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The problem of this study is to determine if school climate perceptions are stable among the departmental subgroups of the high school. In addition, the study seeks to determine if the subject area of the department or patterns of leadership behavior of the department head (as perceived by teachers in the department) have a significant relationship to how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school.

Five research hypotheses are proposed to investigate the problem. A review of the literature applicable to the hypotheses provides a basis for further study into how teachers within a high school department perceive the climate of their school. The review of the literature consists of an examination of the following seven subtopics: The School as a Social System, Organizational Climate, The Impact of Organizational Climate on School Administration, Organizational Climate and Subsystems, Departments as Subsystems Within the High School, Leadership, and Leadership and School Characteristics. The reviewed material includes books, periodicals, papers, and doctoral dissertations.
The population of this study consists of high schools in suburban school districts located in north central Texas. Additionally, the high schools have departmentalized organizational structures, each department having a designated department head. The department head is given time to perform his administrative duties or is paid a supplement to the salary of a full-time teacher.

Eight high schools were selected at random for participation in the study. Teachers in the selected schools were asked to respond to the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire during the spring of 1979.

Among the eight high schools, thirteen subject area departments are identified. A total of 594 teachers participated in the study. Seventy-two departments qualify for inclusion in data analysis.

Each research hypothesis is restated in the null for statistical treatment. For each hypothesis, the data is displayed in a contingency table. Each hypothesis is tested using the chi-square test of independence. If a relationship is significant at the .05 level of significance, a correlation coefficient is calculated to indicate the degree of the relationship.

Data analysis supports a statistically significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and school climate as perceived by the
teachers of the high school as a whole. A phi coefficient of .46 indicates the degree of the relationship. The remaining propositions are not supported by data analysis.

It is concluded that climate perceptions of high school teachers are stable among the departmental subgroups of the high school. Neither the subject area of the department nor the leadership behavior of the department head have a significant influence on how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school.

In consideration of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. Further research on organizational climate in high schools should focus on identification of factors which cause stabilization of climate perceptions among departmental subgroups.

2. Additional studies should analyze the influence of the combined leadership of the principal and the department head on climate perceptions of teachers within a high school department.

3. The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire should be utilized in inservice programs which provide department heads with opportunities for growth in leadership ability.

4. A replication of this study in an urban setting is recommended.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The modern approach to organizational theory originated with the integration of the formal and informal elements of the organization. Chester Barnard first studied the interrelationship of the formal structure and the motivation of individuals within an organization. One of his major contributions was the distinction between the terms effectiveness and efficiency. Barnard used these terms to define two dimensions which should be utilized in examining an organization. Effectiveness refers to the success of the organization in striving for attainment of organizational goals. The second dimension was called efficiency and refers to the success of the organization in striving for satisfaction of the individual needs of group members. Barnard noted that although the two dimensions are distinct, there does exist an interrelationship between the nonpersonal and personal aspects of an organization. An effective and efficient organization is one which is successful at meeting both organizational goals and personal needs of members in the group (10).

In recent years, a major focus of research in educational administration has sought to determine the
organizational characteristics which support maximum effectiveness and efficiency. Many studies have centered on the organizational climate of schools. Climate has been described as the "personality" of the organization. The climate of any group within the school is an aggregate of individual perceptions. Most of the studies of school climate have used populations of elementary schools. More study is needed with regard to the climate of secondary schools (31).

This study utilized the departmental structure of the high school to study how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their schools. Schools were described as having relatively open or relatively closed climates, using the median of the school openness scores to distinguish between relatively open and relatively closed climates.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if school climate perceptions are stable among the departmental subgroups of the high school. In addition, the study sought to determine if the subject area of the department or patterns of leadership behavior of the department head (as perceived by teachers in the department) have a significant relationship to how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school.
Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To determine if a significant number of departmental subgroups within a high school are classified differently than the school as a whole in terms of relative openness of school climate;

2. To determine if the nature of the subject area associated with a department has an influence on how teachers within the department perceive the climate of their school;

3. To determine if the consideration dimension of leadership behavior of the department head has an influence on how teachers within the department perceive the climate of their school;

4. To determine if the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior of the department head has an influence on how teachers within the department perceive the climate of their school;

5. To determine if a combination of the consideration and initiating structure dimensions of leadership behavior of the department head has an influence on how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school.

Hypotheses

The following were research hypotheses for this study.
1. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and school climate as perceived by the teachers of the high school as a whole. School climate for each group is the group's openness score from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

2. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the subject area of the department. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the department's openness score from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

3. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the consideration dimension of leadership behavior of the department head. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the department's openness score from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The consideration score of leadership behavior is measured by a subtest of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire.

4. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior of the department head. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the department's openness
score from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The initiating structure score of leadership behavior is measured by a subtest of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire.

5. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and whether or not the department head has a score above the mean on both dimensions of leadership behavior. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the department's openness score from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Leadership behavior is measured by the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Background and Significance of the Study

Research in educational administration has supported the view that the school is a social system. In order for the school to be productive, attention must be focused upon the goals of the school as well as the needs of the individuals within the school. The interaction of these dimensions is described as organizational climate, measured by the perceptions of the individuals within the system (21).

Extensive research concerning organizational climate began with a study conducted by Halpin and Croft (1962). The climate of each of seventy-one elementary schools was assessed. The results yielded six prototypic climate profiles ranging from open to closed. An important product of their efforts was the Organizational Climate Description
Questionnaire, which has been one of the most widely used instruments for studying school climate during the last sixteen years (15).

The importance of an open climate to the attainment of the school's goals has been confirmed by several studies. A significant positive relationship seems to exist between teacher morale and open climate (9, 23, 30). Newell suggests that the climate of the work environment affects the teacher's self-concept and personality (24).

The school has a profound effect on the student's personality and development. Wiesen found a statistically significant relationship between learner self-concept and open climate (32). Other studies seem to indicate a positive relationship between academic achievement and open climate (9, 24). Hartley and Hoy established that the more open the climate, the less a feeling of alienation by high school students (16).

The relationship between school climate and the leadership behavior of the principal has been the focus of several studies. Some results suggest that the principal has an influence on the openness of the climate (8, 14), while other findings fail to support this conclusion (4, 5, 33, 34). Newell asserts that the principal does more than anyone else to set the climate of a school, and that the principal has more influence in an elementary school than in a secondary school (24).
Gross and Herriott contend that the leadership behavior of the elementary principal is an important determinant of school characteristics. They found a positive relationship between the effort of the principal to improve the performance of his staff and each of the following: student learning, staff morale, and the professional performance of teachers (13).

A major effort to investigate leadership behavior was the Ohio State University Leadership Studies. Two dimensions of leadership behavior were identified as initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the leader's efforts to achieve the goals of the organization, while consideration describes the leader's efforts at group maintenance or concern for the individual staff member (15). This framework of leadership behavior is especially useful when the school is viewed as a social system.

Halpin was involved with the Ohio State Studies and examined the behavior of aircraft commanders as perceived by their crews. He found positive correlations between crew ratings and the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. In another study, Halpin found that the commander's knowledge of how he should behave had little bearing on how his crew perceived his behavior (15).

In a subsequent investigation of fifty Ohio superintendents of schools, Halpin found different perceptions of
the leader's behavior by different groups. A significant positive correlation was found between the perceptions of the school board and those of the staff regarding the initiating structure of the superintendent. However, staff perceptions of consideration were consistently lower than the perceptions of the board (15).

One problem associated with the investigation of climate and leadership behavior in the secondary school is the size of large high schools. A consistent finding is that the climates of secondary schools are closed (20, 28, 31). This study sought to gain insight into climate perceptions by examining the perceptions of subgroups of the high school.

Heller found that few variations exist between informal groups and the entire staff of elementary schools (18). At the secondary level, Marchione discovered that the perceptions of school climate by three departments, English, social studies, and science, tend to follow the perceptions of school climate of the total school staff (22). However, differences in perceptions of school climate by "academic" and "manual trades" teachers within high schools were found by Grassie (12).

Additionally, this study focused on the leadership behavior of the department head and its relationship to how teachers within a department perceive school climate. In large schools, the principal must be concerned with issues
on a global scale. Department heads should be utilized for effective administration. Sergiovanni defines the following areas in which the effective department head works: educational leadership, supervisory leadership, organizational leadership, administrative leadership, and team leadership (26).

The department head occupies a unique position in the high school. Some research has indicated that the responses of department heads might accurately reflect the climate of large high schools (6, 19).

This study was significant in that it investigated each of the following:

1. The relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within departments of the high school and as perceived by teachers of the school as a whole;

2. The influence of subject area associated with a department on how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school;

3. The leadership behavior of department heads within the high school as perceived by the teachers in the department; and

4. The influence of the leadership behavior of the department head on how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school.
Definition of Terms

1. **Organizational climate** is the qualitative aspect of the interpersonal relationships as perceived by the members of an organization (10, p. 102) and as measured by the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**.

2. **Leadership behavior** is the behavior of an individual in terms of initiating structure and consideration as measured by the **Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire**.

3. The **department head** is a member of the teaching staff of a school who is charged with administrative duties relating to a designated subgroup of the school. The department head is paid a supplement to his regular teacher's salary or is given a specific time period each day for performing the administrative duties.

4. A **high school** is a public school with any grade configuration which includes grades ten, eleven, and twelve.

5. A **suburban school district** is a public school district with an average daily pupil attendance between 10,000 and 50,000, located within fifty miles of a city whose population exceeds 400,000.

Limitations

Generalizations of the results of this study are limited to schools in socio-economic environments similar to the schools in the population of this study.
Procedures for Collection of Data

**Instruments**

This study involved the measurement of organizational climate and leadership behavior. Climate was measured by use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBD) was used to measure the factors of leadership behavior.

The OCDQ was developed by Halpin and Croft in 1962, under a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The instrument was used in a study of the climates of seventy-one elementary schools in six regions of the United States (15). The OCDQ has been used to assess the organizational climates of elementary, junior high, and high schools. A copy of the OCDQ appears in the Appendix.

The OCDQ has sixty-eight Likert-type items. Responses follow a four point scale. The respondent is asked to indicate to what extent the item describes his school. About thirty minutes are required for completion of the instrument (15).

The OCDQ is composed of eight subtests. Four are used to describe characteristics of the group. These group characteristics are hindrance, intimacy, disengagement, and esprit. The remaining subtests measure the following...
characteristics of leader behavior: production emphasis, aloofness, consideration, and thrust (15).

The OCDQ yields eight subtest means, a school climate profile, and an openness score. Andrews reported that the subtests possess construct validity for both elementary and secondary schools (1). Hayes found a reliability coefficient for the openness score of .90 (16).

The SBD was developed by Fleishman as part of the Ohio State Leadership Studies project. Norms have been developed using the SBD with supervisors in industry as well as education (11). A copy of the SBD appears in the Appendix.

The SBD has forty-eight Likert-type items. The respondent is asked to indicate to what extent the item describes the behavior of his supervisor. Responses follow a five point scale. For the purposes of this study, instructions accompanied the SBD which instructed the teacher to complete the instrument with the word supervisor meaning department head. The SBD requires about fifteen minutes to complete (11).

The SBD yields two subtest scores for the two dimensions of leadership behavior, consideration and initiating structure. Fleishman reported reliability coefficients for both subtests of the SBD. Using the split-half method, reliability coefficient estimates for the consideration subtest range from .89 to .98. Similarly, reliability coefficient
estimates for the initiating structure subtest range from .68 to .87. Construct validity was maximized by developing the instrument using a factor-analytic procedure with item analysis to provide homogeneous measures of consideration and initiating structure. Forty-eight items were selected from 140 original items. Each item has a high loading on one dimension of leadership behavior with close to zero loadings on the other dimension (11).

The SBD is similar to the older Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. The SBD was chosen for this study because it is shorter than the earlier instrument and was revised in 1970.

The Population

The population of this study consisted of high schools in suburban school districts located in north central Texas. Additionally, the high schools had departmentalized organizational structures, each department having a designated department head. Each department head was given time to perform his administrative duties or was paid a supplement to the salary of a full-time teacher.

Selection of the Sample

A preliminary canvass of public school districts in north central Texas indicated that approximately twenty-four high schools in nine districts met the criteria to be included in the population of this study. The school districts
were sorted alphabetically according to the name of the district. Each district was assigned a number from one to nine, according to the position of the district's name in the alphabetical list. The names of the districts were listed a second time according to random selection, using a table of random numbers (25, pp. 410-411). The first eight districts on the random list constituted the districts in the preliminary sample for this study.

In a similar manner, one high school was chosen from each district in the sample. The high schools in a district were sorted alphabetically according to the name of the school. Each school was assigned a number from one to n (where n is the total number of high schools in the district), according to the position of the school's name in the alphabetical list. The names of the high schools were listed a second time according to random selection, using a table of random numbers (25, pp. 410-411). The first school on the random list was selected for participation in the study.

The districts in the sample were contacted by telephone and visited in order to confirm each school's eligibility and willingness to participate in the study. If district officials did not wish to participate in the study, then the next district in the random list was included in the sample. If the selected high school was ineligible or if school officials did not wish to participate in the study, an attempt was made to include the next high school from the
random list of high schools in the same district. When it was necessary to include two high schools from the same district, the second school was chosen using the same random procedure, beginning at the top of the random list of districts.

Research Design

This study was causal-comparative in nature (3), using a simple randomized design (3, 25). The study sought to determine if a relationship exists between the single dependent variable and each of the three independent variables. No attempt was made to manipulate any of the three independent variables, and no inference was made concerning a cause-and-effect relationship. However, the techniques of statistical inference allow generalization of findings to the population of this study.

Procedures for Collection of Data

An individual packet for each teacher was delivered to each school in the sample. Each packet contained an instruction page (a sample instruction page appears in the Appendix), one copy of the OCDQ, and one copy of the SBD. Each teacher in the school was asked to complete the instruments in the packet. The packets were collected from each school.

The packets were coded in such a way as to provide opportunities for follow-up on non-returns. However,
complete confidentiality in reporting of data was assured to individual districts, schools, and participants.

Collection of data took place during the spring semester of 1979, before May 10, 1979. A minimum of 60 percent of usable returns from a department and in no case less than three returns from a department were necessary in order for data from a department to be included.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Data from the OCDQ were transferred to punched cards for electronic data processing. Scoring of the OCDQ was completed by Don B. Croft at New Mexico State University and returned for analysis. The mean and standard deviation were computed for each subtest of the OCDQ, for the school as a whole, and for each department as a subgroup of the school.

The median of the school openness indices were used to identify schools which were relatively open (the openness score was above the median) and schools which were relatively closed (the openness score was at or below the median). The same median was used to identify departments with teachers who perceived school climate as relatively open and to identify departments with teachers who perceived school climate as relatively closed.

Data from the SBD were transferred to punched cards for electronic data processing. A computer program for
scoring the SBD was developed for use in this study. The scores for both consideration and initiating structure were computed for each department head. For each dimension of leadership behavior, the mean of individual scores was calculated and used to scale the data to nominal form.

Departments were classified first according to whether the department head's score for consideration was above the mean of consideration scores, or was at or below the mean. Secondly, the departments were classified according to whether the department head's score for initiating structure was above the mean for structure scores, or was at or below the mean. Finally, the departments were classified according to whether the department head's score for consideration was above the mean of consideration scores, and his score for initiating structure was above the mean of structure scores; or at least one of the two scores was at or below the corresponding mean.

Each research hypothesis was restated in the null for the purpose of statistical treatment. For each hypothesis, the data were displayed in a contingency table. Each hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence. For each of hypotheses one, three, four, and five, if the average expected frequency was less than 7.5 and there was extreme departure from the ideal of equal expected frequencies, then a shift was made to the Fisher Exact Probability Test. If expected frequencies were approximately
equal throughout the table, an average expected frequency of two was considered adequate (25).

For each hypothesis, in testing for significance, the .05 level was considered significant. Also, each hypothesis was tested using a one-tailed test. In cases in which a significant relationship was found, a correlation coefficient was calculated to indicate the degree of the relationship. The phi coefficient was considered appropriate for hypotheses one, three, four, and five. Cramer's statistic was considered appropriate for hypothesis two.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate how teachers within a high school department perceive the organizational climate of their school. Additionally, factors of total school climate, subject area, and the leadership behavior of the department head were to be examined. A review of the literature applicable to this study is arranged into the following subtopics: The School As a Social System, Organizational Climate, The Impact of Organizational Climate on School Administration, Organizational Climate and Subsystems, Departments As Subsystems Within the High School, Leadership, and Leadership and School Characteristics.

The School As a Social System

Research in educational administration has supported the view that the school is a social system. Each school is composed of subsystems and each school is itself part of larger systems, the school district and the community.

One approach to studying the school as a social system focuses upon the interaction of the individuals within the school. A framework for this approach was proposed by Getzels with later contributions by Guba. The Getzels-Guba model is illustrated in the following figure (18, p. 267).
Nomothetic Dimension

\[
\text{Institution} \rightarrow \text{Role} \rightarrow \text{Expectation} \rightarrow \text{Observed Behavior} \\
\text{Social System} \rightarrow \text{Individual} \rightarrow \text{Personality} \rightarrow \text{Disposition} \rightarrow \text{Need}
\]

Idiographic Dimension

Fig. 1—Getzels-Guba model (18, p. 267)

As depicted in the figure, Getzels and Guba view the school as consisting of two interacting dimensions. The nomothetic dimension represents the school as an institution with certain roles and expectations. The idiographic dimension represents the school as a collection of individuals with certain personalities and needs. The primary role of the leader is to promote a blending of these dimensions (18).

The Getzels-Guba model provides the essential element common to all social systems theories, human interrelatedness. Systems theory suggests that behavior is a function of the context in which it occurs. Hence, the behavior of administrators and teachers should be regarded as attempts to achieve both the goals of the school as well as personal goals and social needs. Behavior of an individual is not isolated, but occurs as part of group movement.
and is related to the behavior of others in the group (39).

The interrelationship of the behavior of individuals within a system produces feelings, attitudes, and perceptions on the part of each individual about others in the group and the group itself. The collective perceptions of group atmosphere have been described as organizational climate. A healthy organizational climate is one which helps individuals to feel secure and to function effectively within the group. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately in a healthy organizational climate (35).

Organizational Climate

Extensive research concerning organizational climate began with a study conducted by Halpin and Croft (1962). The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) was developed by Halpin and Croft as a means to measure school climate. The instrument examines eight dimensions of organizational climate, four of which focus on behavior of teachers in the school and four on the behavior of the principal. The instrument provides a subtest score for each of the eight dimensions and an openness score. The eight dimensions of organizational climate are disengagement, hindrance, esprit, aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration (24). A description of each of the eight aspects of climate follows.
Disengagement refers to teacher behavior in a task-oriented situation, which exhibits a lack of commitment to the associated goal. A group with high disengagement seems to be going through the motions of the task with only a superficial interest in the outcome (24).

Hindrance refers to teachers' feelings that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work. Teachers report the assignment of routine duties and other requirements which they perceive as unnecessary to achievement of group or personal goals (24).

Esprit refers to group morale. High esprit reflects the feeling of achievement on both nomothetic and idio- graphic dimensions (24).

Intimacy refers to the cohesiveness of the group. It reflects the teachers' enjoyment of social relations with each other (24).

Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal, which is characterized as formal and impersonal. The principal, who is perceived as aloof, maintains an emotional distance from his staff and seems concerned only with the nomothetic dimension of the social system of the school (24).

Production emphasis refers to behavior by the principal, which is highly directive. The principal, characterized by a high production emphasis, tends to supervise the staff very closely and is not receptive to feedback from the teachers (24).
Thrust refers to behavior by the principal, which seeks to motivate the teachers in the group, not by close supervision, but rather by setting a personal example and by commitment to the goals of the organization. Even though the principal's behavior is task-oriented, it is viewed favorably by the staff (24).

Consideration refers to behavior by the principal, which reflects a genuine interest in the welfare of the teachers as individuals. Consideration reflects the principal's understanding of personal goals of the teachers in the school (24).

The study conducted by Halpin and Croft utilized the OCDQ. Seventy-one elementary schools were chosen from six regions throughout the United States. The climate of each of the schools was assessed. The results yielded six prototypic climate profiles ranging from open to closed. The climate profiles are open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed (24). Descriptions of the six climate profiles follow.

An open climate describes an energetic, lively group of individuals whose behavior is directed toward meeting the goals of the organization as well as satisfaction of personal goals and social needs. Leadership acts emerge appropriately from both the group and the leader (24).

An autonomous climate describes a group in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group. The leader
exerts little influence on the group. Attention is focused upon both group and personal goals, but satisfaction is derived more from achieving personal rather than group goals (24).

A controlled climate describes a group whose primary concern is achievement of group goals. Little attention is given to the satisfaction of personal needs (24).

A familiar climate describes a group in which little attention is given to achievement of group goals. The primary concern of individuals within the group is the satisfaction of personal needs (24).

A paternal climate describes a group whose leader constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group. The leader attempts to direct all activities of individuals within the group. The group is unable to achieve group goals or satisfaction of personal needs (24).

A closed climate describes a group in which a high degree of apathy exists on the part of all members of the group. The organization is not moving toward achievement of group goals and individuals derive no satisfaction of personal needs (24).

The study by Halpin and Croft can be considered a significant milestone in the development of organizational theory. However, there has been some controversy over the usefulness of the six discrete climate profiles.
Brown reported the results of a study, which sought to replicate the efforts of Halpin and Croft. The OCDQ was administered to teachers in eighty-one randomly selected elementary schools in Minnesota. Brown's conclusions supported the OCDQ as a well-constructed instrument. The results verified that it is possible to identify a climate continuum. However, Brown found eight distinct climate profiles from analysis of the data (9).

Andrews conducted a study of organizational climate in 165 Canadian schools. The primary focus of his study was to validate the OCDQ. Andrews reported good construct validity of the OCDQ (3).

Watkins employed the OCDQ in a study of forty-eight elementary and secondary schools in Georgia. Watkins found an apparent weakness in the middle classifications suggested by Halpin and Croft. In addition, the climates of the secondary schools were found to cluster at the closed end of the continuum (54).

Appleberry and Hoy chose to rank the forty-five elementary schools in their study as relatively open or relatively closed using the openness score from the OCDQ. Openness scores were ranked from highest to lowest. The schools with scores in the upper one-third of the distribution were termed relatively open, while the schools in the lower one-third of the distribution were termed
relatively closed (4). Hoy contends that the OCDQ remains a useful device for the charting of school climate (30).

Impact of Organizational Climate on School Administration

A healthy school climate is an important consideration for the school administrator. Doak asserts that organizational climate always exists and is the first concern in planning and implementing change within the organization. An open climate fosters clear definition of goals. Individuals operate freely in an atmosphere that encourages the examination of alternatives and adoption of a course of action to achieve the desired change (17).

Newell suggests that the climate of the work environment affects the teacher's self-concept and personality (39). Several studies have confirmed a significant positive relationship between teacher morale and open climate (3, 16, 38, 41, 49, 55).

The atmosphere of the school has a profound effect on the student's personality and development. Wiesen found a statistically significant relationship between learner self-concept and open climate (56). Some studies seem to indicate a positive relationship between academic achievement and open climate (16, 39).

In contrast to other studies, Andrews found no significant relationship between school climate and student achievement, as measured by student examinations in academic
subjects and in academic ability. The one subtest of the OCDQ which related most strongly with pupil achievement was intimacy. This finding may suggest that teachers are motivated more through close relationships with their colleagues than they are through principal interaction (3).

In a Florida study, Smith found that student morale was highest in schools that were not classified as most open or most closed. Other factors such as sex, race, and grade level also influenced student morale. Smith concluded that morale of students was high in schools with teachers who perceived climate in the middle of the continuum, but toward the open end. These schools also had a community environment characterized by housing that is not overcrowded, more two parent families, more Spanish-origin students, smaller student-teacher ratios, and greater per-pupil expenditures (44).

Rogers also investigated the effect of organizational climate on the school morale of students in junior high schools. Additional factors of sex, grade level, participation in extracurricular activities, and non-participation in extracurricular activities were considered. The OCDQ was administered to teachers in the selected junior high schools in order to determine the perceived climates of the schools. School morale was measured by the School Morale Scale, which was administered to students in the schools (40).
Analysis of the data revealed that a significant difference existed in the school morale of students in open and closed organizational climates, regardless of sex, grade level, and participation or non-participation in extracurricular activities. Students in schools which had open climates reported a higher level of morale than did students in schools which had closed climates (40).

Appleberry and Hoy studied the relationship of school climate and pupil control ideology. The latter is a concept which can be described in terms of a continuum from custodial at one extreme to humanism at the other (4).

A custodial pupil control ideology is characterized by the importance of maintaining order and an impersonal distance between the teacher and the pupil. In such an environment, students are not trusted and no provision is made for communication and feedback from the students (4).

A humanism pupil control ideology is characterized by the importance of the individuality of each student. The teacher strives to create an atmosphere to meet the variety of needs of all students. Students are trusted to be self-disciplining and responsible (4).

In a sample of forty-five elementary schools, Appleberry and Hoy found that schools with relatively open climates were more humanistic in pupil control ideology than schools with relatively closed climates (4). The findings of
of Appleberry and Hoy were confirmed by a subsequent study involving secondary schools in New Jersey.

Waldman compared organizational climate and pupil control ideology in secondary schools. He found that the more open the climate of the secondary school, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology of teachers in the school (52).

The strength of the relationship between open climate and humanistic pupil control ideology led the researchers in both studies to similar conclusions. They suggested that pupil control ideology may be an important aspect of the human interrelatedness of the social system of the school (4, 52).

Another effort to assess the influence of student attitudes within the social system of the school involved an examination of student alienation and school climate. Using forty-five New Jersey high schools, Hartley and Hoy found that the more open the climate of the school, the less a feeling of alienation by high school students (25).

Organizational Climate and Subsystems

A basic tenant of systems theory is that each system is composed of interdependent subsystems. Several studies have focused upon the climate of the school as perceived by subgroups of the system.
Ulhorn investigated the relationships among the administrative subsystems in the organizational hierarchy of the Baltimore county school system in Maryland. The OCDQ was administered to measure the climate perceptions in the offices of the deputy superintendent, assistant and associate superintendents, and secondary school principals. Secondary department chairmen and secondary teachers also responded to the questionnaire (51).

The results of the study provided mild support for the thesis that there is a relationship between the climate perceptions in the office of the deputy superintendent and the climate perceptions in the offices of the assistant and associate superintendents. There was mild to considerable support for the thesis that there is a relationship between the climate perceptions in the office of each assistant superintendent and the offices of the secondary principals in that area. There was mild to considerable support for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between perceived climate in the school offices and individual departments in the school (51).

Heller examined the informal organization operating within the formal structure of ten elementary schools. A sociometric instrument was used to identify the informal groups within each school. Heller found that grade level, years of teaching experience, years of tenure at the school, and sex of the staff member influenced informal group
membership. However, few variations existed between the school climate as perceived by the total staff of the formal organization and the school climate as perceived by members of the informal subgroups (27).

In a similar study, Anderson found that informal group membership within the elementary school could not be predicted from the factors of age, sex, or teaching experience. His results supported the findings of Heller in that climate perceptions among subgroups within the school were not significantly different. However, when the analysis was limited to the dimensions of thrust and esprit, significant differences among perceptions of the informal subgroups were found (1).

Two studies in high school settings support the findings of Heller. Using twenty-four high schools in Maryland, Marchione studied the relationships among three approaches to school climate assessment, climate as perceived by the total staff, climate as perceived by selected departmental subgroups, and climate as perceived by students. The departments selected were English, social studies, and science. While total staff and departmental perceptions were found to agree, Marchione found no significant relationship between the climate as perceived by students and either departmental or total school climate (36).

Sargent also investigated the climate perceptions of departmental subgroups within the high school. He found
no significant difference among school departments in the perceptions of teachers regarding organizational climate (41).

In contrast, two studies reported differences in perceptions of school climate by subgroups within the school. Grassie found the "academic" teachers perceived climate differently than "manual trades" teachers (20).

McWilliams investigated organizational climate in nine New Jersey high schools and its relationship to factors of school size, grade organization, supervisor-teacher ratio, and the subject matter assignment of teachers. No significant relationship was found between school climate and the variables of school size, grade organization, and supervisor-teacher ratio. However, teachers of the various subject matter areas perceived different organizational climates in the same school (37).

Departments As Subsystems Within the High School

By applying systems theory to the organization of the high school, it becomes clear that the high school exists as a collection of interdependent subsystems. The tasks of the system must be differentiated for each subsystem and provision must be made for integration among the various subsystems. Leadership acts emerge not only from the principal but from the various subgroups as well. Traditionally, the approach to subsystem organization has been specialization
on the part of individuals and small groups. Few high school principals have the background and training necessary to effectively work with teachers in all subject areas. In high schools, subsystems usually exist as departmental units organized by subject areas (12). Utilization of department heads is a realistic approach to improved instructional leadership within the system (31).

According to Anderson and Van Dyke, the primary purposes of departmental organization are to facilitate curriculum planning among grade levels and to use teachers who are specialists in their respective teaching fields. Central to the success of the departmental organization is provision for a department head. The department head is responsible for coordinating the work within the department and for communication between departments (2).

In a nationwide investigation of departmental organization, King and Moon found that 70 percent of the high schools studied had department heads. Fifty-five percent provided lighter teaching loads for the department head, 54 percent provided additional compensation for the department head, 30 percent provided both, while only 29 percent provided neither (32).

In a study of metropolitan high schools, Thorum found that the majority have a departmental organization, with department heads selected by the building principal. Leadership ability was the most important consideration in
selecting the department head. There seemed to be no
difference in opinions about the value of a departmental
organization among schools of varying age. Thorum contends
that the department is an effective unit of management (48).

Buser investigated the position of department heads in
various sized public high schools. Principals of selected
high schools were surveyed regarding the organization of
their schools. Buser found that departmental organization
was most common in large and middle-sized schools. However,
even in small-sized high schools, a majority of those
studied had departmental organization with designated
department heads (11).

The principals who participated in Buser's study
responded that functions of the department heads within their
schools was both supervisory and administrative. The most
important qualities of a department head were reported to
be leadership ability, superior teaching ability, knowledge
and ability in curriculum development, and willingness to
work. The department head was regarded as an important part
of inter-school communication (11).

The department head occupies a unique position within
the high school. He is usually more accessible to teachers
within the department than supervisors who serve several
schools. He is responsible for fewer people than a district
supervisor, assistant principal, or principal. The depart-
ment head is engaged in teaching and confronts problems
similar to those facing others in the department. Finally, the department head has technical expertise in his subject area. The department head should assume a supervisory role, supplemented by the principal and other supervisory staff (28).

The duties of the department head have been the focus of several studies (5, 11, 32). Berrier found that the department head occupies a key role in both supervision and curriculum development (5).

Stephenson suggests that good departmental organization leads to improved communications, more inspired teaching, happier teachers, and a more cohesive work group (45). In general, good departmental organization can foster achievement of goals on both nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. The department head must provide the leadership to assimilate the work of the department into the mainstream movement of the total system.

Leadership

Newell defines leadership as a process through which persons intentionally influence others in order to attain group or organizational goals. Leadership includes both verbal and nonverbal behavior. To be effective, leadership behavior must conform to changes in the nature of the group's task, people in the group, and situational factors (39).
Leadership behavior may be classified as status or emergent. Status leadership is exhibited by persons who occupy certain positions from which leadership and guidance are expected. Emergent leadership describes the behavior of someone who holds no special position but whose actions help to move the group toward its goals (39).

Several theories of leadership have evolved from study and research in attempts to explain effective leadership behavior. One of the earliest theories held that true leaders could be distinguished from others because they possess certain traits. The traitist theory spurred many studies which sought to enumerate the essential traits of a leader. However, many traits isolated in early studies were not found in subsequent investigations. Contradictory findings compounded the issue (30).

Reaction to the traitist theory of leadership caused a reappraisal of leadership theory. Psychologists and sociologists began to examine the environment in which leadership acts emerge. The focus of investigations shifted from a concern with the roles and relationships within the group to an interest in the group's environment. The situational approach emphasized that all leadership behavior is a function of the situation in which the group exists (30).

Neither the traitist nor the situational approach seemed to offer a successful vehicle for the study of leadership. Emphasis shifted next to the study of the behavior of
leaders. Leadership began to be identified as a complex phenomenon involving interactions among the people involved and various situational factors. Many frameworks have been suggested for examining the aspects of leadership behavior, and most of these frameworks approach the concept of leadership as multidimensional (30).

Leadership behavior may be viewed in terms of the Getzels-Guba model as nomothetic or idiographic. A transactional aspect may be added in which leadership behavior is characterized by consideration of both the organization and the individual (39).

Cartwright and Zander proposed that leadership should be described in terms of two sets of group functions, goal achievement and group maintenance. Similarly, Etzioni theorized that leadership behavior is directed toward satisfaction of two sets of group needs, instrumental needs and expressive needs. Instrumental needs refer to the organization of resources to achieve the task of the group. Expressive needs refer to the social interaction of group members. Both of these concepts approach leadership as a stimulus for group action (30).

Stogdill identified twelve dimensions of leadership behavior. Again, the twelve factors may be collapsed into two components, system-oriented behavior and person-oriented behavior (30).
A major effort to investigate leadership behavior was the Ohio State University Leadership Studies. Two dimensions of leadership behavior were identified as initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the leader's efforts to achieve the goals of the organization, while consideration describes the leader's efforts at group maintenance or concern for the individual group member (23).

Halpin was involved with the Ohio State Studies and examined the behavior of aircraft commanders as perceived by their crews. He found positive correlations between crew ratings and the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. The correlation was significantly greater for consideration. In another study, Halpin found that the commander's knowledge of how he should behave had little bearing on how his crew perceived his behavior (23).

In a subsequent investigation of fifty Ohio superintendents of schools, Halpin found different perceptions of the leader's behavior by different groups. A significant positive correlation was found between the perceptions of the school board and those of the staff regarding the initiating structure of the superintendent. However, staff perceptions of consideration were consistently lower than the perceptions of the board (23).

The University of Michigan Survey Research Center conducted studies on leadership behavior during the same period
as the Ohio State studies. The studies done through the University of Michigan dealt primarily with business and industrial organizations (30).

Hoy and Miskel summarized the Michigan studies. Criteria were identified which were considered to measure the effectiveness of the organization. Then, behavior characteristics were located which clustered closely and were highly related to the effectiveness criteria. Two concepts were initially identified. One was employee orientation, which refers to the supervisor who uses the human relations approach in interaction with his employees. The other concept was called production orientation, which is associated with the supervisor whose main emphasis is the job or task to be done (30).

Originally, the two concepts of employee orientation and production emphasis were considered to be categories of leader behavior, which were at opposite ends of the same continuum. Subsequent research led investigators to adjust their conceptual framework to indicate that the two concepts were separate and independent dimensions, not unlike the two dimensions of leader behavior identified by the Ohio State studies (30).

An important part of the early studies of leader behavior was the development of instruments to measure behavior characteristics. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed at Ohio State to rate the
leader on the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. The LBDQ was used in the studies conducted by Halpin (23).

Bimes used the LBDQ to study the leader behavior of department chairmen in selected Missouri high schools. The LBDQ was administered to a sample of teachers in social studies departments as well as their department chairmen. Bimes found that social studies teachers perceived their department chairmen higher on consideration than on initiating structure while performing supervisory and curriculum development functions. A similar view was held by department chairmen. However, teachers and chairmen did not agree on the amount of consideration and initiating structure utilized by the chairmen in their interaction with teachers (6).

Bimes reported additional findings of interest concerning the leadership of department chairmen in the high school. Missouri social studies teachers felt that department chairmen should be utilized more in the administration of the high school. Department chairmen felt that they should strive for leader behavior which would rate higher on both dimensions of initiating structure and consideration (6).

Leadership and School Characteristics

Gross and Herriott contend that leadership behavior of the elementary principal is an important determinant of
school characteristics. They found a positive relationship between the effort of the principal to improve the performance of his staff and each of the following: student learning, staff morale, and the professional performance of teachers (21).

Kunz and Hoy utilized the LBDQ in a study involving a sample of senior high school principals in New Jersey. The study focused on the relationship between leadership behavior and the professional zone of acceptance of teachers. The zone of acceptance refers to the range of behavior within which the subordinate is willing to accept decisions made for him by his supervisor (34).

The findings of the study seemed to support earlier conclusions that the effective leader is perceived by members of the group as strong on both initiating structure and consideration. The widest zone of acceptance was found in schools where the principal was perceived by the teachers as high on both dimensions of leadership behavior. The dimension of initiating structure seemed to be more important than consideration in terms of the zone of acceptance. Principals who were perceived high on initiating structure and low on consideration had faculties with the second largest zone of acceptance. However, principals who were perceived high on consideration and low on initiating structure had teachers with the most narrow zone of acceptance (34).
Upon statistical analysis of the data, the findings indicated that both dimensions of leadership behavior were significantly related to the zone of acceptance of teachers. However, partial correlations revealed that only the dimension of initiating structure was significantly related to the zone of acceptance when controlling for the other leadership dimension (34).

Wiggins hypothesized that a significant relationship exists between leader behavior characteristics of elementary principals and the organizational climates of their schools. A study involving thirty-five randomly selected elementary schools failed to support the hypothesis. Generally, leader behavior and organizational climate were not significantly related. Ancillary findings did reveal the stability of organizational climate, even after the replacement of the principal. Wiggins concluded that school climate has the effect of socializing the principal's behavior (58).

The relationship between leadership behavior characteristics of the principal and school climate has been the focus of several studies. Some results suggest that the principal has an influence on the openness of the climate (15, 22). Other findings fail to support this conclusion (8, 10, 57, 58). Newell asserts that the principal does more than anyone else to set the climate of a school, and that the principal has more influence in an elementary school than in a secondary school (39).
One problem associated with the investigation of climate and leadership behavior in the secondary school is the size of large high schools. A consistent finding is that the climates of secondary schools are closed (30, 46, 54). This study sought to gain insight into climate perceptions of departmental subgroups of the high school. Additionally, the subject area of the department and the leadership behavior of the department head were considered to be possible factors affecting how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school. The following chapter contains a description of the methodology of the study as well as a description of the instruments used in the study.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING AND TREATING DATA

Design of the Study

This study was designed to utilize the departmental structure of the high school to determine how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school. Factors of total school climate, subject area, and the leadership behavior of the department head were examined as possible agents of influence on the climate perceptions of teachers within a department.

The dependent variable was the relative openness of school climate as perceived by departmental subgroups of the school and as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The three independent variables were the relative openness of the total school climate, the subject area of the department, and patterns of leadership behavior of the department head. Leadership behavior of the department head, as perceived by teachers within the department, was measured by the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Since experimental manipulation of the independent variables was not possible, this study can be classified as
an ex post facto, simple randomized design. Kerlinger defines ex post facto research to be a

... systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables (12, p. 379).

Kerlinger supports ex post facto research in areas of educational study in which true experimentation is not possible. He suggests that intelligence, aptitude, teacher personality, and school atmosphere are some of the variables which lend themselves to the controlled inquiry of ex post facto research (12).

A refinement of description can be used to classify this study further as causal-comparative in nature (2). This study sought to determine if a relationship exists between the single dependent variable and each of the three independent variables. While no inference was made concerning a cause-and-effect relationship, the study was aimed at the discovery of possible explanations for variance in school climate perceptions.

The population of this study consisted of high schools in suburban school districts located in north central Texas. Additionally, the high schools had departmentalized organizational structures, each department having a designated department head. The department head was given time to
perform his administrative duties or was paid a supplement to the salary of a full-time teacher.

Eight high schools were selected at random for participation in the study. Teachers in the selected schools were asked to respond to the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire during the spring of 1979.

Scoring of responses to the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire produced an openness index for each of the eight high schools and for each departmental subgroup within each school. The median of the school openness indices was used to identify relatively open schools and relatively closed schools. The same value was used to classify each department in terms of the dependent variable. Individual department classification was the unit of evaluation.

Scoring of responses to the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire produced a score for consideration and a score for initiating structure for each department head. The mean of the consideration scores and the mean of the structure scores was used to classify departments in terms of the leadership behavior of the department head.

Selection of the Sample

A preliminary survey of public school districts in north central Texas indicated that approximately twenty-four
high schools in nine districts met the criteria to be included in the population of this study. The school districts were sorted alphabetically according to the name of the district. Each district was assigned a number from one to nine, according to the position of the district's name in the alphabetical list. The names of the districts were listed a second time according to random selection, using a table of random numbers (14, pp. 410-411). The first eight districts on the random list constituted the districts in the preliminary sample for this study.

In a similar manner, one high school was chosen from each district in the sample. The high schools in a district were sorted alphabetically according to the name of the school. Each school was assigned a number from one to n (where n is the total number of high schools in the district), according to the position of the school's name in the alphabetical list. The names of the high schools were listed a second time according to random selection, using a table of random numbers (14, pp. 410-411). The first school on the random list was chosen for participation in the study.

During the spring of 1979, initial contact was made with the school districts selected through the random process. Each district was contacted by telephone to confirm each school's eligibility to participate in the study. A second purpose of the initial contact was to
determine individual district policy regarding participation in research projects.

The initial canvass of the selected districts revealed that the high schools in one of the districts did not meet the criteria to be included in the study. The high schools in the district had a departmental structure, but designated department heads were not paid a supplement to the regular teacher's salary, and they were not given release time to perform the duties of the department head. Since the district did not qualify for inclusion in the population of the study, the ninth district in the random list was added to the preliminary sample of districts. A high school from the district was also selected at random.

Pursuant to the initial contact, procedures were followed to secure district approval for each selected high school to participate in the study. A copy of the research proposal was forwarded to each district. One district requested the completion of formal application materials. In other districts, additional telephone communication and personal interviews were required before permission was granted to contact the building principal of the selected high school.

Tentative approval was received from the central offices of all eight of the districts. Permission was granted to contact the principals of the selected high
schools. Seven principals approved participation of their schools in the study. One principal declined to participate.

An attempt was made to include another high school from the district in which the principal had declined participation. The second principal contacted also declined to approve the participation of his school in the study.

In order to select an eighth school, the first district in the random listing was contacted concerning the participation of a second high school from the district. This school was chosen using the random procedure. Approval was granted from both the central office and the principal of the selected school. Therefore, the final sample was composed of eight high schools from seven school districts.

Description of Instruments

This study involved the measurement of organizational climate and leadership behavior. Climate was measured by use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBD) was used to measure the factors of leadership behavior.

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)

The OCDQ was developed by Halpin and Croft in 1962, under a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The instrument was used in a study of the climates of seventy-one
elementary schools in six regions of the United States (8). The OCDQ has been used to assess the organizational climates of elementary, junior high, and high schools. A copy of the OCDQ appears in the Appendix.

The OCDQ has sixty-eight Likert-type items. Responses follow a four-point scale. The respondent is asked to indicate to what extent the item describes his school. About thirty minutes are required for completion of the instrument (8).

The OCDQ is composed of eight subtests, yielding eight subtest means, an openness score, and a school climate profile. Four of the subtests are used to describe characteristics of hindrance, intimacy, disengagement, and esprit. The remaining subtests measure the following characteristics of leader behavior: production emphasis, aloofness, consideration, and thrust (8). A description of each of the eight aspects of climate follows.

Hindrance refers to teachers' feelings that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work. Teachers report the assignment of routine duties and other requirements which they perceive as unnecessary to achievement of group or personal goals (9).

Intimacy refers to the cohesiveness of the group. It reflects the teachers' enjoyment of social relations with each other (9).
Disengagement refers to teacher behavior in a task-oriented situation which exhibits a lack of commitment to the associated goal. A group with high disengagement seems to be going through the motions of the task with only a superficial interest in the outcome (9).

Esprit refers to group morale. High esprit reflects the feeling of achievement on both nomothetic and idio-graphic dimensions (9).

Production emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which is highly directive. The principal characterized by a high production emphasis tends to supervise the staff very closely and is not receptive to feedback from the teachers (9).

Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. The principal who is perceived as aloof maintains an emotional distance from his staff and seems concerned only with the nomothetic dimension of the social system of the school (9).

Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which reflects a genuine interest in the welfare of the teachers as individuals. Consideration reflects the principal's understanding of personal goals of the teachers in the school (9).

Thrust refers to behavior by the principal which seeks to motivate the teachers in the group, not by close supervision, but rather by setting a personal example and by
commitment to the goals of the organization. Even though
the principal's behavior is task-oriented, it is viewed
favorably by the staff (9).

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
(OCDQ) was selected for this study on the basis of an
examination of related research reported in current liter-
ature. Thomas identified the OCDQ as the instrument most
often utilized to measure organizational climate (18).
Extensive validity studies of the OCDQ have been conducted
by Andrews (1), Brown (3), Roseveare (15), and Schmidt (16).

Andrews undertook a study involving one hundred sixty-
five schools. He reported good construct validity of the
OCDQ for both elementary and secondary schools. Andrews
examined relationships among the eight subtests of the OCDQ,
between climate and staff characteristics, between climate
and principal effectiveness, and between climate and school
effectiveness (1).

Meaningful intercorrelations were found among subtests
of the OCDQ as high as .66. Of thirty-six relationships,
twenty were significant at the .01 level. The OCDQ demon-
strated a large number of significant relationships (at the
.01 level) with staff characteristics which were consistent
with theory. A strong relationship was found to exist
between teacher satisfaction and organizational climate, as
reflected by a correlation coefficient of .61. An even
stronger relationship was found between principal
effectiveness and climate, indicated by a correlation coefficient of .64. Climate was related to school effectiveness with a correlation coefficient of .61.

Schmidt studied the relationship between subtests of the \textit{OCDQ} and the \textit{Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire}. The study encompassed forty-seven elementary and secondary schools. Significant relationships were found as expected. Correlation coefficients as high as .73 were reported (16).

Brown reported the results of a study which sought to replicate the efforts of Halpin and Croft. The \textit{OCDQ} was administered to teachers in eighty-one randomly selected elementary schools in Minnesota. Brown's conclusions supported the \textit{OCDQ} as a well-constructed instrument. The results verified that it is possible to identify a climate continuum. However, Brown found more distinct climate profiles from analysis of the data than were found in the initial Halpin-Croft model (3).

Roseveare investigated the validity of the Esprit and Thrust subtests of the \textit{OCDQ} using an interview schedule, The Espirt-Thrust Interview Schedule. Intercorrelations by school revealed a significant relationship between the measures of thrust. A less than significant correlation coefficient of .70 was calculated for the measures of Esprit (15).

Hayes calculated reliability estimates of the \textit{OCDQ} using data from two hundred schools. He reported a
reliability estimate of .90 for the openness score. Hayes identified nine climate dimensions and computed reliability estimates for individual dimensions ranging from .55 to .79 (10).

Hoy utilized the OCDQ in a study with forty-five large secondary schools. He concluded that "the subtests of the OCDQ tap and measure important aspects of the organizational climate of secondary schools" (11, p. 50).

**Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBD)**

The SBD was developed by Fleishman as part of the Ohio State Leadership Studies project. Norms have been developed using the SBD with supervisors in medicine and industry as well as education (5). A copy of the SBD appears in the Appendix.

The SBD has forty-eight Likert-type items. The respondent is asked to indicate to what extent the item describes the behavior of his supervisor. Responses follow a five-point scale. For the purposes of this study, instructions accompanied the SBD which instructed the teacher to complete the instrument with the word supervisor meaning department head. The SBD requires about fifteen minutes to complete (5).

The SBD yields two subtest scores for the two dimensions of leadership behavior, consideration and initiating structure.
Consideration reflects the extent to which one's supervisor exhibits behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust and respect, and good "human relations" toward the members of his group. A high score on this dimension indicates a climate of good rapport and two-way communication; a low score indicates that the supervisor is seen to be more impersonal in his relations with group members.

Structure reflects the extent to which one's supervisor exhibits the behavior of a leader in organizing and defining the relationships between himself and the group, defining interactions among group members, establishing ways of getting the job done, scheduling, criticizing, etc. A high score on this dimension describes the supervisor who plays a very active role in directing group activities through planning, supplying information, trying out new ideas, criticizing, and so forth. A low score characterizes supervisors who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways (5, p. 1).

An important research finding is that these two dimensions of leadership behavior are independent (5).

Construct validity was maximized by developing the instrument using a factor-analytic procedure with item analysis to provide homogeneous measures of consideration and initiating structure. Forty-eight items were selected from 140 original items. Each item has a high loading on one dimension of leadership behavior with close to zero loadings on the other dimension (4). Construct validity of the SBD has been supported by Gibb (7).

Empirical validity studies have shown the relationship of the subtests of the SBD to various independent criteria of leadership effectiveness. The relationships between formal grievances and turnover in the work group and ratings
of the supervisor on consideration and initiating structure was significant at the .01 level. The correlation was -.69 between turnover and consideration, and .63 between turnover and structure. Similar coefficients of -.51 and .71 reflect the relationship between the number of grievances from the work group and the dimensions of consideration and structure, respectively (6). These findings were confirmed by Skinner (17).

Misumi and Tosaki found that productivity was high in groups with supervisors that were rated high on both consideration and structure. The group members also exhibited a high degree of morale (13).

Fleishman reported internal consistency reliability coefficients for both subtests of the SBD. Using the split-half method, reliability coefficient estimates for the consideration subtest range from .89 to .98. Similarly, reliability coefficient estimates for the initiating structure subtest range from .68 to .87 (5).

Studies have also been conducted to determine test-retest reliability coefficients. With an eleven month interval, coefficients of .87 and .75 were found for consideration and initiating structure, respectively (4).

The SBD is similar to the older Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. The SBD was chosen for this study on the basis of reported reliability and validity.
In addition, the SBD is shorter than the earlier instrument and was revised in 1970.

**Procedures Used in Collection of Data**

Arrangements were made with each building principal for distribution of research materials. An individual packet for each teacher was delivered to the schools in the sample. Each packet contained an instruction page, one copy of the OCDQ, and one copy of the SBD. Each teacher in the school was asked to complete the instruments in the packet and to return the instruments in the sealed envelope to a collection box in the school office. The packets were collected from each school within one week of their distribution.

Each instrument was coded in such a way as to provide opportunities for follow-up on non-returns. Shortly after the packets were collected from each school, a follow-up letter was prepared and distributed to each teacher who had not responded during the initial collection period. The follow-up letter was placed in the teacher's school mail box. Extra packets were placed in the school office for teachers who had misplaced their original packet. A final collection of packets was made from each school within one week of the distribution of follow-up letters.

Collection of data took place between March 26, 1979, and May 10, 1979. A minimum of 60 percent of usable returns
from a department and in no case less than three returns from a department were necessary in order for inclusion of data from the department. A total of 594 teachers returned usable questionnaires. A total of 72 departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Data from the OCDQ were transferred to punched cards for electronic data processing. Scoring of the OCDQ was completed by Don B. Croft at New Mexico State University and returned for analysis. The mean and standard deviation were computed for each subtest of the OCDQ, for the school as a whole and for each department as a subgroup of the school.

The median of the school openness indices was used to identify schools which were relatively open (the openness score was above the median) and schools which were relatively closed (the openness score was at or below the median). The same median was used to identify departments with teachers who perceived school climate as relatively open and to identify departments with teachers who perceived school climate as relatively closed.

Data from the SBD were transferred to punched cards for electronic data processing. A computer program for scoring the SBD was developed for use in this study. The scores for both consideration and initiating structure were
computed for each department head. For each dimension of leadership behavior, the mean of individual scores was calculated and used to scale the data to nominal form.

Departments were classified first according to whether the department head's score for consideration was above the mean of consideration scores, or was at or below the mean. Secondly, the departments were classified according to whether the department head's score for initiating structure was above the mean for structure scores, or was at or below the mean. Finally, the departments were classified according to whether the department head's score for consideration was above the mean of structure scores; or at least one of the two scores was at or below the corresponding mean.

Each research hypothesis was restated in the null for the purpose of statistical treatment. For each hypothesis, the data were displayed in a contingency table. Each hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence. For each of hypotheses one, three, four, and five, if the average expected frequency was less than 7.5 and there was extreme departure from the ideal of equal expected frequencies, then a shift was made to the Fisher Exact Probability Test. If expected frequencies were approximately equal throughout the table, an average expected frequency of two was considered adequate (14).

For each hypothesis, in testing for significance, the .05 level was considered significant. Also, each hypothesis
was tested using a one-tailed test. In cases in which a significant relationship was found, a correlation coefficient was calculated to indicate the degree of the relationship. The phi coefficient was considered appropriate for hypotheses one, three, four, and five. Cramer's statistic was considered appropriate for hypothesis two.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The problem of this study was to determine if school climate (as perceived by the teachers of the school), subject area, or patterns of leadership behavior of the department head (as perceived by teachers in the department) have a significant influence on how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school. In order to investigate this problem, five hypotheses were proposed and data were collected from teachers in eight high schools.

Among the eight high schools, thirteen subject area departments were identified. A total of 594 teachers participated in the study, representing 70.2 percent of potential participants. A total of 72 departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

Each research hypothesis was restated in the null for the purpose of statistical treatment. In testing for significance, the .05 level was considered significant, using a one-tailed test.

Data Relative to Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one, restated in the null form, proposed that no significant difference exists between the observed and expected frequencies with respect to school climate as
perceived by teachers within a department and school climate as perceived by teachers of the high school as a whole. School climate for each group was the group's openness score from the OCDQ.

The median of the school openness indices was used to stratify both schools as a whole and individual departments in terms of relative openness. Schools which were relatively open had an openness score above the median. Schools which were relatively closed had an openness score at or below the median. School openness scores are presented in Table I. Openness scores by individual departments are presented in Table II through Table IX. The median of school openness scores was 43.

### TABLE I

OPENNESS SCORES OF SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*School classified as relatively open.
Schools 1, 2, and 7 were identified as relatively open. Schools 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 were identified as relatively closed.

Openness scores by individual departments within school 1 are presented in Table II. Ten departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

TABLE II
OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS FOR SCHOOL 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

As reported in Table II, eight departments in school 1 had teachers who perceived the climate of the school as
relatively open. Teachers in only two departments perceived the climate of the school as relatively closed.

Openness scores by individual departments within school 2 are presented in Table III. Nine departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

**TABLE III**

**OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS FOR SCHOOL 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

As reported in Table III, seven departments in school 2 had teachers who perceived the climate of the school as relatively open. Teachers in only two departments perceived the climate of the school as relatively closed.
Openness scores by individual departments within school 3 are presented in Table IV. Ten departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

**TABLE IV**

OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS FOR SCHOOL 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

As reported in Table IV, only three departments in school 3 had teachers who perceived the climate of the school as relatively open. Teachers in seven departments perceived the climate as relatively closed.
Openness scores by individual departments within school 4 are presented in Table V. Ten departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

**TABLE V**

OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS FOR SCHOOL 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

As reported in Table V, five departments in school 4 had teachers who perceived the climate of the school as relatively open. Teachers in five departments perceived the climate of the school as relatively closed.
Openness scores by individual departments within school 5 are presented in Table VI. Five departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

**TABLE VI**
OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS FOR SCHOOL 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

As reported in Table VI, only two departments in school 5 had teachers who perceived the climate of the school as relatively open. Teachers in three departments perceived the climate of the school as relatively closed.

Openness scores by individual departments within school 6 are presented in Table VII. Ten departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

As reported in Table VII, only one department in school 6 had teachers who perceived the climate of the
school as relatively open. Teachers in nine departments perceived the climate of the school as relatively closed.

**TABLE VII**

**OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS FOR SCHOOL 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

Openness scores by individual departments within school 7 are presented in Table VIII. Eight departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

As reported in Table VIII, all departments in school 7 had teachers who perceived the climate of the school as relatively open. School 7 was the only school in the
sample without a mixture of relatively open and closed departments.

**TABLE VIII**

OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS FOR SCHOOL 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

Openness scores by individual departments within school 8 are presented in Table IX. Ten departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

As reported in Table IX, five departments in school 8 had teachers who perceived the climate of the school as relatively open. Teachers in five departments perceived the climate of the school as relatively closed.
TABLE IX
OPENNESS SCORES BY DEPARTMENTS
FOR SCHOOL 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Openness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Department classified as relatively open.

The contingency table for testing the null form of hypothesis one is presented in Table X. Observed and expected frequencies are displayed in the bivariate table. In schools which were perceived as relatively open, twenty-three departments perceived school climate as relatively open, while only four perceived school climate as relatively closed. In schools which were perceived as relatively closed, only sixteen departments perceived school
climate as relatively open, while twenty-nine perceived school climate as relatively closed.

TABLE X
CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total School Climate</th>
<th>Climate as Perceived by Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OF*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Open</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Closed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observed frequency. **Expected frequency.

The hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence (1). A chi-square value of 15.314 was calculated. Results of the test appear in Table XI.

TABLE XI
SUMMARY OF STATISTICS FOR HYPOTHESIS ONE

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Departments</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Rejection</td>
<td>≥ 3.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square Value</td>
<td>15.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Coefficient</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the statistics for hypothesis one caused rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies.
displayed in Table X. Therefore, a relationship exists between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and school climate as perceived by teachers of the high school as a whole. A phi coefficient of .46 indicates the degree of the relationship.

Data Relative to Hypothesis Two

The contingency table for hypothesis two is presented in Table XII. Observed and expected frequencies are displayed in the bivariate table. Of the thirteen subject areas, five subject areas have no variation in observed and expected frequencies, seven subject areas vary by only one, and one subject area varies by two.

Hypothesis two, restated in the null form, proposed that no significant difference exists between the observed and expected frequencies with respect to climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the subject area of the department. School climate as perceived by teachers within a department was the department's openness score from the OCDQ. The data reported in Table XII reflect a stratification of departments based upon relative openness. The same criteria used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis one was used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis two.
TABLE XII
CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Climate as Perceived by Department</th>
<th>Relatively Open</th>
<th>Relatively Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OF*</td>
<td>EF**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OF*</td>
<td>EF**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observed frequency. **Expected frequency.

The hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence (1). A chi-square value of 7.833 was calculated. Results of the test appear in Table XIII.
TABLE XIII
SUMMARY OF STATISTICS FOR HYPOTHESIS TWO

Number of Departments .......... 72
Degrees of Freedom ............. 12
Region of Rejection ............. $\geq 21.026$
Chi-square Value ............... 7.833

Analysis of the statistics for hypothesis two indicated that the null hypothesis should be retained. Support was not found for a relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the subject area of the department.

Data Relative to Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three, restated in the null form, proposed that no significant difference exists between the observed and expected frequencies with respect to school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the consideration dimension of leadership behavior of the department head. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department was the department's openness score from the OCDQ. The consideration score of leadership behavior was measured by a subtest of the SBD.

A total of 59 departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis for hypothesis three. The mean of individual consideration scores was used to scale the leadership data to nominal form. The mean of consideration scores was
calculated to be 80.5. Departments were classified according to whether the department head's score was above the mean, or was at or below the mean.

Departments were also stratified based upon relative openness. The same criteria used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis one was used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis three.

The contingency table for testing the null form of hypothesis three is presented in Table XIV. Observed and expected frequencies are displayed in the bivariate table. Twenty-two departments, which had department heads who scored high on consideration, perceived school climate as relatively open. Seventeen of those departments perceived school climate as relatively closed. Nine departments, which had department heads who scored low on consideration, perceived school climate as relatively open. Eleven of those departments perceived school climate as relatively closed.

**TABLE XIV**

**CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS THREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Classification on Consideration</th>
<th>Climate as Perceived by Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the Mean</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At or Below the Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observed frequency. **Expected frequency.
The hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence (1). A chi-square value of 1.219 was calculated. Results of the test appear in Table XV.

TABLE XV

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS FOR HYPOTHESIS THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Departments</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Rejection</td>
<td>≥ 3.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square Value</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the statistics for hypothesis three indicated that the null hypothesis should be retained. Support was not found for a relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the consideration dimension of leadership behavior of the department head.

Data Relative to Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four, restated in the null form, proposed that no significant difference exists between the observed and expected frequencies with respect to school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior of the department head. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department was the department's openness score from the
OCDQ. The initiating structure score of leadership behavior was measured by a subtest of the SBD.

A total of 59 departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis for hypothesis four. The mean of individual initiating structure scores was used to scale the leadership data to nominal form. The mean of initiating structure scores was calculated to be 33.7. Departments were classified according to whether the department head's score was above the mean, or was at or below the mean.

Departments were also stratified based upon relative openness. The same criteria used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis one was used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis four.

The contingency table for testing the null form of hypothesis four is presented in Table XVI. Observed and expected frequencies are displayed in the bivariate table. Twenty-one departments, which had department heads who scored high on initiating structure, perceived school climate as relatively open. Ten of those departments perceived school climate as relatively closed. Fourteen departments, which had department heads who scored low on initiating structure, perceived school climate as relatively open. Fourteen of those departments perceived school climate as relatively closed.
TABLE XVI
CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS FOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Classification on Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Climate as Perceived by Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OF*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the Mean</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At or Below the Mean</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observed frequency. **Expected frequency.

The hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence (1). A chi-square value of 2.540 was calculated. Results of the test appear in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII
SUMMARY OF STATISTICS FOR HYPOTHESIS FOUR

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Departments</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Rejection</td>
<td>≥ 3.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square Value</td>
<td>2.540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the statistics for hypothesis four indicated that the null hypothesis should be retained. Support was not found for a relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior of the department head.
Data Relative to Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five, restated in the null form, proposed that no significant difference exists between the observed and expected frequencies with respect to school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and whether or not the department head has a score above the mean on both dimensions of leadership behavior. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department was the department's openness score from the OCDQ. The leadership behavior of the department head was measured by the SBD.

The mean of consideration scores and the mean of structure scores was used to scale the leadership data to nominal form. The mean of consideration scores was calculated to be 80.5. The mean of initiating structure scores was calculated to be 33.7. Departments were classified according to whether the department head's consideration score was above the mean of consideration scores, and his structure score was above the mean of structure scores; or at least one of the two scores was at or below the corresponding mean.

Departments were also stratified based upon relative openness. The same criteria used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis one was used to stratify departments in testing hypothesis five.

The contingency table for testing the null form of hypothesis five is presented in Table XVIII. Observed
and expected frequencies are displayed in the bivariate table. Sixteen departments, which had department heads who scored high on both leadership dimensions, perceived school climate as relatively open. Nine of those departments perceived school climate as relatively closed. Fifteen departments, which had department heads who scored low on at least one leadership dimension, perceived school climate as relatively open. Nineteen of those departments perceived school climate as relatively closed.

**TABLE XVIII**

CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS FIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Classification on Both Dimensions of Leadership Behavior</th>
<th>Climate as Perceived by Department</th>
<th>Relatively Open</th>
<th>Relatively Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OF*</td>
<td>EF**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At or Below the Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observed frequency.  **Expected frequency.

The hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence (1). A chi-square value of 2.505 was calculated. Results of the test appear in Table XIX.

Analysis of the statistics for hypothesis five indicated that the null hypothesis should be retained. Support was not found for a relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and whether or not
the department head had a score above the mean on both dimensions of leadership behavior.

**TABLE XIX**

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS FOR HYPOTHESIS FIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Departments</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Rejection</td>
<td>&gt; 3.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square Value</td>
<td>2.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, data analysis supported hypothesis one. However, support was not found for hypotheses two, three, four, and five. A discussion of the results of hypothesis testing appears in the following chapter.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine if school climate perceptions are stable among the departmental sub-groups of the high school. In addition, the study sought to determine if the subject area of the department or patterns of leadership behavior of the department head (as perceived by teachers in the department) have a significant relationship to how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school.

The research hypotheses were stated as follows:

1. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and school climate as perceived by the teachers of the high school as a whole. School climate for each group is the group's openness score from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

2. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the subject area of the department. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the
department's openness score from the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**.

3. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the consideration dimension of leadership behavior of the department head. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the department's openness score from the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**. The consideration score of leadership behavior is measured by a subtest of the **Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire**.

4. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior of the department head. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the department's openness score from the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**. The initiating structure score of leadership behavior is measured by a subtest of the **Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire**.

5. There is a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and whether or not the department head has a score above the mean on both dimensions of leadership behavior. School climate as perceived by the teachers within a department is the department's openness score from the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**.
Climate Description Questionnaire. Leadership behavior is measured by the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire.

A review of the literature applicable to the research hypotheses provided a basis for further study into how teachers within a high school department perceive the climate of their school. The review of the literature consisted of an examination of the following seven subtopics: The School as a Social System, Organizational Climate, The Impact of Organizational Climate on School Administration, Organizational Climate and Subsystems, Departments as Subsystems Within the High School, Leadership, and Leadership and School Characteristics. Information for the review was gathered from a variety of sources which included books, periodicals, papers, and doctoral dissertations.

The population of this study consisted of high schools in suburban school districts located in north central Texas. Additionally, the high schools had departmentalized organizational structures, each department having a designated department head. The department head was given time to perform his administrative duties or was paid a supplement to the salary of a full-time teacher.

Eight high schools were selected at random for participation in the study. Teachers in the selected schools were asked to respond to the Organizational Climate
Description Questionnaire and the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire during the spring of 1979.

Among the eight high schools, thirteen subject area departments were identified. A total of 594 teachers participated in the study. A total of 72 departments qualified for inclusion in data analysis.

Each research hypothesis was restated in the null for the purpose of statistical treatment. For each hypothesis, the data were displayed in a contingency table. Each hypothesis was tested using the chi-square test of independence. In cases in which a significant relationship was found, a correlation coefficient was calculated to indicate the degree of the relationship. The phi coefficient was considered appropriate for hypotheses one, three, four, and five. Cramer's statistic was considered appropriate for hypothesis two.

Findings

From analysis of the statistical data, the following results were found at the .05 level of significance. Discussion of the results is also presented.

Hypothesis one was not rejected. There was a significant relationship between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and school climate as perceived by the teachers of the high school as a whole. This
finding is consistent with the results found by Anderson, Heller, Marchione, and Sargent.

Hypothesis two was rejected. Support was not found for the thesis that a significant relationship exists between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the subject area of the department. This finding contrasts the results found by Grassie and McWilliams.

Hypothesis three was rejected. Support was not found for the thesis that a significant relationship exists between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the consideration dimension of leadership behavior of the department head.

Hypothesis four was rejected. Support was not found for the thesis that a significant relationship exists between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior of the department head.

Hypothesis five was rejected. Support was not found for the thesis that a significant relationship exists between school climate as perceived by teachers within a department and whether or not the department head has a score above the mean on both dimensions of leadership behavior.

Earlier studies conducted by Brinkmeier, Bukhair, and Wiggins failed to find a relationship between leadership
behavior of the principal and organizational climate as perceived by the teachers of the school. However, Bimes reported that high school social studies teachers had a positive attitude toward utilization of the department head in the administration of the high school. In addition, departmental organizational structures are often implemented in an effort to more effectively manage the various sub-systems of a large high school. Therefore, it was felt that the impact of the leadership behavior of the department head would be reflected in climate perceptions of teachers in the department. This assumption was not supported by the findings of this study.

Bimes also found that department heads felt that they should strive for behavior which would rate higher on both dimensions of leadership behavior. Thorum reported that leadership ability was the principal's most important consideration in selecting a department head. Examination of the data relative to hypotheses three, four, and five revealed that a majority of department heads in this study scored high on consideration, and a majority scored high on initiating structure. However, less than one-half of the department heads scored high on both dimensions of leadership behavior. This finding may indicate that more opportunities should be made available for the department head to strengthen his leadership abilities.
In general, the findings of this study seem to indicate that teachers in the high school form a more autonomous group than expected. Climate perceptions appear to be more affected by perceptions of the peer group than by formal subgroup divisions or the leadership behavior of the department head.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions are made.

1. Perceptions of organizational climate by high school teachers are stable among the departmental subgroups of the school. Teachers in departmental subgroups do not report isolated, differing perceptions of the school as a whole.

2. Factors which affect the climate perceptions of high school teachers are not confined to a departmental subgroup of the school. In particular, the subject area of the department and the leadership behavior of the department head do not seem to have a significant influence on how teachers within a department perceive the climate of their school.

3. Neither the consideration dimension nor the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior of the department head appears to significantly influence
climate perceptions of teachers within a high school department.

4. Leadership behavior of the department head, which is characterized as high on both consideration and initiating structure dimensions, does not seem to significantly influence climate perceptions of teachers within a high school department.

Recommendations

In consideration of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. Further research on organizational climate in high schools should focus on identification of factors which cause stabilization of climate perceptions among departmental subgroups.

2. Additional studies should be conducted in order to analyze the influence of the combined leadership of the principal and the department head on climate perceptions of teachers within a high school department.

3. The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire should be utilized in inservice programs which provide department heads with opportunities for growth in leadership ability.

4. A replication of this study in an urban setting is recommended.
To: Research Study Participants

From: Patricia Leslie

Your participation in this study is most appreciated. I am very excited about this study and the contribution that we can make to the improvement of education.

Enclosed in this packet, you will find two questionnaires. Please mark each item on the questionnaires.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire has questions about your school. Indicate how you believe the situation to be in your school.

The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire is intended to focus upon your department head. Indicate how each item describes the behavior of your department head.

When you have completed the questionnaires, please return them in the sealed envelope to the collection box in your school office. All responses will be kept completely confidential in reporting the results of the study.

Thank you again for your time and interest.
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
A. W. Halpin and D. B. Croft

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Printed below is an example of a typical item found in the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire:

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

Teachers call each other by their first names.  1  2  3  4

In this example the respondent marked alternative 3 to show that the interpersonal relationship described by this item “often occurs” at his school. Of course, any of the other alternatives could be selected, depending upon how often the behavior described by the item does, indeed, occur in your school.

Please mark your response clearly, as in the example.

PLEASE BE SURE THAT YOU MARK EVERY ITEM.

Department: ____________________________________________
(Write in the name of your department.)

Position: Please place a check to the right of the appropriate category.
1. Principal
2. Department Head
3. Teacher
4. Other
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

1 - 12 Coding information for computer processing.

13. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.  
14. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.  
15. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.  
16. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.  
17. Teachers invite other faculty to visit them at home.  
18. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.  
19. Extra books are available for classroom use.  
20. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.  
21. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.  
22. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.  
23. In faculty meetings, there is a feeling of "let's get things done."  
24. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.  
25. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.  
26. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.  
27. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.  
28. Student progress reports require too much work.  
29. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.  
30. Teachers interrupt faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.  
31. Most of the teachers here accept the fault of their colleagues.  
32. Teachers have too many committee requirements.  
33. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.

1. Rarely occurs  
2. Sometimes occurs  
3. Often occurs  
4. Very frequently occurs
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Custodial service is available when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The principal does personal favors for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. The morale of the teachers is high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. The principal uses constructive criticism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
57. The principal criticizes a specific act rather than a staff member. 

58. Teachers help select which courses will be taught. 

59. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes. 

60. The principal talks a great deal. 

61. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers. 

62. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers. 

63. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously. 

64. The rules set by the principal are never questioned. 

65. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers. 

66. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use. 

67. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference. 

68. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive. 

69. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports. 

70. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda. 

71. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings. 

72. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across. 

73. Teachers talk about leaving the school system. 

74. The principal checks the subject matter ability of teachers. 

75. The principal is easy to understand. 

76. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit. 

77. Grading practices are standardized at this school. 

78. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity. 

79. Teachers leave the building as soon as possible at day's end. 

80. The principal clarifies wrong ideas a teacher may have. 

1. Rarely occurs  
2. Sometimes occurs  
3. Often occurs  
4. Very frequently occurs
June 4, 1980

Ms. Patricia J. Leslie
6517 Woodcreek Lane
Fort Worth, Texas 76118

Dear Ms. Leslie:

This is in reply to your letter of May 27 requesting permission to include a copy of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire in the appendix of your dissertation. Permission is granted.

I would value a summary of your study and any descriptive statistics and normative data bearing on the utility of the Questionnaire.

Good luck in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Edwin A. Fleishman, Ph.D.
SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION

by

Edwin A. Fleishman, Ph.D.

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have observed your own supervisor and probably you know pretty well how he operates. In this questionnaire, you are simply to describe some of the things your own supervisor does with your group.

For each item, choose the alternative which best describes how often your supervisor does what that item says. Remember...there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. The items simply describe the behavior of the supervisor over you; they do not judge whether his behavior is desirable or undesirable. Everyone's supervisor is different and so is every work group, so we expect differences in what different supervisors do.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the box (a, b, c, d or e) next to each item to indicate your choice.
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HE IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HE ENCOURAGES OVERTIME WORK.</td>
<td>a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HE TRIES OUT HIS NEW IDEAS.</td>
<td>a. often  b. fairly much  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HE SACKS UP WHAT PEOPLE IN HIS WORK GROUP DO.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HE CRITICIZES POOR WORK.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HE DEMANDS MORE THAN WE CAN DO.</td>
<td>a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HE REFUSES TO GIVE IN WHEN PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP DISAGREE WITH HIM.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HE EXPRESSES APPRECIATION WHEN ONE OF US DOES A GOOD JOB.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. HE INSISTS THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOLLOW STANDARD WAYS OF DOING THINGS IN EVERY DETAIL.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. HE HELPS PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP WITH THEIR PERSONAL PROBLEMS.</td>
<td>a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. HE IS SLOW TO ACCEPT NEW IDEAS.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. HE IS FRIENDLY AND CAN BE EASILY APPROACHED.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. HE GETS THE APPROVAL OF THE WORK GROUP ON IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. HE RESISTS CHANGES IN WAYS OF DOING THINGS.</td>
<td>a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. HE ASSIGNS PEOPLE UNDER HIM TO PARTICULAR TASKS.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. HE STRESSES BEING AHEAD OF COMPETING WORK GROUPS.</td>
<td>a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. HE CRITICIZES A SPECIFIC ACT RATHER THAN A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL.</td>
<td>a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18. HE LETS OTHERS DO THEIR WORK THE WAY THEY THINK BEST.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

19. HE DOES PERSONAL FAVORS FOR THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

20. HE EMPHASIZES MEETING OF DEADLINES.
   a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all

21. HE SEES THAT A WORKER IS REWARDED FOR A JOB WELL DONE.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

22. HE TREATS PEOPLE UNDER HIM WITHOUT CONSIDERING THEIR FEELINGS.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

23. HE INSISTS THAT HE BE INFORMED ON DECISIONS MADE BY THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

24. HE OFFERS NEW APPROACHES TO PROBLEMS.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

25. HE TREATS ALL WORKERS UNDER HIM AS HIS EQUALS.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

26. HE IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

27. HE ASKS SLOWER PEOPLE TO GET MORE DONE.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

28. HE CRITICIZES PEOPLE UNDER HIM IN FRONT OF OTHERS.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

29. HE STRESSES THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH MORALE AMONG THOSE UNDER HIM.
   a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all

30. HE TALKS ABOUT HOW MUCH SHOULD BE DONE.
   a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all

31. HE "RIDES" THE PERSON WHO MAKES A MISTAKE.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

32. HE WAITS FOR PEOPLE UNDER HIM TO PUSH NEW IDEAS BEFORE HE DOES.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

33. HE RULES WITH AN IRON HAND.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

34. HE TRIES TO KEEP THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM IN GOOD STANDING WITH THOSE IN HIGHER AUTHORITY.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never
16. HE REJECTS SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

36. HE CHANGES THE DUTIES OF PEOPLE UNDER HIM WITHOUT FIRST TALKING IT OVER WITH THEM.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

37. HE DECIDES IN DETAIL WHAT SHALL BE DONE AND HOW IT SHALL BE DONE.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

38. HE SEES TO IT THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM ARE WORKING UP TO THEIR LIMITS.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

39. HE STANDS UP FOR PEOPLE UNDER HIM EVEN THOUGH IT MAKES HIM UNPOPULAR.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

40. HE MAKES THOSE UNDER HIM FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING WITH HIM.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

41. HE PUTS SUGGESTIONS THAT ARE MADE BY THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM INTO OPERATION.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

42. HE REFUSES TO EXPLAIN HIS ACTIONS.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

43. HE EMPHASIZES THE QUANTITY OF WORK.
   a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

44. HE ASKS FOR SACRIFICES FROM HIS PEOPLE FOR THE GOOD OF THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

45. HE ACTS WITHOUT CONSULTING THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM FIRST.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom

46. HE "NEEDLES" PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOR GREATER EFFORT.
   a. a great deal  b. fairly much  c. to some degree  d. comparatively little  e. not at all

47. HE INSISTS THAT EVERYTHING BE DONE HIS WAY.
   a. always  b. often  c. occasionally  d. seldom  e. never

48. HE ENCOURAGES SLOW WORKING PEOPLE TO GREATER EFFORT.
   a. often  b. fairly often  c. occasionally  d. once in a while  e. very seldom
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