set of requirements makes adjustment to the other impossible or at least difficult. Role conflicts in this sense are situational givens and are independent of the personality of the role incumbent. They are evidence of disorganization in the nomothetic dimension and may arise in several ways:

(1) Disagreement within the referent group defining the role. For example, the principal of the school may be expected by some teachers to visit them regularly for constructive help and by others to trust them as professional personnel not in need of such supervision.

(2) Disagreement among several referent groups, each having a right to define expectations for the same role. For example, the university faculty member may be expected by his department head to emphasize teaching and service to students but by his academic dean to emphasize research and publication.

(3) Contradiction in the expectations of two or more roles which an individual is occupying at the same time. For example, a teacher may be attempting to be both a devoted mother and a successful career woman.

c) Personality conflicts occur as a function of opposing needs and dispositions within the personality of the role incumbent. The effect of such personal disequilibrium is to keep the individual at odds with the institution either because he cannot maintain a stable relation with a given role or because, in terms of his autistic reactions, he habitually misperceives the expectations placed upon him. In any case, just as role conflict is a situational given, personality conflict is an individual given and is independent of any particular institutional setting. No matter what the situation, the role is, in a sense, detached by the individual from its institutional context and function and is used by him to work out personal and private needs and dispositions, however inappropriate these may be to the goals of the social system as a whole.
In the terms of our model, these three types of conflict represent incongruence in the nomothetic and the idiographic dimensions, or in the interaction between the two dimensions of the social system under study. Such incongruence is symptomatic of administrative failure and leads to loss in individual and institutional productivity.

2. Effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction

A primary concern in any organization is the effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction of the staff (the role incumbents). The administrative problems concerned with effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction have been confused for want of an appropriate frame of reference. The terms have often been used interchangeably, and the significant issues and fruitful distinctions that the concepts imply are obscured altogether. The model we are using makes possible clear-cut and heuristic distinctions between the terms so that a given role incumbent may, for example, be seen as effective without being efficient, and efficient without being effective, and satisfied without being either effective or efficient.

We may recall our basic formulation of behavior in the administrative situation as a function of role expectations and personality dispositions. Effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction may be seen as relationships among these primary elements of the model. The relationships are shown in Figure 3.

a) The criterion for effectiveness is typically the observed behavior of the individual being rated. However, we maintain that the standard cannot be the behavior itself but the behavior relative to
some expectation held by the rater for the behavior. Two crucial consequences follow from this. The first is that the same behavior may be labeled “effective” at one time and “ineffective” at another time by the same person, depending on the expectations he applies to the behavior. The second is that the same behavior may be labeled “effective” and “ineffective” simultaneously as a result of different expectations held by different referent groups. In either case, judgments of effectiveness and ineffectiveness are incapable of interpretation unless both the expectations being applied and the behavior being observed are known. In the terms of our model, effectiveness is a function of the congruence of behavior with expectations, and it must be assessed as such.

b) Efficiency is a relationship between needs and behavior. To the extent that needs and expectations are discrepant, behavior may conform to one or the other or, what is more likely, to some compromise between the two. When behavior conforms to the needs dimension, it appears “natural,” even pleasurable, and is forthcoming with a minimum of strain or expenditure of psychic energy. In this sense, the behavior is efficient. When the behavior conforms to the expectations dimension and there is a gap between expectation and needs, behavior is “unnatural,” even painful, and is forthcoming with a maximum of strain and expenditure of psychic energy. In this sense, the behavior is inefficient. In the terms of our model, we may say efficiency is a function of the congruence of behavior with need-dispositions.

c) When we consider satisfaction (5), we recognize that the administrator is faced with the dilemma of behaving in such a way as to produce maximal effectiveness or to produce maximal efficiency in the role incumbent. Usually he tries to maintain an appropriate balance between the alternatives. His dilemma would be resolved if the needs and the expectations could be made to coincide (selection and in-service training procedures are often directed toward just this goal). In that case, the behavior of the role incumbent would simultaneously meet situational expectations and personal needs. The re-
lation of the individual to the organization would be ideal and presumably would produce maximum satisfaction for all concerned. In the terms of our model, satisfaction is a function of the congruence of institutional expectations with individual need-dispositions.

It should be apparent that, when expectations and needs are not congruent, satisfaction is reduced below the theoretical maximum. The individual may choose to maximize his effectiveness or to maximize his efficiency without necessarily being satisfied. We may summarize by suggesting that effectiveness is situational in origin and point of assessment, that efficiency is personal in origin and point of assessment, and that satisfaction is a function of the relationship between situation and person, the three concepts being entirely independent of one another in the present analysis.

3. Leadership-followership styles

The terms "leader" and "follower" in the administrative situation have been variously defined, and nothing will be gained by further elaboration here. For present purposes we may say that "to lead" is to engage in an act which *initiates* a structure in interaction with others, and that "to follow" is to engage in an act which *maintains* a structure initiated by another. The terms "leader" or "superordinate" and "follower" or "subordinate" in this usage are only relative; for the follower is not altogether passive in the relationship, and the leader is by no means always dominant. The nature of the relationship depends on the operating leadership-followership styles in the particular social system.

In the terms of our model, we have identified three distinct leadership-followership styles: the nomothetic, the idiographic, and the transactional. These styles are represented pictorially in Figure 4. It should be noted that in this conception both the leader and the follower are goal-oriented, and their behavior is directed toward achieving a common institutional purpose. The three styles of leadership-followership are three *modes of achieving the same goal*; they are *not* different images of the goal. We may examine the vari-
ations in the three leadership-followership styles with respect to several major elements of our model: the proportion of role and personality factors in the behavior; the nature of the predominant conflicts recognized and handled; and the relative weight given to effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction.

a) The nomothetic style emphasizes the nomothetic dimension of behavior and accordingly places emphasis on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectation rather than on the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the need-disposition. In the equation $B = f(R \times P)$, $P$ is minimized, $R$ is maximized. It is assumed that, given the institutional purpose, appropriate procedures can be discovered, perhaps through time and motion studies and the like. These procedures are then incorporated in the role expectations, and every role incumbent is required to adhere, in minute detail, to the expectations. It then follows that, if roles are clearly defined and everyone is held responsible for doing what he is supposed to do, the desired outcomes would naturally ensue regardless of who the particular role incumbents might be, provided only that they have the necessary technical competence.

In short, with the nomothetic style of leadership-followship, the most expeditious route to the goal is seen as residing in the nature of the institutional structure rather than in any particular persons. The obligation of the follower is to do things "by the book"; the obligation of the leader is to "write the book." The predominant conflict that is likely to be recognized is role conflict, since this is immediately related to the institution-role-expectation dimension of

---

**Fig. 4.**—Three leadership-followership styles
behavior. The standard of administrative excellence is institutional adjustment and effectiveness rather than individual integration and efficiency.

b) The idiographic style of leadership-followership emphasizes the idiographic dimension of behavior and accordingly places emphasis on the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the need-disposition rather than on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectation. In our equation \( B = f(R \times P) \), \( R \) is minimized, \( P \) is maximized. This does not mean that the idiographic style is any less goal-oriented than is the nomothetic style; it means that the most expeditious route to the goal is seen as residing in the people involved rather than in the nature of the institutional structure. The basic assumption is that the greatest accomplishment will occur, not from enforcing adherence to rigorously defined roles, but from making it possible for each person to contribute what is most relevant and meaningful to him. This point of view is obviously related to the particular individuals who fill the roles at a particular time, and expectations must be kept vague and informal. In effect, change the individual role incumbent, and you change with him the definition of the role. Normative prescriptions of the sort included in typical role expectations are seen as unnecessarily restrictive and as a hindrance rather than a guide to productive behavior. The best government is the one that governs least, or, better, not at all. The predominant conflict that is likely to be recognized is personality conflict, since this is immediately related to the individual-personality-needs dimension of behavior. The standard of administrative excellence is individual integration and efficiency rather than institutional adjustment and effectiveness.

c) The transactional style of leadership-followership, as might be expected, is intermediate between the other two and is, therefore, least amenable to "pure" or even clear-cut definition. Since the goals of the social system must be carried out, it is obviously necessary to make explicit the roles and expectations required to achieve the goals. And, since the roles and expectations will be implemented by
flesh-and-blood people with needs to be met, the personalities and
dispositions of these people must be taken into account. But the
solution is not so simple as appears from just saying that one should
hew to the middle course between expectations and needs, that is,
between the nomothetic and the idiographic axes. Instead, the aim
throughout is to acquire a thorough awareness of the limits and
resources of both individual and institution within which admin-
istrative action may occur (that is, from the nomothetic to the
idiographic extreme) and an intelligent application of the two as a
particular problem may demand. In the equation $B = f(R \times P)$,
$P$ and $R$ are maximized or minimized as the situation requires.
Institutional roles are developed independently of the role incum-
bents, but they are adapted to the personalities of the individual
incumbents. Expectations are defined as sharply as they can be but
not so sharply as to prohibit appropriate behavior in terms of need-
dispositions. Role conflicts, personality conflicts, and role-person-
ality conflicts are recognized and handled. The standard of admin-
istrative excellence is individual integration and efficiency, satisfac-
tion, and institutional adjustment and effectiveness.

4. Morale

Definitions of “morale,” like those of “effectiveness,” “efficiency,”
and “satisfaction,” are necessarily more or less arbitrary. The model
suggests one possible definition which takes into account the two
elements most often identified with morale in the literature, namely,
feelings of identification and belongingness, and suggests a third
additional element, often overlooked, which is, however, as vital as
the other two.

To understand the relevance of the model for morale, let us turn
to Figure 5. We may again suppose that there exists a role incum-
bent subject to the expectations of his role and bringing to the role
his individual pattern of needs. The goals to which the institution
is directed may or may not represent the personal goals of the actor.
Let us represent the terms, “expectations,” “needs,” and “goals,” in
a triangular relationship in the same way in which “expectations,” “needs,” and “behavior” were previously represented. Each of these three terms may overlap the other two to a greater or lesser extent. We may attach the designation “belongingness” to the needs-expectations congruence, “rationality” to the expectations-goals congruence, and “identification” to the needs-goals congruence.

The variable belongingness represents the anticipation, on the part of the role incumbent, that he will be able to achieve satisfaction within the institutional framework, since it appears to him that meeting institutional expectations will also permit him to serve personal needs. Under such circumstances, as we have already observed, institutional activity is easy and natural to the subject, and he carries it out with a minimal cost in psychic energy. The energy so preserved is available for other purposes—a fact from which both the institution and the individual profit. If extra effort is required, the subject has available resources of energy upon which he can, and probably will, call.

The variable rationality represents the extent to which expectations placed upon a role are logically appropriate to the achievement of the proposed institutional goals. An individual may well have low morale if he sees little or no relation between what he is expected to do and what the institution as a whole is presumed to be doing.
There seems to be little point in expending even normal effort on what appear to be tangential activities; putting forth extra effort would simply be useless.

The variable identification represents the degree to which the subject is able to integrate the goals and actions of the institution into his own structure of needs and values. Unless the subject is able to make this integration, it appears unlikely that he will be properly motivated to carry out the enterprise functions in an expeditious and thorough fashion. It is difficult to imagine how high morale, in the sense of a predisposition to put forth extra effort in the furtherance of group goals, might be maintained under such circumstances.

In terms of the model, then, morale may be understood as resulting from the interaction of three factors: belongingness, rationality, and identification. Morale cannot be high if even one of these factors is zero; morale can, however, reach acceptable levels if all three factors are maintained to some degree. In this sense, then, the task of the administrator seeking to develop high morale is the maintenance of reasonable levels of agreement among expectations, needs, and goals.

In conclusion, we wish to disown any implication that the improvement of administrative practice will automatically ensue from a knowledge or manipulation of concepts and variables of the sort proposed in this model. This would be like saying that the success of a medical practitioner depends solely on his knowledge of medical science—physiology, biochemistry, and such. On the other hand, there is little doubt that these are of no small value in successful medical practice. Similarly, the application of systematic concepts from social science to a real situation will help the administrator to sort out the problems confronting him, to examine them in appropriate contexts, and to understand something of their internal dynamics. Such formulations, though they may not provide generalized decisions for action, and at this time are perhaps of greater
research value than applied value, may at least make it possible for the administrator to understand why certain decisions and practices work while others do not (6). There seems to us, in short, little doubt of the heuristic value of such models.

NOTES

1. Our indebtedness to the work of Talcott Parsons will be self-evident throughout this and subsequent sections of the paper. See also J. W. Getzels, "A Psycho-sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration," Harvard Educational Review, XXII (Fall, 1952), 235–46.


5. The term "satisfaction," as it is used here, is more or less synonymous with "contentment" and should not be taken to include such additional concepts as fundamental agreement with institutional objectives or the feeling that the institutional environment lives up to the incumbent's standards of technical or professional adequacy. These concepts involve certain additional factors, as, for example, the level of aspiration of the incumbent, which are too complex to be handled here.