A STUDY OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND THE
PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY
SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN BANGKOK, THAILAND

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Sumeth Deoisres, B.A., M.Ed., Ed.S.
Denton, Texas
May, 1979

The problem of this study was to determine teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate, to determine teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership behavior, and to ascertain the relationships between teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate and principal's leadership behavior.

The study had three major purposes. The first was to determine teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) across selected variables. The second was to determine teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) across selected variables. The third was to ascertain whether significant relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior.

A group of 300 secondary school teachers in Bangkok, Thailand, was selected to participate in this study. Of the 300 teachers, 286 (95.33 per cent) completed and returned the two sets of questionnaires--the OCDQ and the LBDQ.
The variables employed in this study were sex of the teacher, teachers’ years of teaching experience, teachers’ educational level, and sex of the principal.

The school organizational climate as perceived by teachers was determined by the formula adapted from Halpin’s study and his prototypic climate profile. One-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe test were utilized to determine the significant differences in the way in which teachers perceived their principal’s leadership behavior. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was utilized to ascertain the significant relationships between teachers’ perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal’s Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Based on the analyses of data, the conclusions could be drawn that:

1. The school organizational climates as perceived by secondary school teachers tended to fall into the closed end of the open-closed climate continuum. It is interesting to note that teachers with more years of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climates as being open.

2. All of the teachers in this study perceived their principal as an effective leader.

3. There was a significant relationship between organizational climate and principal’s leadership behavior; however, no matter how teachers perceived their school organiza-
tional climate, they still perceived their principal as an effective leader.

As a result of the findings of the study, it is recommended that

1. The secondary school principals in Bangkok should make themselves familiar with research studies and literature concerning teachers' perceptions of organizational climate and leader behavior. In turn, they should utilize the results of research studies on leadership and organizational climate to more efficiently formulate and accomplish school goals and objectives. They should participate in programs offering activities that emphasize the human relations aspects of administrative leadership.

2. Additional research should be conducted to determine the school organizational climate, the principal's leadership behavior, and their relationships in other provinces in Thailand. Further studies should be conducted to determine why teachers with eleven years or more of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climate as being open as opposed to being closed or paternal as indicated by those with less years of teaching experience. Also studies should be conducted to determine why teachers who worked under a male principal perceived their school organizational climate as being closed as opposed to those who worked under a female principal and perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

School administration is a process concerned with the execution of policies within a unified system related to organizing and allocating human and material resources to accomplish predetermined objectives (21, p. 23). The school administrator devotes much of his professional time to developing strategies and techniques of planning, coordinating, and controlling the affairs of organizations. He functions within the environment of the educational system, and, to a considerable extent, it is in this setting where he makes decisions, exercises leadership, and in general "behaves" as a school administrator (24, p. 45).

Each individual school unit is led by a school administrator whose position is called "principal." The principal has the responsibilities of coordinating educational purposes, teaching strategies, service personnel, time distribution, public interpretation, and the evaluative demands of a specific school within a total school system (11, p. 189).
The administrative structure of the Thai educational system differs from that in the United States. In the United States the state is the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for education. State legislatures, within the limits expressed by the federal Constitution and respective state constitutions, are the major policy makers for education. State legislatures grant powers to state boards of education, state departments of education, chief state school officers, and local boards of education. In Thailand the central government is responsible for education by delegating powers to the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Education consists of four offices, seven departments, and one institution; namely: (a) The Office of the Secretary to the Minister, (b) The Office of the Under-Secretary of State for Education, (c) The Office of the Private Education Commission, (d) The Office of the Youth Promotion; (a) The Department of General Education, (b) The Department of Vocational Education, (c) The Department of Physical Education, (d) The Department of Teacher Training, (e) The Department of Educational Techniques, (f) The Department of Religious Affairs, (g) The Department of Fine Arts; and (a) Institute of Technology and Vocational Education (31, p. 1). But at the local school level the organizational structure is much the same in both the United States and Thailand. The principal is the person who sets the tone of his school.
In the process of school administration, school principals are likely to exhibit their own leadership styles. They demonstrate their styles by the ways in which they do what they do (9, p. 22). One of the major analyses of leadership within an institutional framework appears in the work of Getzels and Guba, who stated that administration may be conceived structurally as the hierarchy of subordinate-superordinate relationships within a social system (14, p. 133). The term "social system" is conceptual rather than descriptive, and should not be confused with society or state. A school-community may be considered as a social system; and the school itself or even a single class within the school may be considered a social system in its own right (6, p. 184).

The social system consists of two aspects. These are: first, the institutions with certain roles and expectations that will fulfill the goals of the system; and second, the individuals with certain personalities and need-dispositions inhabiting the system. Social behavior is a function of the two major elements: institution, role, and expectation, which constitute the nomothetic or organizational dimension; and individual, personality, and need-disposition, which constitute the idiographic or personal dimension of activity in a social system (12, p. 266)
Social behavior results as the individual attempts to cope with an environment composed of patterns of expectations for his behavior in ways consistent with his own independent pattern of needs. A principal is "nomothetic" to the extent that he is influenced by institutional or organizational expectations and "idiographic" to the extent that he is influenced by personal need-dispositions (2, p. 237). Getzels expressed this idea by giving the following equation: $B = f ( R \times P )$, where $B$ is observed behavior, $R$ is a given institutional role defined by the expectations attaching to it, and $P$ is the personality of the particular role incumbent defined by his need-dispositions (13, p. 157).

The Getzels-Guba's social systems theory suggests that some leaders may be more nomothetic or normative in their behavior and some more idiographic or personal in their behavior. Moser was able to use these ideas and defined three styles of leadership as follows:

1. The nomothetic style is characterized by behavior which stresses goal accomplishment, rules and regulations, and centralized authority at the expense of the individual. Effectiveness is rated in terms of behavior toward accomplishing the school's objectives.

2. The idiographic style is characterized by behavior which stresses the individuality of people, minimum rules and regulations, decentralized authority, and highly individualistic relationships with subordinates. The primary objective is to keep subordinates happy and contented.

3. The transactional style is characterized by behavior which stresses goal accomplishment, but which also makes provision for individual need fulfillment. The transactional leader balances nomothetic
and idiographic behavior and thus judiciously utilizes each style as the occasion demands (23, p. 2).

In an analysis of a theoretical framework for the study of behavior in organizations, Shartle stated that in the study of administrative behavior it seems important to consider the environmental setting in which the administrator works as well as his personal performance. He added that in studying the behavior of persons in organizations, events with various reference points must be considered. These included: (a) individual behavior (acts of a particular person, such as an administrator); (b) organizational behavior (events occurring within the organization); (c) environmental events (events outside the organization, such as those that occur in the community); and (d) interactions of (a), (b), and (c) (27, pp. 73-75).

In administering the school, the principal would benefit from knowing how teachers perceive his behavior and the organization. An individual teacher's out-of-school life may influence his perceptual patterns; however, what teachers perceive in their in-school daily life may be a major determinant. Combs asserted that people do not behave according to the facts as others see them. What governs behaviors from the point of view of the individual are his unique perceptions of himself and the world in which he lives, the meanings things have for him (7, p. 17). As a result, the perceptual patterns of the teacher can be ascertained by their reaction to general and specific conditions or persons existing in the school setting.
According to Halpin, the administrators' behavior as perceived by organizational members is a major aspect of organizational climate. These perceptions are essential information for the principal. The principal, who wants to be successful, has to provide leadership behavior affecting teachers' perceptions and behaviors that consequently contribute to the development of school organizational climate and that is conducive to achieving predetermined goals and objectives. Teachers' perceptions of organizational climate and the principal's leadership behavior have been determined using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) respectively in numerous studies.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate, to determine teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership behavior, and to ascertain the relationships between teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were

1. To determine teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate as measured by the Organiza-
tional Climate Description Questionnaire across selected variables.

2. To determine teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire across selected variables.

3. To ascertain whether significant relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior across selected variables.

4. To provide information contributing to an understanding of school organizational climate and leadership behavior which may encourage school systems to recognize the important role of educational research which is necessary for solving problems concerning school administration.

Independent and Dependent Variables

The following variables were used in this study which the literature and research indicate may be influential factors effecting both leader behavior and organizational climate. The independent variables for teachers were

1. Sex of the Teacher:
   (a) Male
   (b) Female

2. Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience:
   (a) 5 years or less
   (b) 6 years - 10 years
   (c) 11 years or more
3. Teachers' Educational Level:
   (a) Less than a bachelor degree
   (b) Bachelor degree with or without additional course works
   (c) Master degree or higher

4. Sex of the Teachers' Principal:
   (a) Male
   (b) Female

The dependent variables for teachers were

1. Teacher "raw" composite scores (rating) of their school organizational climate on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire:
   (a) Disengagement
   (b) Hindrance
   (c) Esprit
   (d) Intimacy
   (e) Aloofness
   (f) Production Emphasis
   (g) Thrust
   (h) Consideration

2. Teachers mean composite score (rating) of their school organizational climate on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

3. Teacher mean composite scores (rating) of their principal's leadership behavior on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire:
   (a) Initiating Structure
   (b) Consideration

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study initially sought answers to the following research questions:

(a) How do teachers across selected variables perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)?
(b) How do teachers across selected variables perceive their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)?

Secondly, this study tested the following hypotheses:

\( H_1 \): There is no significant difference in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceive the leadership behavior of their principals as measured by the LBDQ.

\( H_2 \): There is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceive the organizational climate of schools and the leadership behavior of principals as measured by the OCDQ and the LBDQ.

Definition of Terms

Perception--is a continuous process of integration of present and past sensory impressions (16, p. 413), as indicated by the subjects' responses to the questionnaires used in this study.

Organizational Climate--is theoretically defined as a set of properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the employees, assumed to be a major force in influencing employee behavior (15, p. 480); and operationally defined as the teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ.

Leadership Behavior--is theoretically defined as the leader's ability and readiness to inspire, guide, or manage his subordinates (16, p. 332); and operationally defined as the teachers' perceptions of their principal's behavior as measured by the LBDQ.
Secondary School--is a school in Thailand, comprising Maw Saw 1 to Maw Saw 5 which is equivalent to American grades 8 to 12.

Secondary School Teacher--is a teacher who is responsible for instruction in a secondary school.

Changwad--can be comparable to a state in the United States because each changwad is governed by a governor. There are seventy-one changwads (provinces) in Thailand.

Background and Significance of the Study

Thailand is a part of Southeast Asia and borders on the Indian Ocean and Burma on the West, Cambodia and Laos on the East, Laos and Burma on the North, Malaysia and the Gulf of Thailand on the South. The population at the present time is approximately 42,600,000 (28, p. 580).

Thailand was originally known as Sayam. The name was changed in the 1850s to Siam and was so known until 1939, when the name Thailand (land of the free) was adopted. In 1945, the name reverted back to Siam, but was changed back again to Thailand in 1949 (20, p. 6).

The modernization of the Thai nation took place slowly. It took Thai education, for instance, over hundred years to make the transition from the traditional to the modern system that it has today (5, p. 1). The present system of education in Thailand is the product of many
forces and influences which have forged and tempered it over many centuries. The first educational system (1257-1868) in Thailand was quite similar to that of the monastic and cathedral schools of Medieval Europe, i.e., it had a religious orientation and was centered in the temples (31, p. 1).

Between 1868-1931, known as the expansion period, King Chulalongkorn (Rama) was a pioneer and reformer in education and in government. A modern school was established on the palace grounds in 1871. Palace schools were established for the express purpose of training boys for office work or the civil service (17, p. 3). In 1887, the Department of Education was established and five years later it became a ministry. The new ministry was assigned the responsibility for cultural and religious affairs as well as for educational administration. The Ministry of Education laid the foundation for educational expansion and better administration (1, p. 3).

The year 1932 marked the beginning of the modern era of Thai educational history. The absolute monarchy in Siam came to an end and was replaced by a constitutional monarchy. With the establishment of a Parliament, a need was felt for greater literacy in the adult population. The lion's share of the education budget that went to elementary and adult education focused on basic literacy (17, p. 4).
The school organization of Thai education has been changed many times. In 1913, there was a 3-3-3-2 plan; in 1932, a 4-4-4 plan; in 1936, a 4-3-3-2 plan; and in 1960, a 7-3-3-2 plan (10, pp. 4-6). In 1977, the Ministry of Education adopted a 6-3-3 plan, which is the most popular school organization in the United States. A diagram of the present educational system in Thailand is shown in Appendix B.

According to the National Scheme of Education 1977, the Thai educational system is divided into four levels (29, pp. 129-131):

(a) Pre-school education—which is aimed at child rearing and upbringing prior to compulsory education.

(b) Primary education—which is aimed at providing and maintaining literacy and developing in the individual cognitive ability, numerical manipulation and communication skills, adequate knowledge and abilities to apply in future occupational roles. It is also aimed towards personal development and the promotion of upright citizenry desirable for life in a democratic government under the Monarchy. Primary education shall be offered in continuity for a period about six years.

(c) Secondary education—which is aimed at providing appropriate academic and vocational knowledge compatible with the learner's age, needs, interests, skills and aptitudes
which ultimately will be beneficial to his chosen career and his society. Secondary education shall be divided into two segments--lower and upper secondary education, each of which requires three years of study.

(d) Tertiary level or higher education—which is aimed at providing for the full development of human intellectual abilities to facilitate the advancement in knowledge and technology. High level academic and professional manpower for national development is to be produced.

Today, education in Thailand basically is centralized; however, at the primary educational level there is some decentralization. For instance, responsibility for the administration, operation, and financing of primary education is vested in the Seventy-One Changwad Administrative Authorities. At the same time, however, what is taught in the primary schools, the curriculum, is still centralized in the Ministry of Education. Secondary education also is highly centralized. Responsibility for secondary education is centralized in the Ministry of Education and the Departments concerned (19, pp. 2-3).

In 1970, Raksasataya predicted:

The pendulum toward monopolizing education will swing back toward the direction of decentralization. Within twenty years, the government will face such a financial burden in providing more education to everyone that it will have to let private and local authorities provide some services for the people. Since the government will not have enough money to do all these itself, it will have to relinquish its
control to the people who actually pay for the schools and colleges. They will, of course, then have a more decisive role to play, that is decentralization (26, p. 60).

Educational issues have been an important cause of national government controversy in the past twenty years. There are serious problems of shortages of all kinds—of teachers, classrooms, qualified administrators, supervisors, and funds (25, p. 160).

The fact that Thailand allocated almost as much of its annual budget to education (19.1 per cent in 1973) as it did to its top priority sector, national defence (19.5 per cent), should constitute convincing evidence of the faith that political and educational leaders place on the power of the classroom, with or without walls, to shape national destiny. But faith alone, and even money, are not enough. Imaginatively conceived action programs, founded on sound theoretical and conceptual constructs, and balanced by pragmatic and hard-earned practical experience, are surely needed (22, p. 8).

It is true that experimentation and research in education are necessary for solving problems in school administration, teaching, and learning. In the United States, governmental enthusiasm for funding educational research influences many of the larger school districts. Many large- and medium-size districts employ full-time research directors who
plan and carry out research projects aimed at evaluating the educational effectiveness of the district and developing and validating new curricula, teaching methods, and educational programs (3, p. 485).

In Thailand, the situation is different. The Thai government lacks funds to fully support educational research and development. For the past twenty-five years support of educational development has been given by the United States government in cooperation with many outstanding universities, such as Indiana University, the University of Texas, Colorado State University, the University of Hawaii, Michigan State University, and Oklahoma State University (1, pp. 12-14). Although research activities based on Thai problems were successfully carried out and many well-informed Thai researchers were produced as a result of these activities, there is no discernible advancement of educational experimentation and research at the present time. The main problem seems to be the lack of adequate financial support from the government (8, p. 4).

Little research has been done in educational administration, especially in the areas of school organizational climate and leadership behavior. It was this situation that influenced this study to emerge. Hopefully this study would contribute to the advancement of the Thai educational system
and lead the government to recognize research as an essential technique for solving school administration, learning, and teaching problems and encourage them to provide more support for educational research.

The focus of this study was an attempt to determine whether there was a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the school organizational climate and the principal's leadership behavior.

The significance of this study may be realized if it contributes to the general understanding of the relationship between the school organizational climate and the principal's leadership behavior as perceived by teachers. In addition, the study could provide principals and other educational administrators in Thailand with instruments to investigate the school organizational climate and the leadership behavior of the principal. As Brown stated, "The main thing an officer of an organization can do about organizational climate is to study its climate. After that, specific practice suggests itself" (4, p. 44).

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study was limited to identifying teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior. It was limited to selected public secondary school teachers in Bangkok,
Thailand. The findings and conclusions of this study are valid for the population studied and others that might be similar.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that (a) the Thai translation of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) have validity as a criterion for assessing the principal's leadership behavior and the school organizational climate, (b) the teachers expressed their perceptions according to what they had experienced in the actual school environment, and (c) the variables selected in this study would be factors influenced the responses of the subjects. In addition, within schools and by subjects analyses of the data were conducted upon the assumption that since all Thai secondary schools are organized and controlled by the Ministry of Education, there would be no significant variance among teachers' perceptions of organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior between schools.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I includes an introduction, statement of the problem, purposes of the study, research questions and hypotheses, definition of terms, background and significance of the study, limitations of the study, basic assumptions, and organization of
the study. Chapter II is a presentation of the review of the literature and related research. Chapter III delineates the instruments employed in the study, population and sample, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures. Chapter IV deals with a presentation and analyses of data. Chapter V consists of the summary, findings, conclusions and implications, and recommendations.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is divided into three sections--(a) theory and research in educational administration, (b) research studies on school organizational climate, and (c) research studies on the leadership behavior of the principals.

Theory and Research
In Educational Administration

The word "theory" means different things to different people. Feigl's definition of theory is widely accepted and very popular in the literature of educational administration. He defined theory as "a set of assumptions from which can be derived by purely logico-mathematical procedures, a larger set of empirical laws" (28, p. 182). According to Feigl, the theory furnishes an explanation of these empirical laws and unifies the originally relatively heterogeneous areas of subject matter characterized by those empirical laws.

Theory has potential not only for explaining and predicting events but also for gaining new knowledge through application of formal deductive logic to verifiable major
premises (52, p. 138). Theory guides practice; practice, in turn, guides theory. Without theory, practice can be only incidentally successful (26, p. 264). Theory, stated Dewey, is in the end the most practical of all things (21, p. 17).

Theories in the behavioral and administrative sciences are very useful for the principal. They provide him with principles, concepts, alternative ways of viewing, understanding, ordering a multitude of variables, and predicting and influencing the outcomes of issues with which he must deal on a daily basis. A theoretical view serves the principal as would a "pair of spectacles," bringing into focus a few selected aspects of the world around him which he, perhaps negligently, would not otherwise have singled out for attention (12, p. 179).

In order to serve as a basic background for the principalship, three eras of administration--(a) classical design theory, (b) the human relations movement, and (c) modern organizational theory--are delineated.

**Classical Design Theory**

The ideas and concepts which comprise classical design theory represent the works of many different writers, both practitioners and scholars (35, p. 263). Frederick Taylor (Scientific Management), Henri Fayol (Classical Organizational Theory), and Max Weber (Bureaucratic Theory)
are three giants in the pre-World War I years who led the way in the efforts to understand the problems of managing modern organizations (71, pp. 9-10).

**Scientific management.**—Frederick Taylor (1856-1915) is commonly regarded as the father of scientific management. His definition of scientific management is as follows:

Scientific management is not any efficiency device, nor a device of any kind for securing efficiency; nor is it any branch or group of efficiency devices. It is not a new system of figuring costs; it is not a new scheme of paying men; it is not a piecework system; it is not a bonus system; it is not a premium system; it is no scheme for paying men; it is not holding a stopwatch on a man and writing things down about him; it is not time study; it is not motion study nor an analysis of the movements of men; it is not the printing and ruling and unloading of a ton or two of blanks on a set of men and saying, "Here's your system; go use it." It is not divided foremanship of functional foremanship; it is not any of the devices which the average man calls to mind when scientific management is spoken of. The average man thinks of one or more of these things when he hears the words "scientific management" mentioned, but scientific management is not any one of these devices. I am not sneering at cost-keeping systems, at time study, at functional foremanship, not at any new and improved scheme of paying men, not at efficiency devices, if they are really devices that make for efficiency. I believe in them; but what I am emphasizing is that these devices in whole or in part are not scientific management, they are useful adjuncts to scientific managements, so are they also useful adjuncts of other systems of management (93, p. 34).

Taylor thought that work could be analyzed scientifically and that it was management's responsibility to provide the specific guidelines for worker performance. As a result,
his thought led to the development of the one best method of doing the task, standardization of this method (usually by means of time and motion studies), selection of workers best suited to performing the specific tasks, and training them in the most efficient method for performing the work. It was an engineering approach and viewed the worker as an adjunct to the machine. The assumption was that workmen would be motivated by great economic rewards which would come from the increasing productivity. Taylor further stated:

It is no single element, but rather this whole combination, that constitutes scientific management, which may be summarized as: Science, not rule of thumb. Harmony, not discord. Cooperation, not individualism. Maximum output, in place of restricted output. The development of each man to his greatest efficiency and prosperity (92, p. 140).

Johns and Morphet remarked that Taylor conceptualized the worker as being only the extension of a machine. He ignored the fact that the worker also belonged to one or more social systems that vitally affected his production (49, p. 39).

From Taylor's various writings, Villers summarized principles of scientific management as follows:

A. Time-Study Principle. All productive effort should be measured by accurate time study and a standard time established for all work done in the shop.
B. Piece-Rate Principle. Wages should be proportional to output and their rates based on the standards determined by time study. As a corollary, a worker should be given the highest grade of work of which he is capable.

C. Separation-of-Planning-from-Performance Principle. Management should take over from the workers the responsibility for planning the work and making the performance physically possible. Planning should be based on time studies and other data related to production, which are scientifically determined and systematically classified; it should be facilitated by standardization of tools, implements, and methods.

D. Scientific-Methods-of-Work Principle. Management should take over from the workers the responsibility for their methods of work, determine scientifically the best methods, and train the workers accordingly.

E. Managerial-Control Principle. Managers should be trained and taught to apply scientific principles of management and control (such as management by exception and comparison with valid standards).

F. Functional-Management Principle. The strict application of military principles should be reconsidered and the industrial organization should be so designed that it best serves the purpose of improving the co-ordination of activities among the various specialists (98, p. 29).

In terms of educational applications, the effects of the scientific management movement carried into the educational enterprise. Faber and Shearron pointed out that efficient operation of schools became a major goal, and too often efficient really meant "cheap." Superintendents gained reputations for being scientific and efficient by eliminating small classes, increasing the pupil-teacher ratio, and
cutting costs in other ways, then preparing charts and graphs to show the resultant of lower costs (26, p. 83).

The focus of scientific management was the work done at the lowest level in the organization. Taylor and his followers analyzed the relationships between the physical nature of work and the physiological nature of workers to determine job descriptions. Therefore, its focus was quite narrow in that it did not propose solutions to the broader and more abstract problems of departmentalization, spans of control, and delegation of authority. The literature which emerged to fill this knowledge gap is termed classical organizational theory (35, p. 263).

Classical organizational theory.--Henri Fayol, a French engineer and geologist, was the first to state the series of principles of management that provide guideposts for successful management coordination in the early 1961 (85, p. 37). He defined the functions of administrator as: (a) to plan, (b) to organize (both men and materials), (c) to command—that is, to tell subordinates what to do, (d) to coordinate, and (e) to control (18, p. 195). He also laid down a number of principles for the administration. Fayol's fourteen principles were

A. Division of Work. The principle of specialization of labor in order to concentrate activities for more efficiency.
E. Authority and Responsibility. Authority is the right to give orders and the power to exact obedience.

C. Discipline. Discipline is absolutely essential for the smooth running of business, and without discipline no enterprise could prosper.

D. Unity of Command. An employee should receive orders from one superior only.

E. Unity of Direction. One head and one plan for a group of activities having the same objectives.

F. Subordination of Individual Interests to General Interest. The interest of one employee or a group should not prevail over that of the organization.

G. Remuneration of Personnel. Compensation should be fair and, as far as possible, afford satisfaction both to personnel and the firm.

H. Centralization. Centralization is essential to the organization and is a natural consequence of organizing.

I. Scalar Chain. The scalar chain is the chain of superiors ranging from the ultimate authority to the lowest rank.

J. Order. The organization should provide an orderly place for every individual. A place for everyone and everyone in his place.

K. Equity. Equity and a sense of justice pervades the organization.

L. Stability of Tenure of Personnel. Time is needed for the employee to adapt to his work and to perform it effectively.

M. Initiative. At all levels of the organizational ladder zeal and energy are augmented by initiative.

N. Esprit de Corps. This principle emphasizes the need for teamwork and the maintenance of interpersonal relations (27, pp. 19-42).
Although modifications have been made by later administrative management theorists, these fourteen principles provided the basic foundation for the school of thought. In order to avoid a rigid and dogmatic application of his ideas to the administration of organizations, Fayol emphasized that flexibility and a sense of proportion were essential for managers who adapted principles and definitions to particular situations. His thought was quite different from Taylor who held firmly to uniform, emphatic application of principles.

Bureaucratic theory.--The third major pillar in the development of classical design theory was provided by Max Weber's bureaucratic theory. Gibson stated, "Bureaucracy refers to negative consequences of large organizations, such as excessive 'red tape,' procedural delays, and general frustration" (35, p. 271). However, according to Weber, bureaucracy is the ideal type of structured management for accomplishing organizational purposes (61, p. 26).

In the ideal bureaucracy Weber envisioned certain characteristics which are, in a sense, principles of administration: (a) a division of labor based on functional specialization, (b) a well-defined hierarchy of authority, (c) a system of rules covering the rights and duties of positional incumbents, (d) a system of procedures for dealing
with work situations, (e) impersonality of interpersonal relations, and (f) promotion and selection for employment based upon technical competence (99, pp. 196-198).

Since the concept of authority is central to bureaucratic theory, it is worth discussing Weber's analysis. According to him, there are three types of authority:

A. Rational-Legal Authority. The rational-legal authority is legitimized by a belief in the supremacy of law and the belief that obedience is owed to the legally established, impersonal orders. Persons exercise authority only by virtue of the formal legality of their commands, and only within the scope of authority of their office.

B. Traditional Authority. Traditional authority is based on belief in the sanctity of age-old traditions. The present social order is considered to be sacred and is not to be changed. Those who exercise authority do so under rules that have always existed. Obedience is given not only to the rules, but also to the rulers.

C. Charismatic Authority. Charismatic authority depends on the personal devotion of the followers to the magnetic personality of the leaders. In the eyes of his followers, the charismatic leader has almost superhuman powers; he is viewed as being divinely inspired and incapable of error (100, p. 238).
In terms of bureaucratic attributes of schools, Owens stated that because schools have inherited much of the classical tradition of organization and administration, they exhibit many bureaucratic characteristics. The strong asymmetrical exercise of authority and control from top to bottom is one obvious expression of this tradition. He cites an example that, in order to exercise control of potentially disruptive students, schools have resorted to at least three widely used techniques:

A. The use of rules, often differentially applied.

B. Segregation of students into classes, tracks and schools.

C. Differential treatment in such matters as discipline, giving remarks, and rewarding symbols of status.

In the same way, effort to control potentially disruptive teachers include:

A. The use of rules.

B. Differential treatment in the assignment of classes, facilities, schedules, and symbols of status.

C. Manipulating the system's rewards--both tangible and intangible (72, p. 28).

The Human Relations Movement

Human relations constituted the second major approach to administration. The work of two major contributors in the human relations movement belong to Mary Parker Follett and
Elton Mayo. Although Follett was a contemporary of the other administrative theorists and set forth certain general principles and guidelines for practice, her approach was significantly different. She brought to her writings and speeches a vast knowledge of governmental and business administration. She presented many lectures and wrote articles which taken together established a philosophy of management (32).

Follett was unique in emphasizing the psychological and sociological aspects of management. She viewed management as a social process and the organization as a social system. She tended to reduce her principles of organization to four in number, all aspects of what she termed coordination. The principles were

A. Coordination by direct control of the responsible people concerned. That is, control should be effected horizontally through cross-relations between departments instead of up and down in line through the chief executive.

B. Coordination in the early stages. That is, the direct contact must begin while policy is being formed, not after a policy has been laid down when all that remains is compliance.

C. Coordination as the reciprocal relating of all the factors in the situation. That is, an individual does not only adjust to another individual, but also is influenced
by him, and among all individuals and units within the organization.

D. Coordination as a continuing process. That is, attention must be given to new machinery, procedures, information, and knowledge as the basis for renewal of both the organization and the individual (72, p. 297).

While Follett became the first great exponent of the aspect of human relations in administration, the systematic and empirical data in support of this view came from a number of experiments in human engineering carried out by Mayo and his colleagues. They conducted a series of research studies at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company between 1927 and 1932. Their five-year period studies covered these three phrases: (a) the relay assembly test room experiment, (b) the interviewing program, and (c) the bank wiring observation room (50, p. 79). Mayo drew conclusions from these experiments that employees would be happy and productive only if they could belong to a cohesive and stable work group, that the "sense of belonging" was more important to them than anything else (18, p. 187).

After the human relations movement in the 1920s, new concepts were available to the administrator to use in approaching his work. Among them were (a) morale, (b) group dynamics, (c) democratic supervision, and (d) personnel
relations. The human relations movement emphasized the human and interpersonal factors for administering the affairs of organizations. Supervisors in particular drew heavily on human relations concepts, employing such notions as involvement, motivational techniques, the sociometric of leadership, and democratic procedures (71, p. 10).

In the field of education, the concept of democratic procedures was not new during the human relations movement. John Dewey wrote of the need for democratic procedures in school administration as early as 1903 that 

...But until the public school system is organized in such a way that every teacher has some regular and representative way in which he or she can register judgement upon matters of educational importance, with the assurance that this judgement will somehow affect the school system, the assertion that the present system is not, from the internal standpoint, democratic seems to be justified. Either we come here upon some fixed and inherent limitation of the democratic principle, or else we find in this fact an obvious discrepancy between the conduct of the school and the conduct of social life, a discrepancy so great as to demand immediate and persistent effort at reform (20, pp. 194-195).

However, the other concepts emerged during the human relations movement spread rapidly and became vastly influential in the field of education. More recently, human relations efforts have been directed toward the development and utilization of new techniques, such as T-groups, encounter groups, and other modes of sensitivity training. Course, seminar, workshop, and other pre-service and in-service
training experiences are now utilized in many colleges, universities, and school districts to improve the human relations skills of principals and other educational personnel (61, p. 25).

**Modern Organizational Theory**

One of the most profound and insightful treaties on organization and administration was written by Chester I. Barnard (5), based upon his many years of experience as president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company. In *The Functions of the Executive*, originally published in 1938, he made important contributions to the understanding of (a) the satisfactions of individuals received from the organization, (b) the concepts of effectiveness and efficiency, (c) the importance of communication, and (d) the relationship of the formal and informal organization.

**Satisfactions of individuals.**—Barnard stressed that the existence of the organization depended upon the maintenance of an equilibrium between the contributions and the satisfactions of the organizational participants. The satisfactions an individual receives in exchange for his contributions may be regarded as incentives, in which economic motives play a secondary tough indespensable place. Specific inducements include (a) material inducements, such as money; (b) personal non-material opportunities for distinction,
prestige, and personal power; (c) desirable physical working conditions; and (d) ideal benefactions, such as pride of workmanship, sense of adequacy, or feelings of loyalty. He also listed four general types of incentives: (a) associated attractiveness based upon compatibility with coworkers; (b) adaptation of working conditions to habitual methods and attitudes; (c) opportunity for the feeling of enlarged participation in the cause of events; and (d) the opportunity for comradeship, satisfactory social relations, and mutual support in personal attitudes (5, pp. 142-149).

**Effectiveness and efficiency.**—Barnard's second major contribution was the distinction he made between the concepts of effectiveness and efficiency. Effectiveness was defined as system-oriented, having to do with the achievement of cooperative and organizational goals; efficiency was defined as person-oriented, having to do with the feelings of satisfaction an individual derives from membership in an organization. Campbell, Bridges, and Nystrand remarked that the interrelationship of organization achievement and individual satisfaction was noted for the first time. This conception did much to put the work of Taylor and Fayol, who had concentrated on organization achievement, and Follett and Mayo, who had tended to emphasize individual satisfaction, in appropriate perspective (11, p. 93).
Communication.--Barnard emphasized the role of communication in maintaining the organization as a cooperative system. By a cooperative system, he meant a group of persons some or all of whose activities are coordinated. The system was held together by a common purpose as well as by the willingness of certain people to contribute to the operation of the organization. People are in a position to cooperate more effectively if they can communicate with one another. Aside from stressing the importance of the informal organization to the communications process, Barnard confined himself to such formal principles as follows:

A. Channels of communication should be definitely known.

B. Objective authority requires a definite, formal channel of communication to every member of an organization.

C. The line of communication must be direct or short as possible.

D. The complete line of communication should usually be used.

E. The competence of the persons serving as communication centers, that is, officers, supervisory heads, must be adequate.

F. The line of communication should not be interrupted during the time when the organization is to function.

G. Every communication should be authenticated (5, pp. 175-180).
Formal and informal organization.--Barnard was among the first to differentiate between the formal and informal aspects of organization. He explained that a formal organization was

an impersonal system of coordinated human efforts; always there is purpose as the co-ordinating and unifying principle; always there is the indispensable ability to communicate, always the necessity of personal willingness, and for effectiveness and efficiency in maintaining the integrity of purpose and the continuity of contributions (5, pp. 94-95).

Barnard pointed out that in each formal organization there are informal organization. One cannot exist without the other. He claimed:

Informal organization is definite and rather structureless, and has not definite subdivision. It may be regarded as a shapeless mass of quite varied densities, the variation in density being a result of external factors affecting the closeness of people geographically or of formal purposes which bring them specifically into contact for conscious joint accomplishments. These areas of special density, I call informal organizations, as distinguished from societal or general organizations in their informal aspects. Thus there is an informal organization of a community, of a state. For our purposes, it is important that there are informal organizations related to formal organizations everywhere (5, p. 115).

In addition to Barnard's analysis of informal organization, the answer to the question of how informal organizations develop within each formal organization can be found from the analysis of George Homans (48). There are three elements in a social system--(a) activities, (b) interactions, and (c) sentiments. Activities are the tasks that people
perform. Interactions are the behaviors that occur between people in performing these tasks. Sentiments are the attitudes that develop between individuals and within groups. Homans argued that while these concepts are separate, they are closely related. A change in any of these three elements will produce some change in the other two.

In an organization, certain activities, interactions, and sentiments are essential, if it is to survive. Jobs (activities) have to be done that require people to work together (interactions). These jobs must be sufficiently satisfying (sentiments) for people to continue doing them. People develop sentiments toward each other as they interact in their jobs. As the interaction increases, more positive sentiments will tend to develop toward each other. The more positive the sentiment, the more people will tend to interact with each other. Along with the occurrence of the process, there is a tendency for the group members to become more alike in their activities and sentiments. The group will tend to develop expectations or norms that specify how people in the group "might" tend to behave under specific circumstances (44, pp. 58-59). This is the way in which the informal organization is formed.

The informal organization, stated Gorton, may operate either for or against the interests of the formal organization. An understanding of the informal organization and its
important components and elements is vital for the school administrator. Its operation can affect (a) the implementation of administrative policy; (b) the role behavior of an individual or group; (c) the extent to which communication within the formal organization is accurate and complete; and (d) the degree of satisfaction experienced by people working within the organization (37, pp. 342-343).

Another influential work utilizing the behavioral sciences in the analysis of administration was Administrative Behavior by Herbert A. Simon (84). He asserted that the most fruitful approach to understanding and improving administrative behavior was through a decision-making framework. He attacked the classical principles of organization as proverbs, superficial, oversimplified, and unreal. Dimock remarked although Simon was forced to reject former principles of organization as mere "proverbs," he came up with some suggestions of his own which sounded familiar (23, p. 115). These suggestions included five mechanisms of organization influence affecting the decisions of individual member. They were: (a) the organization divides work among its members; each is given a particular task and he limits himself to that task; (b) the organization establishes "standard" practices; (c) the organization transmits decisions through its ranks by establishing "systems" of authority and influence; (d) it
provides channels of communication for decision-making; and (e) it trains and "indoctrinates" its members, this last being called the "internalization" of influence (84, pp. 102-103).

Simon attempted not only to propose that administration is a science in a framework of decision making, he also brought mathematical decision theory into administrative thought through the use of such concepts as limits of decisions, utility of decisions, maximization of decisions, and rationality of decisions. In his analysis of organizational decision processes, Simon was also concerned with such issues as planning, budgeting, controlling, and coordinating by means of decisional terms. His emphasis on decision making gave his analysis of the administrative process a unity and coherence which earlier formulations lacked.

While Simon is developing a new approach to administrative decision making, other new theoretical approaches are starting to come into existence. Among these are information theory, cybernetics, operations research, game theory, and general systems theory. Other theories which are arbitrarily classing as administrative rather than organizational theory include the work of Jacob W. Getzels, Egon G. Guba, Daniel E. Griffiths, John K. Hemphill, and Andrew W. Halpin (26, pp. 101-102).
The year 1950 may be the turning point in the development of educational administration (71, p. 16). With the increasing ferment in education, attention was focused upon the roles and the functions of the educational administrator, both in the operation of the schools and in providing the leadership which is essential for maintaining the viability of public education in a dynamically changing society. Since 1950 the training of educational administrators has been altered in significant ways. Whereas the training of administrators previously emphasized the technological problems of school administration, the "new movement" stressed the importance of administrative theory, the applications of the behavioral sciences to the problems of educational administration, the social context in which educational administration takes place, the analysis of school organization as a social system, the analysis of the reciprocal relationships of diverse roles within the organization, and the interpretation of educational administration within the boarder sphere of public administration of the public schools (36, p. 1).

In 1955, Coladarci and Getzels did much to stimulate concern and interest in theories related to educational administration. Two major premises of their work were that theory and practice constitute an integrity and that theorizing is always present in human behavior (14, p. 7).
Since the latter years of the 1950s, interest in theories related to educational administration has grown considerably. There has been an attempt to develop a global theory of school administration. The past decade has brought forth a variety of theories, none of which explains the overall task of administration. What have been developed are administratively related theories--theories of administrative functions and behavior, and theories of dimensions tangential to the process of administration. However, one important development has been the interdisciplinary approach to the study of educational administration. New insights into the process of administration have been gained by interrelating the available facts and theories of a variety of disciplines, such as the social sciences, psychology, and philosophy (86, pp. 75-76).

Within the scope of this study, leadership theories will be discussed. These leadership theories are believed to be foundational and have great potential for assisting an individual to understand and thereby improve the behavior of principals.

Leadership

The successful organization, stated Blanchard and Hersey, has one major attribute that sets it apart from unsuccessful organizations--dynamic and effective leadership
(44, p. 83). In general leadership has been a loosely defined term. Leadership has meant and still means different things to different persons at various times under differing situations. Of the many different attempts to define leadership, none seems to be all inclusive. In discussing some of the various definitions of leadership, it is recognized that an operational definition may best describe and serve principals on the job.

Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly defined leadership as an attempt at interpersonal influence which involves the use of power and the acceptance of the leader by followers. The ability to influence is related to the followers' need satisfaction (35, p. 195).

Davis described leadership as the ability to persuade others to seek defined objectives enthusiastically. He felt that it was the leader who is in a strategic position with the power to motivate people and guide them toward goals (19, pp. 96-97).

Southworth pointed out that leadership is not the imposition of the status leader's will upon the group or the implementation of the will of the group by the status leader. Rather leadership is a combination of the will of the status leader and the will of the group, developed in a collegial way, so that the leadership that evolves represents the best thinking of all concerned individuals (87, p. 31).
Lipham placed administration and leadership in correlate and approximate positions. He stated that:

Except perhaps for a few complex institutions of very large size, leadership functions and administrative functions are usually combined in a single-role incumbent. The superintendent of a school, for example, must, at times, wear an "administrative hat." Having but one head, the superintendent should, indeed, be aware of which "hat" he is wearing, since he undoubtedly is expected both to administer and to lead.

The distinction made here between leadership and administration carries no implication that one is universally more appropriate, more important, or more difficult than the other. In both leadership and administration, the same organizational and individual variables are involved. Although the initiation of change within an organization is usually perceived as a complex and energy-consuming process, adherence to existing goals, structures, and procedures in a kaleidoscopic field of forces can be equally as demanding (60, p. 123).

**Styles of Leadership**

One theory which has been particularly influential in the field of education was stated by Lewin, Lippit, and White. They classified leadership into three forms—(a) authoritarian, (b) democratic, and (c) laissez-faire (57, pp. 271-299). In authoritarian leadership decision-making is centered in one person or a very few persons. Under authoritarian leadership the behavior and thinking of the group are dominated by the leader. The group that functions under democratic leadership has the opportunity to decide its own objectives and policies on the basis of group
information and discussion. Under laissez-faire leadership the group members are given complete freedom to decide what they are going to do and how they are going to do it.

Two additional styles of leadership were added to the above formulation by Hubert Bonner (7). They were bureaucratic and charismatic. Bureaucratic leadership suggested that the structured arrangements within which leaders rely upon were for their status and for making decisions and getting the work done. A bureaucratic leader is an incumbent in a bureaucratic office. His style, typically, is a combination of authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire styles of leadership. Owens remarked that how well a bureaucratic leader integrates, blends, balances, and adjusts the components of his style in concert with the situation, the group, and his personal being will largely determine his impact as a leader in the organization (71, pp. 135-136). Charismatic leadership is a compound of personal charm and inner spiritualness by which leaders influence their followers' decision-making and functioning (24, p. 26). However, charismatic leadership tends to be unstable because it is linked to one mortal man. The death or replacement of the charismatic person may seriously disrupt the functioning of the organization (26, p. 77).

In each of five aforementioned styles, the leader may choose to direct or influence the group in four ways:
(a) Force, which can come from any source, but is usually inherent in the leader's own status or position.

(b) Paternalism, the "papa-know-best; you-wouldn't-want-to-hurt-papa" gambit.

(c) Bargaining, by which the leader says, in effect "You help me, and I'll help you," or "You grant me the favor, and I'll grant you one in return."

(d) Mutual means, in which leader and followers share the same aims, so that neither needs to force the other to subscribe to them and pursue them (53, p. 39).

Situational Leadership Theory

Gorton rejected the premise that one style of leadership is preferable to another or that there exists a set of personal qualities which every leader must possess (37, p. 296). Stoops and Johnson claimed that in leadership situations two factors are always present--the characteristics of the leader and the environmental conditions which demand attention. Basically leadership depends upon one's ability to satisfy the needs of others. This ability requires knowledge of the needs and an understanding of those conditions which can fulfill those needs. A successful leader must have the ability to know that (a) which is needed and (b) how best to secure it (91, p. 37).

McKague emphasized that

The situation approach to leadership supports the view that more must be involved than simply the leader and the group. Unless a situation exists, such a problem to be solved or a decision to be
made, groups may not require leadership. Situational theory does not maintain that personal qualities of leadership are unimportant; neither does it state that situations automatically produce the leadership required. But it does maintain that personal qualities must be examined in the context of a particular situation (64, p. 2).

Contingency Leadership Theory

The contingency leadership theory by Fiedler (30) proposed that leadership effectiveness is contingent upon the interaction of the leader's style and the favorableness of the situation for that leader. Fiedler classified leaders as being task-oriented or interpersonal relations-oriented on the basis of the way they described the individual with whom they least liked to work (59, p. 574). His extensive research strongly indicated that task-oriented leaders perform most effectively either under favorable or unfavorable situations. Relationship-oriented leaders, on the other hand, obtain more effective group performance in situations that are intermediate in favorableness (83, p. 107). Fiedler concluded that the most effective leadership style is dependent upon three conditions--(a) relations between the leader and group members, (b) nature of the task to be accomplished--whether structured or unstructured, and (c) position power of leader (30, p. 22).
Exchange Theory of Leadership Determination

George Homans (47) developed a theory of exchange for explaining social behavior. Exchange theory incorporated four basic concepts—reward, cost, outcome, and comparison level. The concept of Homans' exchange theory of leadership determination can be explained as follows. In a problem situation that an actor in a group wants to initiate a leadership act, he considers what rewards he may receive if he provides leadership in terms of increased status, need for dominance, desire to see the problem solved, and other factors. He then considers the cost in terms of loss of status if the group rejects him or his solution fails, increased effort and responsibility on his part, and other factors. He then attempts to determine the outcome by subtracting the costs from the rewards. If the outcome is positive, it is a profit, and if negative, a loss. His decision to act will also depend upon the comparison level. The profit must be sufficiently above a "break even" point, and his past experiences in comparable situations must have been successful often enough for him to take the chance of leadership (66, p. 142).

Kimbrough pointed out that the exchange theory of leadership can be applied to educational administration (51, p. 101). The principal incurs costs when he exerts leadership. Some of these costs might be loss of friendship,
failure, lack of promotion, hostility from the faculty, and eventual loss of prestige. On the other hand, the principal is rewarded by successful leadership. These rewards may include satisfaction in goal accomplishment, social recognition, promotions, and many others. Thus the principal unconsciously and consciously balances the costs and rewards as a basis for his leadership behavior.

The Group Dynamics Theory of Leadership

The group dynamics theory of leadership by Cartwright and Zander advanced the idea that leadership should vary according to the needs of the group with which the administrator is associated. This theory stresses that the needs of the group define the nature of the situation to which the leader should respond and will constitute the expectations against which the leader's behavior will be evaluated (37, p. 298).

Cartwright and Zander, based on the findings of numerous studies at the Research Center for Group Dynamics, claimed that most groups possess two basic needs—(a) group achievement and (b) group maintenance (13, pp. 496-499). They stated that the type of behavior involved in goal achievement is illustrated by these examples—the manager "initiates action...keeps members' attention on the goal...clarifies the issue and develops a procedural plan" (13,
In meeting the maintenance needs of any group with which he works, the dynamics oriented administrator will involve himself in the following kinds of activities—(a) creating and maintaining positive interpersonal relations among the members of the group, (b) fostering feelings of cohesion and unity on the part of the group, (c) ameliorating interpersonal conflict among the members of the group, and (d) stimulating self-direction on the part of the group (13, p. 496).

Research Studies

On School Organizational Climate

The primary rationale for the existence of organizations is that certain goals can be achieved only through the concerted action of groups of people (35, p. 4). Whether the goal is profit, providing education, religion, or health care, or getting a candidate elected, organizations are characterized by their goal-directed behavior.

No organization exists in a vacuum. Each must deal with its environment every day. Each organization continually interacts with other organizations and individuals in that environment—customers, students, parents, and citizens. The Lewin study in 1930s caused the study of the linkage between individuals and environment to emerge. As a part of his study, he proposed formula number 25 which can be
described in words as that every behavior Be is a function of the total life space (L) which includes both the person P and the environment E. This formula can be written as (56, pp. 78-79):

\[ B_e = F(L) = F(P,E) \]

In the field of education, Halpin and Croft (41) studied the climate of elementary schools by sampling teachers' perceptions of their school environment. Halpin defined organizational climate as the way that a school "feels" of its own "personality." He wrote:

"It is this "personality" that we describe here as the "organizational climate" of the school. Analogously, personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization (40, p. 131)."

One of major motivations that prompted Halpin and Croft to study the organizational climate of schools was their dissatisfaction with the concept of morale and with the sloppy way in which this concept had been used in typical studies of schools and school systems. Statements about the morale in a school failed to indicate enough about the school's organizational climate (40, p. 132).

After the study of Halpin and Croft, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) has been used many times. Brown replicated the original OCDQ analysis with a sample of eighty-one schools drawn from the
St. Paul-Minneapolis area. He found that the pattern of intercorrelations among the subtest score was, in general, similar to that found in the original study (39, p. 7). Andrew's study based on data from 165 Alberta schools. He concluded that the OCDQ possessed good construct validity. He stated that the eight subtest scores were measures of the concepts they purported to measure (4, pp. 332-333). From his study involving a sample of twenty teachers and 779 students, Hinojosa concluded that the OCDQ was appropriate and valid instruments for the purpose for which they were designed (46, p. 6901).

But different results were found in Roseveare's study. A sample of ten schools with faculties ranging from twelve to fourteen teachers was used in his study of the validity of the OCDQ. On the basis of his findings of the study, it was concluded that the subtest Thrust of the OCDQ was a valid measure and that the subtest Esprit of the OCDQ seemed to have validity, but the data were not conclusive. The subtests Intimacy, Aloofness, and Production Emphasis contained very low reliability coefficients in this sample indicating that utmost caution should be used in interpreting data obtained from these subtests (80, p. 7501).

However, Owens indicated that the OCDQ represents the most practical of the pioneer technique available for assessing the organizational climate of schools in a sys-
tematic way. This technique provides an overall assessment of the interpersonal milieu of a school organization expressed in terms of certain behavioral dimensions as perceived by teachers (71, p. 194).

Anderson studied the significance of the differences in perception of climate in three ways—(a) differences in perception of climate between members of the same subgroup, (b) differences in composite perception of subgroups within the same school, and (c) between school differences of comparable subgroups in composite perception of climate. It was found that differences in perception of climate between members of the same subgroup were not significantly different. Differences between composite subgroups in the same school were not significant when all eight subtests were considered. There were statistically significant differences when analysis was limited to differences in subtests, Thrust and Esprit. The only between schools constant discernible to composite subgroups was the presence of the principal. Differences between composite subgroups including principals in membership were not statistically significant (2, pp. 5900-5901).

Novotney investigated the organizational climate of selected Roman Catholic elementary schools. The OCDQ was administered to 1,072 principals and teachers in 100 Roman Catholic elementary schools in the Los Angeles Archdiocese. He found that factor analysis of item intercorrelations
resulted in loadings on eight dimensions. Items loading distribution on the eight subtest dimensions generally coincided with the results obtained by Halpin and Croft. Factor analysis of the parochial school profile intercorrelation matrix revealed three factors which delineated six types of organizational climate—open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed. Two-thirds of the parochial schools were placed in categories construed as "open" (69, pp. 3723-3724).

Organizational Climate and Student Achievement

Kritzmire studied the relationship between gain in academic achievement of students and the educational environment. He found that there was insufficient evidence to indicate the existence of a relationship between student achievement and staff perception of the educational environment. School environments perceived as favorable by students are more likely to be characterized by higher achievement than school environments which students perceived as unfavorable (54, p. 5471).

Panushka investigated the relationship between elementary school climate and student achievement in a large metropolitan school district. A sample of his study consisted of twenty-six principals from twenty-six schools, 447 teachers, and 2,300 students of grades five and six. He
concluded that no important evidence was found of a relationship between climate or climate dimensions and student achievement. When the findings were dichotomized by the Getzels' nomothetic-idiographic model, teacher social needs satisfaction, as measured by OCDQ subtests, was held as more important to student achievement than the institutional goal behavior of principals (73, p. 2072).

Feldvebel studied the relationships of OCDQ variables with student achievement in Illinois, using urban fifth-grade students. The two significant relationships he found were negative with Production Emphasis (-.40) and positive with Consideration (.39). Intimacy was not significant and was not reported. It is interesting to note that Feldvebel did not control academic ability, although its effects might be speculated upon in his findings regarding socio-economic status. Both variables which he found to be significantly related to achievement were more strongly related in the opposite direction to socio-economic status (Production Emphasis .51 and Consideration -.41). Had the socio-economic status factor been removed, the relationships between these two variables and achievement would likely have disappeared (29, pp. 1-4).

Flagg attempted to show existing relationships between organizational climate and student achievement in reading. A sample of his study included ten elementary schools in the
South Side Project Area in Newark, New Jersey. He concluded that no relationship between climate and student achievement in reading could be said to have established because of the relative sameness in climate of the schools in the study. He also found that as the size of the school increased, the climate tended to become more closed (31, p. 818).

A study was undertaken by Morton attempting to determine if a relationship existed between teacher perception of organizational climate of the elementary school and the academic achievement of students. The sample included 306 elementary schools. Correlational analyses among the student achievement variable (math and reading scores) and the eight subscales of elementary school organizational climate found no significant relationship (67, p. 2463).

Reilley's study was an attempt to find the answer to the following question. Are teacher responses to subscales derived from the OCDQ significantly and meaningfully correlated with measures of student achievement derived from the Assessment Battery of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program? A sample of his study consisted of 120 elementary schools which had participated in the 1970-1971 Michigan Educational Assessment Program. A finding generally supported recent assertions that achievement in school was largely a function of the socio-economic background and native ability the student brought to the school (79, p. 2988).
Organizational Climate and Other Variables

Winter investigated the relationship of certain personal status factors of elementary school professional staff members and organizational climate. Three conclusions drawn from an analysis of the data were: A. Middle Tennessee elementary schools have a tendency to fall near the closed end of the organizational climate continuum, with paternal climate being the most common. B. There is a significant relationship between organizational climate and certain personal status factors of elementary school professional staff members. C. The personal status factor "age" has more significant relationship to organizational climate than other personal status factors tested. The factor "age" also related significantly to more of the other personal status factors tested than any other factor (101, p. 2083).

McLeod's study was concerned with the relationship of principal-teacher interaction and the organizational climate existing in fifty-six elementary schools located in a large, suburban district in Colorado. The data suggested that teachers with more classroom experience tended to have the more open climate (65, pp. 2298-2299).

Lutzemeier studied the relationships between and among organizational climate, teachers' needs, and pupil-pupil classroom relations in elementary schools. A sample of his study included the faculties and principals of twenty
elementary schools from four suburban school districts in Houston, Texas metropolitan area. It was found that: A. Principals of the schools assessed tended to perceive school climate as being more open than teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate. B. The organizational climates of these schools did not seem to be related to the inter-personal needs of teachers. Teachers appeared to demonstrate occupational uniformity in aspects of personality. C. Organizational climate did not appear to be related to pupil-pupil classroom relations. The social structures of these classrooms were apparently the products of some other factor or factors (62, p. 2295).

Ford investigated the relationships between aspects of the psychological health of elementary school principals and certain leadership behaviors contributing to the organizational climate of the school. The subjects consisted of forty-two principals serving elementary schools in Central New York. It was concluded that principals serving open climate schools possessed a higher measured level of psychological health than principals serving closed climate schools. The open climate principal possessed greater acceptance of his own aggressiveness, greater self-acceptance and greater capacity for intimate contact than the principal serving the closed climate school (33, p. 900).
Hillman's study sought to determine the relationship between organizational climate and innovation and also leader characteristics and innovation in selected high schools in south-western Ohio. The sample of the study consisted of twenty-four high schools. The results of the study showed a definite relationship between organizational climate and innovation. It showed further that there was a strong coexistence between salaries paid to the principals and the amount of innovation occurring in the school. The consistency of more open climates in the smaller schools seemed to indicate that the principal-teacher communication and subsequent relationship was better in the smaller schools, but that because of insufficient personnel great amounts of innovation were not taking place. The indication of a greater amount of innovation in the larger schools tended to support earlier studies (45, pp. 3816-3817).

Lewis attempted to study the relationship between size, span of control, leadership behavior and organizational climate in the educational organization. It was concluded that organizational climate was not a function of the interaction of size and span of control with leadership behavior, nor could leadership behavior be implied from the size of school or span of control. The results of the study did indicate that there was a hierarchy of factors among which leadership and role perceptions, structural, social, envi-
ronmental, situational and professional training factors seemed to be prominent in their influence on leadership behavior (58, p. 3295).

Lake studied to identify specific variables related to characteristics of principals, teachers, and school which tend to influence or contribute to climate openness in schools. He found that principal age, experience, acceptance of self and perceptions of self-acceptance of others could not serve as criteria for identifying school climate. Principals' educational levels were predictors of school climate. Teacher age and experience could not be predictors of school climate; sex could be. Size of enrollment, attendance, and student population could not serve as a basis for identifying school climate. With teachers and principals combined into a single group, age was a predictor of climate, while sex and experience were not (55, p. 1153).

Null studied (a) the relationships between personal variables of teachers and the way in which these teachers perceived the eight dimensions of organizational climate, and (b) the differences in attitude and personality factors among teachers in schools characterized by different climates. The population studied consisted of 154 elementary schools located in number districts of the Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. He concluded that relationships were found between teacher
attitude toward children and teacher perception of the eight dimensions of climate, and between certain personality factors and perception of certain of the dimensions of climate (70, p. 4392).

Sellinger tried to determine if there were relationships among organizational climate of elementary schools, teacher anxiety, and student test anxiety. A sample of his study included teachers and students in twenty-three elementary schools in New London County in the State of Connecticut. He found that students in elementary schools with open organizational climate exhibited slightly more test anxiety than students in elementary schools with closed organizational climates. Organizational climate and teacher anxiety had significant interactional effects on student test anxiety (82, p. 5515).

Braden investigated the relationship between teacher, principal, and student attitudes and organizational climate. He found that the attitudes teachers held toward students differed between teachers in differing organizational climate groups. The teachers in the more open climate schools held more positive attitudes toward students. The attitudes students held toward teachers did not differ between students in differing organizational climates. The attitudes students held toward schools did not differ between students in differing organizational climates. Teachers and principals who
perceived their own school's organizational climate in a similar manner appeared to hold similar attitudes toward the students of that school (9, p. 3801).

Possible relationships between the organizational climate of an elementary school as perceived by teachers and student achievement, student self concept as a learner, student classroom behavior, and student attendance in schools with divergent climates were studied by Pumphrey. A sample of his study consisted of teachers and students in twenty-six schools in Anne Arundale County, Maryland. He found that no statistically significant relationships were found between teachers' perceptions of organizational climate in an elementary school and: achievement of students; student self concept as a learner; teachers' perceptions of students' classroom behavior; nor student absence or tardiness. The study did not find empirical evidence to support the assumption that students, with regard to the variables considered, benefited more from one organizational climate than from another (76, p. 1377).

In his study of the relationships between the organizational climate and student ideology as perceived by teachers, and the self esteem and power dimensions of the students' self concept as perceived by the students, Hinojosa used a sample of twenty-nine teachers and 779 students. They came from the fourth and sixth grades of six elementary
schools in the Corpus Christi Independent School District. He found that there was a positive relationship between organizational climate and student power (46, p. 6901).

Prenoveau attempted to determine what relationships existed between dimensions of the perceived organizational climate of schools, as measured by Halpin and Croft's OCDQ, and a measure of the teaching-learning process, Vincent's Indicators of Quality. The sample consisted of twenty-nine rural-suburban schools. The findings of his study provided empirical evidence to confirm that behaviors in the classroom were linked to social interactions which prevailed in the schools, and that the social interactions were linked to the principal's perceived behaviors wherein he set a high standard of performance by example coupled with a high level of concern for teachers. These findings confirmed that the level of morale in an elementary school was an important aspect of the organizational climate highly related to classroom behaviors (74, p. 6724).

Magee examined relationships between bureaucratic structure and organizational climate in schools as perceived by teachers in selected elementary schools. His sample composed of all teachers of a single elementary school building in each of the three communities which were located in New England. There was a total population of sixty-four teachers. It was found that a trend that older teachers who had been
in their present position longer was found in the more closed urban school. Trends indicated that teachers perceived rules, regulations and procedures as inhibiting the principal to facilitate the task-accomplishment of teachers and the ability to motivate the teachers by setting a good example. Teachers in the more closed school viewed structure as being more of a constraint on organizational climate (63, p. 3189).

The relationships between and among leadership style, leadership effectiveness, and organizational climate in the elementary principalship were studied by Albright. A sample of his study included twenty-one principals and 100 teachers in the State of Kansas. He concluded that the research variables--leadership style, leadership effectiveness, and organizational climate--were highly correlated. The partial correlations indicated that subordinates viewed Initiating Structure and Consideration as being important to organizational climate. Leadership styles were correlated with types of climates found in schools (1, p. 3818).

Thayer investigated the relationships between some variables of the classroom and the school pertaining to the elementary school environment. Teachers and students from sixteen schools in sixteen school districts were included in the sample. He found that there was no relationship among the spread of the teachers' and students' perceptions of organizational climate (95, p. x).
Research Studies on School Organizational Climate in Thailand

Dachanuluknukul studied the organizational climate of elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai. A sample of the study included thirty-four elementary schools. The conclusions of the study indicated that the climate of the elementary schools tended to be more closed than open. Principals tended to perceive the climate of the school to be more open than did the teachers. Teachers in elementary schools with enrolments of 300 or less perceived the climate of the schools to be more open than did teachers in elementary schools with enrolments of more than 300 students. And when the school size increased the climate was more likely to be closed (17, pp. i-iii).

Musigsarn investigated the relationship of certain personal status factors of the principals of comprehensive secondary schools and organizational climate. The total number of 1024 teachers and principals from fourteen comprehensive secondary schools were included in her study. Results of the study indicated that comprehensive secondary schools tended to have autonomous climate continuum with controlled climate. The personal status factors of principals showed significance related to organizational climate. Only certain dimensions of organizational climate were significantly different among schools categorized by principals' age, educational backgrounds, and years of experience as a
principal. The older principal had more degree of openness for hindrance and aloofness, less esprit, production emphasis, thrust and consideration than the younger one. The qualified-educational-background principal had less degree of openness for disengagement and intimacy than the unqualified one. The principal with more years of experience had a greater degree of openness for aloofness and production emphasis, and a less degree of openness for thrust and consideration (68, p. 1).

Research Studies on the Leadership Behavior of the Principal

One major emphasis of early research focused upon isolating the physical, intellectual, or personality traits that distinguished a leader from his followers. Tead (94) reported that the traits of the effective leader were nervous and physical energy, a sense of purpose and direction, enthusiasm, friendliness, integrity, technical mastery, decisiveness, intelligence, teaching skills, and faith. He emphasized, "Leadership is known by the personalities it enriches, not by those it dominates or captivates. Leadership is not a process of exploitation of others for extraneous ends" (94, p. 81). Barnard (5) stated that the significant traits that distinguished leaders from their
followers were physique, technical skill, perception, knowledge, memory, imagination, persistence, endurance, and courage.

Stogdill examined 124 leadership studies conducted in both organizational and experimental environments (89, pp. 35-71). He concluded that a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. He further concluded that the followings were associated with leadership and classified them as follows:

(a) Capacity--intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, judgment.

(b) Achievement--scholarship, knowledge, athletic accomplishments.

(c) Responsibility--dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, desire to excel.

(d) Participation--activities, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, humor.

(e) Status--socioeconomic position, popularity (90, p. 58).

The most recent approach to the study of leadership is the analysis of leadership behavior, which recognizes that both psychological and sociological factors, both individual and situational variables, are powerful determinants of behavior (61, pp. 180-181). John Hemphill had been
known for scholarly studies of leadership when he and Alvin Coons developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire at the Ohio State University (43). All details concerning this study can be found in Chapter III.

In education there is no single best pattern to prepare principals. There is no educational program that will ensure success in administration. It appears that leadership has no specific curriculum, no predetermined set of performance objectives, and no common experimental base (96, p. 38). Briner gave some suggestions that, to be successful in his principalship, the principal cannot imagine or strive for one particular school model, because each school embodies essentially the people in it who will be self determining and self regulating. What suits the choice of the group within the institution and its environment becomes the fulfillment of the group, just as the choice of activity by the individual becomes his fulfillment (10, p. 35).

Redfern classified the patterns of the principal leadership into four categories--(a) directive behavior, (b) guiding behavior, (c) vacillating behavior, and (d) appeasing behavior (78, pp. 14-16). Directive behavior is aggressive and domineering. The reaction that follows it is either resistive or acquiescent. The staff resents high-handed action, and they either resist or go along to avoid unpleas-
antness. Guiding behavior leads to the release of staff potential and facilitates work. Staff reaction is favorable and accepting, since their work as individuals is recognized. Vacillating behavior is characterized as inconsistent and allows the staff to take the initiative, while the principal withdraws. The staff becomes uncertain and uncomfortable. A principal who expresses appeasing behavior is characterized by timidity and insecurity. He may be striving for personal popularity, or be unable to stand criticism by the staff or his superiors. The natural reaction to this type of leadership is resentment. The tendency is for the staff to take over the leadership role and replace the existing leaders.

Rubin stated that in order to be a successful principal and no matter whatever style and method of leadership he uses, the principal must strive to create the incentive and desire to improve performance. He must give his energies to a constant appraisal of his organization, and he must insist upon renewal and change which is intelligent and purposeful (81, p. 52).

Most of the research concerning the behavior of leaders in the field of education derives from concepts developed at the Ohio State University and at the University of Chicago (61, p. 188). One of the most interesting studies is the study used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). After the study of Halpin, the LBDQ has been used many times.
Hayden studied to determine if a relationship existed between a secondary principal's leader behavior and certain background data relative to his position. Certain conclusions were formulated: A. The number of years of experience in teaching and administrative position had no effect upon the leader behavior effectiveness. B. The social science majors had a considerably higher chance of being an effective secondary principal than those in other fields. C. The active participation of secondary principals in professional, civic and fraternal organizations was conducive to effective secondary administrative leadership. D. Those secondary principals who kept abreast of current theories, concepts, and changes in education and who participated in, conducted or administered in-service training programs, had good staff relations (42, pp. 4373-4374).

In his study to determine if there were significant differences between the leadership behavior of elementary school principals and the organizational climates of the schools which they administered, Cook employed 303 teachers in twenty elementary schools in Camden County, New Jersey. He found that: A. Leadership behavior of elementary school principals differed from situation (climate) to situation. B. The leadership behavior of the elementary school principal was instrumental in determining the organizational climate of his school. C. The size of an elementary school might be a contributing factor to the determination of its orga-
izational climate. D. The age of teachers on the staff of a school may be a contributing factor to the determination of its organizational climate. E. The "Openness" or "Closedness" of the organizational climate of a school might be determined by an analysis of LBDQ scores (15, pp. 345-346).

Trimble examined how teachers judged the principal's leader behavior. The population of the study consisted of twenty-four principals and 110 teachers from elementary schools in Lake County, Indiana. It was found that teachers assigned significantly higher scores to principals on the Consideration dimension as compared to the Initiating Structure dimension of leadership behavior (97, pp. 4432-4433).

The relationships between perceptions of the leadership behavior of principals and the nature of informal groupings in their schools were investigated by Croghan. In his study, the external pattern of the partial social system existing within the school was described by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The internal patterns were measured by the use of Informal Group Membership Device and by the Group Dimensions Description Questionnaire. He concluded that all groups had a need of structure and consideration. If the external pattern did not provide for these needs, the internal pattern would accommodate itself by replacing them in another fashion.
In schools where structure and consideration were not provided by the principal, the informal groups compensated by providing their own negative aspects of structure and sentimental interaction. Structure and consideration appeared to be complementary and interdependent; if one pattern of organization did not provide them, another pattern would do so (16, pp. 3220-3221).

In Beamer's study including 220 teachers in twelve elementary schools, it was found that specific administrative leadership practices by Charles County elementary school principals which tend most to strengthen teacher morale include (a) cooperative practices between teachers and principals, (b) support of teachers, (c) recognition of accomplishments, and (d) cultivating friendly and understanding relations. Specific practices which tend most to weaken teacher morale include (a) lack of teacher participation in policy formulation, (b) unstructured and lengthy faculty meetings, (c) lack of support for teachers in discipline problems, and (d) unavailability of the principal. Specific practices suggested by teachers to improve morale include (a) provision of time for planning, (b) acquisition of teacher aides or assistants, (c) fewer nonteaching duties, (d) recognition of teacher efforts, and (e) better structured and planned faculty meetings (6, p. 574).
Anderson examined the relationships between teacher identified leadership styles of secondary school principals and curriculum patterns and found that: A. Principals of secondary schools with innovative curriculum patterns were more concerned with personal relations than were principals of secondary schools with conventional curriculum patterns. B. Faculties felt the principals, as groups, were equally adept at organization and in setting up procedural methodology. C. Principals attempting to institute innovative curriculum patterns in a school should be cognizant of faculty leadership ideology. D. Differences in leadership behaviors of principals were a matter of emphasis on the part of the principals. E. Principals and staff identified the leadership behaviors of the principals differently. F. Regardless of the curriculum pattern involved staff leadership ideologies are essentially the same. G. Teachers are concerned that their principals be individuals of personal warmth. H. Principals felt that personal relations were more important than organizational skills insofar as leadership was concerned (3, p. 2327).

From his study of the secondary principal's leadership role in organizational problem-solving, Gates concluded that, to be effective, school organizations must satisfy two imperatives--(a) satisfaction of the needs of the organization (internal reciprocity) and (b) satisfaction of the needs
of its surrounding environment (external adaptability). Encouraging staff to participate in problem-solving, the central activity of the school organization, is considered the best vehicle for involving the greatest number of people in the affairs of the school in a meaningful way. If and how the principal approaches the problem-solving leadership role depends mainly on his perception of the nature of man, of organizations, and of leadership (34, p. 4724).

Evans attempted to find, if secondary school principals represent these three organizational types--ambivalents, indifferent, and upward mobiles, whether or not these groupings differ in leadership qualities. It was found that the three organizational types of secondary school principals do not differ with regard to the leadership dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure (25, p. 1206).

Prince investigated if a difference in the leadership behavior of male and female elementary principals was perceived by teachers with various levels of teaching experience in Los Angeles County, California. It was concluded that the teacher's perception of the leadership behavior of the principal was not affected by the sex of the teacher, the length of teaching experience, or the sex of the principal(s) under whom the teacher worked (75, p. 7794).
Quinn compared the self-perceptions of the leadership behavior, instructional leadership, and decisionmaking orientation of male and female elementary school principals in the Chicago public schools. The study indicated some differences between male and female elementary school principals in their perceptions of their administrative behaviors. Marital status, teaching experience, and race were found to affect these differences (77, pp. 6199-6200).

**Research Studies on the Leadership Behavior of Principal in Thailand**

Boonme's study was concerned with describing the secondary school principalship as perceived by selected principals and teachers in Bangkok. A sample of the study consisted of seventy-one principals and 355 teachers from the government and private secondary schools. The conclusions of this study were as follows: A. Principals in government and private secondary schools appeared equivalent in professional preparation as measured by highest degree held. B. Principals in government and private secondary schools earned equivalent salaries. C. Teachers in private secondary schools had less professional preparation than teachers in government secondary schools. D. Teachers in government schools were better paid than teachers in private schools.
E. Principals in both government and private secondary schools perceived their effectiveness as higher than did the teachers in those schools (8, pp. i-iii).

Dheerakul attempted to obtain the description and analysis of the leadership behavior patterns of the secondary school principals in Bangkok based upon sex, experience, age, and education. It was concluded that the principals were more effective in Consideration dimension than the Initiating Structure. The academic background and former professional experience including other training of the principals influenced the leadership behavior more than sex and age (22, p. 520).

Sripraphai studied to determine the secondary school principals' opinions concerning the existing school programs, as well as, the ideal school programs in the public and private schools in Bangkok and Thonburi. The results of the study indicated that: A. Most of the public and private schools had well-established programs to reflect the National Objectives of Education. The curriculum used in the schools had been prepared by the Ministry of Education. Very little adaptation of the curriculum had been made by both the public and private schools to meet the local needs. B. The mutually respectful relation between the teacher and the student was one of the most effective ways to motivate the students in the Thai schools. Most of the public and private schools
lacked adequate audio-visual equipment. Rote learning was the most common method of teaching in the schools. Very few schools had guidance programs to help the students with their personal problems. C. The most widely used method to evaluate students in the secondary schools in Bangkok and Thonburi was by the various examinations conducted by the schools and by the Ministry of Education. The principals, however, expressed the need for new ways to evaluate the students and evaluation by subject rather than by the entire grade was favored. D. The physical structures of the public schools were superior to those of the private schools. Nevertheless, the principals of both school systems were not satisfied with the present physical school structures. Libraries in both school systems were poorly equipped. The principals indicated the need for much improvement in their school library programs. E. Participations by the teachers and the public in the school administration and decision-making were very limited (88, p. 1558).
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into four parts--(a) the instruments, (b) population and sample, (c) data collection procedures, and (d) data analysis procedures.

The Instruments

This research study dealt with teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior. Organizational climate was measured by the OCDQ; and leadership behavior was measured by the LBDQ. These two instruments were described as follows:

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

The OCDQ was developed by Halpin and Croft (5) in 1963 (Appendix C) as an instrument to identify the organizational climate of elementary schools as perceived by teachers. The instrument was developed through an analysis of 71 elementary schools and 1,151 respondents. The questionnaire consists of sixty-four items classified into eight subtests. Four subtests (disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy) are measures of characteristics of the teachers. The other four subtests (aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and
consideration) are measures of the principal. The items in every subtest were answered on a four-point scale—(a) rarely occurs, (b) sometimes occurs, (c) often occurs, and (d) very frequently occurs. A point value of 4 was assigned to items identified as very frequently occurs, 3 to items identified as often occurs, 2 to items identified as sometimes occurs, and 1 to items identified as rarely occurs. Those items with an asterisk were scored inversely.

The OCDQ was translated into Thai in 1969. The coefficients of reliability of the translated questionnaire were as follows—(a) overall behavior = 0.83, (b) teachers' behavior = 0.85, and (c) principal's behavior = 0.77 (8, p. 23). This Thai version of the OCDQ was used as an instrument for this study.

The eight subtests of the OCDQ were labeled and described as follows:

A. Teachers' Behavior

1. Disengagement refers to the teacher's tendency to be "not with it." This dimension describes a group which is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand. This subtest focuses upon the teachers' behavior in a task-oriented situation.

2. Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary busy-work. The teachers perceive that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work.
3. Esprit refers to "morale." The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.

4. Intimacy refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other. This dimension describes a social-needs satisfaction which is not necessarily associated with task accomplishment.

B. Principal's Behavior

5. Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the books" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than deal with the teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation. His behavior, in brief, is universalistic rather than particularistic; nomothetic rather than idiosyncratic. To maintain this style, he keeps himself--at least, "emotionally"--at a distance from his staff.

6. Production Emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive, and plays the role of a "straw boss." His communication tends to go in only one direction, and he is not sensitive to feedback from the staff.

7. Thrust refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization." "Thrust" behavior is marked not by close supervision, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he professionally sets. Apparently, because he does not ask the teachers to give of themselves any more than he willingly gives of himself, his behavior, through starkly task-oriented, is nonetheless viewed favorably by the teachers.
8. Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teacher "humanly," to try to do a little of something extra for them in human terms (3, pp. 150-151).

In their nationwide sample of schools, Halpin and Croft were able to identify "school profiles" which tended to cluster. They arbitrarily identified six such school climate profiles and called them climate types--(a) open climate, (b) autonomous climate, (c) controlled climate, (d) familiar climate, (e) paternal climate, and (f) closed climate (9, p. 178).

These six climates were described as follows:

A. Open Climate--high esprit, group works well together, not burdened by busy work, leader facilitates task accomplishments. Group friendly to each other but not intimate. Considerable job satisfaction and pride in organization. Leader viewed as genuine, works hard himself and is considerate of others. Personal flexibility and integrity, not aloof, low emphasis on production but work gets done.

B. Autonomous Climate--almost complete freedom given to group to provide their own structures. High esprit and intimacy, work well together, and achieve goals. Not hindered by leader but leader remains aloof, little production emphasis, and only moderately considerate. Leader provides thrust and is flexible but mainly allows the group to run the show.

C. Controlled Climate--marked by a press for achievement at the expense of social needs satisfaction. Group works hard, engaged in tasks, and follow the prescribed routine. They have much to do and do not have much social involvement with others. Social isolation is common. The leader is dominating and directive, somewhat aloof and dogmatic. Overall esprit is not bad as all members have a sense of pride in getting things done.
D. Familiar Climate—conspicuously friendly manner of group and leader. Social needs satisfaction is extremely high with little being done toward goal achievement. Everyone is viewed as a big happy family with being nice as the only criteria of success. The leader is concerned with making things easy for everybody.

E. Paternal Climate—group does not work well together, leader does most of work himself. Group does not enjoy friendly relationships with each other and really do not care. The leader is the opposite of aloof, being involved with everything and taking on all responsibilities. He works hard but does not motivate the group to do likewise. The feeling is that "Daddy Knows Best." It appears his consideration for others is a form of over-solicitousness to serve his own social needs rather than the groups'.

F. Closed Climate—group members obtain little satisfaction in respect to task achievement or social needs. The group does not work well together yet they are fairly friendly toward each other. The leader is detached from the group and directs what is to happen. He is viewed as low in consideration and emphasizes production by expecting others to work hard without giving them the freedom to accomplish the task (1, pp. 85-86).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

The operational measure used to determine the leadership behavior of the principal was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). If the principal was placed in Quadrant I, it meant that he was an effective leader. In case that he was placed in Quadrant II, Quadrant III, or Quadrant IV, he was perceived as ineffective. The LBDQ is composed of thirty short, descriptive statements of the way in which leaders behave (Appendix C). The instrument
was developed at the Ohio State University (Copyright 1952, by the Ohio State University, U.S.A.) and has undergone several revisions. The form employed in this study measured two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior--Initiating Structure and Consideration. Each dimension consisted of fifteen Likert-type items. Responses were made on a five-point scale and were scored from four to zero. A point value of 4 was assigned to items identified as always, 3 to items identified as often, 2 to items identified as occasionally, 1 to items identified as seldom, and 0 to items identified as never. The items with an asterisk were scored inversely.

Reliability of the LBDQ, using the Spearman-Brown formula, has been consistently high in Halpin's studies of leader behavior yielding split-half coefficient of .76 and .86 on Initiating Structure and .94 and .93 on Consideration (3, p. 88).

The concept of leadership has been a perennial topic of concern and investigation in many fields such as business, economics, political science, philosophy, history, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and education. Although diverse fields are represented, the major themes in the study of leadership may be grouped according to psychological, sociological, and behavioral approaches (7, p. 176).
Psychological studies of leadership have tended to focus on personal traits associated with leadership, whereas sociological studies have focused on aspects of the situation in which leadership is attempted. Thus, a trait-situation conflict arose because some scholars were convinced that the key to understanding leadership lay in better research on the personality traits of leaders and others were equally sure that the answer lay in better understanding of the interactions between leaders and followers. This trait-situation dichotomy is reminiscent of the nature-nurture conflict over learning theory which raged in academe a few years ago. In recent years, this seemingly fruitless conflict has been superseded by a more general behavioral approach to understanding leadership (9, p. 120). The behavioral approach recognizes that both psychological and sociological factors, both individual and situational variables, are powerful determinant of behavior (7, pp. 180-181).

Numerous studies involving observation of leadership behavior have been reported by various types of organizations--military, educational, business, and others. One of these studies is the Ohio State Leadership Studies which employed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Most of the developmental work on the LBDQ was done in a series of studies of aircraft commanders. Related studies have also been conducted in industry and education (3, p. 91).
The LBDQ was devised by the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University. Hemphill and Coons (6) constructed the original form of this questionnaire, and Halpin and Winer (4), in reporting the development of an Air Force adaptation of this instrument, identified Initiating Structure and Consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. They defined these two terms as follows:

A. Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group, and in endeavoring to establish a well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.

B. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff (3, p. 86).

This two dimensional perspective provides a useful framework for the study of leadership in school. Four quadrants of leadership styles are generated by cross-partitioning the dimensions (2, p. 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(IV) C- S+</td>
<td>(I) C+ S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(III) C- S-</td>
<td>(II) C+ S-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of INITIATING STRUCTURE Scores
Mean of CONSIDERATION Scores
The leader described in Quadrant I are evaluated as highly effective, whereas those in Quadrant III, whose behavior is ordinarily accompanied by group chaos, are characterized as most ineffective. The leaders in Quadrant IV are the "martinets" and the "cold fish" so intent upon getting a job done that they forget they are dealing with human beings, not with cogs in a machine. Those who are in Quadrant II are also ineffective leaders. They may employ human kindness, but this contributes little to effective performance unless their Consideration behavior is accompanied by a necessary minimum of Initiating Structure behavior (3, pp. 98-99).

In order to administer the LBDQ to teachers in Thailand, the researcher translated the LBDQ into Thai. This translated questionnaire was submitted to a jury panel for content validation. The jury panel consisted of three administrators and four instructors (Appendix A). Each jury was requested to consider the relevance and clarity of each translated item. At least five of the seven jury members had to approve an item to be included on the final questionnaire. Then the approved Thai-version LBDQ was administered to teachers.
Population and Sample

The sample of this study was obtained from thirty secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand, drawn by a random sampling technique from the total population of seventy-nine schools. Ten teachers from each school were included in this study. The first teacher was selected at random from each school's roster of teachers and nine more teachers were selected with a sampling interval according to the number of teachers in each school. For example, if there were thirty teachers in the first school, a sampling interval of two was used. If the second school had fifty teachers, a sampling interval of five was employed.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection procedures in this study were accomplished by following these steps:

A. A letter asking permission to collect data and administer the questionnaires to secondary school teachers in Bangkok, Thailand was sent to the General-Director of Department of General Education, Ministry of Education, Bangkok, Thailand.

B. A letter asking cooperation and convenience in the process of collecting data was sent to the principal of each selected secondary school.
C. Letters explaining the purposes of the study and copies of the questionnaires were distributed to selected teachers.

D. Completing two sets of questionnaires took about forty-five minutes. The questionnaires were collected after they had been completed.

Data Analysis Procedures

All responses on the returned questionnaires were tabulated in numerical code for subsequent analyses. The following descriptive and inferential analyses of the data were conducted using Fortran IV statistical technique and programs.

A. Descriptive Statistics:

(1) Calculation of means and standard deviations of teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior across selected variables.

(2) Calculation of "raw" scores of teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate in each subtest across selected variables.

B. Inferential Statistics:

(1) One-way analysis of variance to determine if significant difference existed with respect to teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership behavior across selected variables.

(2) Scheffe test to identify which specific variables there were significant differences in teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of principals.
(3) Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to determine significant relationships in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceived the organizational climate of schools and the leadership behavior of principals.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was rejected if the calculated statistic was equal to or greater than the tabled value, which meant that significant differences existed. If the calculated statistic was smaller than the tabled value, the null hypothesis was not rejected, which meant that no significant differences were found.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF DATA

Analyses of the data concerning Thai secondary school teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior are presented in this chapter. A total of 300 full-time secondary school teachers from Bangkok secondary schools participated in this study. However, only 286 of the subjects returned completed questionnaires, for a 95.33 per cent return. These returned questionnaires were used in data analyses. The first analysis identified the differences in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceived their school organizational climate. The second analysis identified the differences in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceived the two dimensions of their principal's leadership behavior. The third analysis identified the relationship between teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior.
School Organizational Climate

The first research question stated:

(a) How do teachers across selected variables perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)?

In order to analyze how teachers across selected variables perceived their school organizational climate, means and standard deviations of each subtest of the OCDQ of all teacher respondents were computed, as shown in Table I.

**TABLE I**

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF EIGHT SUBTESTS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

*N = 286*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Possible Range of Scores</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>19.552</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>5.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hindrance</td>
<td>13.035</td>
<td>0 - 24</td>
<td>3.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esprit</td>
<td>24.514</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>5.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intimacy</td>
<td>16.395</td>
<td>0 - 28</td>
<td>2.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aloofness</td>
<td>22.014</td>
<td>0 - 36</td>
<td>2.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thrust</td>
<td>24.231</td>
<td>0 - 36</td>
<td>5.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first four subtests of the OCDQ identified teachers' perceptions of teachers' behavior, and the remaining four subtests identified teachers' perceptions of their principal's behavior.

Teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate when collectively grouped are located in Table I. The teachers' perceptions of teachers' behavior revealed a low mean score on the subtest of Disengagement and slightly above average mean scores on the subtests of Hindrance, Esprit, and Intimacy. These data indicated that (a) teachers as a group were not task-oriented (Disengagement), (b) they perceived their principals as burdening them with busy work and not allowing them to make many decisions (Hindrance), (c) they felt that their social needs were being met adequately and at the same time they enjoyed a sense of accomplishment in their work (Esprit), and (d) they enjoyed friendly social relations with each other that were not necessarily associated with task accomplishment (Intimacy).

The teachers' perceptions of principals' behavior revealed above average mean scores on the subtests of Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration. This could be an indication that teachers perceived that their principals (a) went by the rules and policies rather than dealing with them in an informal face-to-face situation (Aloofness), (b) were highly directive (Production Emphasis),
(c) wanted to get things done and set an example for subordinates (Thrust), and (d) treated them "humanly" (Consideration).

Teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate when grouped according to their sex are located in Table II. The teachers' perceptions of teachers' behavior revealed that male teachers had slightly higher mean scores than female teachers on the subtests of Disengagement, Hindrance, and Esprit; however, female teachers had a slightly higher mean score than male teachers on the subtest of Intimacy. These data indicated that male and female teachers (a) perceived their group (teachers) as being task-oriented (Disengagement), (b) perceived their principals as burdening them with busy work and not allowing them to make many decisions (Hindrance), and (c) felt that their social needs were being met and at the same time they enjoyed a sense of accomplishment in their work (Esprit). Both male and female teachers perceived that they enjoyed friendly social relations with each other that were not necessarily associated with task accomplishment (Intimacy).

The teachers' perceptions of principals' behavior revealed that male teachers had slightly higher mean scores than female teachers on the subtests of Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration. These data indicated that both male and female teachers perceived that their principals (a) went by the rules and policies rather than dealing
### TABLE II

**COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE USING TEACHERS' SEX AS THE VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Male Teachers N = 90</th>
<th>Female Teachers N = 196</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>20.722</td>
<td>5.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with them in an informal face-to-face situation (Aloofness), (b) were highly directive (Production Emphasis), (c) wanted to get things done and set an example for subordinates (Thrust), and (d) treated them "humanly" (Consideration).

Teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate when grouped according to their years of teaching experience are located in Table III. The teachers' perceptions of teachers' behavior revealed that teachers with five years
TABLE III
COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE USING TEACHERS' YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS THE VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>5 Years or less N = 91</th>
<th>6-10 Years N = 57</th>
<th>11 Years or more N = 138</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>20.879</td>
<td>5.457</td>
<td>20.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or less of teaching experience had the highest mean scores on
the subtests of Disengagement and Hindrance. Teachers with
eleven years or more of teaching experience had the highest
mean scores on the subtests of Esprit and Intimacy. However,
since the mean scores for all three groups of teachers were
similar and only slightly above average, these data indicated
that they all perceived their group (teachers) as being task-
oriented (Disengagement), perceived their principals as
burdening them with busy work and not allowing them to make
many decisions (Hindrance), but yet felt that their social
needs were being met generally and enjoyed a sense of accom-
plishment in their work (Esprit), and experienced friendly
social relations with each other that were not necessarily
associated with task accomplishment (Intimacy).

The teachers' perceptions of principals' behavior
revealed that teachers of differing years of teaching expe-
rience all were similar and slightly above average on the
subtests of Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Con-
sideration. The perception patterns of these respondents
indicated that they perceived their principals as being for-
mal, directive, task-oriented, and yet tending to be humane.

Teachers' perceptions of their school organizational
climate when grouped across the variables of their educa-
tional level are located in Table IV. These data indicated
that teachers perceived their group (teachers) as being
TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE USING TEACHERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AS THE VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Less than bachelor degree N = 72</th>
<th>Bachelor degree with or without additional course works N = 196</th>
<th>Master degree or higher N = 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
similar and slightly above average on each of the OCDQ sub-test of Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, and Intimacy. Their perceptions of principals' behavior also were similar and slightly above average on the OCDQ subtests of Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

Teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate when grouped according to the sex of the principal under whom they worked are located in Table V. These data indicated that teachers perceived their group (teachers) as being similar and slightly above average on each of the OCDQ subtest of Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, and Intimacy. Their perceptions of principals' behavior also were similar and slightly above average on the OCDQ subtests of Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

In order to determine how teachers perceived their school organizational climates in terms of six different organizational climates--open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed--the "raw" scores (means and standard deviations in Table I) on the eight subtests were standardized by using a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10.

The standardization formula was adapted and shown as follows (1, p. 30):

\[ X_s = \frac{10}{\text{S.D.}} X_{\text{sub}} - \left( \frac{10}{\text{S.D.}} M_{\text{sub}} - 50 \right) \]
## TABLE V

**COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE USING THE SEX OF THE PRINCIPAL AS THE VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Teachers Working under Male Principal  N = 174</th>
<th>Teachers Working under Female Principal  N = 112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esprit</td>
<td>23.805</td>
<td>5.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intimacy</td>
<td>16.282</td>
<td>2.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aloofness</td>
<td>22.132</td>
<td>2.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thrust</td>
<td>23.293</td>
<td>5.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X_s = \text{standardized score} \]
\[ \text{S.D.} = \text{sample standard deviation} \]
\[ X_{\text{sub}} = \text{subtest raw score} \]
\[ M_{\text{sub}} = \text{sample mean of appropriate subtest} \]

A mean was determined for each subtest for each selected variable. The standardized scores served as the data for analyses of school organizational climate.
Prototypic Climate

The prototypic climate of the OCDQ that was developed by Halpin is located in Table VI. The school organizational climate was determined by computing the absolute difference between the scores on each subtest and sum these differences for each of the six prototypic profiles. After a profile similarity had been calculated for each prototypic profile, the prototype with the smallest sum indicated school organizational climate of those selected variables. The results of the analyses were shown in Table VII-XVI.

As shown in Table VII, the Paternal column yielded the smallest total absolute difference with a score of 50.02. This could be an indication that male teachers perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.

In Table VIII, the Paternal column also yielded the smallest total absolute difference with a score of 51.46. This could be an indication that female teachers perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.

Table IX revealed that the smallest total absolute difference fell into the Closed column with a score of 44.41. This could be an indication that teachers with five years or less of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climate as being closed.

It was shown in Table X that a score of 50.88, the smallest total absolute difference, was in the Paternal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C*</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O = Open Climate  
A = Autonomous Climate  
C* = Controlled Climate  
F = Familiar Climate  
P = Paternal Climate  
C = Closed Climate

column. This could be an indication that teachers with six to ten years of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.

As shown in Table XI, the Open column yielded the smallest total absolute difference with a score of 49.79. This could be an indication that teachers with ten years of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climate as being open.

In Table XII, the Paternal column yielded the smallest total absolute difference with a score of 47.20. This could be an indication that teachers with less than a bachelor degree perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.

Table XIII revealed that the smallest total absolute difference was in the Paternal column with a score of 47.20. This could be an indication that teachers with a bachelor degree with or without additional course works perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.

It was shown in Table XIV that a score of 52.46, the smallest total absolute difference, was in the Closed column. This could be an indication that teachers with a master degree or higher perceived their school organizational climate as being closed.

As shown in Table XV, the Closed column yielded the smallest total absolute difference with a score of 51.17.
This could be an indication that teachers working under a male principal perceived their school organizational climate as being closed.

In Table XVI, the Paternal column yielded the smallest total absolute difference with a score of 50.41. This could be an indication that teachers working under a female principal perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.

Data analyses revealed that teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climates fell into three types of climates—(a) open, (b) paternal, and (c) closed. The open climate was characterized by high degree of satisfaction in human relationships and production. The paternal climate indicated that the principal was in the role of non-genuine "papa." The closed climate revealed low degree of satisfaction in both human relationships and production.

According to Halpin, the open climate was indicative of (a) high in Esprit, Thrust, and Consideration, (b) average in Intimacy, and (c) low in Disengagement, Hindrance, Aloofness, and Production Emphasis. The paternal climate was characterized by (a) high in Disengagement and Production Emphasis, (b) average in Consideration and Thrust, and (c) low in Hindrance, Intimacy, Esprit, and Aloofness. The closed climate indicated (a) high in Disengagement, Hindrance,
Aloofness, and Production Emphasis, (b) average in Intimacy, and (c) low in Esprit, Thrust, and Consideration.
### Table VII

**Analysis of Absolute Difference of School Organizational Climate from Prototypic Climate of Male Teachers**

\( N = 90 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>50.64</td>
<td>12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>53.11</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>50.86</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>62.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtests of OCDQ</td>
<td>Standardized Scores</td>
<td>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>50.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>49.60</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>49.69</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IX

**ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF TEACHERS WITH 5 YEARS OR LESS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

N = 91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>50.90</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>46.74</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>51.42</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>46.37</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>75.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE X

**ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF TEACHERS WITH 6 TO 10 YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

\( N = 57 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>51.30</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>49.95</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>49.64</td>
<td>13.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>49.89</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>50.84</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE XI
ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF TEACHERS WITH 11 YEARS OR MORE OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
N = 138

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>51.54</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>51.62</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>51.46</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>51.83</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>49.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XII

**ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN A BACHELOR DEGREE**  
* N = 72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>50.07</td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>47.89</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>51.86</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>49.03</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIII
ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF TEACHERS WITH A BACHELOR DEGREE WITH OR WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COURSE WORKS
N = 196

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>49.63</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>49.53</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>50.49</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>49.91</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>58.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtests of OCDQ</td>
<td>Standardized Scores</td>
<td>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>49.49</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>50.06</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>48.49</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>62.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtests of OCDQ</td>
<td>Standardized Scores</td>
<td>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>50.78</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>50.45</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>48.70</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>48.98</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XVI

**ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF TEACHERS WORKING UNDER A FEMALE PRINCIPAL**

*N = 112*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OODQ</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>49.29</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>51.99</td>
<td>11.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>52.01</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>51.59</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>52.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal's Leadership Behavior

The second research question stated:

(a) How do teachers across selected variables perceive their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)?

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire has a theoretical mean score of 30 on each dimension. The highest possible score of rating for a principal by one teacher could be a score of 60 per dimension while a score of zero could be the lowest possible score. It was shown in Table XVII that there was no single mean score falling below the theoretical mean score. All teachers rated their principals above the theoretical mean score on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. Theoretically speaking, the principals were placed in Quadrant I. It meant that every teacher perceived his or her principal as an effective leader.

In order to analyze the significant difference in the way in which teachers perceived the two dimensions of their principal's leadership behavior across selected variables, the first major hypothesis was tested. The first major hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceived their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Two dimensions of the principal's leadership behavior of
TABLE XVII
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR ACROSS SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex of the Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37.53</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers' Educational Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a bachelor degree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with or without additional course works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree or higher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex of the Principal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this hypothesis were stated in null-form sub-hypothesis for statistical analyses and interpretation. The first sub-hypothesis was that

\[ H_1^1 : \text{There is no significant difference in the way in which teachers perceive their principal's Initiating Structure as measured by the LBDQ, when teachers are grouped according to their sex, years of teaching experience, educational level, and principal's sex.} \]

The analysis of variance was employed to test this sub-hypothesis. The region of rejection at the .05 level was determined to be an F equal to or greater than 3.84 with 1 and 284 degrees of freedom and 3.00 with 2 and 283 degrees of freedom.

As shown in Table XVIII, one of the computed F-ratios obtained a level of significance of .0001, sex of the principal. Only the null hypothesis \( (H_1^1) \) was rejected according to sex of the principal. The null hypothesis was not rejected for teachers grouped according to their sex, years of teaching experience, and educational level. Table XVII showed that those teachers who worked under a female principal, with a score of 39.62, perceived their principal's Initiating Structure higher than did those who worked under a male principal, with a score of 35.70.

\[ H_1^2 : \text{There is no significant difference in the way in which teachers perceive their principal's Consideration as measured by the LBDQ, when teachers are grouped according to their sex, years of teaching experience, educational level, and principal's sex.} \]
TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PRINCIPAL'S INITIATING STRUCTURE ACROSS SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex of the Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.746</td>
<td>11.746</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>18981.285</td>
<td>66.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18993.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138.862</td>
<td>69.431</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>18854.256</td>
<td>66.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18993.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers' Educational Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90.868</td>
<td>45.434</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>18902.183</td>
<td>66.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18993.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex of the Principal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1044.381</td>
<td>1044.381</td>
<td>16.525</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>17948.691</td>
<td>63.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18993.072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of variance was employed to test this sub-hypothesis. The region of rejection at the .05 level was determined to be an F equal to or greater than 3.84 with 1 and 284 degrees of freedom and 3.00 with 2 and 283 degrees of freedom.

As shown in Table XIX, one of the computed F-ratios obtained a level of significance of .0078, years of teaching experience. Only the null hypothesis ($H_1^2$) was rejected according to years of teaching experience. The null hypothesis was not rejected for teachers grouped according to their sex, educational level, and principal's sex.

The Scheffe test was used to identify which specific groups in which there were significant differences in the means of the three groups of teachers' years of teaching experience. The region of rejection was determined to be an F equal to or greater than 3.00. Table XX indicated that Group 3 (teachers having 11 years or more of teaching experience) were significantly different from Group 1 (teachers having 5 years or less of teaching experience). The differences between Group 1 and Group 2 and between Group 3 and Group 2 were not significant. It could be concluded from Table XVII that Group 3 with a score of 38.87 perceived the principal's Consideration higher than did Group 1 with a score of 34.04.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex of the Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>38751.285</td>
<td>136.448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>38754.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1306.380</td>
<td>653.190</td>
<td>4.936</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>37447.703</td>
<td>132.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>38754.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers' Educational Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.298</td>
<td>17.149</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>38719.758</td>
<td>136.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>38754.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex of the Principal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>382.625</td>
<td>382.625</td>
<td>2.832</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>38371.344</td>
<td>135.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>38753.969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table XX

**Scheffe Test of Differences in the Principal's Consideration Among the Three Teachers' Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (5 years or less)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>4.825*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (6 years - 10 years)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (11 years or more)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level

School Organizational Climate and Principal's Leadership Behavior

In order to determine whether a significant relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior, the second major hypothesis was tested. The second hypothesis is that there is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceive the organizational climate of schools and the leadership behavior of principals as measured by the OCDQ and the LBDQ. Each of selected variables of the sub-hypothesis are stated in null form. The first sub-hypothesis is as follows:
There is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ and their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the LBDQ, when teachers are grouped according to their sex.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation served as a statistical tool to test this hypothesis. As shown in Table XXI, the computed Coefficients (r) of school organizational climate and the principal's Initiating Structure and Consideration were significant at the .01 level as perceived by male and female teachers. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected.

**TABLE XXI**

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND THE PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS USING TEACHERS' SEX AS THE VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (Paternal)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.591*</td>
<td>0.422*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (Paternal)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.492*</td>
<td>0.447*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level
$H_2^2$: There is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ and their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the LBDQ, when teachers are grouped according to their years of teaching experience.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to test this hypothesis. As shown in Table XXII, the computed Coefficients ($r$) of school organizational climate and the principal's Initiating Structure and Consideration were significant at the .01 level as perceived by teachers who had years of teaching experience of 5 years or less, 6 to 10 years, and 11 years or more. Therefore the null hypothesis ($H_2^2$) was rejected.

**TABLE XXII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less (Closed)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.588*</td>
<td>0.558*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years (Paternal)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.519*</td>
<td>0.427*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more (Open)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.459*</td>
<td>0.411*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level
$H^3_2$: There is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ and their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the LBDQ, when teachers are grouped according to their educational level.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to test this hypothesis. As shown in Table XXIII, the computed Coefficients (r) of school organizational climate and the principal's Initiating Structure and Consideration were significant at the .01 level as perceived by teachers with less than a bachelor degree and teachers with a bachelor degree with or without additional course works. Therefore the null hypothesis ($H^3_2$) was rejected concerning school organizational climate and the principal's Initiating Structure and Consideration, except for teachers with a master degree or higher.

**TABLE XXIII**

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND THE PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS USING TEACHERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AS THE VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than B.A. (Paternal)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.393*</td>
<td>0.426*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. with or without additional course works (Paternal)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.591*</td>
<td>0.456*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or higher (Paternal)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level*
$H_2^4$: There is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ and their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the LBDQ, when teachers are grouped according to their principal's sex.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to test this hypothesis. As shown in Table XXIV, the computed Coefficients (r) of school organizational climate and the principal's Initiating Structure and Consideration were significant at the .01 level as perceived by teachers who worked under male and female principals. Therefore the null hypothesis ($H_2^4$) was rejected.

TABLE XXIV

correlation coefficients of the school organizational climate and the principal's leadership behavior as perceived by teachers using the principal's sex as the variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male principal (Closed)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.508*</td>
<td>0.454*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female principal (Paternal)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.511*</td>
<td>0.391*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level
Presented in Chapter V was a brief summary of background of this study. The findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations were then presented.

Summary
This study was predicated upon the premises that teachers were in a strategic position to provide relevant information concerning the organizational climate of their school and the leadership behavior of their principal. It has been established through research and literature that, in order to achieve the desired goals of the school, it is necessary for the school administration to establish and maintain a healthy organizational climate. Also, the research and literature supported the supposition that it would be useful in goal achievement and organizational effectiveness for the principal to become aware of his leadership behavior as perceived by teachers within the school setting. The Thai translation of the OCDQ was determined to be a reliable and valid instrument to provide an assessment of the organizational climate of Thai secondary
schools as perceived by the teachers. The LBDQ was translated into Thai by the researcher, and a panel of judges consisting of seven persons at the universities in Thailand verified the accuracy of the translation.

The purposes of this study sought answers to two research questions:

(a) How do teachers across selected variables perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)?

(b) How do teachers across selected variables perceive their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)?

This study also tested the following two hypotheses:

\( H_1 \) : There is no significant difference in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceive the leadership behavior of their principals as measured by the LBDQ.

\( H_2 \) : There is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceive the organizational climate of schools and the leadership behavior of principals as measured by the OCDQ and the LBDQ.

The sample of the study included 286 full-time classroom teachers from thirty randomly selected secondary schools in the Bangkok area. The names of these schools are located in Appendix B.

Data analyses were both descriptive and inferential. The adapted formula of Halpin's original study of school organizational climate and his prototypic climate profile were used to determine school organizational climate of the
schools in this study. One-way analysis of variance was employed to determine the difference in the way in which teachers perceived their principal's leadership behavior. In the event a significant difference was found in the analysis of variance, the Scheffe test was used to identify on which specific variables were the significant differences. Finally, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to ascertain whether a significant relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior. Rejection of all hypotheses was set at the .05 level of significance.

The independent variables for teachers used in this study were

1. Sex of the Teacher:
   (a) Male
   (b) Female

2. Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience:
   (a) 5 years or less
   (b) 6 years - 10 years
   (c) 11 years or more

3. Teachers' Educational Level:
   (a) Less than a bachelor degree
   (b) Bachelor degree with or without additional course works
   (c) Master degree or higher

4. Sex of the Teachers' Principal:
   (a) Male
   (b) Female
The dependent variables for teachers used in this study were

1. Teacher "raw" composite scores (rating) of their school organizational climate on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire:
   (a) Disengagement
   (b) Hindrance
   (c) Esprit
   (d) Intimacy
   (e) Aloofness
   (f) Production Emphasis
   (g) Thrust
   (h) Consideration

2. Teachers mean composite score (rating) of their school organizational climate on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

3. Teachers mean composite scores (rating) of their principal's leadership behavior on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire:
   (a) Initiating Structure
   (b) Consideration

Findings

The data were analyzed with reference to the two research questions and two hypotheses of the study. The first research question was: How do teachers across selected variables perceive their school organizational climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)? The findings relative to this research question were summarized in Table XXV.

These data were analyzed across the selected variables of (1) sex of the teacher, (2) teachers' years of teaching
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Perceived School Organizational Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Sex of the Teacher:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Paternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Paternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Paternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Teachers' Educational Level:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a bachelor degree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Paternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree with or without additional course works</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Paternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree or higher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Sex of the Principal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Paternal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experience, (3) teachers' educational level, and (4) the sex of the principal under whom the teachers served. The data revealed the following findings:

(a) With regard to the variable, sex of the teacher, both male and female teachers perceived the organizational climate of the schools as being paternal.

(b) When tested by the variable of teachers' years of teaching experience, there were differences in the way each group of teachers perceived the organizational climate of the schools. Teachers with five years or less of teaching experience perceived the school organizational climate as being closed, those with six to ten years of teaching experience perceived the school organizational climate as being paternal, and those with eleven years or more of teaching experience perceived the school organizational climate as being open.

(c) The subjects were grouped across the variable of their educational level. Teachers with less than a bachelor degree and those with a bachelor degree with or without additional course works perceived the school organizational climate as being paternal, while teachers with a master degree or higher perceived the school organizational climate as being closed.
The final analysis grouped the subjects according to the sex of the principal with whom they worked. Those teachers who served under a male principal perceived the school organizational climate as being closed, whereas those who served under a female principal perceived the school organizational climate as being paternal.

The second research question was: How do teachers across selected variables perceive their principal's leadership behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)? The result of data analyses indicated that all of the teachers perceived their principal as an effective leader; i.e., they perceived their principal as being high on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. This placed each of the principals in Quadrant I (see pp. 97-98).

There were two major hypotheses tested in this study. The first hypothesis stated,

\[ H_0 \] : There is no significant difference in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceive the leadership behavior of their principals as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

The LBDQ has two dimensions—Initiating Structure and Consideration. The first sub-hypothesis was that there were no significant differences in the way in which teachers
across selected variables perceived their principal's Initiating Structure. These findings were that there were no significant differences concerning teachers' perceptions of their principal's Initiating Structure when they were grouped according to the following variables--(a) sex of the teacher, (b) teachers' years of teaching experience, and (c) teachers' educational level. However, there were significant differences concerning teachers' perceptions of their principal's Initiating Structure with the following variable--(a) sex of the principal for whom they worked. Those teachers who worked for a female principal perceived their principal's Initiating Structure higher than those who worked for a male principal.

The second sub-hypothesis was that there were no significant differences in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceived their principal's Consideration. These findings were that there were no significant differences concerning teachers' perceptions of their principal's Consideration with the following variables--(a) sex of the teacher, (b) teachers' educational level, and (c) sex of the principal. However, there were significant differences concerning teachers' perceptions of their principal's Consideration with the following variable--(a) teachers' years of teaching experience. Teachers with eleven years or more of
teaching experience perceived the principal's Consideration higher than did teachers with five years or less of teaching experience.

The second and final hypothesis stated,

$$H_2 : \text{There is no significant relationship in the way in which teachers across selected variables perceive the organizational climate of schools and the leadership behavior of principals as measured by the OCDQ and the LBDQ.}$$

The data revealed that there were no significant relationships in the way in which teachers perceived their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior (Initiating Structure and Consideration) on the variable--(a) the teacher with a master degree or higher. However, there were significant relationships in the way in which teachers perceived their school organizational climate and their principal's leadership behavior (Initiating Structure and Consideration) with the following variables--(a) sex of the teacher, (b) teachers' years of teaching experience, (c) the teacher with less than a bachelor degree, (d) the teacher with a bachelor degree with or without additional course works, and (e) sex of the principal.

Conclusions and Implications

Conclusions based on the analyses of data gathered through this study could be drawn as follows:
1. The school organizational climates as perceived by secondary school teachers tended to fall into the closed end of the open-closed climate continuum. It is interesting to note that teachers with more years of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climates as being open.

2. All of the teachers in this study perceived their principal as an effective leader, i.e. high on Initiating Structure and Consideration.

3. An analysis of data indicated that there was a significant relationship between organizational climate and principal's leadership behavior as perceived by these secondary school teachers; however, no matter how teachers perceived their school organizational climate, they still perceived their principal as an effective leader.

The result of this study indicated that the school organizational climates as perceived by teachers tended to fall into the closed end of the open-closed climate continuum. There is an argument about whether or not an open climate is good. The research findings concerning students' academic performance and an open climate are mixed. Positive teacher-principal relations might not lead to better cognitive results on student achievement tests. In an open and healthy organizational climate, when a sound new method is introduced openness correlates with achievement. If teaching methodology is not sound, however, the openness in climate
in and of itself may not necessarily lead to gains in learning achievement. Healthy, open organizational dynamics make a contributing impact because they facilitate the process of the organization, not necessarily its product. Openness per se will not make a poor program effective. The principal should be cognizant of these research findings.

In addition, teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climates tending to fall into the closed end of the organizational climate continuum imply average morale in schools. Morale is a significant building force in any organization. It is an essential accompaniment of success in any form. Its connotations are positive with its results measured in accomplishments, either individual or group. Among professional people such as teachers it would seem reasonable to expect good morale without special administrative effort. But teachers have the same emotions as anyone else. Good morale has to be cultivated in schools as well as in other group enterprises. And the key person in building it in a school is the principal. He must understand the desires of his faculty and the factors bearing on their morale. He must do everything within reason to provide the best climate possible for good morale.

Regarding the principal's leadership behavior, this study indicated that the principal was perceived as an effective leader. It meant that he emphasized both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, the principal
should be aware of the fact that the teacher has the definite needs. In some cases, it is impossible to meet the wishes of teachers without violating some rules and regulations established for the operation of the school. His leadership can be most effective when he knows how to utilize his knowledge and learned behaviors along with intuitive insight in sensing needs and providing leadership in a given situation.

As indicated by the result of this study with respect to teachers' perceptions of their school organizational climate, it would be interesting to know why teachers with five years or less, six to ten years, and eleven years or more of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climate as being closed, paternal, and open respectively. On the other hand, teachers with higher educational level perceived their school organizational climate as being closed. What are the factors that make these differences possible? It could possibly be that the number of teachers with a master degree or higher \((n = 18)\) in this study were too small for the result to be conclusive.

The school organizational climates as perceived by teachers who worked under male and female principals were also different. Teachers who worked under a male principal perceive their school organizational climate as being closed. On the other hand, teachers who worked under a female
principal perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal. Do male principals have more of a tendency to dominate over teachers than do female principals? Do the backgrounds of male and female principals cause differences in teachers' perceptions? These are among the types of questions that further research should seek to answer.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that

1. The secondary school principals in Bangkok should make themselves familiar with research studies and literature concerning teachers' perceptions of organizational climate and leader behavior. In turn, they should utilize the results of research studies on leadership and organizational climate to more efficiently formulate and accomplish school goals and objectives. They should participate in programs offering activities that emphasize the human relations aspects of administrative leadership.

2. Additional research should be conducted to determine the school organizational climate, the principal's leadership behavior, and their relationships in other provinces in Thailand. Further studies should be conducted to determine why teachers with eleven years or more of teaching experience perceived their school organizational climate as
being open as opposed to being closed or paternal as indicated by those with less years of teaching experience. Also studies should be conducted to determine why teachers who worked under a male principal perceived their school organizational climate as being closed as opposed to those who worked under a female principal and perceived their school organizational climate as being paternal.
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เริ่่ง ขอความอนุเคราะห์ในการตอบแบบสอบถาม

เริ่่ง อาจารย์ ........................................

ต่อมที่ อาจารย์ นายศุภ.ny เภื่อชัยยศ เข้าสู่การศึกษา นักศึกษาปริญญาตรี สาขาวิชาการศึกษา (Administrative Leadership) ของ North Texas State University, Denton, Texas ขอแนะนำอาจารย์ท่านให้รับเรื่อง A Study of The School Organizational Climate and The Principal's Leadership Behavior as Perceived by Secondary School Teachers in Bangkok, Thailand ต้นเป็นอุปถัมภ์ที่ให้การศึกษาเกี่ยวกับเรื่องนี้ ซึ่งองค์การวิจัยจะสรุปผลลัพธ์เป็นส่วนรวม ข้าพเจ้าจึงมีความ

การตอบแบบสอบถามของอาจารย์จะไม่มีผลกระทบต่อเกณฑ์ต้นแต่ผลตอบ 

ทั้งนี้ ข้าพเจ้าจึงขอความอนุเคราะห์อาจารย์ โปรดตอบแบบสอบถาม

และส่งคืนให้ ........................................ ที่ต้องจัดทำเอกสาร และรวบรวมแบบสอบถามในวันที่ ........................................ ขอขอบพระคุณอาจารย์

ขอแสดงความนับถืออย่างสูง

(นายศุภ.ny เภื่อชัยยศ)
A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL

308 Bradley St., # 29
Denton, Texas 76201

เรียน ผู้บริหารที่เคารพ หลักสูตรการจัดการเป็นเลิศ

เรียน ผู้อำนวยการ อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา และผู้ช่วย โรงเรียน...วังสวัสดิ์ ณ ที่... 

ขอเรียนจาก นายสุเมธ คีมวิทยาธิค พาณิชย์การศึกษา (Administrative Leadership) ของ North Texas State University, Denton, Texas ขอเกี่ยวกับการวิจัยเรื่อง A Study of The School Organizational Climate and The Principal’s Leadership Behavior as Perceived by Secondary School Teachers in Bangkok, Thailand โรงเรียนของท่านเน้นที่แก้ปัญหาในการวิจัยดังกล่าว ขณะที่การวิจัยจะมีการประเมินความรู้สึกด้านสภาพแวดล้อมของโรงเรียน ทำให้ท่านมีความประสงค์ที่จะทราบผลของการวิจัย ขอเรียนท่านอีกหนึ่งครั้งที่จะแจ้งให้ทราบผลลัพธ์จากการวิจัยเร็วที่สุดเท่าที่จะเป็นได้

ขอเรียนจาก checksum ขอความรู้สึกด้านสภาพแวดล้อมของโรงเรียนที่เกี่ยวกับการจัดการทางการศึกษาของท่าน ขอเรียนท่านให้แจ้งผลการวิจัยที่จะมีการจัดการทางการศึกษาล่าสุดที่จะส่งให้ท่านทราบ (นายสุเมธ คีมวิทยาธิค)
SCHOOLS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

1. Watmakutkasat
2. Watsraket
3. Satreemahapruetharam
4. Nontreewitaya
5. Watnongjog
6. Sriayuthaya
7. Sainampung
8. Watnoinai
9. Bangkapi
10. Santiradwitayalai
11. Suksananaree
12. Satreewitaya
13. Bangpakok
14. Watpaknam
15. Buddhachakwitaya
16. Watjaengron
17. Wattrimitr
18. Thepleela
19. Watthatthong
20. Watrachathivas
21. Yothinburana
22. Horwang
23. Surasakmontree
24. Satreewatrakang
25. Thaveethabhisek
26. Prakhanongwitayalai
27. Prathoomkongka
28. Satreesrisuriyothai
29. Watsuthiwararam
30. Thepsirindara
ประวัติส่วนตัว

โปรดใส่เครื่องหมาย ✓ ลงบนรายการที่เกี่ยวกับความต้องการท่านและอาการป่วยที่
ของท่าน

1. เพศของท่าน
   
   ..... (1) ชาย
   
   ..... (2) หญิง

2. ทานมีประวัติการเป็นการสอนมาแล้ว
   
   ..... (1) 5 ปี หรือน้อยกว่า
   
   ..... (2) 6 ปี ถึง 10 ปี
   
   ..... (3) 11 ปี หรือมากกว่า

3. ทานมีป่วย
   
   ..... (1) ทานมีป่วยหรืออุทิศ
   
   ..... (2) ทานมีป่วยหรืออุทิศที่ไม่ชี้แจงปัญหาที่
   
   ..... (3) ทานไม่มีป่วยหรืออุทิศกว่า

4. เทศของอาการป่วยของท่าน
   
   ..... (1) ชาย
   
   ..... (2) หญิง
แบบสอบถามความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับพฤติกรรมของผู้นำ

โปรดจัดระเบียบความในแบบสอบถามด้านล่างนี้ แล้วนับผลรวมมาด้านล่างที่
กว่ามาให้ยึดตั้งแต่เท่านั้น ตามที่เห็นว่าพฤติกรรมของผู้นำที่ปรากฏใน
แหล่งข้อมูลเกี่ยวข้องเกี่ยวกับอาชีพไทยของผู้นำ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>พฤติกรรมที่ไม่เหมาะสม</th>
<th>มีมากนัก 1</th>
<th>มีมากนัก 2</th>
<th>มีมากนัก 3</th>
<th>มีมากนัก 4</th>
<th>มีมากนัก 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>พฤติกรรมที่เกี่ยวข้องกับนโยบาย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พฤติกรรมที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการจัดการ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังชัดเจนของคนเองให้เห็นอาจารย์ทรง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังน่าคิดน่าสนใจ ๆ กับคุณภาพอาจารย์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังงานอย่างกระชับและเน็ติบัณฑิต</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังน่าสนใจซึ่งท่านต้องไม่ได้หน่อย</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังการในลักษณะที่ไม่เหมือนกันให้เห็นได้ชัด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังเคยสอนผู้มีความมุ่งมั่นคิดงาน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังงานโลหิตให้เห็นได้ชัด</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังการจัดการงานของอาจารย์</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังเรื่องการจัดการให้เห็นกล้ามก้าม</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. อาจารย์ในพื้นหล้งเห็นว่าอาจารย์มีคุณธรรม</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>แบบว่าด้วยกัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังมีการอาจารย์ยืนยันกับความ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. อาจารย์ในพื้นหลังให้เห็นว่าอาจารย์มีคุณธรรมตามกฎบัตร</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. อาหารในประเด็นการดูแลงานที่มีความยุ่งเหงา</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. อาการใหญ่เป็นที่น่าเป็นห่วงและพบมี 1 2 3 4 5
28. อาการใหญ่ที่ให้เห็นว่าคลายอาการข้อรั้งเมื่อมีการใช้ยา 1 2 3 4 5
29. อาการใหญ่ของสมองฉุกเฉินในออกจากการทำงาน 1 2 3 4 5
30. อาการใหญ่เวลานานที่ขัดขวางการทำงาน 1 2 3 4 5

(โปรดอ่านให้หน้า 4)
แบบสอบถามความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับระบบการตรวจเรียน

ในกรณีที่ระบบการเรียนของเรานั้นเหมาะสม ควรให้การยอมรับและเห็นควรในการเรียน แต่ในบางกรณีอาจมีข้อบกพร่องในระบบการเรียน ทำให้เรียนการเรียนไม่สะดวก

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ผลิตภัณฑ์เกี่ยวกับระบบการเรียน</th>
<th>มีที่นั่ง 1 2 3 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ผลิตภัณฑ์เกี่ยวกับระบบการเรียน</td>
<td>มีที่นั่ง 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ผลิตภัณฑ์เกี่ยวกับระบบการเรียน</td>
<td>มีที่นั่ง 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ผลิตภัณฑ์เกี่ยวกับระบบการเรียน</td>
<td>มีที่นั่ง 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. กรณีมีการขาดของเรียนในเวลารักษาสูญหาย 1 2 3 4
2. ในกรณีหากขาดการเรียน วัตถุนั้นนั่งออกมาได้ก่อนกิจกรรม 1 2 3 4
3. แต่ละครูรวมถึงฝ่ายบริการครูที่ไม่ปฏิบัติตามเพื่อพยานในเรียน 1 2 3 4

4. ครูและผู้สอนมีส่วนร่วมในกระบวนการเรียนรู้ได้เพียงพอ 1 2 3 4
5. ครูและผู้สอนมีส่วนร่วมในกระบวนการเรียนรู้ได้เพียงพอ 1 2 3 4
6. ครูและผู้สอนมีส่วนร่วมในกระบวนการเรียนรู้ได้เพียงพอ 1 2 3 4
7. ในการประชุม ครูและผู้สอนมีการประชุมและปรึกษาจากผู้ปกครอง 1 2 3 4
8. ครูในเรียนภาษีทางานของเรียนไม่เหมาะสมและยังไม่เหมาะสม 1 2 3 4
9. ครูมีโอกาสทางานและภาคภูมิใจ 1 2 3 4
10. ครูมีการพัฒนา เวลาในด้านของงานสอน 1 2 3 4
11. งานกิจวัตรประจำวันที่равนเท่ากันงานสอน 1 2 3 4
12. ครูมีจิตใจในการทำงาน กระบวนการที่มีนักเรียนมาก่อน 1 2 3 4
13. การพัฒนาของนักเรียนที่มีการพัฒนาในเรียน 1 2 3 4
14. ครูมีการพัฒนาเกี่ยวกับงานสาระความของเรียน 1 2 3 4
15. ครูมีเวลาเสียสละในการเตรียมและจัดตารางงานต่าง ๆ 1 2 3 4
16. โรงเรียนเหล่าเมืองที่จะรวมร่างและไหลลงน้ำเกย์ภูมิ การใช้ประจำการสอนเก่าครู 1 2 3 4
17. ครูโรงเรียนมีวิวัฒนาการ 1 2 3 4
18. ครูทำงานให้ส่งจูงดูอย่างไปด้วยความยินดี ชุมชนวัฒน์และ 4 1 2 3 4
19. ครูแสดงความจงใจเข้าใจเรื่องและมีความมุ่งมั่นใด 1 2 3 4
20. การเรียนรู้ที่จะใช้บริการกลับและนักเรียน 1 2 3 4
21. ครูวิเศษไปโจมตีในอาดิปทานของเพื่อนร่วมงาน 1 2 3 4
22. โรงเรียนจัดการเรียนรู้เพื่อเสริมโรงเรียนต่าง ๆ สำหรับงานสอบ 1 2 3 4
23. ครูทั่วไปมีการหลุดส่านในเรื่องที่มีความถูกต้อง 1 2 3 4
24. ในการประชุมสัญจร ครูรู้สึกว่าความรู้สึกที่จะ 1 2 3 4
25. โรงเรียนจัดการเรียนรู้เพื่อประกอบการสอนในวิทยาการ 1 2 3 4
26. หลังจากโรงเรียนเด็กได้ ครูจึงจะเรียนเกี่ยวกับ 1 2 3 4
27. ครูเทศบาลได้เสนอที่อยู่ในโรงเรียนต่าง ๆ 1 2 3 4
28. ครูทำการสอนครูในโรงเรียนไปยังจนทุกคน 1 2 3 4
29. ครูมานำเกี่ยวกับการพ้นหลักหน่วยครูอื่น ๆ ในโรงเรียน 1 2 3 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>งานที่ต้องดำเนินการ</th>
<th>มีจำนวน</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ตรวจสอบจัดการข้อมูลและเอกสาร</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ตรวจสอบจัดการข้อมูลและเอกสาร</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ตรวจสอบจัดการข้อมูลและเอกสาร</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ตรวจสอบจัดการข้อมูลและเอกสาร</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ข้อความ</th>
<th>จำนวน</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. ตรวจสอบข้อมูลของงานที่เกี่ยวข้อง</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. ตรวจสอบข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการเงิน</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. ตรวจสอบข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการเงิน</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. ตรวจสอบข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการเงิน</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. ตรวจสอบข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการเงิน</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. ตรวจสอบข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการเงิน</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>การอื่นๆ</th>
<th>จำนวน</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. การอื่นๆ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่พยาบาลของดูแลและควบคุมงานเกี่ยวกับความแล้วเสร็จ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>โรงพยาบาลศูนย์และการควบคุมการฝึกอบรมของดูแลบุคคล</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่แล้วเสร็จ ซึ่งจะช่วยในการจัดทำความจำเป็น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ควบคุมความสะดวกของการปฏิบัติงานของดูแลบุคคล</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>การคัดแยกอาจารย์ใหญ่เพื่อเป็นการคัดแยก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานปลั๊กและเบรกการทำงานพิเศษ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่เสริมที่ทำการมีอย่างยิ่งและสามารถทำงานอย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานพิเศษของดูแลบุคคลที่เด็ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานพิเศษของดูแลบุคคลที่เด็ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานพิเศษของดูแลบุคคลที่เด็ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานพิเศษของดูแลบุคคลที่เด็ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานพิเศษของดูแลบุคคลที่เด็ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานพิเศษของดูแลบุคคลที่เด็ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>อาจารย์ใหญ่ทำงานพิเศษของดูแลบุคคลที่เด็ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>หลังจากทำงานวันที่เล็กและอาจารย์ใหญ่ของงานเจ้าหน้าที่</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. อาจารย์หน้าช่วยเก้าอี้และประมีประสม เข้าเบียร์ 1 2 3 4

63. ครูมีการรวบรวมและมีการประกาศในการเรียนและอ่านหนังสือให้ 1 2 3 4

64. อาจารย์พูดคุยเกี่ยวกับช่วยงานในเล่มเรียน เขียนและเลือกชื่อ 1 2 3 4
GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please fill out the information below.

1. Your Sex:
   ___(a) Male
   ___(b) Female

2. Years of Your Teaching Experience:
   ___(a) 5 years or less
   ___(b) 6-10 years
   ___(c) 11 years or more

3. Your Level of Education:
   ___(a) Less than a bachelor degree
   ___(b) Bachelor degree with or without additional course works
   ___(c) Master degree or higher

4. Sex of Your Principal:
   ___(a) Male
   ___(b) Female
THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTION: Please read each statement and choose only one alternative that better describes your school. For each numbered item draw a circle around the 1, 2, 3, or 4 to indicate the answer you have chosen.

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

1. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
2. The mannerism of teachers at this school are annoying.
3. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.
4. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.
5. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
6. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.
7. Extra books are available for classroom use.
8. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.
9. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.
10. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.
11. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

12. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.
13. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.
14. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.
15. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.
16. Student progress reports require too much work.
17. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.
18. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
19. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.
20. Teachers have too many committee requirements.
21. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
22. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
23. Custodial service is available when needed.
24. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.
25. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.
26. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.
27. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.
1 Rarely occurs
2 Sometimes occurs
3 Often occurs
4 Very frequently occurs

28. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers. 1 2 3 4
29. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems. 1 2 3 4
30. Teachers at this school stay by themselves. 1 2 3 4
31. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure. 1 2 3 4
32. The principal sets an example by working hard himself. 1 2 3 4
33. The principal does personal favors for teachers. 1 2 3 4
34. Teachers eat lunch by themselves whenever they can. 1 2 3 4
35. The morale of the teachers is high. 1 2 3 4
36. The principal uses constructive criticism. 1 2 3 4
37. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work. 1 2 3 4
38. Teachers socialize together in small select groups. 1 2 3 4
39. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions. 1 2 3 4
40. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day. 1 2 3 4
41. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions. 1 2 3 4
42. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences. 1 2 3 4
43. The principal schedules the work for the teachers. 1 2 3 4
1 Rarely occurs
2 Sometimes occurs
3 Often occurs
4 Very frequently occurs

44. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day. 1 2 3 4
45. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity. 1 2 3 4
46. Teachers help select what curriculum will be taught. 1 2 3 4
47. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes. 1 2 3 4
48. The principal talks a great deal. 1 2 3 4
49. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers. 1 2 3 4
50. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers. 1 2 3 4
51. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously. 1 2 3 4
52. The rules set by the principal are never questioned. 1 2 3 4
53. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers. 1 2 3 4
54. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use. 1 2 3 4
55. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference. 1 2 3 4
56. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive. 1 2 3 4
57. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports. 1 2 3 4
58. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda. 1 2 3 4
59. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings. 1 2 3 4
1 Rarely occurs
2 Sometimes occurs
3 Often occurs
4 Very frequently occurs

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

61. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.

62. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.

63. The principal is easy to understand.

64. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.
THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTION: Please read each statement and choose only one alternative that better describes your principal's behavior. For each numbered item draw a circle around the 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 to indicate the answer you have chosen.

1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Often
5. Always

1. He makes his attitudes clear to the staff. 1 2 3 4 5
2. He tries out his new ideas with the staff. 1 2 3 4 5
3. He rules with an iron hand. 1 2 3 4 5
4. He criticizes poor work. 1 2 3 4 5
5. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned. 1 2 3 4 5
6. He assigns staff members to particular tasks. 1 2 3 4 5
7. He works without a plan. 1 2 3 4 5
8. He maintains definite standards of performance. 1 2 3 4 5
9. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. 1 2 3 4 5
10. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. 1 2 3 4 5
11. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by all members. 1 2 3 4 5
12. He asks that staff members follow standard rules and regulations. 1 2 3 4 5
13. He lets staff members know what is expected of them. 1 2 3 4 5
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1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Often
5. Always

14. He sees to it that staff members are working up to capacity. 1 2 3 4 5
15. He sees to it that the work of staff members is coordinated. 1 2 3 4 5
16. He does personal favors for staff members. 1 2 3 4 5
17. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the staff. 1 2 3 4 5
18. He is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
19. He finds time to listen to staff members. 1 2 3 4 5
20. He keeps to himself. 1 2 3 4 5
21. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual staff members. 1 2 3 4 5
22. He refuses to explain his actions. 1 2 3 4 5
23. He acts without consulting the staff. 1 2 3 4 5
24. He is slow to accept new ideas. 1 2 3 4 5
25. He treats all staff members as his equals. 1 2 3 4 5
26. He is willing to make changes. 1 2 3 4 5
27. He is friendly and approachable. 1 2 3 4 5
28. He makes staff members feel at ease when talking with them. 1 2 3 4 5
29. He puts suggestion made by the staff into operation. 1 2 3 4 5
30. He gets staff approval on important matters before going ahead. 1 2 3 4 5
ITEMS THAT COMPOSE SUBTESTS OF THE OCDQ AND THE LBDQ

The OCDQ items that compose eight subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' Behavior</th>
<th>Principal's Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LBDQ items that compose two subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scored inversely
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