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The purposes of this study were to assess the organizational climate of selected elementary and secondary attendance centers in Texas and to determine if there is a relationship between certain variables and the openness of the climate in these attendance centers. The variables considered in this study were: 1. the length of a principal's incumbency; 2. the age of a principal; 3. the size of the professional staff; 4. the departments of instruction in secondary attendance centers; 5. the grade levels of instruction in the elementary attendance centers.

All public school districts in Texas with an average daily attendance of 5,000 or more were included. Random selection was used to determine the sample of districts to be included. A stratified sample of seventy-five attendance centers was then chosen. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was administered. A correlational study design was used utilizing Pearson-product moment statistical techniques.
There was a positive correlation between the openness or closedness of the organizational climate of an attendance center. No significant correlations were found for the other variables studied.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The statement "as the principal goes, so goes the school" suggests a truism that what a principal does has an impact upon the educational atmosphere in a public school. The principal exerts a meaningful influence upon the quality of instruction, and his actions affect the morale of staff and students alike. His influence can be detected in all staff relationships and attitudes. The general operation of the entire attendance center reflects the personality of the principal. He is the officially designated leader within a specific attendance center. He practices his art at the point of the learning experience in the public school. Therefore, a relationship between the type of learning atmosphere on a school campus and the behavioral pattern of the building principal could exist.

A principal is confronted by three major sets of responsibilities. First, he is responsible to the community served; students, parents, and patrons comprise this community. Secondly, he is responsible to the members of his own professional staff. This group includes teachers, outside supportive staff, assistant principals, and counselors. Thirdly, he is responsible to the
superintendent, the board of education, and other central administrative staff. These three responsibilities are group pressures which affect "organizational climate." The group-principal interactions are the factors which produce climate.

Organizational climate is generally defined in terms of feelings, or the affective domain. Andrew W. Halpin states,

As any teacher or school executive moves from one school to another he is inexorably struck by the differences he encounters in organizational climates. He voices his reaction with such remarks as, "You don't have to be in school very long before you feel the atmosphere of a place" (13, p. 2).

School staffs are described as "noisy," "on edge," "they shout a lot," "friendly," "warm," "talkative," and "receptive." School principals are described as "emphasizing authority or status," "giving the impression of being too busy," and "striving toward correctness." These terms are attempts at describing organizational behavior. Andrew Halpin makes the concept more understandable when he states, "Personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization" (13, p. 131).

Dante Lupini stated the need for study in this area when he wrote, "Effective leadership of the administrator depends upon an accurate diagnosis of the reality of the situation in which he finds himself" (19, p. 7). Other authorities in climate research have raised some specific
questions. Can a systematic method be developed that will predict the general climate to be expected in a building if a given person is selected for the principal's position? Can a principal assess the organizational climate of an attendance center and effect changes within three to five years? How much time will it take for the principal's characteristics to be adopted by the staff to the degree that the desired climate is achieved (9, 10, 11, 23)? Fred E. Fielder, in his book Leader Attitudes and Group Effectiveness, states, "To determine why some groups become effective and why others disintegrate or remain only marginally productive is, therefore, of considerable importance to any agency or organization which must rely on teams" (5, p. 3).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to assess the associations which exist between the principal's behavior and the behavior of the professional staff as perceived by principals and staff members within selected, secondary and elementary attendance centers.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To determine the organizational climate in selected elementary and secondary attendance centers in Texas as
measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

2. To determine if an association does exist between the principal's leadership behavior and the organizational climate of an attendance center as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

3. To ascertain the effect of the length of a principal's incumbency in an attendance center on the openness of the organizational climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

4. To ascertain the effect of the chronological age of the building principal on the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

5. To ascertain the effect of the size of a school's professional staff on the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

6. To determine whether or not the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire may be identified by the openness score of one of the instructional departments within a secondary attendance center.

7. To determine whether or not the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as measured
by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire may be identified by the openness scores of the primary grade teachers (kindergarten through third) or the openness scores of the intermediate grade teachers (fourth through sixth).

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is a significant positive association between organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the principal and the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

2. There is a significant positive association between the length of a principal's incumbency within an attendance center and the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

3. There is a significant positive association between the chronological age of principals and the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

4. There is a significant positive association between the size of an attendance center's staff and the openness
of the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

5. There is a significant positive association between the mean openness score of principals and the mean openness scores of a department of instruction (language arts, social science, mathematics, science, business, music, industrial arts, physical education, athletics, special education, and vocational programs) within those secondary attendance centers included in this study when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

6. There is a significant positive association between the mean openness scores of principals and the mean openness scores of primary grade teachers (kindergarten through third); and the mean openness scores of the intermediate grade teachers (fourth through sixth) within those elementary attendance centers included in this study when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

Background and Significance

One of the major crisis in the nation's schools seems to be the lack of leadership. The vast majority of administrators do not possess the leadership skills necessary to meet the increasing demand for a variety of serves from the educational enterprise (7). Two major studies, one conducted by the League of Cooperating Schools in California and
another by Goldhammer and Becker, have amply demonstrated that nowhere is the leadership crisis more acute than among school principals (7). Therefore, it is important to examine the relationship between the principal's behavior and the organizational climate of a school.

The principal is one person who can stimulate more productive educational programs in an attendance center. The school principal is one step removed from the immediate classroom and his behavior in interaction with the teachers is of key importance in determining the quality of the educational experience that takes place in the school. Therefore, the selection of people to fill this administrative position is a primary task confronting superintendents. Selection of a principal requires consideration of personal variables relating to age, sex, marital status, intelligence, health, personality, and value patterns plus situational variables related to organizational climate (23).

Researchers do not all agree that the principal changes staff behavior. Some research (3, 18, 19, 29) indicates that interaction between elementary principals and school staffs has a socializing effect on principal behavior. Research supporting this contention has usually been done at the elementary level. Other research indicates that a principal does change staff behavior (1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 22, 12). These studies indicate that a principal's values and orientation are reflected in the staff (11).
Andrew Halpin, at Ohio State University, in the early 1950's developed the Leadership Description Questionnaire, which identified specific styles of leadership on a continuum from structured to non-structured and from high to low on concern (10). D. B. Croft joined Halpin at the University of Chicago where they developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, which identified climates of school staffs on a continuum from open to closed. These studies were based on two general assumptions (11, 13): first, that a principal's leadership style as perceived by the staff is reflected in the organizational climate of that school, and, secondly, that an "open" organizational climate is more desirable for instruction than is a "closed" one. Halpin and Croft have been leaders in the study of organizational climate since the early 1960's.

Research to date indicates that there are identifiable behavior characteristics both of the building principal and the organizational climate of a particular building staff (2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 16, 18, 22, 27, 28, 29). This study utilizes the work of Halpin and Croft in which they identified organizational climates using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) (13). However, this study differs from other studies in the following ways:

1. This study considers the length of the incumbency of a principal in an attendance center in relationship to the organizational climate within that attendance center.
2. This study compares the size of a school's professional staff to ascertain whether a relationship exists between size and "open" to "closed" organizational climates.

3. This study assesses the perceptions of organizational climate by departments of instruction. It compares language arts, social science, mathematics, science, business, music, industrial arts, physical education, athletics, special education, and vocational programs with the organizational climate in each secondary attendance center.

4. This study examines the perceptions of organizational climate by primary and intermediate grade teachers. The primary and intermediate grade teachers' perception of climate is compared to the climate of the same attendance center to see if either group's perception is more congruent with the total attendance center's climate.

Principals perceive school climates as being more "open" than do the members of their professional staff (5, 6). Therefore, it is as important to know how the principal is perceived by the staff as it is to determine how he perceives that climate. A practical result of this study would be to provide assistance in the selection of building principals. It is judged to be of equal importance to know about the climate of the building as well as about the man or woman being considered to serve as principal within the attendance center (17).
Definition of Terms

**Leadership behavior** is the result of the interaction between the group expectations of the principal's role and his need dispositions (9).

**Schools** are hereafter referred to as attendance centers.

**Organizational climate** is conceptualized as the interaction between the task-achievement and the needs satisfaction dimensions within the organization (9).

**Disengagement** refers to the teachers' tendencies to be "not with it." It focuses upon the teachers' behavior in task-oriented situations (13).

**Hindrance** refers to the teachers' feelings that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary "busy work" (13).

**Esprit** refers to the teachers' feelings that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their jobs (13).

**Intimacy** refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other (13).

**Production emphasis** refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff (13).
Thrust refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization" (13).

Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers "humanely," to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms (13).

Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He goes "by the book: and prefers to be guided by rules and policies" (13).

Attendance center refers to one local school campus within a school district as identified by the Texas Education Agency (26).

Limitations

1. The scope of this study was limited to twenty-five Texas school districts, randomly selected from those districts with an average daily attendance of 5,000 or more, as identified by the Texas Education Agency (26).

2. This study uses the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire as a battery of tests.

3. This was a correlational study; correlation does not imply causality.
Instrumentation

The **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire** was developed during the early 1960's as an outgrowth of earlier studies (4, 9, 10). It has been used extensively in combination with a variety of research designs trying to pinpoint and to evaluate the relationship between a variety of variables that relate to the principal and the organizational climate of an attendance center (15, 27, 29). Hayes and Andrew's analysis indicate that the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire** shows its greatest strength and validity as a battery of tests (1, 14). Recent studies have used it as a battery of tests to compare a variety of variables (17, 21, 24).

The **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire** Form IV, is comprised of sixty-four items. Andrew Halpin says, "These items produce eight subtests scores. The first four subtests refer primarily to the behavior of teachers; the second four, to the behavior of the principal" (11, p. 150). Andrew Halpin stated, "... that the eight subtests of the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire** could in fact, be received as a battery of tests, and that the information secured from this battery could be articulated into the present corpus of knowledge about organizational theory" (11, p. 166). Halpin further states that, "... our major purpose in the study was to describe the Organizational Climate of schools as perceived by their respective staffs.
In other words, thus far we have been dealing with eight separate subtests. . ." (11, p. 166). The openness score is not a sum of the eight subtests. It is a combination of three subtests. Esprit, plus Thrust minus Disengagement equals the openness score.

The development of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire provided a basis for the identification and naming of the eight dimensions that compose the Halpin and Croft conceptual model of organizational climate. Several hundred items were selected to compose preliminary forms of the questionnaire. The researchers summarized the scores for each attendance center and factor-analyzed the profiles of the original seventy-one attendance centers. Through this process they identified six groups which they conceptualized along a continuum defined by "open climate" at one end and "closed climate" at the other (12, pp. 166-174).

An extensive reappraisal of the Halpin and Croft model has been conducted by Andrew Hayes at the University of North Carolina and was reported to the New Orleans meeting of the American Educational Research Association in 1973. Hayes has defined several climate types as identified in his analytical study of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, as well as describing subtests that identify the behavior of principal and climate (14).
The dimensions of climate that relate to the staff are
disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy. The
dimensions of climate that relate to the principal are
production emphasis, thrust, consideration, and aloofness.

John H. M. Andrews conducted the most extensive validity
study of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
through his analysis of the data from 165 attendance centers
in Canada. These studies established the reality of the
Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire in secondary
attendance centers as well as elementary attendance centers.
Of significance is the fact that Andrews found the eight subtest
scores are good measures of what they purport to measure. He
reported that the subtests are better predictors of the social
interaction between the principal and his staff and objected
to the use of discrete climate categories as defined in the
original study by Halpin and Croft (1).

The validity and reliability of the Organizational
Climate Description Questionnaire were assessed by Halpin and
Croft in their report (11); the reliability is reported at .92
using the split-half and the split-respondent method (11).
The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were
reappraised by Hayes in his 1973 paper; he reports the canon-
ic reliability at .90 (14).
Procedures for Collection of Data

The data were collected for this study by administering the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to a random sampling of attendance centers in Texas. Twenty-five school districts with an average daily attendance of 5,000 or more were randomly selected for the study from the 1977-78 Texas School Directory (26). The professional staff of the attendance centers from the twenty-five districts became the population from which a stratified sample was drawn. This sample population comprised the professional staff of seventy-five attendance centers. Each district was contacted to secure the cooperation of the superintendent and his staff, and a letter of introduction and explanation was mailed to each principal included in the study. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was administered to each building staff during the 1977-78 school year. Buildings and individuals were identified by numbers to ensure anonymity.

Treatment of Data

Automatic data processing by the computer center at North Texas State University was used for the analysis of the data. Data obtained from each professional staff member were key punched onto IBM cards. The procedures used in this study were those used by Halpin and Croft in their original study (13).
Correlations between the variables and the subtests were obtained. Hypothesis one was tested by grouping attendance centers according to openness scores and computing a correlation coefficient. Hypotheses two and three were tested by grouping the principals according to each of the variables and computing correlations between the groups of principals and the attendance centers to determine whether a significant relationship existed. Hypothesis four was tested by grouping the schools according to size and computing correlations. Hypotheses five and six were tested by grouping teachers by areas and levels of instruction and relating correlationally the mean score of each group to the mean score of the principals.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In a review of the literature pertaining to organizational climate, it became apparent that an abundance of sources existed. Early work in organizational climate tended to be general in scope, whereas recent research has tended to become narrower in scope and has been limited to a small number of variables. This review will move from the general to the specific, beginning with definitions of an organization and ending with a review of organizational climate studies relating to principals, teachers, and attendance centers.

Organizations and Organizational Management

Definitions of organizations are many and varied. They are complex and simple. According to Griffiths and others, "organization is the function of administration which attempts to relate and ultimately fuse the purposes of an institution and the people who comprise its working parts" (23, p. 10). Gaus defines organization as the grouping "of personnel for facilitating the accomplishments of some agreed purpose through the allocation of functions and responsibilities" (21, p. 11). Presthus sees
organization as "large fairly permanent social systems
designed to achieve limited objectives through the coordi-
nated activities of their members" (53, p. 2). Adderfer
defines the concept of organizational climate as composed
of relationships between need satisfactions and organiza-
tional variables (1).

Organizations today are generally described as repre-
senting a blending together of two widely accepted and
earlier held concepts, that of formal and informal organi-
zations. Owens points out that, since, 1900,

. . . we have passed through two recognizable
periods in which sharply differing ideas of what
organizations are like and how they should be
administered have emerged. It seems clear that
we are now in a third stage; a distinguishing
characteristic of the present era is that rather
than being an outright rejection of all that
preceded it, its era represents a . . . synthesis
of important earlier understandings and new know-
ledge and understanding. The three periods are
the: . . . era of scientific management, which
gave rise to the . . . classical theory of adminis-
tration, about 1910-1935, . . . human relations
era, about 1935-1950, . . . era of the behavioral
approach, about 1950 to the present (51, p. 46).

Luthans feels that the major difference between formal and
informal organizations "is that the formal organization
has officially prescribed goals and relationships while
the informal one does not" (43, p. 458).

Managing, or the art of controlling, organizations
has been studied by many. Hersey and Blanchard define
management as "working with and through individuals and
groups to accomplish organizational goals" (34, p. 3).
Henri Fayol focused his studies on the manager rather than on the worker. He separated the processes of administration from the other operations in the organization, and stressed the common elements of the processes of administration among various organizations (17). Fayol defined administration as having five components: to plan, to organize, to command, to coordinate, and to control. He stressed flexibility and a sense of proportion as essential elements for managers (17).

Human Relations and Organizational Management

The human relations concept of organization stems largely from the work of Elton Mayo and his associates. They discovered that "people do not work only for the money they earn, although . . . money is important, but they feel a keen satisfaction in belonging to a group and adhering to its standards and expectations; thus, the concept of morale was born (51, p. 27). Mayo and his associates found that

1. The "output" of a worker--hence, the output of the organization--is determined more by his social capacity than his physical capacity.
2. Money is only one motivation for working in an organization; there are others, and perhaps more important rewards that the worker seeks.
3. Highly specialized division of labor is not the most likely way of maximizing efficiency of an organization.
4. Individual workers react to the organization--its hierarchy, its rules, and its reward system--not as individuals, but as members of groups (51, pp. 47-48).
Administrators in all kinds of organizations, including attendance centers, began to be concerned about people who worked for and with them. In attendance centers this concern took the form of "democratic" supervision and administration. The "emphasis was placed on the 'payoff' of personnel policies that recognized morale problems and the wisdom of involving a wide spectrum of staff in decision making" (51, p. 29).

Yoder summarized the view of human relations theorists when he pointed out that they

. . . emphasized the potential influence of group behavior norms, the individual job satisfaction, morale, personal identification with the organization and its goals, and changing perceptions of role and status. Theorists question the adequacy of economic explanations of working behavior (63, p. 114).

Experimental research became an indispensable tool in developing and testing organizational theory to the practitioner of the human relations concepts.

Luthans views the scientific management study that was conducted at the Hawthorne works of the Western Electric Company in Chicago between 1927 and 1932 by Elton Mayo and others as "... the starting point of the behavioral approach to management" (43, p. 23). This project attempted to determine the effects of varying degrees of illumination on worker productivity. Mayo and his colleagues discovered that employee behavior was affected more by
psychological conditions coming from informal organizations rather than by the physical aspects of the environment.

Luthans draws two important conclusions from the Hawthorne studies:

First, the Hawthorne studies are the first time that the intensive systematic analysis was made of the human factor in management . . . the studies pointed out, and the years of controversy surrounding the results substantiate the extreme complexity of the human element. This complexity is present especially when humans interact in a small group under various organizational conditions. The second major conclusion is that climate of supervision has an important impact on the behavior of work groups . . . the supervisory climate has the ability to influence a work group to react in a positive or negative manner toward formal organizational goal attainment (43, p. 23).

The emergence of democratic district and attendance center administration and supervision was rooted in the concepts developed from the work of these researchers, and their studies still have implications for the successful and effective management of districts and attendance centers.

Modern Theories of Motivation

Modern theories of motivation have been developed by several writers. Their contributions have centered in studies related to work motivation and are usually referred to as motivation theories for management. Two of the most noteworthy figures in this field are Douglas M. McGregor and Abraham Maslow.
McGregor theorized and attempted to explain the aspects of the nature of man. He postulated two very practical theories, X and Y. Both theories of management were based on opposing assumptions about human behavior. On the one hand, theory X postulates that

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all (47, pp. 33-34).

Theory X follows the lines of the classical theorists who wanted employees carefully directed and controlled. It is based on the concept that man is basically motivated by economic reward.

Theory Y, on the other hand, is based on the assumption that man seeks to grow and develop a sense of integrity, fullness of personality, and feeling of self-worth. Theory Y postulates that

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
2. External control and threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions not only to accept but to seek responsibility.
5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly distributed in the populations.

6. Under the condition of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized (47, pp. 47-48).

McGregor summarized the central principle that comes from theory X and theory Y as follows:

"The central principle of organization which derives from theory X is that of direction and control through the exercise of authority... The central principle which derives from theory Y is that of integration: the creation of conditions such that the members of the organization can achieve their own goals but by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise (47, p. 49)."

Abraham Maslow introduced the theory that human beings are characterized by a motive called self-actualization. This motive causes them to strive to reach fully their possibilities for dignity, self-worth, and creativity (45). According to Kagan, Maslow's views "must be taken largely on faith." His theory does not lend "itself to experimental proof or disproof" (39, p. 327). Maslow's theory postulates that

"... human motives are arranged in ... (a) kind of pyramid. Once the psychological motives at the bottom have been satisfied, humans are freed to seek the goals (at the next level) ... and so on up the top (39, p. 327)."

The six levels, in ascending order, are psychological requirements, security, social affiliation, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization. This approach, according to Owens,
... to understanding motivations is behavior-oriented and represents an attempt to explain human participation in an organization on a far more sophisticated and potentially useful level than McGregor's theory X or the simple theory of "economic man" (51, pp. 30-31).

Frederick Herzberg enlarged, extended, and refined the theories of Maslow and McGregor. He states that there are two views of man, for "the human animal has two categories of needs." One category deals with animal needs—food, safety, and other basic requirements. Herzberg refers to these as "hygiene factors." They are "those rewards which the organization offers to meet the lower motivational needs of participants" (51, p. 32). Added to those are fears that people have learned to attach to these basic drives and needs (51). The second category, or the other part of man's nature, is "man's compelling urge to realize his own potentiality by continuous psychological growth" (34, p. 56).

Administrative Theory and Organization

In 1938, Chester Barnard, the President of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, published a book based on his thirty years' experience in business (8). Griffiths points out that "most, if not all, of the present theories in the marketplace have their genesis in Barnard" (23, p. 63). Barnard stated that

Organization, simple or complex, is always an impersonal system of coordinated human efforts; always there is purpose as the coordinating and
unifying principle; always there is the indispensable ability to communicate, always the necessity for personal willingness, and for effectiveness and efficiency in maintaining the integrity of purpose and the continuity of contributions (8, pp. 94-95).

In his book, Barnard dealt with the theory of formal organizations. He believed that the study of administrative behavior should be grounded in the social sciences. Barnard felt that both "effectiveness" and "efficiency" should be present in an organization. "Effectiveness" to him "was the accomplishment of the recognized objectives of cooperative action," and "efficiency," in his opinion, was "the ability of the organization to sustain the continued participation of individuals by offering adequate satisfactions" (8, pp. 55-57). The incongruency, according to Argyris, occurs...

... between the needs of the mature employee and the requirements of the formal organization...

The employee who experiences frustration, conflict, failure, and short-time perspective may leave the organization, climb the employment ladder, or defend his self-concept and adapt through the use of defense mechanism; he may pressure himself to stay by lowering his work standards and becoming apathetic and uninterested, placing more value on material rewards, or teaching his children not to expect satisfaction on the job (5, pp. 78-94).

E. Wright Baklee, in discussing the informal organizational benefits, stated that "the organization to some degree remakes the individual and the individual to some degree remakes the organization" (7, pp. 12-13).

Davis sees numerous practical benefits accruing from the informal organization.
1. It blends with the formal organization to make a workable system for getting work done.
2. It lightens the workload of the formal manager and fills in some of the gaps in his abilities.
3. It gives satisfaction and stability to work groups.
4. It is a very useful channel of communication in the organization.
5. Its presence encourages a manager to plan and act more carefully than he would otherwise (12, pp. 257-259).

Haiman and Scott feel that it is folly for management to suppose that the functioning of the formal system alone can provide the entire range of satisfaction necessary for high spirit among employees. The informal organization has a positive contribution to make in this respect. As such it should be nurtured by management (25, p. 435).

Argyris states that

... if the organization's goals are to be achieved, and knowing that both (the individual and the organization) will always strive for self-actualization, it follows that effective leadership behavior is "fusing" the individual and the organization in such a way that both simultaneously obtain optimum self-actualization. The process of the individual using the organization to fulfill his needs and simultaneously the organization "using" the individuals to achieve its demands has been called by Baklee the fusion process (5, p. 13).

Rensis Likert has conducted extensive studies on the complex problem of administration. His approach has been to identify principles of leadership and management which result in the best job performance, by considering both human and capital resources as assets (41). Likert found that the prevailing management styles of organizations can
be represented along a continuum from System 1 through System 4. He describes these systems as follows:

**System 1**—Management is seen as having no confidence or trust in subordinates, since they are seldom involved in any aspect of the decision-making process. The bulk of the decision and goal setting of the organization are made at the top and issued down the chain of command. Subordinates are forced to work with fear, threats, punishment, and occasional rewards and need satisfaction at the psychological and safety levels. The little superior-subordinate interaction that does take place is usually with fear and mistrust. While the control process is highly concentrated in top management, an informal organization generally develops which opposes the goals of the formal organization.

**System 2**—Management is seen as having condescending confidence and trust in subordinates, such as master has toward servants; while the bulk of the decision and goal setting of the organization are made at the top, many decisions are made within prescribed framework at lower levels. Rewards and some actual or potential punishment are used to motivate workers. Any superior-subordinate interaction takes place with some condescension by superiors and fear and caution by subordinates. While the control process is still concentrated in top management, some is delegated to middle or lower levels. An informal organization usually develops, but it does not always resist formal organizational goals.

**System 3**—Management is seen as having substantial but not complete confidence and trust in subordinates. While broad policy and general decisions are kept at the top, subordinates are permitted to make more specific decisions at lower levels. Communication flows both up and down the hierarchy. Rewards, occasional punishment, and some involvement are used to motivate workers. There is a moderate amount of superior-subordinate interaction, often with a fair amount of confidence and trust. Significant aspects of the control process are delegated downward with a feeling of responsibility at both higher and
lower levels. An informal organization may develop, but it may either support or partially resist goals of the organization.

System 4--Management is seen as having complete confidence and trust in subordinates. Decision making is widely dispensed throughout the organization, although well integrated. Communication flows not only up and down the hierarchy but among peers. Workers are motivated by participation and involvement in developing economic rewards, setting goals, improving methods, and appraising progress toward goals. There is extensive friendly superior-subordinate interaction with a high degree of confidence and trust. There is widespread responsibility for the control process, with the lower units fully involved. The formal and informal organizations are often one and the same. Thus all social forces support efforts to achieve stated organizational goals (41, pp. 4-10).

It can be seen that System 1 is a task-oriented, highly structured, and authoritarian management style. System 4, however, is a relationship-oriented management style. It is based on teamwork, confidence, and mutual trust. Systems 2 and 3 are intermediate stages. Systems 1 and 4 are similar to McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y.

Andrew Halpin has stated that it was not until the post-World War II period that school administrators became "aware of the role of theory and have come to recognize the contributions that social scientists can make to our understanding of educational administration" (28, p. 3). The development of theory in educational administration, according to Halpin, was beset by problems from three major sources which can be classified "roughly as substantive, communicative, and motivational" (28, p. 6). Halpin further states,
our efforts . . . have been impeded by three substantive problems: (1) We have not been clear about the meaning of theory. (2) We have tended to be preoccupied with taxonomies and have confused these with theories. (3) We have not been sure of the precise domains of a theory we are seeking to devise . . . to discuss the problem of developing theory in administration, the use of language arises. Practitioners and theorists must work together in developing theory and must be able to communicate with each other . . . (28, pp. 6-20).

Organizational Climate

The concept of organizational climate is relatively new to administrative research. As the theories of organizational behavior developed, the use of the concept of climate developed.

In a case study of behavior in a bank, Argyris was able to identify four levels of analysis within the organization. It was the combination of these four levels of analysis that served "to create a model of living complexity known as the climate of an organization" (55, p. 501). The four levels he identified within the organization are the

formal organizational variables such as policies, practices, and job descriptions which are used to induce members of the organizations to behave in such a way that the organization can achieve its objectives and maintain itself.

. . . personality variables such as needs, abilities, values, self-concepts, and defenses inducing organization members to behave in such a way that they may express their personality.

. . . complicated informal variables resulting from a person's attempting to adapt to formal organization while at the same time allowing for some self-expression.
... the organizational behavior level, is a discrete legitimate level of analysis having different properties, from the formal, the personality, or the informal levels of analysis (5, p. 501).

Matthews, in studying the organizational climate of nine hospitals, found that those hospitals having a clearly-defined social and technological philosophy retained their nurses longer than hospitals that had a contradictory nature in their administrative orientation (46). In her investigation she measured five dimensions of climate—leadership, decision-making, goal integration, influence, and personal relations. She placed these five dimensions on a continuum that ranged from a social philosophy to a technological philosophy of administration.

Taginre points out that in "the concept of organization climate: there is a lack of agreement on a definition of climate (59, pp. 35-36)." He points out, however, that climate refers to some features or characteristics of the environment. He further states that the features or characteristics may be responsible for the behavior of an individual or a group to which the individual is somehow responsive. In Taginre's opinion, it appears that, if everything else is held constant, climate and behavior converge. He proposes that, for the purpose of accounting for the behavior of the individual or groups, climate may be thought of as a concept which stands between the broadest concept of environment and specific concepts such as situation, behavioral setting, and
conditions. Taginre defines the concept of "climate of an organizational setting" as

a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of the organization, that is (a) experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (not attitudes) of the organization (59, p. 27).

There are different kinds of organizational climate, just as there are different types of personalities among people. Various labels are used in the literature to categorize organizational climates. The two most often seen are "open" climate and "closed" climate (21, 28, 43).

Lippitt states that if Rokeach's characteristics of open-closed systems were applied to organizations it would be observed that an organization system is open to the extent that the specific content of beliefs by the people in the organization is to the effect that the organizational work life environment is primarily friendly; it is closed when the work world is seen as a threat.

Open organization systems hold to a scheme of values founded in the belief that authority is rational and tentative, and that persons are not to be judged according to their agreement or disagreement with authority. In closed systems the value is that authority is considered absolute, and that persons are to be accepted or rejected in accordance with their relation to such authority.

Open organization systems will value and practice a relative open communication pattern among persons, and in a closed system the converse will apply (42, p. 48).

It has been pointed out that an "open system is in continual interaction with its environment and achieves a
steady state or dynamic equilibrium while still retaining the capacity for work" (29, p. 119).

The question of what type of organizational climate would be more desirable has generally been avoided by researchers, but Halpin has made several worthy suggestions. He takes a strong position favoring an open climate as desirable, stating that "the members of schools with closed climates are not sinners to be castigated, but victims to be helped" (28, pp. 136-137).

Leadership Studies Related to Attendance Centers

The emphasis on people that came from the human relations approach to management developed and matured from the early 1930's to the early 1950's and gave rise to studies of organizational leadership. Leadership has simply been viewed as the behavior of a person in the leadership role; a study of that person seeks to evaluate one's performance in that role. Sanford summarized the confusion surrounding studies of the leader:

From all these studies of the leader we can conclude with reasonable certainty that: . . . there are either no general leadership traits or if they do exist, they are not to be described in any of our familiar psychological or common-sense terms, . . . in a specific situation, leaders do have traits which set them apart from followers, but what traits set what leaders apart from what followers will vary from situation to situation (54, p. 5).
Numerous studies suggest that the behavior exhibited by leaders falls into categories or dimensions. The two terms most widely used are structure and consideration. According to Flanders,

Structure includes behavior in which the supervisor organizes and defines group activities and its relations to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects members to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production.

Consideration includes behavior indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This does not mean that this dimension reflects a superficial . . . kind of human relations behavior. This dimension appears to emphasize a deeper concern for group members needs and includes such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication (20).

At Ohio State University, Hemphill and Coons developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which consists of a series of short descriptive statements concerning the behavior of leaders. As a result of their research, they were able to include a wide range of behavior employed by leaders in their LBDQ (33). Luthans commented on the Ohio State studies:

The value of the studies to the historical foundation is their empirical determination of the functions of leadership. They were the first to point out and emphasize the importance of both task direction and consideration of individual needs in assessing leadership behavior. This two dimensional approach lessened the gap between the strict task orientation of the scientific management movement and the human
relations emphasis implied by the Hawthorne studies (43, p. 36).

During the Korean war, Halpin utilized the LBDQ with B-29 bomber flight crews as a part of a study of leadership problems in the military. He found that there is a "mix" of factors that seem to be important in the behavior pattern of leaders. Halpin discovered that two factors were significant for describing the differences in leader behavior of airplane commanders: (a) "Consideration," which he analyzed as behavior based on friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between plane commander and crew; and (b) "Initiating Structure," in which the plane commander defines role expectation for the crew and establishes well-defined patterns of organization, communication channels, and methods of job accomplishment (27).

There are many similarities between leader behavior of airplane commanders and school superintendents, as Halpin points out (28, pp. 14-26). Although supervisors tend to see leader behavior differently from subordinates, "it seems clear that initiating structure and consideration are dimensions that are essential to the behavior of leaders . . . yet to be effective . . . the behavior of leaders must be genuine" (51, p. 124).
Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

The first attempt to establish a conceptual model of organizational climate in an attendance setting occurred in the early 1960's and was developed by Halpin and Croft. As a result of their own and others' experiences with the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), they developed an instrument to measure eight dimensions of the personality of an attendance center and six climate types. They observed that "as one moves to . . . schools, one finds that each appears to have a 'personality' of its own. It is this 'personality' that we describe . . . as the 'organizational climate' of the school" (28, pp. 135-137).

In developing their research, Halpin and Croft constructed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) to enable them "to portray the organization climate of an elementary school" (28, p. 131). The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire contains sixty-four Likert-type items. It can be administered in about thirty minutes, either individually or in a group situation.

Halpin and Croft used the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to analyze the organizational climate of seventy-one elementary attendance centers selected from six different regions of the United States. Their analyses were based upon the description of the selected attendance centers given by 1,151 respondents.
Each of the items was assigned to one of eight subtests which they delineated by factor-analytic techniques. Four of the subtests pertain to characteristics of the principal as a leader, and the other four subtests pertain to characteristics of the faculty as a group. The attendance center's organizational climate was developed from the scores on the subtests. Distinguishing characteristics of an attendance center's organizational climate can be perceived by comparing the different attendance center profiles (28, p. 133). The four dimensions of organizational climate which measure the teachers' behaviors, according to Halpin and Croft, are disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy; the four dimensions which measure the principals' behaviors are aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration (28, pp. 150-151).

Halpin and Croft identified six organizational climates based on the content of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire items through their research. The following are brief descriptions of the six organizational climates:

1. The Open Climate describes an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals and which provides satisfaction for the group members' social needs.

2. The Autonomous Climate is described as one in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group.
3. The **Controlled Climate** is best characterized as impersonal and highly task-oriented. The group's behavior is directed primarily toward task accomplishment.

4. The **Familiar Climate** is highly personal, but under-controlled. The members of this organization satisfy their social needs but pay relatively little attention to social control in respect to task accomplishment.

5. The **Paternal Climate** is best described as one in which the principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group and attempts to initiate most of these acts himself.

6. The **Closed Climate** is characterized by a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization. The organization is not "moving"; *esprit* is low because the group members secure neither social needs satisfaction or the satisfaction that comes from task achievement (21, pp. 2-3). It is important to note that the climate of an attendance center is open if the teachers perceive it as open. The **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**, therefore, is really a measure of perception.

In summarizing the classification of the seventy-one elementary attendance centers with regard to organizational climate, Halpin points out that

We may say from the profile analysis we have inferred **three parameters** which can be used
to conceptualize the social interactions that take place within an organization:

1. Authenticity: the "authenticity," or "openness" of the leaders and group members' behavior.

2. Satisfaction: the group members' attainment of cognizant satisfaction in respect to task accomplishment and social needs.

3. Leadership Initiation: the latitude within which the group members, as well as the leader, can initiate leadership acts (28, p. 192).

Stansbury found, in a validation of the study of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire in 139 Iowa elementary attendance centers using statistical procedures similar to those employed by Halpin, that questionnaire items grouped themselves as well as they did in Halpin's study, except for the subtests of trust and consideration. He further recommended that the use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire should be limited to the eight subtest scores (28). Many studies have supported the reliability of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. According to Hay and Appleberry, there is considerable support for both the validity and reliability of the instrument (4).

Hayes has conducted the most recent and most comprehensive study of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The main purpose of this study was "to determine the extent to which the ... Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire is currently useful for
supporting a conceptualization of the organizational climate of schools" (32, p. 1). Hayes' data revealed nine dimensions rather than the original eight described by Halpin and Croft. The aloofness dimension could not be identified from Hayes' data. Hayes pointed out that

It is the opinion of the investigator that the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire in its present form will measure, with different degrees of dependability, all the dimensions which are identified by Halpin and Croft except aloofness. Furthermore, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire will provide measures of Logistical Support and Object Socialization—the additional dimensions which were revealed by the analyses of the current data (32, p. 50).

Hayes' study is particularly significant when one considers that he used more sophisticated statistical procedures and third generation computers to assist him in conducting his investigation. Hayes also noted that in some school systems where teachers are affiliated with labor unions, the administrator behavior dimensions of climate may not be useful to define the climate of the schools. In many of these cases the administrator-teacher relationships are a matter of contractual requirements rather than a function of administrator-teacher interpersonal behavior. It has been the experience of the present author that teachers in labor-organized schools tend to respond to the items according to the contractual role of the administrator rather than his leadership characteristics (31, pp. 25-26).

It should be noted that in Texas a "loose" contractual agreement is made by local boards of education. These contracts describe salaries, fringe benefits, and general
working conditions. The contract clearly does not create unnecessary constraints or interactions between principals and teachers. Hayes' caution, however, would have to be viewed differently if the principals and teachers were in different negotiating units, or if the teachers in Texas were affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers rather than the National Education Association.

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
Studies Relating to Characteristics of Principals

Anderson, in a comparative study of personal variables of principals within three types of organizational climates, reported the following differences:

1. Principals in the closed climate schools were more evasive, more changeable and worrying, and more lacking in frustration tolerance than the principals in either of the other two groups.

2. Principals in the closed climate schools were more submissive, more dependent, more conventional and mild, more easily upset than principals in the open and middle climate schools.

3. Principals in the open climate schools were more confident, self-secure, self-confident, and cheerful than either of the other two groups of principals.

4. Principals in the open climate schools were more resourceful and self-sufficient than their sociably grouped dependent counterparts in the middle climate schools.

5. Principals in the open climate schools were more controlled and exacting, more successful in productive organizational activities than were the principals in the closed climate schools (2, pp. 67-68).

Feetler found a significant relationship between organizational process and leader behavior. The implication is
that positive regard for teachers exhibited by the principal is a determining factor in the organizational environment of the attendance center (18).

In a study conducted by Guy on the relationship of organizational climate to leadership and progress, the leadership of the principal was positively related to the subtest of Esprit (24). Schmidt sought to determine the relationship between organizational climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and leader behavior in principals as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. He found a significant correlation between leader behavior and the subtest of organizational climate (57).

Watkins, in his investigation of organizational climate in forty-eight elementary attendance centers in a large southern school system undergoing desegregation, drew the following conclusions:

1. The principal's attitudes do influence the staff.
2. The principal's perception of values and skills of his staff must be accurate as the staff's awareness of the priority he places on improved teaching.
3. Principals who had innovating staffs were attuned to the teachers' feelings and values and were better informed about their informal relationships. They were more professionally oriented than their colleagues with less innovative staffs.
4. The Negro staff became a closely knit group and excluded the principal from the group. This apparently resulted from the delicate position of the principal due to interaction with the white hierarchy which led to the directed or closed school (62, pp. 11-15).
Fascetti studied organizational climates of secondary and elementary attendance centers and found that all attendance centers with female principals exhibited open tendencies, but other personal variables of principals did not prove to be significant. Fascetti reports,

The secondary principal usually has a larger faculty with many more supporting staff members and he, of necessity, tends to delegate authority and responsibility and has less opportunity to interact with his teachers on a personal basis. The secondary principal, by the very nature of the size of the organization tends to be impersonal, and is inclined to enforce rules and regulations on an impersonal basis (16, p. 74).

Watkins suggests that the climate of the attendance center and the school district influences the behavioral characteristics of principals. He states, "In large urban areas apparently the school district and not the school is the institution (system) which contributes to and is influenced by the principal" (62, p. 105).

McKay concluded that the principal behaviors of thrust and consideration, which were positive factors to humanism and morale in the educational environment, were related to alienation as a negative factor (48). Manning's data, in his study of open and closed climate secondary attendance centers, revealed no significant differences in the characteristics of principals. However, his study did indicate that principals of more open climate attendance centers were older and had more years of experience in
education and educational administration (44). McKay's study indicated that a relationship does exist between the age of a principal and the number of years in education with educational environment (48).

Hargrove found a low but positive relationship between openness of climate and the principal's understanding of interpersonal relationships (29). Some evidence to support this finding was provided by Thomas, who discovered that a human relations laboratory training program for principals appeared to cause shifts in their teachers' Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire responses toward more open climate (60).

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
Studies Relating to Characteristics of Teachers

Briner's study indicates that teachers' perceptions of organizational climate could be seen as functions of the interplay between teachers' personalities and the structure of the organization in which the individual functions (10).

Grant's research "indicated that open climate schools were characterized by higher teacher morale than were closed climate schools" (22, p. 77). His study was conducted in Fairfax County, Virginia, with a sample of sixteen attendance centers, eight being open climate and eight being closed climate. He found that "high morale reflects faculty satisfaction with goal achievement and social needs fulfillment" (22, p. 77).
Appleberry and Hay investigated the relationship between the pupil control ideology of teachers and the organizational climate of elementary attendance centers (4, pp. 74-84). Open climate attendance centers were found to be custodial in ideology. Additionally, Hay, in a similar study, investigated the organizational climate and pupil control orientation of forty-five secondary attendance centers in New Jersey. The study results indicated that secondary attendance centers exhibited a high degree of student alienation. They may be characterized by a more closed organizational climate and a more custodial pupil control orientation (30).

Null found that teachers with a good attitude as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) toward children tended to perceive all eight of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire dimensions in a manner indicative of an open climate. Teachers with a poor attitude toward children tended to view all eight dimensions in a manner indicative of a closed climate (50, pp. 351-354). Blair also determined that teachers' attitudes were significantly different between relatively open and relatively closed climates (9). Anderson failed to establish a relationship between personality attributes of teachers and organizational climate of attendance centers. Using a sample of 126 teachers in a southern
school system, he concluded that the measured personality attributes of teachers in open climate attendance centers were not significantly different from those of teachers in attendance centers with closed organizational climates (2).

Faber reported that the sex of teachers is not related to organizational climate, but that the longer a teacher has been in an attendance center, the more he tends to perceive the climate as open (15). On the other hand, Flanders found that teachers with fewer years of experience viewed the climate of the attendance center as being more open than closed (20). Blair also found that teachers with less experience perceived the climate as more open than closed (9). In a related study, Bushinger concluded that closed climate attendance centers tended to have teachers with longer tenure (11). Hoagland stated that the personal factor of sex and degrees held are not related to the teachers’ perception of climate (36).

Koplyay and Mathis attempted to determine if any type of salary schedule had any consistent relationship to teacher morale. The following conclusions were supported by their data:

1. Morale, as measured by the five subtests or areas of the morale inventory, was more a function of the particular organizational climate than of the type salary schedule employed by the district.
2. The open nature of the attendance center's climate appears to be associated with higher morale.

3. The closed nature of the attendance center's climate appears to be associated with low morale.

4. Attendance centers with an autonomous climate characterized by freedom and high cooperation between principal and teachers seem to be unaffected with respect to morale by the salary schedule of the district. When teachers are assured of cooperation, assistance, guidance, and social needs satisfaction, it appears to make no difference whether the salary plan is merit or non-merit.

5. The morale inventory appears to be a reliable and valid instrument capable of measuring differences between attendance center populations relative to the rationale for morale which served as the basis for the identification of the five attitudinal areas in the inventory (40).

Ignatovich studied the responses from teachers and principals of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in ninety-nine Iowa attendance centers. His data revealed three types of principal-leaders. Sixty-nine percent of the principals exhibited considerate and tolerant behavior, twenty-one percent exhibited "bureaucratic" behavior, and ten percent of the principals were described as permitting
teachers complete freedom and not assuming the role of leader. The esprit behavior of teachers was significantly higher under the principal-leader whose behavior was considerate and tolerant. Ignatovich found no significant difference in this size of staff or organizational intimacy and types of principal-leaders (38).

Manning's research indicated that in open-climate attendance centers teachers were significantly older and had more years of experience. There appeared to be no sex difference in open or closed attendance centers (44).

Anderson's research, in open and closed elementary attendance centers, indicated that the more open attendance centers had significantly older principals than the less open attendance centers. Also, the principals years of experience in education were not significant to an attendance center being more open or less open (2). Davis' study revealed an opposite conclusion. His data indicated that a more open-climate attendance center can be expected if the principal is a younger person and has fewer years of experience at his present attendance center (13).

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
Studies Related to Characteristics of Attendance Centers

Trump studied the thirty National Association of Secondary School Principals' model attendance centers and made the following points about them concerning interpersonal
climate. The interrelationships among teachers, administrators, and students and the ways in which they perceive the educational change process have a direct impact upon the direction and momentum of change. A climate in which people accept each other and in which they feel free to differ but continue to strive for improvement is a more positive climate than one in which persons constantly experience interpersonal frustrations. Attendance center environments torn by interpersonal strife are not likely to be healthy climates for innovative change. Consequently, prior to the implementation of change, efforts should be made to ascertain the interpersonal and institutional climate. The climate must be reasonably healthy if change is to occur. All too frequently administrators and teachers attempt to circumvent the problems of tension within an attendance center by introducing educational changes, but, more often than not, such attempts collapse under the onslaught of interpersonal tensions (61).

Reynoldson investigated the interrelations of educational decision-making with the organizational climate and innovativeness in public attendance centers. The data were gathered from 1,250 professional staff members in forty-nine public attendance centers (55). More innovation was indicated in attendance centers with greater openness of organizational climate. Hughes supported this finding
when he reported that highly innovative attendance centers were more similar to the open climate than to the closed (37, pp. 15-25). Low innovative attendance centers were more similar to the closed climate. The subtests of esprit, thrust, and disengagement were used to differentiate between high innovative and low innovative attendance centers. In support of the relationship of openness of organizational climate and innovativeness, Davis states,

A "climate" for change within the school organization is most conducive to innovation. An "open" and informal atmosphere that is free from pressure, has two-way communications, and embodies a spirit of cooperation, is more likely to produce change than is a "closed" and formal system with rigid rules and regulations (13, p. 39).

Rice concluded that an open climate does have a significant relationship to high-achieving elementary attendance centers as contrasted with a closed climate and low-achieving elementary attendance centers. Feldnebel (19) concluded that the global concept of organizational climate and pupil achievement showed no significant relationship. Andrews determined that there was a significant relationship between the subtest score on intimacy and student achievement (3). Miller, utilizing 400 teachers to obtain a climate description and 6,000 pupils to identify achievement in twenty-nine urban attendance centers, judged openness to be related to achievement (49). Hale reported that organizational climate was significant when related to language
scores on the California Achievement Tests, but he reported
no significant relationship between organizational climate,
reading, and arithmetic (26).

Acceptance of Self and Others

Ernest measured the principal's acceptance of self
and his perception of how other principals accept themselves
(14). He included this variable in his investigation of the
relationships of organizational climate to certain personal
characteristics of elementary attendance center principals
(14). One hundred forty-eight principals were utilized in
this study. One hundred ten of the principals had positive
perceptions of themselves while thirty-eight indicated
negative perceptions of themselves; thus, the majority of
the principals had a positive self-concept. An assumption
of this study was that the attendance center principals
would have a positive self-regard and a respect for the
abilities of others. There are many definitions of
self-concept, but, according to Pames,

the concept of self is an awareness of one's
existence as an entity separate from other
selves. It consists of one's recognition of
similarities and dissimilarities to others.
This awareness is learned by the interaction
of the self with society. Inherent in the
self-concept of each individual are values,
beliefs, emotions, needs, wants, ideas,
activities, possessions, and appearance as
well as an awareness of the attitudes of
others toward the self. Self-acceptance,
then, is the degree to which an individual,
having considered his personal characteris-
tics, is able and willing to live with them
(52, p. 421).
Faber found that open-climate attendance centers had principals with more self-acceptance, more acceptance of their own aggressiveness, and greater capability for intimate contact than principals of closed-climate attendance centers (15). Purkey defines self as "a complex and dynamic system of beliefs which an individual holds true about himself, each belief with a corresponding value" (54, p. 7). Researchers agree that the self is generally stable, characterized by harmony and orderliness. A person has countless beliefs about himself, not all equally sufficient. Some beliefs are very close to the self; others are less important. Some are negative, while others are positive. Each self is absolutely unique. The single most important factor of the self is the motive behind all behavior (54, p. 7). "Individual behavior is always influenced by the social context in which it occurs (35, p. 552). Man is born dependent upon other human beings, and his life is spent largely in interaction with other people. People are both stimuli for him and the occasions for his responses. These responses determine many of the things that he does and feels (35, p. 552)."

Summary

A consideration of all the models and theories that have been presented in this section indicates that attendance center administrators and supervisors must understand
the needs and motivations of their employees if they are going to work to improve instruction and to help their staffs obtain greater job satisfaction. Successful attendance center administrators have drawn on theories and models presented in this section, and others, in the process of evaluating the effectiveness of their organizations.

Since the advent of Halpin and Croft's Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire on the educational scene, the number of studies pertaining to organizational climate have multiplied at a rapid rate. The possibilities suggested by the instrument are numerous. It has been a subject for many studies of validity and its value as a tool toward understanding the complex group of variables known as organizational climate has been widely accepted.

Many variables have been considered in previous studies such as age, years in education and sex of the principal (18, 24, 44, 48, 62). These studies have been limited geographically to small areas and usually to elementary attendance centers. Secondary attendance centers have been studied primarily in the eastern and northeastern areas of the United States. Recent studies have tended to become narrower in scope. They have tended to be limited to small geographical locales and two or three dimensions of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.
The review of the literature suggests the continued use of the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire** to assess organizational climate (3, 31, 32). The review raises some questions that should be noted as climate investigation continues. These questions are as follows:

1. Can a workable definition of climate be agreed upon so that research can be compared? Present definitions of climate tend to be ambiguous. Most research defines climate in terms of a person's perception (1, 21, 28). This makes the instruments used in climate research difficult to validate.

2. Does the principal have an effect on climate or does the climate of an attendance center and the policies of a district affect the behavioral characteristics of the principal (1, 21, 62)?

3. Climate dimensions and job satisfaction scales have many similar elements (5, 8, 22, 40). This fact raises a question about the openness scores in climate research using the Halpin and Croft model. Is the openness score a measure of climate or a measure of job satisfaction?

4. Is climate research in education another attempt to measure teacher attitudes toward students (9, 2, 50)?

The review of the literature suggests investigating a cross section of Texas attendance centers at both the elementary and secondary levels. The contractual
arrangements between teachers and boards of education in other sections of the United States are more formal and structured than in Texas. Climate research in other sections of the United States may be a response to contractual satisfaction more than a response to a building principal (31). Texas has an informal contractual agreement with teachers when compared to other sections of the United States. Therefore, teachers work more directly with a building principal in Texas and may be responding more to their perception of his leadership. Most studies have dealt with small sections of a state or with either elementary or secondary attendance centers separately (4, 21, 22, 30, 38, 44, 62).
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the methodology employed in this study is described. The sample of attendance centers studied, a description of the instrument used, the procedures for administering and scoring the instrument, and the methods used to analyze the data are detailed. This research is a correlational study as described in *Empirical Foundation of Educational Research*, by Gilbert Sax (5, pp. 292-302).

Sample of Attendance Centers

Sampling procedures used in this study are those outlined by Sax (5, pp. 128-141). These procedures apply to this study in the following ways. All public school districts in Texas with an average daily attendance of 5,000 or more composed the population for this study; Bulletin 716 of the Texas Education Agency was used to identify the population. Twenty-five school districts were randomly selected by use of a table of random numbers. All attendance centers within a district were listed, and a stratified sample was drawn. The sample population comprised the professional staff of seventy-five attendance centers.

Letters were mailed to the superintendent of each public school district requesting cooperation and assistance with
the study. Letters were then mailed to each principal in the attendance centers selected, asking for support and assistance in assembling data. Packets were prepared containing instruments and instructions for the building principal. These packets included return envelopes that were self-addressed for return to sender. The packets were mailed to each attendance center to be administered by the building principal.

Description of the Instrument

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was the instrument used to collect the data for this study. The instrument provides eight measures or scores. It is a battery of tests and produces eight separate subtests (1, 3, 4). Halpin, the developer of the battery, stated "... that the eight subtests of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire could in fact, be reviewed as a battery of tests . . ." (3, p. 166). The openness score is a combination of three subtests.

The reliability coefficients for the eight subtests were established by the split-half, split-respondents, and the commonalities yielded by the three-factor rotational solution. Table I is reproduced from the original study to illustrate the estimate of internal consistency and equivalence of the eight subtests.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire includes a biographical section and a Likert-scaled section.
The biographical section collected information about age, position, sex, teacher assignment, years of experience in education, and years on present campus. The biographical section also requested the present grade or subject assignment of each respondent. In elementary attendance centers it asked for grade level; in secondary attendance centers it asked for teaching assignment by subject area. Information about position was requested as to principal, teacher, or other.

The Likert-scaled section collected information about attendance center climate as perceived by the respondent. This section of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire contains sixty-four items, producing scores for eight subtests. The first four subtests refer to the behavior of teachers' and the second four refer to the behavior of the principal.

Those areas referring to teachers' behavior are disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy; and those referring to principals' behavior are aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration. A brief definition of each of these areas is as follows:

1. Disengagement refers to the teachers' tendency to be "not with it." It describes a group which is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand.
TABLE I

ESTIMATES OF INTERNAL CONSISTENCY AND OF EQUIVALENCE FOR THE EIGHT OCDQ SUBTESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimate of internal consistency  
**Estimate of equivalence  
***These are lower-bound, conservative estimates of equivalence

Source: Halpin and Croft, The Organizational Climate, p. 66.
2. Hindrance refers to the teachers' feelings that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers judge as unnecessary.

3. Esprit refers to teacher morale. Teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied and that, at the same time, they are experiencing a sense of accomplishment in their job.

4. Intimacy refers to teachers' feeling that their social needs are being satisfied. They enjoy a friendly social relationship with each other.

5. Aloofness refers to the behavior by the principal which is described as formal and impersonal. To maintain this study of leadership, the principal keeps himself at a distance from the staff.

6. Production emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which described by the staff as close supervision; he may be described as a "straw boss." His communication tends to be in only one direction.

7. Thrust refers to principal behavior that is described as effort to "move the organization." He attempts to motivate staff through the example which he personally sets.

8. Consideration refers to principal behavior which is characterized as treating teachers "humanly," to try to do a little something extra for them.
9. Openness scores were computed from the standardized school means by computing the sum of the Esprit and Thrust scores and subtracting the Disengagement score.

Table II reports the items that compose each of the eight subtests. Items are used only once for a single subtest. Internal consistency data is reported in Table No. I.

**TABLE II**

**OCDQ, FORM IV—ITEMS THAT COMPOSE FOUR SUBTESTS: TEACHERS' BEHAVIOR**

I. Disengagement

*1. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.
2. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.
3. Teachers exert group pressure on nonconforming faculty members.
4. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.
5. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
6. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
7. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.
8. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.
9. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.
10. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.

II. Hindrance

11. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.
12. Teachers have too many committee requirements.
13. Student progress reports require too much work.
14. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.
15. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.
TABLE II--CONTINUED

16. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.

III. Esprit

17. The morale of the teachers is high.
18. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.
19. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.
20. Custodial service is available when needed.
21. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.
22. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.
23. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
24. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."
25. Extra books are available for classroom use.
26. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.

IV. Intimacy

27. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
28. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
29. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.
30. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.
31. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.
32. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.
33. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.

V. Aloofness

*34. Faculty meetings are organized according to a right agenda.
35. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
TABLE II--Continued

36. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference.
37. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.
38. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classroom.
39. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
40. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.
41. School secretarial service is available for teacher use.
42. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.

VI. Production Emphasis

43. The principal makes all class scheduling decisions.
44. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.
45. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.
46. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.
47. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.
48. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.
49. The principal talks a great deal.

VII. Thrust

50. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.
51. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.
52. The principal uses constructive criticism.
53. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.
54. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.
55. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
56. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.
57. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.
TABLE II--CONTINUED

58. The principal is easy to understand.

VIII. Consideration

59. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.
60. The principal does personal favors for teachers.
61. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.
62. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.
63. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
64. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.

*These numbers are used solely to list the items here by subtest. The numbers do not correspond to the sequence in which the items actually appear in Form IV.

The Likert-scaled section of the instrument provides four responses to each of the sixty-four items, namely, 1 = rarely occurs; 2 = sometime occurs; 3 = often occurs; and 4 = very frequently occurs.

The validity and reliability of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire are assessed by Halpin and Croft in their report (3). They reported reliability at .92, using the split-half and split-respondent method (3). The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were reappraised by Hayes in his 1973 paper; he reports the canonical reliability at .90 (4).
Procedures for Collecting Data

A letter was sent to each school district superintendent to secure his cooperation for the study. Letters of introduction and explanation were then mailed to each principal whose attendance center was included in the study. Packets containing instruments for principals and teachers were mailed to each attendance center, including self-addressed labels so that packets could be returned. Principals administered the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire within their buildings.

Telephone calls were made to principals who had not returned their packets after two weeks, and additional calls were made at the end of four weeks. A second mailing of packets was made to six per cent of the attendance centers which indicated that they had never received the first mailing.

The methods used to test each of the hypotheses are as follows:

1. The first hypothesis was tested by testing for significant correlations between the mean scores of the fifty-five principals and the mean scores of the 895 teachers for all eight subtests. No response to assignment was indicated for 140 respondents. Correlations were computed for all eight subtests and the openness score.
2. The second hypothesis was tested by grouping the attendance centers into three groups according to the length of a principal's incumbency and testing for significant correlations between the mean scores of the principals in each group (A, B and C) with the mean scores of the teachers in each group. Group A included attendance centers whose principal's length of incumbency was equal to or less than nine years. Group B included attendance centers whose principal's length of incumbency was ten through nineteen years. Group C included attendance centers whose principal's length of incumbency was twenty years and up.

3. The third hypothesis was tested by grouping attendance centers into three groups according to the chronological age of the principal and testing for significant correlations between the mean scores of the principals in each group (A, B and C) and the mean scores of the teachers in each group. Group A included attendance centers whose principal's ages were twenty through thirty-nine. Group B included attendance centers whose principal's ages were forty through forty-nine. Group C included attendance centers whose principal's ages were fifty years and more.

4. The fourth hypothesis was tested by grouping attendance centers into three groups according to the number of professional staff members at each attendance center and
testing for significant correlations between the mean scores of the principals of each group of attendance centers with the mean scores of the teachers in that group. Group A included attendance centers with professional staffs of one through eighteen. Group B included attendance centers with professional staffs of nineteen through twenty-nine. Group C included attendance centers with professional staffs of thirty and up.

5. The fifth hypothesis was tested by grouping the secondary attendance centers into three groups according to the openness score of the principal and testing for significant correlations between the mean scores of principals and the mean scores of the teachers within each department of instruction. Group A included attendance centers whose principal's mean openness scores were equal to or less than eighty-two. Group B included attendance centers whose principal's mean openness scores were eighty-three through eighty-seven. Group C included attendance centers whose principal's mean openness scores were more than eighty-seven.

6. The sixth hypothesis was tested by grouping the elementary attendance centers into three groups according to the openness score of the principal and testing for significant correlations between the mean scores of principals and the mean scores of the teachers within each group of primary (grades K-3) and each group of intermediate
(grades 4-6) grade teachers. Group A included attendance centers whose principals mean openness scores were equal to or less than eighty-two. Group B included attendance centers whose principal's mean openness scores were eighty-three through eighty-seven. Group C included attendance centers whose principal's mean openness scores were more than eighty-seven.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The procedures used for the analysis of data were those used by Andrew Halpin in his original study (3). Mean scores were computed for each respondent, attendance center means were computed on each of the eight subtests, and means were then computed for various groupings according to biographical information. Openness scores were computed for each attendance center. Correlations were computed between the groupings of attendance centers and the various groupings of principals. Pearson product-moment correlations were run to test the variables. A correlation of .05 was used to accept or to reject the hypotheses.


CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents the analysis of the data. It describes the general characteristics of the population included in the sample and analyzes the population in terms of the variables including length in attendance center, chronological age, size of professional staff, and teaching assignment. The results of testing the research hypotheses are then presented.

Review

Fifty-one attendance centers from twenty-one school districts cooperated with the study by completing and returning the surveys. Only one attendance center had to be dropped for inadequate returns. Sixty-seven percent of the attendance centers selected responded to the study and are included, one percent of the attendance centers was dropped for failure to return enough instruments, and thirty-two percent chose not to participate by not returning their packets.

A total of 1,090 valid cases was considered in the study. These were grouped by attendance centers, age, years in education, years in attendance centers, subject area or grade level, and sex.
The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was used as a battery of tests. It produces eight subtest scores and an openness score. Table III shows the breakdown by teaching assignment. Eight hundred ninety-five teachers responded to the assignment item, as well as fifty-five principals. One hundred-forty faculty indicated other as their response to assignment. Twenty-eight

**TABLE III**

**DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY ASSIGNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Grade</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Grade</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Programs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Principals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percent of the respondents were elementary teachers and fifty-five percent of the respondents were secondary teachers.

The sample population included 266 men, comprising 24 percent of the total. It included 803 women in the sample population which constituted 74 percent of the total. Two percent of the sample population did not respond to this item.

The sample population included an age span from twenty to sixty-five years. The breakdown of the respondents into age groups is as follows: 20-29 years of age, 28 percent; 30-39 years of age, 35 percent; 40-49 years of age, 20 percent; 50-59 years of age, 11 percent; and 60 or more years of age, 3 percent. Sixty-three percent of the respondents were under forty years of age, while 14 percent were over fifty years of age; and three percent failed to indicate an age. Twenty percent were between 40-49 years of age.

The 1,090 cases analyzed varied from beginning teachers with no teaching experience to teachers with over thirty years of experience. The sample was divided into four groups according to their years in education (see Table IV). Over one-half of the teachers and principals have been in education for less than ten years. Eighty-two percent of the sample population have been in education less than twenty years; four percent have been in education more than
twenty years. Twelve percent have been in education from 20-29 years. Two percent did not respond to this item.

TABLE IV
YEARS IN EDUCATION OF SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Education</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-up</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample population was divided into four groups according to the number of years they have stayed in their present attendance center. Seventy-nine percent of the population had worked less than ten years in their present building (See Table V). Twenty percent of the respondents have been in education more than ten years. One percent did not indicate the length of time they had been in their present attendance center.

The scores of professional staff members were used to compute the openness scores for each attendance center. The principal's score was not included in the computation.
The openness score reflects how the teachers perceive the climate within their attendance center. Means, standard deviations, and amount of variance by attendance center are reported in Table VI. The mean for the total sample of attendance centers was 81.72 with a standard deviation of 7.46 and a variance of 55.67. Eight attendance centers were more than one-half of a standard deviation above the mean for all schools. These attendance centers are classified as "most open" climate schools. Six attendance centers had a mean score one-half a standard deviation below the mean for the total population of schools. These six were classified as "most closed" climate schools. The "most open" climate schools were all low in variance within their climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Attendance Center</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-up</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI
OPENNESS SCORES BY ATTENDANCE CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>89.26</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>88.80</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>25.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>86.53</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>39.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>86.33</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>26.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>85.74</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>46.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>85.48</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>22.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>85.25</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>29.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>85.14</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>84.84</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>25.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>84.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>84.47</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>61.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>84.16</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>20.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>83.95</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>54.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>83.53</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>40.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>83.36</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>36.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>51.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>82.54</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>82.52</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>36.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>37.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>58.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>82.06</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>81.38</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>42.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>81.28</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>64.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>81.26</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>36.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>47.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>33.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>80.63</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>23.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>80.53</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>43.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>80.41</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>67.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>80.32</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>41.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>58.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>39.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>79.82</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>79.79</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>68.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>79.48</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>46.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>78.38</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>63.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>78.35</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>45.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>44.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>78.11</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>41.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>77.95</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>93.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>54.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>28.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>24.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>74.91</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>65.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>74.71</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>95.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>81.72</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>55.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

schools, while the "most closed" climate schools had very high variance scores. School number 265 had the highest "openness" score and was more than one and one-half standard deviations above the mean for the total sample. School number 315, with the lowest "openness" score, was more than one standard deviation below the mean for the total sample of schools.

The difference between the "most open climate" schools and the "most closed climate" schools was reflected by the subtest for esprit. Table VII presents the data for the more closed and the more open climate schools. The mean openness scores and the mean esprit scores are reported in Table VII.
Hypothesis number one stated that there is a positive association between the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the principal and the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.
A significant positive correlation was found when the fifty-five principals' mean openness scores were compared with the mean openness scores of the 895 teachers. Pearson product-moment correlations were run for each of the eight subtests and for the openness score between the mean scores of the principals and the mean scores of the teachers. A significant $r$ of .4337 was found for the openness score. Table VIII presents the data.

Hypothesis number two stated that there is a significant positive association between the length of a principal's incumbency within an attendance center and the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Attendance centers were grouped according to the length of the incumbency of the principals within an attendance center into three groups. The three groups of attendance centers were group A (zero to nine years); group B (ten to nineteen years); and group C (twenty years and up). No significant correlations were found between the mean scores for groups A, B or C and the mean scores of the principals in each group.

Hypothesis number three stated that there is a significant positive association between the chronological age of principals and the openness of the organizational climate
### Table VIII

**Correlations for 55 Building Principals with 895 Teachers on Eight Subtests and Openness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55 Building Principal's Scores</th>
<th>895 Teachers Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>0.4571 s=0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>0.0652 s=0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>0.0102 s=0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>0.1789 s=0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>0.2121 s=0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>0.2180 s=0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>0.3215 s=0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>0.1179 s=0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-0.0959 s=0.517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VIII—Continued

**Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aloofness</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Thrust</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1512</td>
<td>0.0769</td>
<td>0.0954</td>
<td>-0.0375</td>
<td>-0.1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.305</td>
<td>s=0.603</td>
<td>s=0.519</td>
<td>s=0.800</td>
<td>s=0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1405</td>
<td>0.1992</td>
<td>0.1396</td>
<td>0.0997</td>
<td>0.1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.341</td>
<td>s=0.175</td>
<td>s=0.344</td>
<td>s=0.500</td>
<td>s=0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3301</td>
<td>0.4054</td>
<td>0.1367</td>
<td>0.2466</td>
<td>0.3193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.022</td>
<td>s=0.004</td>
<td>s=0.354</td>
<td>s=0.091</td>
<td>s=0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2378</td>
<td>0.2226</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.0878</td>
<td>-0.0075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.104</td>
<td>s=0.128</td>
<td>s=0.735</td>
<td>s=0.553</td>
<td>s=0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4134</td>
<td>0.1478</td>
<td>0.0922</td>
<td>0.1930</td>
<td>0.0288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.003</td>
<td>s=0.316</td>
<td>s=0.533</td>
<td>s=0.189</td>
<td>s=0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1433</td>
<td>0.2538</td>
<td>0.1358</td>
<td>0.2546</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.331</td>
<td>s=0.082</td>
<td>s=0.357</td>
<td>s=0.081</td>
<td>s=0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4284</td>
<td>0.3214</td>
<td>0.4007</td>
<td>0.3394</td>
<td>0.2598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.002</td>
<td>s=0.026</td>
<td>s=0.005</td>
<td>s=0.018</td>
<td>s=0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4268</td>
<td>0.1953</td>
<td>0.2049</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.002</td>
<td>s=0.183</td>
<td>s=0.162</td>
<td>s=0.312</td>
<td>s=0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3557</td>
<td>0.3899</td>
<td>0.3514</td>
<td>0.3691</td>
<td>0.4337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=0.013</td>
<td>s=0.006</td>
<td>s=0.085</td>
<td>s=0.010</td>
<td>s=0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Attendance centers were grouped according to the chronological age of the principal. Group A included ages forty through forty-nine years; and group C included ages fifty years and up. No significant correlations were found between the mean scores for groups A, B or C and the mean scores of the principals in each group.

Hypothesis number four stated that there is a significant positive association between the size of an attendance center's staff and the openness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Attendance centers were grouped according to the number of professional staff members at an attendance center. Group A included professional staffs of one through eighteen. Group B included professional staffs of nineteen through twenty-nine. Group C included professional staffs of thirty and up. No significant correlations were found between the mean scores for groups A, or B, or C, and the mean scores of the principals in each group.

Hypothesis number five stated that there is a significant positive association between the mean openness score of principals and the mean openness scores of a department of instruction (language arts, social science, mathematics,
science, business, music, industrial arts, physical education, athletics, special education, and vocational programs) within those secondary attendance centers included in this study when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Attendance centers were grouped according to the openness scores of the principal. Group A included openness scores equal to or less than eighty-two. Group B included openness scores of eighty-three through eighty-seven. Group C included all openness scores more than eighty-seven. Pearson product-moment correlations were run between the mean scores of each group of principals and the mean scores of teachers within each department of instruction. No significant correlations were found.

Hypothesis number six stated that there is a significant positive association between the mean openness scores of principals and the mean openness scores of primary grade teachers (kindergarten through third); and the mean openness scores of intermediate grade teachers (fourth through sixth) within those elementary attendance centers included in this study when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Attendance centers were grouped into three groups according to the principal's openness score. Group A included principals with an openness score equal to or less than eighty-two. Group B included principals whose openness scores were eighty-three through
eighty-seven. Group C included all openness scores of more than eighty-seven. Correlations were run between the mean scores of each group of principals and the mean scores of all primary grade teachers (kindergarten through third grade) within groups A, B and C. No significant correlations were found. Correlations were then run between the mean scores of each group of principals and the mean scores of intermediate grade teachers (fourth through sixth grades) within groups A, B and C. No significant correlations were found.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The summary and findings are based on the analysis of data presented in the previous chapter and review of the literature. The conclusions are drawn from the findings and the review of the literature. The recommendations make some practical suggestions for further inquiry in light of the conclusions. These should be interpreted within the context of the limitations of a correlational study.

Summary

The problem of this study was to assess the effect principals have on the organizational climate of attendance centers as perceived by principals and staff members within selected secondary and elementary attendance centers in Texas. The study included a random selection of twenty-five school districts from the ninety-five districts with an average daily attendance of five thousand students or more. The attendance centers within the twenty-five districts became the general population for the study.
The purpose of the study was to determine if a correlation existed between the principals' behavior and the organizational climate.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was administered to the professional staffs of twenty-five attendance centers. Twenty-one of the twenty-five school districts selected cooperated with the study. Fifty-one of the seventy-five attendance centers cooperated by returning their instruments. A total of 1,090 individual staff members returned an instrument and were included in the study.

Findings

The following findings are presented based upon the data reported in Chapter IV.

1. There was a positive correlation between the openness or closedness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the principal and the openness or closedness of the organizational climate of an attendance center as perceived by the professional staff when utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The positive correlation is significant at the .002 level. However, the r score of .433 raises some question for future research.

2. There were no significant correlations using the variables: chronological age of building principals; length of time a principal serves an attendance center; or
the size of an attendance center's professional staff. Previous studies using one or more of these variables have presented conflicting results. An example would be when Anderson (1) found significant correlations with age of building principals and openness while Davis' study (5) found the opposite conclusions.

3. There were no significant correlations between any of the perceptions of the teachers grouped by departments of instruction and the perceptions of the building principals. A variety of combinations of departments were used in an attempt to find a significant correlation with building principals in this study but none were discovered. Contractual arrangements with teachers, district policies, central administration directives, curriculum consultants and many other variables may have affected the results. This study assumed that teachers in the core curriculum departments such as English, History, Science and Mathematics would have a positive correlation with the building principal. However, no significant correlations were found individually or by various groupings.

4. There were no significant correlations between the perceptions of teachers at the primary or intermediate level of instruction in the elementary attendance centers and the openness or closedness of the attendance centers as perceived by the building principals. This study assumed that the perception of primary level teachers would have
a significant correlation with the perception of building principals but none were found. Andrew Hayes indicates that some perceptions of climate may be a response to a subsystem such as a department or a level of instruction, more than a response to the organization as a whole or to the principal's leadership style (13). A second grade teacher may be responding more to the climate within the second grade than to the climate for the attendance center.

5. Age, years in education, and years in the present attendance center reflect a youthful, inexperienced and mobile population for this study. The younger respondents outnumbered the older respondents two to one, using forty years as the dividing point. Those respondents with less than ten years of experience out-numbered those with twenty or more years in education by three and three tenths to one. Respondents with less than five years in the same attendance center outnumbered those with twenty or more years in the same attendance center by seventeen to one.

The review of the literature in this study has raised some questions that should be considered as the findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented. The literature reveals some general agreements among researchers into organizational climate as well as some contradictory studies using similar techniques, the same instrument and similar variables.

Many of the researchers agree that the leader does make a significant difference in the attitudes of the group
and the openness or closedness of an organizational climate. The leader may be leading a bombing crew in Korea; or be a Superintendent in Ohio; or be a building principal in a school system (10, 11, 20). There seems to be agreement among the majority of climate research in concluding that the principal does make a difference in the organizational climate of an attendance center. They generally agree that open climate attendance centers are characterized by higher teacher morale than are closed climate attendance centers (8, 16, 17).

There seems to be agreement among researchers that the longer a group of teachers and a principal serve in the same attendance center, the more closed the climate will become (3, 4, 7). A minority opinion suggests that the longer a group of teachers and a principal serve in the same attendance center, the more open the climate (5). This study found no significant correlations either way.

A review of the literature reveals contradictory results on a few variables in studies using similar techniques and the same instrument. Guy found that leadership was most positively related to the subtest Esprit (9) while McKay concluded that Thrust and Consideration were the most positive factors (17). Andrews found a significant correlation between achievement and the subtest scores on Intimacy (2) while Miller found achievement to relate to the subtest score related to Openness (18).
Null (19) and Blair (3) found that teacher attitude predicted an openness perception while Anderson (1) failed to find a relationship between openness and attitude. Faber (6) and Bushinger (4) found that the longer a teacher had been in an attendance center, the more he tends to perceive the climate as open; but, Flanders (7) and Blair (3) found that the teacher with fewer years of experience viewed the attendance center as more open. Anderson (1) found that open climate attendance centers had older principals, while Davis' (5) study revealed an opposite conclusions. The above results and the findings of this study seem to indicate a general need in climate research to refine the labels used in describing what is being measured.

The above findings also suggest that more objective measures be developed as opposed to perceptual measures for use in climate research. Perceptual conceptions have been of primary interest in climate research. The scope and types of characteristics attributed to climate as a result of previous studies have varied among researchers (3, 6, 7); this affects the respondent's perception. How a climate is perceived by a respondent may be a response to the organization as a whole or to a subsystem, or to some of both.

The results of climate research may be affected by geographical locales, ethnic differences, level of
instruction or any combination of these. A majority of the studies have been done at the elementary level of instruction (6, 7, 8, 17, 18). Ethnic differences have not been considered a factor. Trump's study of the thirty model attendance centers as identified by the National Associations of Secondary Principals is one of the few studies that is broad based (20). The results of climate research may be more useable and reliable if the studies were broader based.

More work should be done toward improving the reliability score for the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The attempts to replicate the original study have provided similar results with reliability around .90. This study found that best reliability score on the dimension of Disengagement at .45. The openness score reliability was .43. This study suggested that there may be too many uncontrolled variables when the instrument is used for a large and diverse population.

Conclusions

The conclusions are as follows:

1. There is a positive relationship between the perceptions of organizational climate by principals and the perceptions of organizational climate by professional staff members. However, the low r score raises some questions about the degree of relationship. The reliability may be less than desired because of the large
percent of inexperienced teachers in the sample. The youthfulness and the mobility of the sample may be affecting the reliability score.

2. The chronological age of building principals does not have an effect on the climate for a given attendance center.

3. The length of time a principal serves an attendance center does not have an effect on the climate for a given attendance center.

4. The size of an attendance center's professional staff does not have an effect on the climate for a given attendance center.

5. The level of instruction (primary vs intermediate) at the elementary attendance center does not have an effect on the climate for a given attendance center.

6. Age, years in education and years in the present attendance center are not acceptable variables to be used with the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

7. Geographical differences need to be considered in climate research in the field of education. There are major differences between regions of the United States. Contractual arrangements, unions, mobility of teachers and a variety of other factors need to be considered in future attempts at climate research. Texas is a unique region for climate studies in education. In Texas contractual arrangements are loose and informal and unions are just
beginning to develop. Relationships between teachers and principals are casual and informal.

8. This study raises some serious doubts about the use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for educational research in these changing days.

Recommendations

In view of the results of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. A reliability study of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire should be made in Texas to determine if regional differences do affect the scores.

2. The dimensions of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire should not be used as a base to make educational decisions for Texas schools. The concept of climate and the relationship between principals and teachers suggest great potential for describing the behavior of organizations. But the ambiguities within the instrument make its practical use difficult.

3. A study should be undertaken to separate satisfaction from climate. Climate dimensions are attempts to describe individual behavior within the organization. Satisfaction scales are attempts to evaluate individual behavior within the organization. Many items are common to both measures.
4. Work should be done to isolate and identify internal and external factors that affect climate in Texas public schools.

5. A study should be undertaken to determine if a sex bias is reflected in the use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

6. The use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire as a primary instrument in climate research should not be continued until the dimensions are refined.
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APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
A. W. Halpin and C. B. Croft

The items in this questionnaire describe typical behaviors or conditions that occur within a school organization. Please indicate to what extent each of these descriptions characterizes your school. Please do not evaluate the items in terms of "good" or "bad" behavior, but read each item carefully and respond in terms of how well the statement describes your school.

The descriptive scale on which to rate the items is printed at the top of each page. Please read the instructions which describe how you should mark your answer sheet.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to secure a description of different ways in which teachers behave and of the various conditions under which they must work. After you have answered the questionnaire, we will examine the behaviors or conditions that have been described as typical by the majority of the teachers in your school, and we will construct from this description a portrait of the Organizational Climate of your school.

Marking Instructions: A regular IBM answer sheet will be provided for recording your answers to the items. Instructions for items one (1) through twelve (12) will
vary from school to school and will be given orally. For items thirteen (13) through eighty (80), you are to select one of the numbers following the items according to the following scale:

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

Any of the alternatives could be selected. You are to make your choice depending upon how often you feel the behavior described by the item does indeed occur in your school.

Please mark your responses clearly. Be sure that they are dark and that they completely fill the horizontal spaces provided. If you erase, do so completely. Incomplete erasures might be read as intended responses. Please be sure that you mark every item. Please do not mark on the booklets, as they will be used repeatedly in the study.

Biographical Information

Items

5, 6, 7 School Number (Your school number will be given orally.)

8. Position: 1. Principal
   2. Teacher
   3. Other

9. Sex: 1. Man
   2. Woman
10. Age:  
   1. 20-29  
   2. 30-39  
   3. 40-49  
   4. 50-59  
   5. 60 or over

11. Years of experience in education:  
   1. 0-9  
   2. 10-19  
   3. 20-29  
   4. 30 or over

12. Years at this school:  
   1. 0-4  
   2. 5-9  
   3. 10-19  
   4. 20 or over  
      1. Rarely occurs  
      2. Sometimes occurs  
      3. Often occurs  
      4. Very frequently occurs

13. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.  
      1 2 3 4

14. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.  
      1 2 3 4

15. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.  
      1 2 3 4  
      1. Rarely occurs  
      2. Sometimes occurs  
      3. Often occurs  
      4. Very frequently occurs

16. Instructions for the operation of teachers' aids are available.  
      1 2 3 4
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

17. Teachers invite other faculty to visit them at home. 1 2 3 4
18. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority. 1 2 3 4
19. Extra books are available for classroom use. 1 2 3 4
20. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports. 1 2 3 4
21. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members. 1 2 3 4
22. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members. 1 2 3 4
23. In faculty meetings, there is a feeling of "let's get things done." 1 2 3 4
24. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school 1 2 3 4
25. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members. 1 2 3 4
26. Teachers seek special favors from the principal. 1 2 3 4
27. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork. 1 2 3 4
28. Student progress reports require too much work. 1 2 3 4
29. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time. 1 2 3 4
30. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings. 1 2 3 4
31. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues. 1 2 3 4
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

32. Teachers have too many committee requirements.  
    
33. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.  
    
34. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.  
    
35. Custodial service is available when needed.  
    
36. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.  
    
37. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.  
    
38. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.  
    
39. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.  
    
40. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.  
    
41. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.  
    
42. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.  
    
43. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.  
    
44. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.  
    
45. The principal does personal favors for teachers.  
    
46. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

47. The morale of the teachers is high.                      1 2 3 4
48. The principal uses constructive criticism.              1 2 3 4
49. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work. 1 2 3 4
50. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.     1 2 3 4
51. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions.     1 2 3 4
52. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.       1 2 3 4
53. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions. 1 2 3 4
54. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences. 1 2 3 4
55. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.      1 2 3 4
56. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.       1 2 3 4
57. The principal criticizes a specific act rather than a staff member. 1 2 3 4
58. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.      1 2 3 4
59. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.               1 2 3 4
60. The principal talks a great deal.                       1 2 3 4
61. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers. 1 2 3 4
62. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers. 1 2 3 4
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

63. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously. 1 2 3 4

64. The rules set by the principal are never questioned. 1 2 3 4

65. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the teachers. 1 2 3 4

66. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use. 1 2 3 4

67. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference. 1 2 3 4

68. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive. 1 2 3 4

69. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports. 1 2 3 4

70. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda. 1 2 3 4

71. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings. 1 2 3 4

72. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across. 1 2 3 4

73. Teachers talk about leaving the school system. 1 2 3 4

74. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers. 1 2 3 4

75. The principal is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4

76. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit. 1 2 3 4

77. Grading practices are standardized at this school. 1 2 3 4

78. The principal ensures that teachers work to their full capacity. 1 2 3 4
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

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

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

LETTERS OF COMMUNICATION REGARDING STUDY
Principal
School House
Anytown, Texas 76041

Dear Colleagues,

I have written your Superintendent and I have received permission to include your campus in an important survey. I am seeking to show a correlation between principals and teachers perception of the organizational climate within their campus.

Please distribute one copy to each professional staff member during a called faculty meeting. Ask them to complete their survey and return them. Thirty minutes should be enough time to complete the survey.

Return all of the surveys in the enclosed packet with the self-addressed envelope.

Your help is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ray E. Williams

Ray E. Williams
Superintendent  
Big State School District  
Big State, Texas 76041

Dear Colleague:

I am working toward the completion of a graduate program at North Texas State University in Administrative Leadership. I am asking for your cooperation and support in this project. With your permission, I will contact some of your building principals. I will mail to them copies of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, with instructions for completing.

You may be assured that all responses will be held in strict confidence. Each district and attendance center will be coded with numbers. No names will be used to identify districts.

You will find enclosed a brief description of the study. I think it will help you understand the importance of this study.

Sincerely,

Ray E. Williams

Ray E. Williams
October 27, 1978

Mr. Van R. Williams
Principal
North Junior High School
St. Louis, Mo. 63117

Dear Mr. Williams:

You have permission to use, in the North Junior High School, "The
Teaching of Acute and Chronic Periods" from PRIMARY AND SECONDARY
EXPERIMENTATION by Andrew W. Porter, subject to the following limitations:

1. Proper credit is required for use of this material in a manner and for
the purpose specified in this letter. More than one reproduction is to be
considered (more than an University, More than it is necessary to replace
for the one).

2. A fee of $10.00 per issue is required for a line of 500 words. This fee is
imperative under existing

T
definite. It must be given to every copy reproduced as follows:

MACMILLAN PUBLISHING CO., INC.
866 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022

Primary and Secondary Experimentation, Copyright 1951, 1958, 1963, 1970 by
D. C. Heath & Company. Copyright for this edition 1975 by
D. C. Heath & Company. All rights reserved.

I have signed the releases of hearing officers and have carefully read the
letter of instruction to the teacher.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

D.C. Heath & Company
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