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The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of bureaucratic structure to communication satisfaction of teachers in a suburban school district in north Texas. This study compared seven components of communication satisfaction of teachers in Authoritarian schools with those of teachers in Professional schools.

Twelve of the district's thirty-five elementary schools were randomly selected. The instruments were given to the teachers in faculty meetings and the overall response rate was 344 representing 92.2 per cent. Responses to the School Organizational Inventory (SOI) were used to determine the grouping of schools relative to their bureaucratic structure, including Weberian, Professional, Authoritarian, and Chaotic. Three schools were in each of the four groups. Those schools in the Authoritarian and Professional groups were used to test the hypotheses of this study.

Teachers' responses to the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) were statistically analyzed using one-way analysis of variance. The findings indicated that although
respondents in the Authoritarian schools were more satisfied with communication than they were dissatisfied, they were less satisfied with all seven components of communication satisfaction than were teachers in Professional schools. They were significantly less satisfied with organizational integration, communication with superiors, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality. Teachers in the Authoritarian schools were also less satisfied with general organizational perspective and personal feedback than were teachers in Professionally structured schools, but the differences between the two groups in the level of satisfaction for these two components of communication satisfaction were not statistically significant.

It was concluded that teachers in schools with a Professional bureaucratic structure are more satisfied with communications than are teachers in Authoritarian schools.

Recommendation was made to continue the study of communication in schools and the study of bureaucratic structure.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Bureaucracy, as a concept for the structure of organizations, was developed by Max Weber (14). His writings have gained wide acceptance as a theoretical framework. According to Hoy and Miskel (5), almost all modern organizations have many of the characteristics enumerated by Weber: hierarchy of authority, division of labor and specialization, rules and regulations, specifications, impersonality, and career orientation. Keith F. Punch (11) says that this bureaucracy is the organizational form designed to accomplish large scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals.

A school can be conceptualized as a bureaucracy, which points to its formal organizational aspects. The research of Punch (11), David A. MacKay (8), and Isherwood and Hoy (6) indicate that Weber's six characteristics can be put into two groups when considering the bureaucratic structure of schools. These two groups characterize the two most commonly found types of schools: Authoritarian and Professional.

Though studies on communications within organizations are limited in number, several researchers have recently gathered data relating communication and job satisfaction. These
examinations have produced a construct called "communication satisfaction." L. O. Thayer (13) refers to communication satisfaction as the personal satisfaction in successfully communicating to someone or in successfully receiving communications. In elaborating Thayer's definition to show that communication satisfaction is multi-dimensional rather than unidimensional and to relate those individual dimensions to global job satisfaction, Downs and Hazen (3) developed the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire. This instrument measures employee perceptions of eight dimensions of an organization's communication system: (1) General Organizational Perspectives, (2) Personal Feedback, (3) Organizational Integration, (4) Communication with Superiors, (5) Communication Climate, (6) Horizontal Communication, (7) Media Quality, and (8) Communication with Subordinates.

John Dewey (2) suggested that communication is the establishment of cooperation in an activity in which there are partners, and in which the activity of each is modified and regulated by partnership. Certainly, to establish this cooperation and partnership there must be a high degree of satisfaction on both the part of the sender and the receiver of communication. A measure of the level of communication satisfaction of teachers should be useful to school administrators as a guide to determine if changes in the communication process would improve the communication climate within their schools.
Statement of the Problem

Does the communication satisfaction of teachers vary according to a school's bureaucratic structure, Authoritarian or Professional?

Purposes of the Study

The specific purposes of this study are (1) to investigate variance in the seven components of communication satisfaction of public school teachers as measured by the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) according to the bureaucratic structure of the schools in which those teachers work as measured by the School Organizational Inventory (SOI), (2) to contribute information based on the findings that may be useful in improving the internal communications and ultimately the teaching and learning in the schools studied, and (3) to provide a basis for further educational research in communication satisfaction of public school teachers.

Using the findings of this study, the administrators of the schools studied, and administrators of similar schools, may be better able to predict which areas of communication teachers perceive as more highly satisfying in Authoritarian schools and those areas of communication teachers generally find more satisfying in Professional schools. This knowledge will allow school administrators to adjust and improve communication attempts in light of the bureaucratic organizational
patterns which exist in their schools, and thereby enhance effective and meaningful administration in the school organization.

Hypotheses

$H_1$—Teachers' perceptions of general organizational perspective will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

$H_2$—Teachers' perceptions of personal feedback will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

$H_3$—Teachers' perceptions of organizational integration will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

$H_4$—Teachers' perceptions of communication with superiors will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

$H_5$—Teachers' perceptions of communication climate will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

$H_6$—Teachers' perceptions of horizontal communication will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

$H_7$—Teachers' perceptions of media quality will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.
Limitations

The scope of this study is limited to teachers in the suburban Texas public school district studied. This investigation is also limited to the elementary school teachers in the school district. The findings and conclusions are generalizable to the population studied and to others which have similar characteristics.

Assumptions

The basic assumptions developed for this study include the following:

1. Most schools are either more Authoritarian or more Professional in their bureaucratic structure.

2. The type of bureaucratic structure for individual schools is predetermined by the individual administrators within the framework of district policy.

3. Teachers have accurate perceptions of the organization of their schools.

Definition of Terms

The following words are defined within the context of this study.

Authoritarian—a school organizational structure in which the dominant operational mode would be "power centered in the hierarchy coupled with centralized decision making" (6, p. 126). This variable was operationalized by deriving scores on the School Organizational Inventory (SOI).
Communication satisfaction—"personal satisfaction inherent in successfully communicating to someone or in successfully being communicated with" (13, p. 144). This variable was operationalized by deriving scores on the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ).

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ)—an instrument which measures employees' perceptions of an organization's communication system.

Professional—a school organizational structure which "emphasizes shared decision making between the administrators and the professional staff" (5, p. 94). This variable is operationalized by deriving scores on the School Organizational Inventory (SOI).

School Organizational Inventory (SOI)—an instrument which measures bureaucratic patterns in schools.

Additionally, the following dimensions of communication satisfaction, the criterion variables for this study, are defined.

General organizational perspective—information relating to the overall function of the organization.

Personal feedback—personal achievement and work and how they are recognized by the organization.

Organizational integration—the individual's satisfaction with the information that he receives about the organization and the immediate work environment.
Communication with superiors—two-way communication with superiors.

Communication climate—communication at the organizational and personal levels or the extent to which communication motivates and stimulates workers to meet goals.

Horizontal communication—informal communication among fellow employees.

Media quality—the degree to which employees perceive the major forms of communication (memos, publications) as functioning effectively.

Background and Significance

The theorizing of Weber (14) has sparked numerous investigations on bureaucracy in organizations including studies on bureaucratization of school systems. Communication in schools has not been as widely studied, but there are a few significant studies. Some of the literature and research on both bureaucracy and organizational communication which applies to this investigation are discussed here.

Bureaucracy

Keith Punch (11) points out three basic ideas brought to mind by the term bureaucracy. First, it is the organizational form designed to accomplish large scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals as in large, formal organizations. Second,
bureaucracy refers in detail to the internal structure of organizations with the emphasis on differentiating between organizations. They differ in bureaucratization according to their stress in operation on Weber's bureaucratic characteristics. Last, bureaucracy is used negatively to symbolize arbitrary power, inefficiency, red tape, and additional factors which point to the dysfunctions of bureaucracy. Punch (11, p. 44) concludes that investigation "ought to concentrate on comparison between organizations, so that bureaucratization, the level of 'bureaucrativeness,' becomes the key notion." Since all schools may be seen as bureaucracies, it is the extent of bureaucratization which is of primary concern.

This importance has been recognized and attempts at the measurement of bureaucratization have been made by several researchers using various methods, but Richard Hall's work (4) at Ohio State University started a systematic approach which has been adapted and refined to a very useful instrument. Hall's questionnaire, the Organizational Inventory, was used to test the applicability of a six-dimensional bureaucratic model to several types of organizations. Those dimensions, which Hall isolated from the literature, are six of the major characteristics or traits of organizations which Weber identified in his ideal model of organizational structure. They are (1) Hierarchy of Authority, (2) Specialization (or Division of Labor), (3) Rules for Incumbents,

David MacKay (8) modified Hall's instrument and applied the bureaucratic model to schools. However, the six dimensional framework was not fully substantiated in that the correlational analysis indicated the possible presence of two subsets of dimensions, one bureaucratic, the other abureaucratic. Punch (11) also used MacKay's instrument with schools. He made significant modifications in the questionnaire and found Dimensions 2 and 6 (Specialization and Technical Competence) did not correlate with the other four dimensions. Punch (11, p. 52) deduced that "they make up a second, minor factor," called "Professionalization." The dimensions of Hierarchy of Authority, Rules for Incumbents, Procedural Specifications, and Impersonality are the central notions in the major factor of bureaucratization (Authoritarianism) and contribute approximately equally to it.

The Isherwood and Hoy (6) study tended to confirm Punch's findings and went on to posit a four-fold typology of school bureaucratic structure as an analytical device to categorize specific types of bureaucratic structures. They found that most schools are either Authoritarian or Professional.

Communication Satisfaction

Phillip Lewis (7) discussed organizational communication as encompassing "the interpersonal relationships of people,
their attitudes and feelings within an organizational structure. . . . Communication is defined as the sharing of messages, ideas, or attitudes resulting in a degree of understanding between a sender and a receiver." Banard (1, p. 91) said that, "in an exhaustive theory of organization, communication would occupy a central place, because the structure, extensiveness, and scope of organization are almost entirely determined by communication techniques." Maher and Piersol (9, p. 132), in discussing organizational morale, say there is "a critical need for thorough understanding of communication media as well as ability in oral and written communication skills in order for an administrator to be successful." Communication is vital to a successful organization.

The sociopsychological theory of communication is described by Hoy and Miskel (5, p. 293) as having a basic generalization which is "the meaning of a message is to be found in what people take to be the meaning and not necessarily in the intended content." People can only convey words. They do not always convey their intended meaning. Interpretations are influenced by many factors such as environmental differences and differing levels of knowledge, communication abilities and backgrounds. The communication process consists of a communication loop in which the roles of the communicators, sender and receiver, are alternately reversed as long as two-way communication continues. The
sender organizes an idea to be communicated into symbols, verbal or nonverbal, and transmits it to the receiver who decodes the message to attempt to interpret the intentions of the sender. If feedback is required, the roles are then reversed.

Perceptions of messages are greatly effected by the satisfaction people find with communication. Therefore, employees' satisfaction with the communication process within an organization are vitally important for the organization and its administrators. The overall degree of satisfaction an employee perceived in his total communication environment is termed "communication satisfaction."

Redding (12, p. 433) concludes that communication satisfaction does seem to offer a "useful and practical way of describing an important aspect of organizational communication." It does seem highly probable that the study of communication satisfaction will add much to the theory and practice of communication within organizations.

Downs and Hazen (3) extended the meaning of communication satisfaction to imply a multidimensional construct dealing with such organizational practices as (1) explanation of policies, (2) advance notice of changes, (3) freedom to make suggestions to superiors, (4) expression of appreciation for good performance, (5) freedom to complain, (6) adequacy of information on matters regarded as relevant by the employee,
and (7) accessibility of superiors. In developing a communication satisfaction questionnaire, Downs and Hazen found that communication factors which correlated with job satisfaction varied, but they concluded that the most important were personal feedback, relation with supervisor, and communication climate.

Jean Hagewood Nicholson (10) used the Downs and Hazen instrument in an educational setting after making slight modifications. It was reported that the majority of those surveyed were satisfied with the school system's communications. In every communication component, percentage responses of the subjects were higher in the satisfaction category than the responses in the dissatisfaction category. A significant relationship was found between the level of job satisfaction and the level of satisfaction of each of the communication components.

Review of related literature and research relevant to bureaucratic orientations of organizations and to communications within those organizations and the perceptions of members of those organizations of those communications brought into focus findings which have provided important information to the educational community. A study of bureaucratic structure and its relationship to communication satisfaction appeared to be needed.
Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I provides an introduction to and background of the study. Chapter II presents the review of the related literature. Four general areas are included: (1) Bureaucracy: Weber's Ideal Type; (2) Bureaucratic Structure in Practice; (3) Communication in Organizations; and (4) Communication Satisfaction. Chapter III consists of the design of the study and outlines the procedures used in collecting and analyzing data. The population to be tested is identified and research instruments are reviewed. The presentation and analysis of the data are in Chapter IV. Chapter V presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. Suggestions for further research are also included.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into four parts. The first explains Max Weber's ideal type bureaucracy, and the second summarizes research and discussions on how that theoretical framework is applied to practicing organizations. Literature relating to communication within organizations is reviewed in three, and the final section deals specifically with communication satisfaction.

Bureaucracy: Weber's Ideal Type

Max Weber was a German sociologist who lived from 1864 to 1920. He was described by Miller (44) as a man with a broadly ranging mind and a historical bent. In several of his explanations of abstract economic theory, Weber used synthetic constructs which have been labeled "ideal types." Shils and Finch (59) say these ideal pictures of historical phenomena are like a utopia which was arrived at by the analytical accentuation of certain elements of reality. The abstract construct, or ideal type, could be used as a point of reference for comparing empirical data from situations which exist in reality to some extent. In its conceptual purity, this mental construct cannot be found empirically.
in reality. However, the ideal type does offer guidance to the construction of hypotheses. Bendix and Roth (8) say these ideal types are prerequisites for specific theories, and Runciman (57) describes them as constructions which furnish a standard in terms of which actual forms of social organization can be classified and compared.

Bureaucracy was one of these ideal types of which Weber wrote. Monahan (45) feels it is important to note that Weber did not invent bureaucracy. However, he did define, explain and formulate it. In doing so, Weber (64) drew on the following historical examples: (a) Egypt, during the period of the new Empire; (b) the later Roman Principate, and especially the Diocletian monarchy and the Byzantine polity which developed out of it; (c) the Roman Catholic Church, increasingly so after the end of the thirteenth century; (d) China, from the time of Shi Huangti until 1900; (e) in ever purer forms, the European states of the early 1900's, and increasingly, all public corporations after the time of princely absolutism; and (f) the large capitalist enterprise.

Murton (43, p. 196) summarizes Weber's conception.

Bureaucracy involves a clear-cut division of integrated activities which are regarded as duties inherent in the office. A system of differentiated controls and sanctions is stated in the regulations. The assignment of roles occurs on the basis of technical qualifications which are ascertained through formalized, impersonal procedures (e.g., examinations). Within the structure of hierarchically arranged authority, the activities of "trained and salaried experts" are governed by general, abstract, and
clearly defined rules which preclude the necessity for the issuance of specific instructions for each specific case. The generality of the rules requires the constant use of categorization, whereby individual problems and cases are classified on the basis of designated criteria and are treated accordingly. The pure type of bureaucratic official is appointed, either by a superior or through the exercise of impersonal competition; he is not elected. A measure of flexibility in the bureaucracy is attained by electing higher functionaries who presumably express the will of the electorate (e.g., a body of citizens or a board of directors).

Gouldner (24) says that Weber believed bureaucracy was one of the characteristic and ubiquitous forms of administration in modern society, not confined, by any means, to government. Nisbet (47) agrees, and says that such a system is always identified as bureaucracy in public government, but the same basic system in business is called management. Elsewhere, Gouldner (25) states that Weber saw bureaucracy in the perspective of his remarkable fund of historical knowledge, as the most efficient form of social organization ever developed. Blau (10) describes bureaucracy as the type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals. Owens (48) writes that bureaucracies in spite of disadvantages, are needed in our modern world because of their efficiency, predictability, impersonality, and speed. Merton (42) and Robbins (54) agree that no other method of structuring certain types of complex activities has been found to be as efficient as a bureaucracy.
Among the characteristics Weber (64) lists for the ideal type bureaucracy are (a) an official jurisdictional area with policies, official duties, and authority; (b) a hierarchy; (c) written documents or files of management; (d) trained management; (e) official activity occupying the full work day of officials; and (f) rules which regulate all official activity. Elsewhere, Weber (65) mentions (g) systematic division of labor; and (h) impersonal interaction of officials and workers. In reviewing these works and the works of numerous authors discussing Weber, Punch (50) says it is possible to find twenty-six characteristics of Weber's bureaucratic model. However, he concludes that there is substantial agreement in the literature on the basic elements and agrees with Hall's isolation of six fundamental characteristics. Hall (29, p. 95) defined the six characteristics as follows.

1. The hierarchy of authority--the extent to which the locus of decision making is prestructured by the organization.
2. Division of labor--the extent to which work tasks are subdivided by functional specialization decided by the organization.
3. Presence of rules--the degree to which the behavior of organizational members is subject to organizational control.
4. Procedural specifications--the extent to which organizational members must follow organizationally defined techniques in dealing with situations which they encounter.
5. Impersonality--the extent to which both organizational members and outsiders are treated without regard to individual qualities.
6. Technical competence—the extent to which organizationally defined "universalistic" standards are utilized in the personal selection and advancement process.

Bureaucratic Structure in Practice

While Weber's notions on organizations formed a point of departure for defining bureaucratic structure, more recent research provides valuable insight into the theoretical and operational explanations of this concept and their application to schools.

Much of the criticism of Weber's ideal type bureaucracy has been aimed at his emphasis on impersonality. Likert (38) insists that the human element in any organization cannot be ignored and value must be placed on it. Argyris (3) would agree and goes a step further to say that today's organizations are deteriorating because their design ignores the individual. Elsewhere, Argyris (4) says that in order for an organization to improve, not only the treatment of individuals, but the individuals themselves must improve. In defending the ideal type, Blau (11) says that Weber could not have meant that associations in peer groups should be strictly impersonal, but that effective exercise of bureaucratic authority requires an official to be not only formally independent of others but also removed from the full impact of informal pressure others can exert.

Though most would agree that the rules and specifications for jobs result in high efficiency, Getzels and Guba
(21) remind that individuals with distinctive personalities and needs fill these jobs. Blau (12) warns that rules and regulations tend to become an end in themselves, rather than a means for achieving ends.

An additional problem, especially for bureaucratically structured schools, is the fact that the people in school organizations consider themselves professionals. Though many of the characteristics of professionalism are the same or similar to characteristics of bureaucratism, Blau and Scott (13) point out that the control structure is completely different. Professionals generally claim self-control through some type of organization which has voluntary membership, while bureaucrats exercise and are subject to hierarchial authority. Corwin (16) and Bidwell (9) agree that the conflict in education, as in many other modern organizations is between the two bases of authority, the profession and the bureaucracy.

Gouldner (23) pursues the problem and his research shows that professionals tend to lack loyalty to the organization and therefore, make poorer bureaucrats than less-trained employees. Hersey and Blanchard (30) even feel that professionals are more likely to rebel against bureaucratic authority and are therefore less productive for the organization. Anderson (2) concludes that administrators must allow individual teachers enough autonomy to stimulate their professional initiative.
Efforts to measure bureaucracy have also pointed to this conflict of the professional in a bureaucracy. Hall (28) developed the Organizational Inventory to measure six dimensions of bureaucracy. They are (1) hierarchy of authority, (2) specialization (or division of labor), (3) rules covering employee rights and duties, (4) procedures for dealing with work situations, (5) impersonality, and (6) technical competence. Hall found dimension six to be what Udy (63) had earlier defined as "rational" instead of bureaucratic. In a later study, Hall (29) explored specifically the relationship of professionalization and bureaucratization. He found, with the exception of the technical competence dimension, an inverse relationship exists between the levels of bureaucratization and professionalization.

MacKay (39) discusses four doctoral dissertations written at the University of Alberta from 1964 to 1967, starting with his own and including three which were written under his professorship. MacKay's original study modified Hall's instrument and applied the bureaucratic model to schools. However, the six-dimensional framework was not fully substantiated in that the correlational analysis indicated the possible presence of two subsets of dimensions, one bureaucratic, the other abureaucratic. Robinson's study (39) was completed two years later in 1966. Robinson and MacKay (39) refined the instrument and some new variables were introduced into the
research design. Again, there were problems in applying the six-dimensional theoretical framework. In 1967, two more studies of bureaucracy in schools were completed. Mansfield (39) took an entirely different approach by positing an unidimensional measure of bureaucracy putting almost singular emphasis on rules as the crucial determinant of the extent of bureaucracy. This study used major modifications of MacKay's instrument to present a more simplified global description of school organizations. In the same year, Kolesar (39) used the MacKay-Robinson version of the six-dimensional questionnaire as part of his study of pupil alienation in the bureaucratic organization. On the basis of factor analysis in his study, Kolesar reconstructed the framework into a twodimensional one.

Punch (50) made significant modifications in MacKay's School Organizational Inventory (SOI), and his study of elementary schools led him to conclude that bureaucratic structure in schools is realistically conceptualized as a unitary, homogeneous variable only if restricted to the dimensions of (I) hierarchy of authority, (III) rules, (IV) procedural specifications, and (V) impersonality. He found (II) specialization and (VI) technical competence made up a second major dimension—professionalism.

Isherwood and Hoy (32, 33) confirmed Punch's findings in their study of secondary schools. Also using the SOI,
they concluded that the organizational structure of schools is a dualistic notion of authority. They went on to posit a four-fold typology of school bureaucratic structure as an analytical device to categorize specific types of bureaucratic structures. They used the term "authority" to mean that decision making was prestructured in the organization, there was a high level of organizational control of members' behavior, there was an extensive set of procedures for meeting situations, and there were universalistic relationships among organizational members and between organizational members and clients. "Expertise" was defined as a high level of functional specialization within organizational roles and as an extensive use of universalistic standards in the advancement and selection processes (32, p. 125).

Figure 1 depicts the typology.

![Four-fold typology of school bureaucratic structure](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type I Weberian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type III Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type II Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type IV Chaotic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1--A four-fold typology of school bureaucratic structure.

A Type I organization possessed a high degree of both Authority and Expertise. This would be similar to Weber's ideal model which was delineated in the Theoretical Framework. A Type IV organization, in contrast, possessed neither
Authority nor Expertise, and would be characterized by confusion, conflict, duplication of effort, and individual disgust with the system. Both Weberian and Chaotic were found to be much less likely to occur than the other two types. Type II, or Authoritarian, schools were power centered in the hierarchy and exhibited centralized decision making. Type III, or Professional (also referred to as collegial), schools demonstrated authority based on shared decision making among all members of the staff with expertise on a particular issue. It was assumed that most schools would tend to fall into either the Authoritarian or Professional organizational forms. In fact, only one of the thirteen schools fell outside of those two quadrants.

Balderson's (6) research in elementary schools divided the School Organizational Inventory into two scales, a bureaucratic and a professional. His findings tended to confirm those previously discussed.

Communication in Organizations

According to Thayer (61) there is no single integrated body of literature on organizational communication. It has been described in various ways. Wofford (68) has said that communication is the binding agent of all social systems. Redding and Sanborn (53) simply defined communication as the sending and receiving of messages. Thayer (60) said that the different methods of transferring information make up a
dynamic, continual, and complex process; and that process
(communication) underlies the existence, growth, change, and
behavior of all living systems from the individual to the
organization. Allen (1) defined communication as any transfer
of meaning from one person to another. Lewis (37) stated that
communication may take the form of written or spoken words,
gestures, or visual symbols. Communication conveys messages
by action, touch or sound. Goldhaber (22) has said it is the
creation and exchange of messages within a network of inter-
dependent relationships to cope with environmental uncertainty.
Katz and Kahn (35) described communication as the exchange of
information and the transmission of meaning.

In his classic work, The Functions of the Executive,
Barnard (7) said that communication is the most essential
characteristic of an organization. Bormann (14, p. 1)
supported this with his statement, "All organizations are
held together by, and perform their functions through, inter-
personal communications." Katz and Kahn (35) said that com-
munication is the very essence of an organization.

According to Rogers (56), organizational structure
limits and guides communication flow. March and Simon (41)
have pointed out that it should be and usually is planned,
but even if it is not, communication will develop through
usage. There will be communication within an organization
whether the management plans for it or not.
Many communication-related problems can develop within an organization. Read (51) felt that problems in organizational communication are both the cause and effect of major operational and administrative problems. One source of problems described by Browning (15) is that an individual is capable of registering only a certain number of messages; therefore, messages are competing for the attention of the individual. Another reason for communication problems is the fact that it is a changing process. Downs (20) called this process the most basic principle of communication. Maher and Piersol (40) related that when management does not communicate goals, purposes and justifications, employee problems in job satisfaction and commitment develop. Guetzkow's (26) study pointed to the extreme complexity of communications within organizations. Hage, Aiken, and Marrett (27) discussed the communications problems brought about by increased size and increased formality of an organization.

To transfer exact meaning from one person to another is very difficult. Lewis (37) has stated that one person never comprehends fully or identically what another person is saying because of differences in such elements as their environment, upbringing, and frames of reference. This is the essence of what Hoy and Miskel (31) called the socio-psychological theory of communication. They have described a communication loop in which the rolls of the communicators, sender and receiver, are alternately reversed as long as
two-way communication continues. The sender organizes an idea into words and transmits them to the sender who then must decode the message in an attempt to interpret the intensions of the sender. Along this same line of thought, Rockey (55) said that essentially words do not mean; people mean.

The discussion of organizational communication is limited to ideas leading to the concept of communication satisfaction. Several areas, such as non-verbal communication, are not specifically addressed because they are not directly related to communication satisfaction.

Communication Satisfaction

One major factor in the decoding of a message is the receiver's degree of satisfaction with the message, or with the organizational communication in general. In reviewing the recent literature on organizational climate, Lau (36) proclaimed that results clearly indicate that the quality of communication within an organization represents an important component of the total climate of the organization.

Redding (52) credits Dale Level with originating the term communication satisfaction in his 1959 Purdue dissertation. The intent was to combine under a single category a number of diverse phenomena. He felt that an organization member can report a generalized feeling about the communication events and attitudes that he encounters in the
organization. Level found that communication satisfaction correlated moderately with over-all morale, but that knowledge employees had about the organization did not correlate with their morale, or over-all satisfaction. Perry and Mahoney (49) reported similar results in their study of five different companies. There was no consistent or meaningful association between being informed and being highly satisfied on the job. Whyte (66) has confirmed this conclusion.

However, Baird and Bradley (5) say that communication content and communication style do have distinct impact upon employees' morale. The work of Shaw and Rothschild (58) indicated that one's position in the communication network determines satisfaction. They found that people located at the center of a centralized network expressed greater satisfaction than did people elsewhere. Wiio (67) warned that his results indicated that the relationship between communication and job satisfaction is situational and contingent, depending on the organization and communication climate. He feels communication and job satisfaction are fundamentally different.

During the 1960s several students at Purdue University did research involving communication satisfaction. Redding (52) mentions the work of Sanborn, Tompkins, Zima, and Minter among those. They differed in their components of communication satisfaction, but generally included how a respondent perceives these entities. They include
--explanations of policies, in answer to employee questions;
--understanding what is expected of one in performing his job;
--advance notice of changes, through official sources;
--freedom to make suggestions to superiors;
--adequacy of information on those company matters regarded by the receiver as relevant to him;
--extent to which important information is obtained from sources or media preferred by the receiver;
--freedom to make complaints, to "sound off";
--accessibility or approachability of superiors;
--degree to which supervisor makes an effort to understand feelings and problems of subordinates;
--degree to which higher officers or management are open, willing to initiate communication; and
--degree to which supervisors express appreciation of good performance by subordinates.

Redding (52, p. 433) concludes that communication satisfaction does seem to offer a "useful and practical way of describing an important aspect of organizational communication" and it does seem highly probable that the communications one receives from an organization and the manner in which they are received will be related to the person's attitude toward the organization.

Downs and Hazen (17, 18, 19) extended the meaning of communication satisfaction to imply a multidimensional construct dealing with such organizational practices as (1) explanation of policies, (2) advance notice of changes, (3) freedom to make suggestions to superiors, (4) expression of appreciation for good performance, (5) freedom to complain, (6) adequacy of information on matters regarded as relevant by the employee, and (7) accessibility of superiors. In developing a communication satisfaction questionnaire, Downs
and Hazen found that communication factors which correlated with job satisfaction varied, but they concluded that the most important were personal feedback, relation with supervisor, and communication climate.

In her study using the communication satisfaction instrument developed by Downs and Hazen, Thiry (62) found that professional nurses in Kansas working in offices and nursing homes were generally more satisfied with communication than hospital and staff nurses. She concluded that, in general, the more hierarchical and complex the organization, the less satisfied were the nurses. All of the factors were highly correlated with each other.

Nicholson (46) used the Downs and Hazen instrument in an educational setting after making slight modifications. She found that the majority of those surveyed were satisfied with the school system's communication. In every communication component percentage responses of the subjects were higher in the satisfaction category than the responses in the dissatisfaction category. A significant relationship was found between the level of job satisfaction and the level of satisfaction of each of the communication components. Jones (34) did a study similar to Nicholson's and her findings were similar.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter identifies the selection of subjects, the instruments, and the data collection procedures of the study. Finally, the statistical treatment of the data is provided.

Selection of Subjects

This study utilized the responses to the questionnaires from teachers in a suburban school district in North Texas. The school district is comprised of four high schools, ten junior high schools and thirty-five elementary schools. There are approximately 35,000 students in average daily attendance. There are 2,002 teachers employed. Of those teachers, 996 are assigned to elementary schools.

The sample for this study included the 373 teachers in twelve randomly selected elementary schools in the district. Questionnaires were completed and returned by 344 teachers. This was 92 percent of those surveyed.

Instruments

The instruments chosen for this study are (1) School Organizational Inventory (SOI)--to assess the bureaucratic structure of the schools (Appendix A), and (2) Communication
Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ—to assess perceptions of organizational communications (Appendix B).

School Organizational Inventory

The School Organizational Inventory (SOI) measures bureaucratic patterns in schools. It was developed by MacKay (4) for use in schools from an instrument that Hall (2) first conceived for general use in industry. It has six dimensions: (1) Hierarchy of Authority; (2) Specialization or Division of Labor; (3) Rules and Regulations; (4) Specifications of Procedures; (5) Impersonality; and (6) Technical Competence. Punch (6) found in a factor analytical study of Canadian elementary schools that the six dimensions could be reduced to two more general factors or clusters which are independent of each other. Dimensions 2 and 6 formed a minor cluster which Isherwood and Hoy (3) labeled "Expertise." Dimensions 1, 3, 4, and 5 form the major cluster "Authority." Punch's modified SOI has forty-eight Likert-type items and is used in the present study. The respondent is asked to respond to each item by indicating on a five-point scale ranging from "very frequently or always true" (five points) to "very rarely or never true" (one point). On eighteen of the items the scoring is reversed and, therefore, goes from one to five.

Hall (2) applied the Spearman-Brown formula for split-half reliability to each of the subscales. The reliability
coefficients were greater than .80 on each scale. He validated the instrument by the use of expert judges who correlated their subjective observations with report of instrument measures for each subscale.

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

Downs and Hazen (1) reported the development of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) which was designed to measure the employee's level of satisfaction within the organization on each of the eight components of communication satisfaction. In formulation of the CSQ, research was conducted in three stages. An original questionnaire was developed, administered, and factor analyzed. On the basis of the factor analysis, a new questionnaire was refined and then administered to four different organizations, and factor analyzed again. Reliability of the questionnaire is reported by the authors to be .94.

The instrument was constructed so that each respondent is asked to indicate the level of satisfaction with the particular item on a one to seven point scale between "very satisfied" and "very dissatisfied." Satisfaction is measured by a range of "very satisfied" to "slightly satisfied" and is indicated on the scale by points one through three. Point four on the scale indicates "indifferent." Dissatisfaction is measured by a range of "slightly
dissatisfied" to "very dissatisfied" and is indicated on the scale by points five through seven.

Communication satisfaction, as determined on the basis of factor analysis, consists of the following eight components: (1) Corporate Perspective—these items reflect information relating to the overall functioning of the organization; (2) Personal Feedback—this factor relates to personal achievement and work and how they are recognized by the organization; (3) Organizational Integration—this reflects the individual's satisfaction with the information that he receives about the organization and the immediate work environment; (4) Communication with Superiors—these items refer to two-way communication with superiors; (5) Communication Climate—this broad factor reflects communication at the organizational and personal levels or the extent to which communication motivates and stimulates workers to meet goals; (6) Horizontal Communication—these items relate to informal communication among fellow employees; (7) Media Quality—this factor reflects the degree to which employees perceive the major forms of communication (publications, memos) as functioning effectively; and (8) Communication with Subordinates—this focuses on two-way communication with subordinates. (Since teachers are not management, this component was not used in this study.)

Five items on the questionnaire are grouped to form each communication satisfaction component. A component score is computed by summing the scores of responses to the five items,
which will range from five to thirty-five for each component. Responses in the range of five to fifteen indicate satisfaction of the communication satisfaction component. Responses in the range of sixteen to twenty-four indicate indifference of the communication satisfaction component, and responses in the range of twenty-five to thirty-five indicate dissatisfaction of the communication satisfaction component. Additionally, there is a global measure of job satisfaction within the CSQ. Job satisfaction is rated on a one to seven point scale with point one indicating "very dissatisfied" to point seven indicating "very satisfied."

In her study at Vanderbilt University, Jean Hagewood Nicholson (5) revised the instrument specifically for use in schools. That revised form was used in the present study. Nicholson's changes were (a) the use of the term school system for the word company; (b) elimination of the three questions concerning the level of productivity; and (c) explanation of the word supervisor to mean person who evaluates you.

Data Collection Procedures

The following procedures for collecting data were conducted.

1. Permission to use the copyrighted Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire was obtained from one of its authors (Appendix C).
2. Permission to collect data by administering the questionnaires to elementary school teachers in the district was received from the district's Deputy Superintendent for Planning, Development, and Evaluation (Appendix D).

3. Twelve elementary schools were randomly selected.

4. Cooperation in arranging the administration of the instruments to the teachers was obtained from the principals.

5. Questionnaires were administered during the first two weeks of May, 1983, with the assistance of prepared assistants who are not on the staff of the school responding. These assistants were three instructional consultants for the school district.

6. After the oral reading of verbatim instructions (Appendix E), copies of the questionnaires were given to the teachers in a faculty meeting with sufficient time given the teachers for completion of the questionnaires. Principals were not in the room during the administration of the questionnaires.

**Statistical Procedures**

The sample included 373 teachers in twelve randomly selected elementary schools in the district. Ninety-two per cent (344) of the questionnaires were completed and the information was transferred to data cards for analysis.

Individual school mean scores on authority and professional factors on the SOI were compared with the mean scores
on these factors for the entire sample of schools. This procedure was originally used by Isherwood and Hoy (3, p. 125). The schools with mean scores above the group mean on the authority factor and below the group mean on the professional factor were considered to be Authoritarian schools. The schools with mean scores below the group mean on the authority factor and above the group mean on the professional factor were considered to be Professional schools. Only those schools which were determined to be Authoritarian or Professional were considered in this study. The schools with mean scores above the group mean on both the authority factor and the professional factor were determined to be Weberian schools and were not used to test the hypotheses. The schools which had mean scores below the group mean on both the authority factor and the professional factor were considered to be Chaotic and were not used to test the hypotheses.

After the two groups of schools, Authoritarian and Professional, were established, a comparison of the responses to each of the seven components of the CSQ was made. These seven components correlate to the seven hypotheses of this study. One-way analysis of variance was utilized. The probability (P) was obtained from analysis of each of the seven components. The P value was used to determine if there was a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of
communication satisfaction between Authoritarian schools and Professional schools. The data analyzed reflected communication satisfaction on the following seven components: (1) corporate perspective, (2) personal feedback, (3) organizational integration, (4) communication with superiors, (5) communication climate, (6) horizontal communication, and (7) media quality.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The results of the study are presented in this chapter. Comparison of the Authoritarian and Professional bureau-
cratically structured schools is provided, hypotheses are
reiterated, and the statistical analyses are presented.

Subjects of Study and Response Rates

The subjects of this study were teachers in a suburban
school district in north Texas. The district employs 2,002
teachers. Of those, 996 teachers are assigned to the
district's thirty-five elementary schools. The sample for
this study included 373 teachers in twelve randomly selected
elementary schools. For purposes of description, these twelve
schools were labeled A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, and L.
The number of teachers on each school's staff, the number of
teachers who completed and returned the questionnaires, and
the percentage that represents are listed in Table I.

A review of Table I indicates that schools A and F had
a 100 per cent response rate. The lowest response rates were
81.8 per cent at school I and 82.1 per cent at school K. At
all of the other schools the teachers returned the question-
naires at rates ranging from 88.0 per cent to 97.1 per cent.
TABLE I

STAFF SIZE AND RESPONSE RATE FOR SAMPLE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teachers on Staff</th>
<th>Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The over-all response rate for the total sample was 92.2 percent. This was 344 completed questionnaires from the total 373 teachers in the twelve randomly selected elementary schools. The twenty-nine teachers who did not return the questionnaires were either absent or had conferences or assignments elsewhere during administration of the instruments.
Procedure

Permission to collect data by administering the School Organizational Inventory (SOI) and the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) was received from the district's Deputy Superintendent for Planning, Development, and Evaluation. The cooperation of the principals of the twelve randomly selected elementary schools was obtained and the instruments were administered during the first two weeks of May, 1983, with the aid of three prepared assistants. Copies of the questionnaires were given to the teachers in the twelve respective faculty meetings. Verbatim instructions were read orally before teachers began responding. Principals were absent from the room during administration of the questionnaires.

Statistical Analysis

The following hypotheses were submitted to statistical analysis of variance (one-way design).

1. Teachers' perceptions of general organizational perspective will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

2. Teachers' perceptions of personal feedback will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.
3. Teachers' perceptions of organizational integration will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

4. Teachers' perceptions of communication with superiors will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

5. Teachers' perceptions of communication climate will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

6. Teachers' perceptions of horizontal communication will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

7. Teachers' perceptions of media quality will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

The .05 level of significance was used as the level of acceptance of the hypotheses.

The responses to the School Organizational Inventory were analyzed. For thirty of the forty-eight items, response A, "Very Frequently or Always True," was valued at five, and scoring ranged downward to response E, "Very Rarely or Never True," which was worth one. Values were reversed for items 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 18, 19, 31, 36, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47 and ranged from response A being worth one to response E being worth five. Results were used to divide the twelve schools into four groups as Isherwood and Hoy (1) did.
in their study in 1973. Items 3, 4, 8, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, 29, 30, 39, 43, and 48 made up the expertise, or professional, factor. The remaining thirty-four items composed the authority factor. Each school's mean score for each of these two sets of items was compared to the corresponding mean score for the total twelve-school sample. The Weberian schools' mean scores for the authority factor items and for the professional factor items are listed in Table II.

**TABLE II**

**WEBERIAN SCHOOLS' MEANS FOR AUTHORITY AND PROFESSIONAL FACTOR ITEMS ON THE SOI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Authority Factor</th>
<th>Professional Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>113.28</td>
<td>44.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>105.37</td>
<td>46.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>104.79</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Sample* Mean Scores | 103.51 | 44.10 |

*Twelve schools.

Examination of Table II indicates that for the authority factor items on the SOI, school A was 9.77 above the mean for the total twelve-school sample, school B was 1.86 above the mean for the total sample, and school C was 1.28 above the mean for the total sample. For the professional factor items, school A was 0.02 above the mean for the total sample, school
B was 1.93 above the mean for the total sample, and school C was 1.73 above the mean for the total sample. Schools A, B, and C were identified as Weberian schools. Isherwood and Hoy (1) used this title in their study to identify the schools which were closest to Max Weber's ideal-type bureaucracy with relatively high degrees of both authority and professionalism.

The Authoritarian schools' mean scores for the authority factor items and for the professional factor items are listed in Table III.

### TABLE III

**AUTHORITARIAN SCHOOLS' MEANS FOR AUTHORITY AND PROFESSIONAL FACTOR ITEMS ON THE SOI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Authority Factor</th>
<th>Professional Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>118.86</td>
<td>43.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>109.50</td>
<td>43.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>103.83</td>
<td>43.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample*</td>
<td>103.51</td>
<td>44.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Twelve schools.

Review of Table III indicates that for the authority factor items on the SOI, school D was 15.35 above the mean for the total twelve-school sample, school E was 5.99 above the mean for the total sample, and school F was 0.32 above the mean for the total sample. For the professional factor...
items, school D was 0.91 below the mean for the total sample, school E was 0.95 below the mean for the total sample, and school F was 0.43 below the mean for the total sample. Schools D, E, and F were identified as Authoritarian schools because of their relatively high scores on the authority factor items and relatively low scores on the professional factor items.

The Professional schools' mean scores for the authority factor items and for the professional factor items are listed in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**

**PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS' MEANS FOR AUTHORITY AND PROFESSIONAL FACTOR ITEMS ON THE SOI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Authority Factor</th>
<th>Professional Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>96.95</td>
<td>44.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>96.78</td>
<td>44.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>93.67</td>
<td>44.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample* Mean Scores</td>
<td>103.51</td>
<td>44.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Twelve schools.

Review of Table IV indicates that for the authority factor items on the SOI, school G was 6.56 below the mean for the total twelve-school sample, school H was 6.73 below the mean for the total sample, and school I was 9.84 below the
mean for the total sample. For the professional factor items, school G was 0.17 above the mean for the total sample, school I was 0.16 above the mean for the total sample. Schools G, H, and I were identified as Professional schools because of their relatively low scores on the authority factor items and their relatively high scores on the professional factor items.

The Chaotic schools' mean scores for the authority factor items and for the professional factor items are listed in Table V.

TABLE V
CHAOTIC SCHOOLS' MEANS FOR AUTHORITY AND PROFESSIONAL FACTOR ITEMS ON THE SOI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Authority Factor</th>
<th>Professional Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>101.79</td>
<td>43.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>100.35</td>
<td>43.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>99.56</td>
<td>43.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Mean Scores</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Twelve schools.

A review of Table V indicates that for the authority factor items on the SOI, school J was 1.72 below the mean for the total twelve-school sample, school K was 3.16 below the mean for the total sample, and school L was 3.95 below the mean for the total sample. For the professional factor
items, school J was 0.70 below the mean for the total sample, school K was 0.76 below the mean for the total sample, and school L was 0.51 below the mean for the total sample. Schools J, K, and L were identified as Chaotic because their low scores on both authority and professional factor items placed them the most distant from Max Weber's ideal-type bureaucratic structure.

By comparing each school's mean scores, which are presented in Tables II, III, IV, and V, with the group mean scores, each school was placed into a group relative to the other schools within the total sample. A school which was identified as Authoritarian for this study, could be identified in another group in another study because the mean scores for the new total sample would be different. The groupings only identified the school which, in the way they were bureaucratically structured, were relatively more like each other than they were like the other schools in this study.

The fact that all four groups were composed of three schools was coincidental. It was anticipated that almost all schools would be either Authoritarian or Professional. For example, when Isherwood and Hoy (1) used this technique with a total sample of thirteen schools, only one school was not in one of these two groups.

A graphic display of the grouping of the twelve schools of this study into quadrants is found in Figure 2.
School mean score on authority factor items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>120.00-</th>
<th>Weberian</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115.00-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.00-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.51</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School mean score on professional factor items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46.00</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.10**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>Chaotic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*103.41 was the mean on the authority factor items for the total twelve-school sample.

**44.10 was the mean on the professional factor items for the total twelve-school sample.

Fig. 2--Grouping by school mean scores for authority and professional factor items on the SOI.
The horizontal axis in Figure 2 is 103.51 which is the mean score on the authority factor items for the total twelve schools in the study. The vertical axis is 44.10 which is the mean score on the professional factor items for the total twelve schools in the study. Schools A, B, and C are in the Weberian quadrant. Schools D, E, and F are in the Authoritarian quadrant. Schools G, H, and I are in the Professional quadrant. Schools J, K, and L are in the Chaotic quadrant. The Authoritarian schools and the Professional schools were used to test the hypotheses of this study.

Hypothesis 1 states that teachers' perceptions of general organizational perspective will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional. This hypothesis was tested using one-way analysis of variance. Responses to items 4, 10, 11, 14, and 15 on the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire were used to measure the teachers' perceptions of general organizational perspective. These items reflect information relating to the overall functioning of the organization such as policies, goals, and changes. Summary data and analysis of variance data for responses to these items are presented in Table VI.

Examination of Table VI reveals that responses to the general organizational perspective items on the CSQ by the eighty-five teachers in schools which were identified as Authoritarian had a mean of 16.99. Responses to those same five items by the seventy-six teachers in the schools which
were identified as having a Professional bureaucratic structure had a mean of 15.46. The CSQ uses a seven-point scale ranging from one point for "Very Satisfied" to seven for "Very Dissatisfied." Therefore, the higher scores from the respondents in the Authoritarian schools indicate they are less satisfied with the general organizational perspective component of communication satisfaction than are the teachers in the Professional schools. However, the resultant F ratio of 3.29 for the analysis of variance was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY DATA AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR GENERAL ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>15.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4523.87</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4617.52</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2 states that teachers' perceptions of personal feedback will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional. This hypothesis was tested using one-way analysis of variance on the responses to five items on the CSQ. Items 5, 6, 7, 12, and 16 measured the teachers' perceptions of personal feedback. These five items relate to personal achievement and work, and how it is recognized by the organization. Information as to how a person is being judged and recognized for efforts is found in this component of communication satisfaction. Summary data and analysis of variance data for responses to these items are presented in Table VII.

Examination of Table VII reveals that responses to the personal feedback items on the CSQ by the eighty-five teachers in schools which were identified as Authoritarian had a mean of 17.19. Responses to those same five items by the seventy-six teachers in the schools which were identified as having a Professional bureaucratic structure had a mean of 15.79. The CSQ uses a seven-point scale ranging from one point for "Very Satisfied" to seven for "Very Dissatisfied." Therefore, the higher scores from the respondents in the Authoritarian schools indicate they are less satisfied with the personal feedback component of communication satisfaction than are the teachers in the Professional schools. However, the resultant F ratio of 1.92 for the analysis of variance was not significant at the .05 level.
TABLE VII

SUMMARY DATA AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
DATA FOR PERSONAL FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6509.62</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6588.12</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3 states that teachers' perceptions of organizational integration will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional. This hypothesis was tested using one-way analysis of variance on the responses to five items on the CSQ. Items 2, 3, 8, 9, and 13 measured the teachers' perceptions of organizational integration. These five items recognize the individual's satisfaction with the information that is received concerning the organization, and the immediate work environment. The information would include personnel news, employee benefits,
and pay. Summary data and analysis of variance data for responses to these items are presented in Table VIII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of Table VIII reveals that responses to the organizational integration items on the CSQ by the eighty-five teachers in schools which were identified as Authoritarian had a mean of 14.78, and responses to those same five items by the seventy-six teachers in the schools which were identified as having a Professional bureaucratic structure had a mean of 13.14. The CSQ uses a seven-point scale ranging from one point for "Very Satisfied" to seven for "Very Dissatisfied."
Therefore, the higher scores from the respondents in the Authoritarian schools indicate they are less satisfied with the organizational integration component of communication satisfaction than are the teachers in the Professional schools. The resultant F ratio of 4.62 for the analysis of variance was significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 4 states that teachers' perceptions of communication with superiors will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional. This hypothesis was tested using one-way analysis of variance on the responses to five items on the CSQ. Items 18, 20, 23, 27, and 32 measured the teachers' perceptions of communication with superiors. These five items refer to the two-way communication with superiors. Information includes the extent to which the supervisor listens, pays attention to the employee, and is open to ideas. Summary data and analysis of variance data for responses to these items are presented in Table IX.

Examination of Table IX reveals that responses to the communication with superiors items on the CSQ by the eighty-five teachers in schools which were identified as Authoritarian had a mean of 14.60. Responses to those same five items by the seventy-six teachers in the schools which were identified as having a Professional bureaucratic structure had a mean of 11.78. The CSQ uses a seven-point scale ranging from one point for "Very Satisfied" to seven for "Very Dissatisfied."
TABLE IX
SUMMARY DATA AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR COMMUNICATION WITH SUPERIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>319.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>319.92</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6899.60</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>43.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7219.52</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the higher scores from the respondents in the Authoritarian schools indicate they are less satisfied with the communication with superiors component of communication satisfaction than are the teachers in the Professional schools. The resultant F ratio of 7.37 for the analysis of variance was significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 5 states that teachers' perceptions of communication climate will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional. This hypothesis was tested using one-way analysis of variance on the responses to five items on the CSQ. Items 17, 19, 21,
24, and 25 measured the teachers' perceptions of communication climate. This refers to the communication at the organizational and personal levels; the extent to which communication motivates and stimulates employees to meet goals. Information includes the extent to which people in the organization have ability as communicators and the extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communication channels. Summary data and analysis of variance data for responses to these items are presented in Table X.

**TABLE X**

**SUMMARY DATA AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR COMMUNICATION CLIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>16.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>223.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233.69</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6466.66</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6690.35</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination of Table X reveals that responses to the communication climate items on the CSQ by the eighty-five teachers in schools which were identified as Authoritarian had a mean of 18.51. Responses to those same five items by the seventy-six teachers in the schools which were identified as having a Professional bureaucratic structure had a mean of 16.14. The CSQ uses a seven-point scale ranging from one point for "Very Satisfied" to seven for "Very Dissatisfied." Therefore, the higher scores from the respondents in the Authoritarian schools indicate they are less satisfied with the communication climate component of communication satisfaction than are the teachers in the Professional schools. The resultant F ratio of 5.50 for the analysis of variance was significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 6 states that teachers' perceptions of horizontal communication will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional. This hypothesis was tested using one-way analysis of variance on the responses to five items on the CSQ. Items 26, 28, 29, 30, and 35 measured the teachers' perceptions of horizontal communication. This component relates to the informal communication among fellow employees. Information includes the extent to which the grapevine is active in the organization and the extent to which horizontal and informal communication is accurate and free flowing. Summary data and analysis
of variance data for responses to these items are presented in Table XI.

TABLE XI
SUMMARY DATA AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR HORIZONTAL COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>13.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>127.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127.44</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4576.44</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4703.88</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of Table XI reveals that responses to the horizontal communication item by the eighty-five teachers in schools which were identified as Authoritarian had a mean of 15.51. Responses to those same five items by the seventy-six teachers in the schools which were identified as having a Professional bureaucratic structure had a mean of 13.72. The CSQ uses a seven-point scale ranging from one point for "Very Satisfied" to seven for "Very Dissatisfied." Therefore, the
higher scores from the respondents in the Authoritarian schools indicate they are less satisfied with the horizontal communication component of communication satisfaction than are the teachers in the Professional schools. The resultant F ratio of 4.43 for the analysis of variance was significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 7 states that teachers' perceptions of media quality will vary significantly according to whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional. This hypothesis was tested using one-way analysis of variance on the responses to five items on the CSQ. Items 22, 31, 33, 34, and 36 measured the teachers' perceptions of media quality. This reflects the degree to which employees perceive the major forms of communication, like memos and publications, as functioning effectively. Information includes the extent to which written directives and reports are clear and the extent to which organizational meetings are well organized. Summary data and analysis of variance data for responses to these items are presented in Table XII.

Examination of Table XII reveals that responses to the media quality items on the CSQ by the eighty-five teachers in the Authoritarian schools had a mean of 15.96, and that responses to these same five items by the seventy-six teachers in Professional schools had a mean of 13.99. The CSQ uses a seven-point scale ranging from "Very Satisfied" to "Very
Dissatisfied. The higher scores from the respondents in Authoritarian schools indicate they are less satisfied with the media quality component of communication satisfaction than are the teachers in the Professional schools. The resultant $F$ ratio of 4.89 of the analysis of variance was significant at the .05 level.

**TABLE XII**

**SUMMARY DATA AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

**DATA FOR MEDIA QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>156.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.96</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5101.88</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5258.84</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Findings**

In addition to the testing of the hypotheses of the study, examination of the data collected indicates several findings. The number of teachers on the staff of each school
and the bureaucratic structure groupings of the schools are presented in Table XIII.

**TABLE XIII**

**NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER SCHOOL WITH SCHOOLS GROUPED BY BUREAUCRATIC STRUCTURE***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weberian Schools</th>
<th>Authoritarian Schools</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
<th>Chaotic Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean             | 30.33 | Mean | 29.33 | Mean | 28.67 | Mean | 36.00 |

*Total sample N = 373, Mean = 31.08.

Examination of Table XIII reveals that two of the three schools with the largest staff were grouped in the Chaotic bureaucratic structure group. Of the schools with a staff of thirty-five or more, only school E was outside of the Chaotic group. The mean for the Chaotic schools was 5.67 more than the mean for the Weberian schools which had the second highest group mean.

Of the twelve schools involved in the study, nine had male principals. Schools D, E, and F had female principals.
and clustered together in the grouping through the analysis of the SOI data. The Authoritarian bureaucratic structure group contained all of the schools with female principals and only schools with female principals.

Mean scores of responses to CSQ items for each component of communication satisfaction and their ranks by bureaucratic structure groups are presented in Table XIV.

Examination of Table XIV indicates that all group mean scores were under eighteen. Since the CSQ uses a seven-point scale and these mean scores are for the five items of each component, a score between five and eighteen indicated some degree of satisfaction. Scores between nineteen and twenty-one would have indicated indifference, and any scores over twenty-one would have indicated a degree of dissatisfaction. Therefore, the majority of the teachers in all groups were satisfied with all seven components of communication. Examination of the rankings of mean scores in Table XIV reveals that teachers in Authoritarian schools are the least satisfied of any group for every component of communication satisfaction. Teachers in Professional schools ranked first, or the most satisfied among the four groups in four component areas, and teachers in Weberian schools ranked first, or the most satisfied, in the other three component areas.

Table XV also presents mean scores of teachers' responses to CSQ items for each component of communication satisfaction, but with rankings within each bureaucratic group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weberian</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Chaotic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General organizational perspective</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal feedback</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational integration</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with superiors</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication climate</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal communication</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media quality</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XV

MEAN SCORES AND RANK BY COMPONENT OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weberian</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Chaotic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General organizational perspective</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal feedback</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational integration</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with superiors</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication climate</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal communication</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media quality</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination of Table XV indicates that teachers in schools in all four bureaucratic structure groups had a higher level of satisfaction with communication with superiors than with the other component areas of communication satisfaction. The mean for communication with superiors ranked first in all four groups. Organizational integration and horizontal communication ranked next highest among each of the four groups with a ranked mean of 2.5. Media quality ranked fourth within all four groups. Though still indicating satisfaction, as opposed to dissatisfaction, the components receiving the higher mean scores, or lower levels of satisfaction, were corporate perspective, personal feedback, and communication climate.

Item number one of the CSQ asked, "How satisfied are you with your job?" The data relevant to this indication of overall job satisfaction are summarized in Table XVI.

Examination of Table XVI shows that most teachers in all four groups were satisfied with their jobs. There were more teachers who were dissatisfied with their jobs in the Weberian and Authoritarian schools than in the Professional and Chaotic schools. Only nine-tenths of one per cent of all teachers in the sample were indifferent about job satisfaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Weberian</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Chaotic</th>
<th>Entire Sample*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissatisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indifferent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Slightly Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Satisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Very Satisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Satisfied</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 342 for this table, two teachers did not respond to item 1.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, findings, and conclusions of this study. Recommendations and recommendations for further research are also made.

Summary

This study investigated the relationship of bureaucratic structure to communication satisfaction of teachers in a suburban school district in north Texas. This study compared the seven components of communication satisfaction of teachers in Authoritarian schools with those of teachers in Professional schools.

Twelve of the district's thirty-five elementary schools were randomly selected. The instruments were given to the teachers in faculty meetings and the overall response rate was 92.2 per cent. Responses to the School Organizational Inventory (SOI) were used to determine the grouping of schools relative to their bureaucratic structure, including Weberian, Professional, Authoritarian, and Chaotic. Three schools were in each of the four groups.

The schools which composed the Authoritarian and Professional groups were used to test the hypotheses of this
study. The Authoritarian group was school D, n = 21; school E, n = 34; and school F, n = 30. The Professional group was school G, n = 22; school H, n = 27; and school I, n = 27.

One-way analysis of variance was used to analyze statistically teachers' responses to the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ). Results indicated that although respondents in the Authoritarian schools were more satisfied with communication than they were dissatisfied, they were less satisfied with all seven components of communication satisfaction than were teachers in the Professional schools. The difference in levels of communication satisfaction between teachers in Professional and Authoritarian schools for hypotheses 1 and 2, which dealt with general organizational perspective and personal feedback, were not significant at the .05 level. Testing of hypotheses 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, involving organizational integration, communication with superiors, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality, resulted in differences which were significant at the .05 level.

Findings

The following findings resulted from the study.

1. No significant difference was found in the teachers' perceptions of general organizational perspective in Authoritarian schools and those in Professional schools (p = .07). Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Items in this component reflected
information relating to the overall functioning of the organization such as policies, goals, and changes.

2. No significant difference was found in the teachers' perceptions of personal feedback in Authoritarian schools and those in Professional schools \((P = .17)\). Hypothesis 2 was rejected. Items in this component related to personal achievement and work and how it is recognized by the organization.

3. A statistically significant difference was found in teachers' perceptions of organizational integration in Authoritarian schools and those in Professional schools \((P = .03)\). Hypothesis 3 was accepted. Items in this component measured the individual's satisfaction with the information that is received concerning the organization, and the immediate work environment, including personnel news, employee benefits, and pay.

4. A statistically significant difference was found in teachers' perceptions of communication with superiors in Authoritarian schools and those in Professional schools \((P = .01)\). Hypothesis 4 was accepted. Items in this component referred to the two-way communication with superiors, including the extent to which the supervisor listens, pays attention to the employee, and is open to ideas.

5. A statistically significant difference was found in teachers' perceptions of communication climate in Authoritarian schools and those in Professional schools \((P = .02)\). Hypothesis 5 was accepted. Items in this component referred
to the communication at the organizational and personal levels including the extent to which communication motivates and stimulates employees to meet goals, the extent to which people in the organization have ability as communicators, and the extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communication channels.

6. A statistically significant difference was found in teachers' perceptions of horizontal communication in Authoritarian schools and those in Professional schools (P = .04). Hypothesis 6 was accepted. Items in this component related to the informal communication among fellow employees including the extent to which the grapevine is active in the organization and the extent to which horizontal and informal communication is accurate and free flowing.

7. A statistically significant difference was found in teachers' perceptions of media quality in Authoritarian schools and those in Professional schools (P = .03). Hypothesis 7 was accepted. Items in this component reflected the degree to which employees perceive the major forms of communication, such as memos and publications, as functioning effectively.

Additional Findings

A review of the data revealed the following additional findings. The first two of these findings were based on an authority factor mean score of 103.5 and a professional
factor mean score of 44.10 for the total twelve-school sample.

1. Two of the three largest schools were in the Chaotic group. Chaotic schools were identified by being below the means for the total sample on both authority and professional factor items on the SOI. On a continuum of bureaucratic structures, they were the most distant from Max Weber's ideal-type.

2. All three schools with female principals were in the Authoritarian group. Only schools with female principals were in the Authoritarian group. Authoritarian schools were identified by being above the mean for the total sample on authority factor items on the SOI and below the mean for the total sample on the professional factor items.

3. Teachers in the Authoritarian schools though satisfied with communication were less satisfied with all seven components of communication than were teachers in Weberian, Professional, and Chaotic schools. Teachers in the Professional schools were the most satisfied of all four groups with general organizational perspective, personal feedback, organizational integration, and media quality, and teachers in Weberian schools were the most satisfied with communication with superiors, communication climate, and horizontal communication.

4. Teachers in all groups were more satisfied with communication with superiors than any other component.
Organizational integration and horizontal communication were the next most satisfying. Media quality ranked the fourth most satisfying component in all four groups. General organization perspective was fifth and personal feedback was sixth. The least satisfying component was communication climate.

5. Eighty-one per cent of the subjects were satisfied with their jobs, but there were more who were dissatisfied with their jobs in the Weberian (20.7 per cent) and Authoritarian (21.2 per cent) schools than in the Professional (15.8 per cent) and Chaotic (15.1 per cent) schools.

The findings alluded to in this and the preceding section apply solely to the subjects of this study. The findings were contingent upon the variables considered, the conditions under which the study was conducted, and the instruments used to collect the data.

Major Conclusions

The following major conclusions were reached from the findings of the study. These conclusions apply only to the subjects of this study. They can be generalized only to the population studied.

1. Teachers in schools which are Professional in their bureaucratic structure are more satisfied with five components of communication than were teachers in Authoritarian schools. The five components are organizational integration,
communication with superiors, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality.

2. Teachers' perceptions of general organizational perspective and of personal feedback do not vary significantly whether their schools are Authoritarian or Professional.

It can be concluded that teachers in schools with a Professional bureaucratic structure are more satisfied with communications than teachers in Authoritarian schools, since the teachers in the Professional schools are more satisfied with five of the seven components of communication satisfaction.

Additional Conclusions

Additional conclusions which were reached from the findings of the study follow. As in the preceding section, it is necessary to restate that these conclusions apply only to the subjects of this study. They can be generalized only to the population studied.

1. The majority of subjects are satisfied with communications of the suburban school district in north Texas. The highest levels of satisfaction are in communication with superiors, organizational integration, and horizontal communication.

2. Larger schools tend to be Chaotic in their bureaucratic structure. Chaotic is that group of schools which
on a continuum of bureaucratic structure are most distant from Max Weber's ideal type.

3. Female principals tend to be in Authoritarian schools as defined in this study.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further research are made based on the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. The study should be replicated involving other populations to confirm the findings and conclusions. Specific recommendations include (a) the study should be replicated with secondary teachers in the district studied, (b) the study should be replicated with building-level administrators and with central-office administrators in the district studied, and (c) the study should be replicated in other school districts.

2. The study of organizational communications within educational organizations needs further study. Some specific topics recommended for future research include (a) formal communication between subordinates and superiors in schools, (b) horizontal communications in schools, (c) informal communications in schools, (d) the preparation of educators in the communication process, and (e) relationships between communication satisfaction and productivity of schools such as student achievement gains.
3. Studies relating to the bureaucratic structure of schools include (a) relationship of numbers of staff members to the bureaucratic structure of schools, (b) relationship of the sex of principals to the bureaucratic structure of schools, and (c) relationship of job satisfaction to the bureaucratic structure of schools.

Recommendations

Specific recommendations for the school district studied include the following.

1. The administrative personnel of the district should recognize the bureaucratic structure of the individual school does influence teachers' levels of satisfaction with five of the seven components of communication. Principals with Authoritarian leadership styles should initiate efforts to make communication more satisfying to teachers.

2. The items of the communication climate component received a lesser degree of satisfaction than the other components of communication satisfaction. Recommendation is made for the administrators of the district to implement methods to motivate and stimulate educators to meet school system goals, to aid educators in the communicating process, and to handle conflicts appropriately through proper channels.

3. Another area of needed improvement was in the personal feedback component items. Although every educator
is formally evaluated yearly, a plan is needed to improve the communication process for information flow related to personal achievement and work and of recognition for those by the organization.

Additional Recommendations

Additional recommendations include the following.

1. Institutions which prepare educational administrators should make future principals aware of the types of bureaucratic structures and of the components of communication which need the most attention to be satisfying to teachers in each of these groups.

2. Professional organizations for administrators should inform their members of the components of communication which teachers find more satisfying in various bureaucratic structures.

3. Other school districts should be aware of the conclusions of this study and through inservice training make their principals aware that teachers' perceptions of communication satisfaction vary according to the bureaucratic structure of their schools.
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Appendix A

The School Organizational Inventory
(Punch, 1967)

Following is a list of items that may be used to describe the way your school operates. The items describe typical conditions that occur within a school. Please indicate to what extent each of these descriptions characterizes YOUR SCHOOL. Please do NOT evaluate the items as "good" or "bad" conditions, but read each item carefully and decide how well the statement describes your school. Although some items may appear similar, they express important differences. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability of consistency in answering. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe this school, as accurately as possible.

It is important that your answers be "independent," so please do not discuss them with other teachers.

Please be frank in your responses with the assurance that all responses are strictly confidential.

Please respond to EVERY item.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how the statement describes your school.

c. DECIDE to what extent the condition described is true in your school.

d. DRAW a circle around one of the five letters following the item to show your answer.

A = VERY FREQUENTLY or ALWAYS true
B = OFTEN true
C = OCCASIONALLY true
D = SELDOM true
E = VERY RARELY or NEVER true
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I get approval for decisions I make ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rules stating when teachers arrive and depart from the building are strictly followed ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotions are based on how well you are liked ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers are required to sponsor activities for which they have no suitable background ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The time for informal get-togethers during the school day is strictly regulated ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Red tape is a problem in getting a job done in this school ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The organization sponsors staff get-togethers ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers receive help from the custodial staff in setting up audio-visual equipment ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Staff members here do almost as they please in classroom work ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students are treated within the rules of the school, no matter how serious a problem they have ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There isn't much chance for a promotion unless you are &quot;in&quot; with the administration ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>We follow strict operating procedures at all times ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A person who wants to make his own decisions would quickly become discouraged in this school ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teachers in this school follow a set of rules and regulations ... A B C D E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 Teachers do their own preparing of stencils for classroom use . . . . . A B C D E
16 Going through the proper channels is important in this school . . . . . A B C D E
17 Assignment of teaching duties is made without regard for the teacher's training or qualification . . . . . A B C D E
18 Staff meetings proceed in a friendly and informal manner . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
19 We do a lot of paper work which could be done by a school office staff . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
20 Even small matters are referred to someone higher up for a final answer . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
21 Teachers are periodically evaluated for competence in the job . . . . . A B C D E
22 Standardized classroom methods and procedures are used by all teachers . . A B C D E
23 For student behavior problems, the school has standard punishments for standard offenses, regardless of the individual involved . . . . . . . A B C D E
24 There can be little action until decisions are approved . . . . . . A B C D E
25 The instructional program is departmentalized into specific subject areas with specific teachers assigned . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
26 Teachers do not leave their classrooms unless they have permission . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
27 Whenever we have a problem, we go to the same person for an answer . . . . . . A B C D E
28 No matter how special a pupil's or parent's problem appears to be, he is treated the same way as anyone else . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
A record of every staff member's job performance is kept. 

Discipline problems are referred to a definite person within the school.

Nothing is said if you get to school just before roll call or leave right after dismissal occasionally.

Relationships among staff members are formal and impersonal.

No one can get necessary supplies without permission from the principal or vice-principal.

Written orders from higher up are followed unquestioningly.

We follow standard procedures in dealing with most situations which arise.

People make their own decisions here without checking with anyone else.

Teachers are careful not to violate the rules in this school.

Teachers follow clearly specified procedures for doing the job here.

Many teachers are hired simply because they have attractive personalities.

I ask someone higher up before I do almost anything.

Teachers are aware of rules regarding their behavior in and around the school.

I feel that I am my own boss in most matters.
Teaching here involves a variety of tasks and responsibilities from day to day.

Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.

Teachers experiment with procedures for classroom teaching and other work.

Teachers' closest friends are other staff members at this school.

How things are done in the classroom is pretty much up to the individual teacher.

Promotion is not on personal preferences of the selectors, but on an objective evaluation of teacher capabilities.
Appendix B

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire
(C. W. Downs & M. D. Hazen, copyright, 1973)

INTRODUCTION. Most of us assume that the quality and amount of communication in our jobs contribute to both our job satisfaction and our productivity. Through this study we hope to find out how satisfactory our communication practices are and what suggestions you have for improving them. Your answers are completely confidential so be as frank as you wish. This is not a test--your opinion is the only right answer. Do not sign your name; we do not wish to know who you are. The answers will be combined into groups for reporting purposes.

1. How satisfied are you with your job? (Check one.)

   ___ 1. Very dissatisfied  ___ 5. Slightly satisfied
   ___ 2. Dissatisfied          ___ 6. Satisfied
   ___ 3. Somewhat dissatisfied  ___ 7. Very satisfied
   ___ 4. Indifferent

A. Listed below are several kinds of information often associated with a person's job. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the amount and/or quality of each kind of information, by circling the appropriate number at the right.

   1 = Very satisfied
   2 = Satisfied
   3 = Slightly satisfied
   4 = Indifferent
   5 = Somewhat dissatisfied
   6 = Dissatisfied
   7 = Very dissatisfied

   2. Information about my progress in my job . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   3. Personal news . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   4. Information about school system policies and goals . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   5. Information about how my job compares with others . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   6. Information about how I am being judged . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   7. Recognition of my efforts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Information about departmental policies and goals ............... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Information about the requirement of my job .................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Information about government action affecting my school system .............. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Information about relations with unions .................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled ............... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Information about employee benefits and pay ............................ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Information about school system financial standing .................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Information about accomplishments and/or failures of the school system ........ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following. (Circle the appropriate number at the right.)

16. Extent to which my superiors know and understand the problems faced by subordinates .............. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Extent to which school communication motivates and stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting its goals ............. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Extent to which my supervisor listens and pays attention to me ............... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Extent to which the people in my organization have great ability as communicators ...................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance for solving job-related problems .................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. Extent to which the school system's communication makes me identify with it or feel a vital part of it ........ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Extent to which the school system's publications are interesting and helpful.

23. Extent to which my supervisor trusts me.

24. Extent to which I receive on time the information needed to do my job.

25. Extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communications channels.

26. Extent to which the grapevine is active in our organization.

27. Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas.

28. Extent to which horizontal communication with other employees is accurate and free-flowing.

29. Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies.

30. Extent to which my work group is compatible.

31. Extent to which our meetings are well organized.

32. Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right.

33. Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise.

34. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication in the school system are basically healthy.

35. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate.

36. Extent to which the amount of communication in the school system is about right.
July 21, 1982

Everett Williams
NTSU
4519 Arcady
Dallas, TX 75205

Dear Mr. Williams:

I am happy to give you permission to use the Com Sat questionnaire for your dissertation. In return, I would like to receive a copy of the study and duplicate set of computer cards.

Sincerely,

Cal W. Downs
Professor
Organizational Communication
Appendix D
Richardson Independent School District

April 20, 1983

Mr. Everett Williams
4519 Arcady
Dallas, Texas 75205

Dear Mr. Williams:

Your request to conduct research in the Richardson Independent School District has been reviewed and approved by this office. This letter is your official notification to begin your study, "Relationship of Bureaucratic Structure to Communication Satisfaction of Teachers in a Suburban Texas School District."

Please advise us when you have completed your study. We look forward to receiving a copy of your final report.

Thank you for your interest in the Richardson Independent School District.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rex A. Carr
Deputy Superintendent
Planning, Development and Evaluation

400 S. Greenville Avenue   Richardson, Texas 75081   214/238-8111
Appendix E

Verbatim Instructions for Administration of Instruments

Thank you for your cooperation in responding to two questionnaires. One is on school organizational patterns and the other is on employee satisfaction with communications. There are no right or wrong or good or bad answers.

Student teachers, aides, secretaries, and principals are not being asked to respond. Substitutes should respond only if they have been in the building for four of the past six weeks.

No one will know your individual responses. We do not want your name on your questionnaire. School group responses will be statistically analyzed to help in the overall administration of our district's schools.

The School Organization Inventory may take a little over fifteen minutes, but the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire should take less than ten minutes.

Please read the introduction and directions on each test before beginning it. When you finish, leave your questionnaires with me. Thank you again.
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