





MSU

OVERDUE FINES ARE 25¢ PER DAY PER ITEM

Return to book drop to remove this checkout from your record.

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF OPEN CLIMATE AND CLOSED CLIMATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AS MEASURED BY AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLIMATE INVENTORY

By

Karen Patricia Roth

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

ABSTRACT

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF OPEN CLIMATE AND CLOSED CLIMATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AS MEASURED BY AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLIMATE INVENTORY

By

Karen Patricia Roth

Problem

The problem that was addressed in this research study was: The determination and identification of describable, observable factors that distinguish between open climate and closed climate elementary schools.

The purpose of the research study was to:

- Investigate the climate of elementary schools designated as open and those designated as closed by the Panel of Experts.
- Determine the describable, observable factors which discriminate between open climate and closed climate elementary schools.
- 3. Develop an <u>Inventory</u> of describable, observable factors of an open climate school.

Methodology

A Panel of Experts nominated open climate and closed climate elementary schools for the study. The final sample consisted of fifteen open climate and thirteen closed climate elementary schools. A trained observer visited each building and collected data on Section One: Unobtrusive <u>Data</u> of the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>. The principal and staff members of each building completed two instruments: the <u>Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire</u>, an instrument measuring characteristics of the teachers as a group and the principal as leader; and the <u>Preliminary Ele-</u> <u>mentary School Climate Inventory</u>, the researcher-developed instrument, measuring physical facilities, positive atmosphere, human interaction, individualized learning practices and principal/teacher relationships.

Relationships Investigated

The following relationships were investigated in the study:

- Schools selected by the Panel of Experts and the OCDQ.
- Schools identified as open or closed by the <u>OCDQ</u> and the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>.
- Ratings of the schools as open or closed by the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>.
- The four positive subtests of the <u>OCDQ</u> and the <u>Pre-</u> liminary Elementary School Climate Inventory.
- The four negative subtests of the <u>OCDQ</u> and the <u>Pre-</u> <u>liminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>.
- Ratings of the observers and the schools identified as open or closed by the Panel of Experts.

- Ratings of the observers and the schools identified as open or closed by the OCDQ.

Findings

After analyzing the data, the following conclusions can be made:

- The <u>OCDQ</u> discriminated between open climate and closed climate elementary schools identified by the Panel of Experts, on three subtests: <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>.
- 2. The <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> discriminated between open climate and closed climate elementary schools identified by the <u>OCDQ</u> on two sections, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General Data About</u> School and Total Score.
- 3. There was no significant relationship between the classification of schools as open or closed by the Panel of Experts and by the <u>OCDQ</u>.
- A positive correlation existed between the four positive subtests of the <u>OCDQ</u> and the <u>Preliminary</u> Elementary School Climate Inventory.
- 5. There was no significant relationship between the negative subtests of the <u>OCDQ</u> and the <u>Preliminary</u> Elementary School Climate Inventory.
- There was a positive relationship between the ratings of the observers and the classification of open or closed schools by the Panel of Experts.

 There was no significant relationship between the ratings of the observers and the classification of open or closed schools by the OCDQ.

Summary

Through this research study, a list of describable and observable items that discriminate between open climate and closed climate elementary schools were determined. These items were then incorporated into the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven-</u> tory. The areas included: physical facilities; positive atmosphere; human interaction; individualized learning practices; and principal/teacher relationships. Through the use of the <u>Inventory</u>, it was possible to discriminate between open climate or closed climate elementary schools, identified by the OCDQ, on all areas except physical facilities.

This instrument can be used by an elementary school staff as an initial assessment of school climate. It may also assist staffs in identifying school climate improvement goals and in providing future direction for professional development. Thus through the use of the <u>Preliminary Ele-</u> <u>mentary School Climate Inventory</u>, it may be possible to bring about significant changes in school climate and positively affect academic achievement and self concept.

ⓒ

Copyright by KAREN PATRICIA ROTH 1979

DEDICATION

To Clay, my friend and my husband, whose patience, sensitivity and humor, I treasure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation was a long and arduous task. Several individuals provided me with support and encouragement during the planning stages, the implementation of the study, and the writing of the dissertation. I would like to express my deep appreciation to the following people:

Dr. Charles Blackman, my Advisor and Committee Chairman, whose wisdom and understanding helped me to maintain a sense of balance throughout the long dissertation process.

Dr. Pete Cooper, who raised some appropriate cautions about the nature of the study, and whose support and confidence I have felt since I have known him.

Dr. Sam Corl, who, in our discussions, provided me with a sense of direction for the conceptual framework of the study.

Dr. Frederick Ignatovich, whose help with the sections on methodology and data presentation and analysis was invaluable.

Dr. William Miller, my boss and my friend, his personal interest in this project from the very beginning was both gratifying and encouraging.

iii

The Panel of Experts, who shall remain anonymous, for their interest in my study and their assistance in the selection of the open climate and the closed climate elementary schools.

Barbara Carroll and Sue Williams, the observers, for: their invaluable assistance in collecting the data from the sample schools; their sincere interest in my study; being my "goodwill ambassadors" as they traveled through the county; and our friendship that has developed during the study.

My mother, who didn't see much of her daughter for the last four years, but whose love and support were always there.

My deceased father, who instilled in me, as a child, the feeling that I could do anything I really wanted to do.

Clay, my husband, who accepted this major interruption of our lives and helped me through the many moments of frustration and exhaustion.

Finally, to my family and friends, who have understood and supported me during my long hiatus from them.

iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	Background	1 4 4 6 7 9 11 13
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
	Introduction	14 15 18 21 26 28 34 38 38 42 44 52
III.	METHODOLOGY	56
	Introduction	56 57 57 58 59 61 64

	Selection of Schools .	, ,	• •	•	•	•	•	٠	٠	•	٠	•	65
	Instrumentation	, ,		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	69
	Organizational Climat	:e	De	esc	rip	oti	Loi	מ					
	Questionnaire			•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	70
	Preliminary Elementar	.v	Sc	ho	01	C]	lin	nat	ce				
	Inventory	,			•		•		-				70
	Physical Facilities	5.				•					•	•	71
	Inventory Items									-		-	72
	Positive Atmosphere				•						•	•	73
	Inventory Items		•••	•	•	·		•				•	73
	Human Interaction		• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	74
	Inventory Items		• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	75
	Inventory items			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	75
			LIIS	5•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	70
	Inventory Items		•	•	•,	:	•	٠	•	٠	٠	•	77
	Principal/leacher R	(e)	lat	.10	nsr	ΠĒ	S	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	70
	Inventory Items		• •	•	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	•	٠	•	/9
	Data Collection		• •	•	•	•	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	•	80
	Data Analysis		• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	83
	Limitations			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	84
	Hypotheses			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	86
	Summary			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	87
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	; (ΟF	TH	ΕI)A]	[A]	•	•	•	•	•	89
	Introduction			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	89
	Test of Hypotheses			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	89
	Hypothesis I			•	•		•		•	•			89
	Hypothesis II							•				•	91
	Additional Analyses .			•		•		•	•			•	92
	Hypothesis III						Ī	•		•			94
	Additional Analyses		•••	•	•	•			•				97
	Hypothesis IV		•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	97
	Hypothesis V	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	101
	Hypothesis V	•	• •	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	103
	Hypothesis VI		• •	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	103
	Hypothesis VII	•	• •	•	•	٠	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	104
	Summary		• •	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	106
v	SUMMARY CONCLUSTONS REC	ŝ	MM F	חאי	Δ Τ1	. UV	JC						110
۷.	Sommari, Concessions, Rec	,O_	ш.11			01	10	•	•	•	•	•	110
	Summary					•			•		•		110
	Conclusions			•					•		•	•	111
	Summary				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	123
	Discussion	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	124
	Recommendations	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	125
	Nort Stone	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	125
	Successions for Further	. т	• •	•		•	٠	٠	•	•	•	•	107
	Suggestions for further		res	ed	rcr	1	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	•	12/

Appendix A: Composite Definitions: Open Climate; Closed Climate	129
Appendix B: Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire	131
Appendix C: <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>	137
Appendix D: Double Standardized Scores for Eight OCDQ Subtests, Sample Schools	142
Appendix E: Prototypic Profiles for Six Organiza- tional Climates Ranked in Respect to Openness	
Vs. Closedness	143
Appendix F: Quantitative Data	144
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145
AUTOBIOGRAPHY	151

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Interrater Reliability (Pilot Study)	62
2.	Reliability of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u> , Using Cronbach's Alpha, Teachers and Principals; Principals Only; Teachers Only (Pilot Study)	63
3.	Sample Schools	69
4.	Eight Subtests of the OCDO, Comparing Mean Scores of the Open Climate and Closed Climate Schools, Identified by the Panel of Experts, Teachers Only	90
5.	Three Sections and Total Score of the <u>Prelimi-</u> nary Elementary School Climate Inventory, Comparing Mean Scores of the Open Climate and Closed Climate Schools, Identified by the <u>OCDQ</u> , Teachers Only	92
6.	Ranking of the Twenty-Eight Schools, Using Halpin's Prototypic Profiles for Six Organi- zational Climates Ranked in Respect to Openness Vs. Closedness	93
7.	Schools Identified as Open or Closed by the Panel of Experts, the OCDQ, Schools Both the Panel of Experts and the OCDQ Agree Upon, and Schools the Panel of Experts and the OCDQ Disagree Upon	95
8.	Comparison Between Open Climate and Closed Climate Elementary School Ratings by the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>	96
9.	Three Sections and the Total Score on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven-</u> <u>tory</u> , Comparing Mean Scores of Open Climate and Closed Climate Elementary Schools Identified by the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u> , Teachers Only	98

TABLE

10.	Correlation Between Three Sections of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> <u>Inventory and the Four Positive Subtests</u> <u>of the OCDQ, Esprit, Intimacy, Thrust,</u> <u>Consideration</u>	00
		77
11.	Correlation Between the Three Sections of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven-</u> tory and the Four Negative Subtests of the <u>OCDO</u> , <u>Disengagement</u> , <u>Hindrance</u> , <u>Aloofness</u> , Production Emphasis	102
12.	Comparison of the Mean Scores of Open Climate and Closed Climate Elementary Schools, as Identified by the Panel of Experts, on the two sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u> , <u>Interac-</u> tion, and the <u>Sub Total</u> of the <u>Preliminary</u> Elementary School Climate Inventory,	104
13.	Comparison of the Mean Scores of Open Climate and Closed Climate Elementary Schools, as Identified by the OCDQ, on the two sections, Physical Facilities, Interaction, and the Sub Total of the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory, Observers Only	104
		200
14.	Summary of the Status of Each Hypothesis	106

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Background

In growing numbers, educators are concerned with developing a humane school climate. Studies indicate that a positive climate makes it possible for schools to work productively toward important goals, such as academic learning, social development and curriculum improvement. This positive climate also contributes toward making school a satisfying and meaningful place in which both adults and youth want to spend time.

A positive school climate includes emphasis on the development of the total child, "as effective living requires heart and head, so effective education needs them both" (Aspy & Roebuck, p. 10). Earl Kelley has said that the people around the individual form the climate and the soil in which the self grows. If the soil is fertile and the climate is wholesome, there is vigorous and healthy growth. If the climate is unwholesome and unkind, growth is stunted or stopped, and illness occurs (p. 93).

The following are indicators of a positive, open school climate:

<u>Open Communication</u>. Principal, staff, parents, and students listen to each other and are listened to. There is much enthusiastic sharing of ideas and materials.

<u>Pleasant Atmosphere</u>. There is a warm, easy "feeling" in this type of school. It is reflected by the smiles one sees, and the laughter one hears. Someone has said that an effective classroom has one good laugh an hour, in which everyone heartily participates.

<u>Pride and Appreciation</u>. Students, staff and parents alike are proud of their school, and each person feels appreciated.

<u>Supportive Principal/Teacher Relationships</u>. The principal and teachers work together as a team. When there are disagreements or misunderstanding, they are dealt with in an atmosphere of openness and desire to compromise to reach consensus without threat.

<u>Uniqueness is valued</u>. Each individual is valued and respected for his/her special talents. Learning experiences and programs are designed to provide success opportunities for all children.

In an open, positive, healthy school climate, there are high levels of productivity and satisfaction for all of its members.

There is a relationship between school climate and self concept. Hinojosa (1974) found a relationship between high self esteem and an open climate, and low self esteem and a

closed climate in the elementary classroom. Staines (1958) investigated the relationship of the teacher to a child's self concept and found that changes in the child's self concept do occur as an outcome of the learning situation, and that the self must be recognized as an important factor in learning. Next to the home, the school is the single most important force in shaping the child's self concept, according to Purkey (1970).

Research evidence clearly shows a persistent and significant relationship between self concept and academic achievement. Brookover et al. (1967) concluded, from his extensive research on self image and achievement, that "the assumption that human ability is the most important factor in achievement is questionable, and that the student's attitudes limit the level of his achievement in school."

Morrel Clute (1977) says:

we must eliminate those conditions in our educational institutions that tend to leave children feeling helpless, fearful, hostile, and worthless. How an individual feels about himself or herself is more important as a determiner of behavior than what he/she knows.

The basic need that children have of organized education is that it helps them become more able and adequate, more courageous, more cooperative, and more understanding and accepting of themselves and others. This is the humanistic need which must be the allencompassing concern of education. (p. 2)

Ways must be found to help educators study the climate of their schools and bring about the necessary changes.

Statement of the Problem

The problem to be addressed in this research study is: The determination and identification of describable, observable factors that distinguish between open climate and closed climate elementary schools.

Rationale for the Study

This study was justified for two salient reasons. Research indicates a clear, significant relationship between school climate and self concept. It, therefore, seems essential to better understand what the schools can do to enhance this relationship.

A very significant relationship between self concept and academic achievement is supported by a number of important research studies (Brookover et al.; Aspy & Roebuck). And one of education's major goals is the cognitive development of the child. Thus, educators must discover specific ways to develop, enhance, and nurture the self concepts of its children in order to insure higher levels of academic achievement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the research study is to:

 Investigate the climate of elementary schools designated as open and those designated as closed.

A Panel of Experts, using composite definitions of open and closed climate schools (Appendix

A), identified a list of open climate and closed climate elementary schools. The investigation was conducted in these schools.

 Determine the describable, observable factors which discriminate between open climate and closed climate elementary schools.

This will be accomplished in two ways:

- Trained observers will gather unobtrusive data from each school, using two sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u> and <u>Interaction</u>, of the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> Inventory.
- b. The principal and staff of each building will complete two instruments, the <u>Organi-</u> <u>zational Climate Description Questionnaire</u> <u>and the Preliminary Elementary School</u> Climate Inventory.
- 3. Develop an <u>Inventory</u> of describable, observable factors of an open climate elementary school.

An elementary staff could use this instrument as an initial step to assess their school climate. The <u>Inventory</u> would identify a school's strengths and weaknesses and give direction to specific ideas and activities to enhance the school climate.

Significance of the Study

Currently, several school climate instruments exist. Some of them measure the relationship between the principal and teachers. Halpin's <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> <u>Questionnaire</u> is an example of this type of instrument. While it is true that this relationship is key to the climate of the school, the researcher believes there are other factors that need to be investigated.

Other instruments (<u>The CFK LTD. School Climate Profile</u>) are more comprehensive but often tend to be so general that they serve as an overall school climate assessment tool, but their results do not infer specific steps or actions that can be taken.

Still, there are other school climate instruments that provide a list of humanistic conditions that are found in an open climate school, and a principal and staff may use this list as a reference for designing humanistic practices. These lists are meant to serve as a guide or model for locally produced instruments.

While all of the above types of instruments may be helpful in assessing a school's climate, and each type has its strengths; it is difficult for the staff to infer specific direction for improvement.

The <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> is unique in several ways. It includes items dealing with principal/teacher relationships and humanistic conditions

and practices. Most of the items on the <u>Inventory</u> are observable and describable. A staff using the instrument could easily determine the absence or presence of these items. The <u>Inventory</u> requires minimal time to score. A mean score for each item on the <u>Inventory</u> can be computed on a hand calculator. Perhaps most important, a staff can use the <u>Inventory</u> to determine specific curriculum areas or professional development activities that they may wish to pursue.

The study itself is unique in that school climate is being investigated from two perspectives: the staff and the observers. This should provide cross validation and interesting insights into the further understanding of school climate.

From the study, it is hoped that the researcherdeveloped instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>, will prove to be both a valid and a reliable determiner of an open school climate. It is also hoped that the instrument can be used by elementary school staffs as a first step in assessing school climate and as a basis for setting and pursuing school climate improvement goals. The results of the self study, using the <u>Inventory</u>, may also give the staff future direction for professional development.

Research Questions

The planned research will investigate the following questions:

- 1. Is there a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, on the eight subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production Emphasis</u>, <u>Thrust and Consideration</u>, of the <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> Questionnaire?
- 2. Is there a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the <u>Organizational Climate Description Ques</u>tionnaire, on the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General Data About School</u>, and <u>Total Score</u> of the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> School Climate Inventory?
- 3. Is there a positive relationship between the classification of elementary schools as open or closed by the Panel of Experts and by the <u>Organizational</u> Climate Description Questionnaire?
- 4. Is there a positive relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u>, on the <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> <u>Questionnaire</u>?

- 5. Does no relationship exist between the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction and General</u> <u>Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness and Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, on the <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> Questionnaire?
- 6. Is there a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, and the ratings of the observers?
- 7. Is there a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the <u>Organizational Climate Description Question</u>naire, and the ratings of the observers?

Limitations of the Study

The following items represent the limitations the researcher considered before the study was implemented:

 The topic of the study. School climate seems to be a sensitive and emotional topic. Investigating a school's climate is similar to analyzing one's personality. Because of the delicate nature of the study, some schools may choose not to participate.

- 2. The time of year. The study will be implemented during the month of May, 1979. This is a very busy time of year for principals and teachers. There are end-of-the-year reports, filling out children's records, as well as the regular day-to-day responsibilities. Another factor to consider is that as the school year progresses, enthusiasm and morale seem to decline.
- 3. Procedures. Because of a specific time line, most of the organizational tasks were done using letters and the telephone, i.e. contacting principals, obtaining a definite commitment to participate in the study. Personal contact may be very important in a study of this nature.
- 4. Honesty of response. Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed to all participants. However, in an effort to "look good," some respondents may complete the instruments as they think the school situation "should be" rather than the "way it is."
- Results of the study are generalizable only to elementary schools in the geographical area studied.

These limitations may have an impact on the outcome of the present study.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following operational definitions will be used:

<u>Affective</u>: pertaining to or resulting from an emotion, a feeling, a value, or a degree of acceptance or rejection.

<u>Climate</u>: "feel," "ethos," or personality of an environment. Closed Climate: characterized by a high degree of apathy on

- the part of all members of the organization. It has a confining, concealing, restricting atmosphere. Low morale is evidenced by principal, staff, parents and children (Halpin).
- <u>Cognitive</u>: pertaining to the mental process or faculty by which knowledge is acquired.
- <u>Open Climate</u>: characterized by an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals. It has a caring, accepting, honest atmosphere. High morale is evidenced by principal, staff, parents and children (Halpin).
- Organizational Climate: the personality of the organization, involving the relationships between superordinates and subordinates; the product of the interaction among the following constituent parts: (1) the formal organization and its role structure; (2) the individual and his personality disposition; and (3) the informal group and its norms and culture (Mehra, p. 61).

- Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire: a 64-item instrument developed by Andrew Halpin to assess the climate of an organization. There are eight subtests; four pertain to the characteristics of the faculty as a group, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Esprit</u>, and <u>Intimacy</u>; the other four pertain to the characteristics of the principal as leader, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u>. Six organizational climates are identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>: <u>Open</u>, <u>Autonomous</u>, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal and Closed.
- <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>: a 45-item instrument developed by the researcher to assess the climate of an elementary school. There are three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General</u> Data About School.
- <u>School Climate</u>: prevailing atmosphere; the "feel" a school has which expresses its human qualities: its compassion and stimulation or its indifference and falsity (Wallin, p. 83).
- <u>Self Concept</u>: a complex and dynamic system of beliefs which an individual holds true about himself, each belief with a corresponding value (Purkey, p. 7).
- <u>Unobtrusive Measure</u>: "non-reactive" data gathering; collection of data about or surrounding an event rather than relying on measures which "require the cooperation of the respondent and that in themselves do not contaminate the response" (Webb et al., 1966, p. 2).

Overview of the Dissertation

This dissertation consists of four additional chapters. In Chapter II, a conceptual framework for this study is provided with an emphasis on school climate and self concept. It includes a review of the literature relevant to the problem under consideration.

The procedures employed in the implementation of the research design in this study are described in Chapter III. It includes: an overview of the research design, a summary of the pilot study, selection of schools, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, limitations of the methodology, and a presentation of the hypotheses to be tested in the research study.

Each hypothesis and the statistical results that test each hypothesis are presented in Chapter IV. Additional analyses that are considered significant and relevant are also presented.

Results of the study are discussed in Chapter V. General conclusions are drawn from the results of the research study, and the chapter ends with recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

There are two emphases related to this study: school climate and self concept. School climate is included because it is a significant factor in determining a child's success in school. This relationship has been validated by a number of significant studies (Brookover, 1964, 1965, 1967; Aspy, 1976). School climate is the subject investigated in the present study. Self concept is included because there is also a significant relationship between it and school climate, as found in studies by Purkey (1970), Combs (1975), Hinojosa (1974), and Staines (1958). Self concept is a major reason for studying school climate. Together, these areas of emphasis combine to provide a conceptual framework for this study. Literature related to each is described in two separate sections of this chapter.

Within the section dealing with school climate, the following topics are included: precedent studies, definitions, open/closed climate, classroom climate, physical environment, principal/teacher relationships and instruments.

The following topics are presented in the second section dealing with self concept: humanistic goals of

education, importance of the self in education, self image and achievement, and impact of parents and teachers.

A summary concludes the chapter.

School Climate

In the literature, the terms "school climate" and "organizational climate" are often used synonymously. Because this study relates to the school setting, the term "school climate" will be used.

Precedent Studies

The first explicit studies of organizational climate were initiated by Kurt Lewin in the 1930s. In seeking to describe the essential dynamics that linked human behavior to generalized environmental stimuli, he states:

To characterize properly the psychological field, one has to take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, needs, social relations, as well as more characteristics of the field as the atmosphere (for instance, the friendly, tense, or hostile atmosphere) or the amount of freedom. These characteristics of the field as a whole are as important as, for instance, the field of gravity for the explanation of events in classical physics. Psychological atmospheres are empirical realities and are scientifically describable facts. (1951, p. 241)

Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) attempted to study climate as an "empirical reality" in an experiment involving the behavioral effects of three different leader-induced atmospheres. The three leadership roles were authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. They reported: The adult-leader role was found to be a very strong determiner of the pattern of social interaction and emotional development of the group. Four clear-cut types of social atmosphere emerged, in spite of great member differences in social expectation and reaction tendency due to previous adult-leader (parent, teacher) relationships. (p. 297)

In other words, the climate itself proved more powerful than previously "acquired" behavior tendencies, and it was able to change the observed behavior patterns of the group members. Lewin and his associates carefully reviewed the individual differences in the various boys' clubs studies, and concluded:

It can be reported that in nearly all cases differences in club behavior could be attributed to differences in the induced social climate rather than to constant characteristics of the club personnel. (Lippitt & White, 1958, p. 506)

They go on to state:

It was clear that previous group history (i.e., preceding social climates) had an important effect in determining the social perception on leader behavior and reaction to it by club members. A club which had passively accepted an authoritarian leader in the beginning of its club history, for example, was much more frustrated and resistive to a second authoritarian leader after it had experienced a democratic leader than a club without such a history. (Lippitt & White, 1958, pp. 510-511)

In Lewin's theory of motivation, the concept of atmosphere or climate was an essential functional link between the person and the environment. He was convinced that climates were "scientifically describable facts" and "empirical realities." Muzafer Sherif (1958), explaining the formation of "social norms," came to the same conclusion. We know that the general setting in which a stimulus is found influences its properties, and unless we take a critical and analytic attitude toward the situation, we need not be aware that its properties are largely determined by its surroundings. (p. 228)

Litwin and Stringer (1968) conducted an experimental study to test certain hypotheses regarding the influence of leadership style and organizational climate on the motivation and behavior of organization members. The study involved the creation of three simulated business organizations, each headed by a president with a distinct leadership style.

The implications of the study revolve around two major findings:

First, it seems clear that distinct organizational climates can be created by varying leadership style. Such climates can be created in a short period of time, and their characteristics are fairly stable. Second, once created, these climates seem to have significant, often dramatic, effects on motivation and, correspondingly, on performance and job satisfaction. (p. 144)

These findings suggest that climate is an important variable in the study of human organizations. The climate concept should aid in understanding the impact of organizations on the person and the personality and in the study of the management process, particularly with regard to the effects different styles of management have on people.

Fiedler's theory of leadership, called the "Contingency Model" (1967), has been developed over the past 25 years. This theory holds that the effectiveness of a group or an organization depends on two interacting or "contingent" factors. The first is the personality of the leaders which determine their leadership style. The second factor is the amount of control or influence which the situation provides leaders over their group's behavior, the task, and the outcome. This factor is called "situational control."

Fiedler developed a classification system of task groups. Groups were first categorized into interacting, coacting, and counteracting groups, based on the degree to which the group members have to interact and coordinate their work in order to complete the common task.

A further classification was made of interacting groups. This classification is based on the degree to which the leader-member relations are good, the degree to which the task is structured or unstructured, and the degree to which the organization endows the leadership position with high or low power.

A tentative categorization of interacting task groups therefore leads to a three-dimensional system which classifies groups as falling into the upper or lower half of the distribution in each of the three dimensions, hence in one of eight cells or octants in the system.

Definitions of School Climate/Organizational Climate

Halpin states that:

Anyone who visits more than a few schools notes quickly how schools differ from each other in their "feel." In one school the teachers and the principal

are zestful and exude confidence in what they are doing. They find pleasure in working with each other; the pleasure is transmitted to the students, who thus are given at least a fighting chance to discover that school can be a happy experience. In a second school the brooding discontent of the teachers is palpable; the principal tries to hide his incompetence and his lack of a sense of direction behind a cloak of authority, and yet he wears this cloak poorly because the attitude he displays to others vacillates randomly between the obsequious and the officious. And the psychological sickness of such a faculty spills over on the students who, in their own frustration, feed back to the teachers a mood of despair. A third school is marked by neither joy nor despair, but by hollow ritual. Here one gets the feeling of watching an elaborate charade in which teachers, principal, and students alike are acting out parts. The acting is smooth, even glib, but it appears to have little meaning for the participants; in a strange way the show just doesn't seem to be "for real." And so, too, as one moves to other schools, one finds that each appears to have a "per-sonality" of its own. It is this "personality" that we describe as the "Organizational Climate" of the school. Analogously, personality is to the individual what Organizational Climate is to the organization. (p. 131)

Holland (1969), in apparent agreement, describes some schools as "terrible, rigid, uncreative and dull" and other schools as "exciting and extra healthy in their makeup."

Buckminster Fuller (1969) says to those who would seek to improve society: "Reform the environment." Fuller applies this to education by saying that changing the environment is better than trying to change the students. By environment, Fuller means more than the physical nature of the classroom or college campus. He is referring to "all the forces in the school that affect the student."

Contemporary theory views a social organization as comprised of a number of interdependent and interrelated
parts. These parts in their operation interact and by their interaction is created a new entity, which may be termed as the "climate" or the character of the organization. A study of the literature on organization points to three basic components of a social organization: (1) The formal organization and its role structure; (2) The individual and his personality disposition; and (3) The informal group and its norms and culture. The <u>organizational climate</u> may be defined as the product of the interaction among these various constituent parts (Mehra, p. 61).

Howell berates educators for using the term "school climate" so loosely:

Used glibly by educators to describe everything from interpersonal relations to a hot classroom sans air conditioning the words are in danger of death by overuse. These words explicitly defined are the essence of the schooling process, the umbrella term that sums up nicely just how we're doing. A learning climate is what our public expressly wants us to provide. It is their way of saying humane, communicative, compassionate, individually responsive, and all the other terms that mean "treat my kid like he counts for something." (p. 1)

Smith further defines school climate as follows:

If we were to begin to name the qualities of the environment we might wish for a child we would list these things. We would say, let it be an environment that is accepting and forgiving; let it be one that takes him out of himself and involves him in group activities; and let the inducements to sociability be attractive and vivid, yet let them be measured accurately to his own capacities; and let there be a real pressure in the environment, let it make definite and clean-cut demands, yet let the demands be flexible; and let there be no formal punishment or long-lasting ostracism; and let there be abundant physical contact and physical exertion; and let the environment offer him a sense of the skills and the varieties of behavior that lead to greater pleasure, greater security, and let the rewards for this kind of growth be immediate and intrinsic in the activities themselves. (p. 17)

In their 1974-75 Policies and Standards for the Approval

of Optional Schools and Special Function Schools booklet, the

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools lists the following standards under the heading of school climate:

- 1. The school provides a positive social and academic climate which enhances and strengthens the student's self-esteem and academic performance.
- 2. The school fosters in its students an understanding of the divergent value systems that are integral to our pluralistic democratic society.
- 3. The school encourages supportive norms for accomplishing academic work, but it provides considerable latitude to accommodate diverse styles of learning.
- 4. The school encourages open communication among staff, students and community. Large amounts of dialogue and feedback characterize the communication.
- 5. The school fosters a sense of belonging and feeling of security among its students.

Whatever definition is considered, it is clear that school climate is a composite of human interactions within a school community.

Open/Closed Climate

As one closely examines school climate and discovers differences in the quality of the different climates, judgments begin to emerge. Halpin (1966) referred to open climate as the "good guys" and closed climate as the "bad guys" and "unfortunate guys" (p. 135). A closed climate was not to be viewed as evil but rather unhealthy or sick (p. 137). He also referred to openness versus closedness in organizational climates as a dichotomy. This dichotomous construct was used to create an array of climates ranging from Open to Closed (p. 227). These climates were identified as follows:

- 1. The <u>Open Climate</u> describes an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals, and which provides satisfaction for the group members' social needs. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately from both the group and the leader. The members are not preoccupied disproportionately with either task-achievement or social-needs satisfaction. Satisfaction on both counts seems to be obtained easily and almost effortlessly. The main characteristic of this climate is the 'authenticity' of the behavior that occurs among all members.
- 2. The <u>Autonomous Climate</u> is one in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group. The principal exerts very little control over the group members. High esprit results primarily from social-needs satisfaction. Satisfaction from task-achievement is also present, but to a lesser degree than in the Open Climate. The distinguishing feature of this organizational climate is the

almost complete freedom that the principal gives to teachers to provide their own structures for interaction, as well as to find ways within the group for satisfying their social-needs.

- 3. The <u>Controlled Climate</u> is characterized best by impersonal and highly task-oriented behavior. The group behavior is directed primarily toward taskachievement, while relatively little attention is given to social-needs satisfaction. The climate lacks 'openness' or 'authenticity' of behavior because the group is disproportionately preoccupied with task-achievement.
- 4. The <u>Familiar Climate</u> is highly personal but undercontrolled. The members of this organization satisfy their social-needs, but pay relatively little attention to social control in respect to task-accomplishment. Accordingly, <u>Esprit</u> is not extremely high simply because the group members secure little satisfaction from task-achievement. Hence, much of the behavior within this climate can be construed as 'inauthentic.'
- 5. The <u>Paternal Climate</u> is characterized best as one in which the principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group and attempts to initiate most of these acts himself. The leadership skills within the group are not used to

supplement the principal's own ability to initiate leadership acts. Accordingly, some leadership acts are not even attempted. In short, little satisfaction is obtained in respect to either achievement or social-needs; hence, <u>Esprit</u> among the members is low.

6. The <u>Closed Climate</u> is characterized by a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization. The organization is not moving. <u>Esprit</u> is low because the group members secure neither social-needs satisfaction nor the satisfaction that comes from task-achievement. The members' behavior can be construed as 'inauthentic'; indeed, the organization seems to be stagnant. (Halpin, pp. 174-181)

Silverblank (1973) suggests that "it seems that where the administrator is authoritarian, there are closed, formalized relationships among school personnel and these relationships in turn, hinder group responsibility. On the other hand, where there are open channels of communication, where responsibilities are not compartmentalized, where there is encouragement of consensus decision making, the atmosphere is conducive to successful innovation" (p. 241).

Another way of thinking about open climate and closed climate was expressed by Earl Kelley:

The people around the individual form the climate and the soil in which the self grows. If the soil is fertile and the climate is wholesome, there is vigorous and healthy growth.

If the climate is unwholesome and unkind, growth is stunted or stopped, and illness occurs. There is either growth or nongrowth--and nongrowth is illness. One who has been subjected to an unhealthy climate and is forced to build defenses actually closes out the stuff of healthy growth. Knowledge then is distorted or closed out and growth is stopped. Learning under these circumstances is in terms of selfprotection, not in terms of self-growth. (Perceiving, p. 93)

Dillon says there are some very simple ways to recognize a healthy school climate. "Let's walk into a school where the climate appears to be positive. These are some of the things we'll probably notice or sense."

Open Communication. There appear to be few tightlyknit, exclusive cliques. Teachers seek out opportunities to help newcomers get started and continue to nurture and support them. There are few isolates either on the staff or in the classrooms. There is much enthusiastic sharing of ideas and materials.

<u>Pleasant Atmosphere</u>. People of all ages genuinely smile and laugh a lot. Someone has said that an effective classroom has one good laugh an hour, in which everyone heartily participates. Warmth is projected by the expressions on the faces of student and staff members. There is an "easy" feeling which is hard to describe, but obvious to all who enter.

<u>Purposeful Activity</u>. There is no lack of accomplishment or standards--in fact, achievement is often better than in similar but less comfortable schools. Effective classroom management may be either structured or unstructured, but it is always task-directed and sensitive.

<u>Pride and Appreciation</u>. There is little of the "just a teacher" philosophy evident in teacher behavior, and children have good things to say about their teachers and the school. Parents act as volunteers and actively support the school. People of all ages feel that their efforts are appreciated. It is apparent that teachers, students, and parents respect each other.

<u>Supportiveness</u>. When there are disagreements or misunderstandings, they are dealt with in an atmosphere of openness and desire to compromise to reach consensus without threat. There is a feeling of collegiality between staff members and administrators.

<u>Hospitality</u>. Outsiders are readily made a part of the group within the building, and are made to feel welcome both through overt action and general attitude.

Social and Psychological Health. There is a minimum of serious physical confrontation, and there is evidence of concern for the physical and psychological well-being of others. . . Angry voices are seldom heard--either small ones or large ones. Discipline is consistent and evident but never harsh. . . Rules are held to a minimum but consistently enforced. (pp. 34-35)

Classroom Climate

Since it is in the classroom that the students spend most of their school life, it is the classroom which has the major responsibility for creating the environment where healthy emotional growth and maximum intellectual growth can occur.

Classrooms must be places which facilitate the business of looking at self and the world. They must provide a climate which encourages exploration and discovery. Whatever produces defensiveness and rigidity and inability to look at self or the world in any form inhibits the process of free discovery and exploration. This calls for classroom climates which are high in challenge and low in threat.

Such a climate also calls for a deep respect for the uniqueness of the individual. The discovery of self is a deeply personal matter that does not come about in blanket ways. Each individual must discover his own unique being in his own unique way. This is unlikely to occur in classrooms where everyone is treated alike and where differences are regarded as bad or improper (Perceiving, p. 105).

Carl Rogers offers the following Principles of Learning as fundamental to a positive classroom environment:

- 1. Human beings have a natural potentiality for learning.
- 2. Significant learning takes place when the subject matter is perceived by the student as having relevance for his own purposes.
- 3. Learning which involves a change in self organization--in the perception of oneself--is threatening and tends to be resisted.
- 4. Those learnings which are threatening to the self are more easily perceived and assimilated when external threats are at a minimum.
- 5. When threat to the self is low, experience can be perceived in differentiated fashion and learning can proceed.
- 6. Much significant learning is acquired through doing.
- 7. Learning is facilitated when the student participates responsibly in the learning process.
- 8. Self-initiated learning which involves the whole person of the learner--feelings as well as intellect--is the most lasting and pervasive.
- 9. Independence, creativity, and self-reliance are all facilitated when self-criticism and selfevaluation are basic and evaluation by others is of secondary importance.
- 10. The most socially useful learning in the modern world is the learning of the process of learning, a continuing openness to experience and incorporation into oneself of the process of change. (Freedom to Learn, pp. 157-163)

The teacher who incorporates these Principles of Learning into the classroom is providing an environment of acceptance and encouragement for the students.

Physical Environment

The physical space in which the teaching/learning process takes place also has an impact on the classroom/ school atmosphere. The general appearance of the school, as well as the individual classrooms, reflect how people, big and small, feel about being there.

John Holt (1974) has said that "the right kind of space creates activity. A child sees the space and his imagination begins to soar. . . . It is as if there were in his mind all sorts of things ready to happen and waiting only for the space to appear in which they could happen" (p. 141). He also sees physical space as a motivator for children. "We would have to worry a lot less in our schools about 'motivating' children, about finding ways to make good things happen if we would just provide more spaces in which good things <u>could</u> happen" (p. 144).

Thomas David concurs that "... the built environment does have an effect on our behavior, an effect which we are only beginning to understand. The school building is more than just a neutral shelter from the elements" (p. 178).

Proshansky and Wolfe have found that the physical setting is also related to the goals of a school:

There are two major ways in which the design and arrangement of space and furniture are factors in implementing educational goals. First, physical and spatial aspects of a learning environment communicate a symbolic message of what one expects to happen in a particular place. The atmosphere of a classroom is readily apparent when one enters it and is reflected by subtle cues in the physical arrangement as well as by the style of teaching. The teacher's desk, once physically isolated and raised on a platform to signify the teacher's status in relation to the student and the direction of the flow of knowledge, can communicate the same authoritarian message by its placement at the center front of the classroom, immobile and inviolate. In the same way, a large open center in a classroom may invite large motor movements which the teacher may not necessarily consider desirable in the room or desirable at a particular time.

Second, physical and spatial factors play a <u>pragmatic</u> role in the learning situation. The effective arrangement and management of space can facilitate the learning process, while the unplanned, ineffective use of space can result in unforeseen and unexpected interference, and even possibly serve to instigate interpersonal conflicts. The informal seating arrangement referred to above not only makes it difficult for a child to concentrate on the class lesson but also facilitates conversation between children. If the conversation is antithetical to the teacher's goals, the children will undoubtedly be reprimanded for inattention without the teacher's realizing that he/she has, indeed, created the situation. (pp. 32-33)

Principal/Teacher Relationships

In the literature on effective management, this relationship is discussed in broader terms and is often referred to as the superior-subordinate relationship.

In <u>New Patterns of Management</u>, Likert (1961) devotes a complete chapter to research findings relevant to superiorsubordinate relationships and concludes that productivity increases and worker attitudes improve when employers are viewed by workers as being employee-centered rather than job-centered, and when employers carry out their activities in such a way that they are perceived by employees as being supportive and considerate of them.

Job-centered employers are those "... who tend to concentrate on keeping their subordinates busily engaged in going through a specified work cycle in a prescribed way and at a satisfactory rate as determined by time standards" (p. 7).

Employee-centered employers "... focus their primary attention on the human aspects of their subordinates' problems and on endeavoring to build effective work groups with high performance goals" (p. 7).

In a study involving ten superior life insurance companies, in terms of production, and ten mediocre agencies, Likert found that managers of superior agencies were more likely to be described by their employees as "unselfish," "cooperative," "sympathetic," "democratic," and "interested in the agent's success," than were managers of mediocre agencies. In effect, managers of superior agencies were looked upon by employees as being more supportive and considerate of employees (p. 11).

To Likert the most successful supervisors are those who are employee-centered and attempt to build effective work groups with high performance goals. To achieve this, managers must create a climate in which there is a

preponderance of favorable attitudes on the part of each member of the organization toward all other members and a high level of confidence and mutual trust throughout the organization. In addition, the organizational social system must include "... a high degree of group loyalty among the members and favorable attitudes and trust between superiors and subordinates," with efficient and effective communication between levels. Such a social system must include provision for effective social interaction and mutual influence between all levels.

A total climate of this type can best be achieved when the leader operates under the "principle of supportive relationships." Under this principle, there will be a "maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organization, each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance" (pp. 102-103).

To Douglas McGregor, management will never realize the full potential of the human talent available in industry until it recognizes that control consists in "selective adaptation to human nature rather than in attempting to make human nature conform to our wishes."

Such a condition will be achieved through the utilization of "Theory Y." The central principle of "Theory Y" is the concept of "integration," identified by McGregor as "the

creation of conditions such that the members of the organization can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise." Such a theory assumes that the average worker will expend physical and mental effort as he seeks to accept responsibility and practice self direction and self control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

The key to the success of such a theory lies in the development of a psychological climate which permits interdependence in supervisor-subordinate relationships. The supervisor-subordinate relationship is an outgrowth of the parent-child relationship which the worker once experienced and the inherent dependency of such a relationship must be changed to a status of interdependency. Such a change will occur when a supervisor practices "employee-centered" supervisory techniques which enhance the development and dignity of the worker.

Leadership, McGregor feels, is really a complex relationship among certain variables, including the characteristics of the leader, the characteristics of the group, the characteristics of the organization, and the total environment of their relationships.

In relating the above theories to the educational setting, the same relationships can be found between the "employee-centered" principal and his staff and the "jobcentered" principal and his staff. The former will tend to

have high satisfaction and high productivity, and the latter will have low satisfaction and low productivity.

The principal is the key figure in a school. How the people in the school feel about him/her has a great deal to do with the climate that is operating in that building. In order to improve the climate of the classroom or school, it must become a school-wide goal with the school administrators working in conjunction with the rest of the staff (Pino, p. 45).

If the administrator perceives his/her role as catalyst, rather than executive, he/she can help create a climate where there is concert to achieve either specific outcomes or general goals. If teachers perceive their roles as part of a unified enterprise in which they support and reinforce each others' efforts as well as over-all school objectives, there can be administrative leadership and teacher autonomy in the interactive process of achieving common goals. The educational climate can become one of trust and understanding where both educational leadership and teacher autonomy have an opportunity to grow and strengthen each other. In this setting, a healthy and dynamic school climate can develop (Sa'ad & Hamm, pp. 225-227).

Carl Rogers sees the responsibility of educational administration as "organizing the resources of the institution--the teachers, the students, the funds, the equipment and materials in such a way that all of the persons involved

can work together toward defining and achieving their own educational goals." The task of the administrator is to arrange the organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can best achieve their own goals by also furthering the jointly defined goals of the institution. The administrator finds that his work consists primarily of removing obstacles such as "red tape," of creating opportunities where teachers and students and administrators (including himself/herself) can freely use their potential, of encouraging growth and change, and of creating a climate in which each person can believe that his/her potential is valued, his/her capacity for responsibility is trusted, his/her creative abilities prized (Freedom, p. 207).

Instruments

There are several instruments that have been designed to measure some aspect(s) of school climate. Below is a brief overview of the key instruments that are currently being used in school climate studies.

The <u>Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire</u> (<u>OCDQ</u>) was developed by Halpin and Croft in order to better understand and define organizational climate. In their initial research, Halpin and Croft studied 71 elementary schools chosen from six different regions of the United States. After certain refinements, the sixty-four item <u>OCDQ</u> was divided into eight subtests; four of these tapped the characteristics of the faculty as a group, and the other four pertained to characteristics of the principal as leader. The group behavior subtests were intended to measure <u>Disengagement</u> (teachers' tendency toward anomie), <u>Hindrance</u> (Do the teachers feel the principal facilitates or hinders their work?), <u>Esprit</u> (teachers' morale), and Intimacy (social-needs satisfaction).

The leader behavior subtests were intended to measure <u>Aloofness</u> (Is the principal impersonal and formal, or emotionally involved with his staff?), <u>Production Emphasis</u> (Is the principal highly directive and not sensitive to staff feedback?), <u>Thrust</u> (Does the principal motivate teachers by setting a good example and personally moving the organization?), and <u>Consideration</u> (Does the principal treat teachers "humanly"?).

The ranking of the climates on Openness roughly parallels the scores which the schools receive on <u>Esprit</u>, the best single indicator of morale. As the loadings on <u>Esprit</u> are traced through the six climates, <u>Open</u>, <u>Autonomous</u>, <u>Controlled</u>, <u>Familiar</u>, <u>Paternal</u> and <u>Closed</u>, these loadings become increasingly smaller as one moves from the more <u>Open</u> to the more <u>Closed</u> Climates. <u>Esprit</u> is regarded as the key subtest for describing a school's Organizational Climate. Halpin infers that high <u>Esprit</u> reflects an "effective" balance between task accomplishment and social needs satisfaction. From his nationwide sample of schools, Halpin was able to identify "school profiles" which tended to cluster; he identified six such school climate profiles and called them <u>climate types</u>, ranking in order from <u>Open to Closed</u>. They are: <u>Open</u>, <u>Autonomous</u>, <u>Controlled</u>, <u>Familiar</u>, <u>Paternal</u> and Closed.

From the scores on the eight subtests, a profile, or psychograph, is then constructed for each school, depicting the school's organizational climate. By comparing the profiles of different schools, distinguishing features of each school's organizational climate can be noted.

In the years since Halpin devised the <u>OCDQ</u>, it has been utilized in a variety of research studies examining different aspects of organizational climate, specifically, school climate. Although other researchers have devised other measures of organizational climate, the majority of the research on school climate seems to have involved the use of the OCDQ (ERIC Clearinghouse).

The CFK LTD. School Climate Profile was designed by a group of educators who were associates of CFK LTD., the Charles F. Kettering II philanthropic foundation dedicated to improving administrative leadership and the learning climate of elementary and secondary schools. The instrument is designed to serve two purposes: (1) to provide a convenient means of assessing the school's climate factors and determinants so that initial decisions can be made about priority targets for improvement projects, and (2) to serve as a benchmark against which a school may measure climate change.

It includes a sample of five indicators for each of the climate factors and determinants identified in the conceptual scheme. Since it does not pretend to include an item on every indicator that might be important, the instrument is more valuable as an overall school climate assessment tool than as a definitive or exhaustive survey. It can provide data to help in deciding what factors and determinants of the climate should be looked at more intensively (Fox, p. 51).

A <u>Checklist for Humanistic Schools</u> was designed by a task force of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Working Group on Humanistic Education. The checklist is intended to be useful in:

- Observing the degree to which school systems, schools, teachers, and students are operating in humanistic ways.
- Getting teachers, administrators, and other school personnel to examine their own practices, then setting and pursuing goals for improving them.
- Helping parents, board members, legislators, and the general public better understand and support humanistic endeavors of schools.

Although not a complete instrument, the checklist provides, (a) a starting point which school practitioners may use for exploring current practice, and (b) a list of humanistic conditions that may serve schools and teachers as a reference source for designing humanistic practices. The list can be used in its present form, or as a model for locally produced instruments (Combs, 1978, pp. 45-46).

Self Concept

Humanistic Goals of Education

The 1962 ASCD Yearbook, <u>Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming:</u> <u>A New Focus for Education</u> states that "the fullest possible flowering of human potentiality is the business of education. It is our reason for being. What we decide is the nature of the fully functioning, self-actualizing individual must become at once the goal of education" (p. 2). In this Yearbook, four persons were asked to provide a description of the fully functioning person as they saw him/her.

Earl Kelley defined the fully functioning self as one who:

thinks well of himself.
thinks well of others.
sees his stake in others.
sees himself as part of a world in movement-in process of becoming.
sees the value of mistakes.
develops and holds human values.
knows no other way to live except in keeping with his values. -is cast in a creative role. (pp. 18-20)

Carl Rogers finds a fully functioning person:

- -to be a human being in flow, in process, rather than having achieved some state.
- -to be sensitively open to all of his experiencesensitive to what is going on in his environment, sensitive to other individuals with whom he is in relationship, and sensitive perhaps most of all to the feelings, reactions, and emergent meanings which he discovers in himself.
- -experiences in the present, with immediacy. He is able to live in his feelings and reactions of the moment.
- -is trustingly able to permit his total organism to function freely in all its complexity in selecting, from the multitude of possibilities, that behavior which in this moment of time will be most generally and genuinely satisfying.
- -is a creative person. With his sensitive openness to his world, and his trust of his own ability to form new relationships with his environment, he is the type of person from whom creative products and creative living emerge.
- -lives a life which involves a wider range, a greater richness. They have this underlying confidence in themselves as trustworthy instruments for encountering life. (pp. 31-32)

Abraham Maslow referred to the fully functioning

person as a self-actualizing person. He is one who:

-is sufficiently free of illness.

-is sufficiently gratified in his basic needs.

-is positively using his capacities.

-is motivated by some values which he strives for or gropes for and to which he is loyal. (Maslow, 1969, p. 36)

Arthur Combs identifies a fully functioning person as an adequate person. He is one who:

- -has a positive view of himself. He sees himself as a person who is liked, wanted, acceptable, able; as a person of dignity and integrity, of worth and importance.
- -identifies with others. It is a feeling of unity or oneness, a feeling of sharing a common fate, or of striving for a common goal. It represents a real extension of the self to include one's fellow.
- -is open to experience and acceptance. This makes life more pleasant and exciting for adequate persons. It permits him to feel a greater wonder and appreciation of events. Without the necessity for defensiveness, the world can be met more openly and gladly. Life can be experienced and savored without fear or hesitation. Such people experience more of what Maslow has called "peak experiences." What is more, adequate persons seem to remain more imaginative and creative even when well along in years.
- -has a rich and available perceptual field. This is a product of the kinds of opportunities an individual has been exposed to. Other things being equal, the richer the opportunity, the more likely the development of a rich and extensive field.

Since all of these ways of perceiving are learned, they can also be taught if we can but find ways to provide the necessary kinds of experiences. No other agency in our society is in a more crucial position to bring about these necessary conditions than the public schools. Indeed, the development of such people must be the primary goal of education (<u>Perceiving</u>, pp. 61-62).

In a recent paper, Morrell Clute (1977) reinforces the positions of the above authors when he says that "the basic need that children have of organized education is that it helps them become more able and adequate, more courageous, more cooperative, and more understanding and accepting of themselves and others. This is the humanistic need which must be the all-encompassing concern of education" (p. 2).

In <u>Humanistic Education: Objectives and Assessment</u>, (1978) humanistic education is defined as a "commitment to education and practice in which all facets of the teachinglearning process give major emphasis to the freedom, value, worth, dignity, and integrity of persons" (p. 9).

It is further defined by the following seven goals.

Humanistic Education:

- 1. Accepts the learner's needs and purposes and develops experiences and programs around the unique potentials of the learner.
- Facilitates self-actualization and strives to develop in all persons a sense of personal adequacy.
- 3. Fosters acquisition of basic skills necessary for living in a multi-cultured society, including academic, personal, interpersonal, communicative, and economic proficiency.
- 4. Personalizes educational decisions and practices. To this end it includes students in the processes of their own education via democratic involvement in all levels of implementation.
- 5. Recognizes the primacy of human feelings and utilizes personal values and perceptions as integral factors in educational processes.
- 6. Develops a learning climate which nurtures growth through learning environments perceived by all involved as challenging, understanding, supportive, exciting, and free from threat.
- 7. Develops in learners genuine concern and respect for the worth of others and skill in conflict resolution. (pp. 9-10)

The Importance of the Self

One of the most outstanding contributions of the humanistic movement to our understanding of learning is its concern with the self concept. Combs has stated:

The self concept, we now know, is the most important aspect of any human interaction, a major determiner of every behavior. It is a vital determinant of intelligence, human adjustment, or success and self-realization in any aspect of life. It is learned from experience, and, once established, is often self-corroborative. What happens to the self in the course of schooling may be far more important than whatever else schools think they are teaching. Self concept is a vital part of the learning process and truly effective education must be humanistically oriented toward student self concepts. (1978, p. 4)

Carl Rogers views the self as the central aspect of personality. It is of central importance to that individual's behavior and adjustment. Rogers described the self as a "social product, developing out of interpersonal relationships and striving for consistency." He believed that "there is a need for positive regard both from others and from oneself, and that in every human being there is a tendency toward self-actualization and growth as long as this is permitted by the environment" (Rogers, 1947).

Arthur Combs defines self concept as the "ways in which an individual characteristically sees himself. This is the way he 'feels' about himself" (<u>Perceiving</u>, p. 51). According to Combs, it is this "feeling" about himself, not what he says about himself, that determines his behavior. To emphasize the importance of the self concept to education, he states: We know that what a person believes about himself is crucial to his growth and development. We also know that a person learns this self concept from the way he is treated by significant people in his life. The student takes his self concept with him wherever he goes. He takes it to Latin class, to arithmetic class, to gym class, and he takes it home with him. Wherever he goes, his self concept goes, too. Everything that happens to him has an effect on his self concept. (1975, p. 6)

In attempting to understand the self and its importance to education, Purkey defines the self "as a complex and dynamic system of beliefs which an individual holds true about himself, each belief with a corresponding value" (p. 7). It is the maintenance and enhancement of this perceived self which is the motive behind all behavior. The school can play a major role in affecting the way a child perceives himself.

Neil Postman emphasizes the significant role of the school in relation to self concept:

Schools must assume some responsibility for the emotional life of children. By this, I do not mean that schools should become psychiatric hospitals. But the plain fact is that an awful lot of children have been rendered intellectually ineffective and socially destructive by worry, dread, rage, hostility, and confusion. Some of them even kill themselves, and an alarming number grow up to kill others. The public school cannot deal with this problem by hiring a few guidance counselors. What we have to do is to make the study of one's own feelings a legitimate school activity, invested with an importance at least equal to that presently given to map-reading skills and spelling.

. . . we do know that when schools take the feeling-life of children seriously, children become less fearful, less diffident, less lost, and as a consequence, more fully functioning human beings. They also become better learners. (1974, p. 60)

Self Image and Achievement

Academic success or failure appears to be as deeply rooted in concepts of the self as it is in measured mental ability, if not deeper. Research evidence clearly shows a persistent and significant relationship between the self concept and academic achievement.

Brookover et al. (1967) concluded, from extensive research on self image and achievement, that "the assumption that human ability is the most important factor in achievement is questionable, and that the student's attitudes limit the level of his achievement in school."

Recent studies (Shaw, Edson, & Bell, 1960; Fink, 1962; Brookover et al., 1964, 1965; Caplan, 1966; Gill, 1969) have shown a very significant relationship between positive self concept and achievement and negative self concept and underachievement. This relationship has been found in males and females, in both white and black students, and at the elementary and secondary grade levels.

The successful student has a relatively high opinion of himself and is optimistic about his future performance (Ringness, 1961). He has confidence in his general ability (Taylor, 1964) and in his ability as a student (Brookover, 1967). He needs fewer favorable evaluations from others (Dittes, 1959), and he feels that he works hard, is liked by other students and is generally polite and honest (Davidson & Greenberg, 1967). Judging by their statements, successful

students can generally be characterized as having positive self concepts and tending to excel in feelings of worth as individuals. This is in stark contrast to the self image of the majority of unsuccessful students.

Judging by the preponderance of available research, it seems reasonable to assume that unsuccessful students, whether underachievers, nonachievers, or poor readers, are likely to hold attitudes about themselves and their abilities which are pervasively negative. They tend to see themselves as less able, less adequate, and less self reliant than their more successful peers. This is particularly true of boys, and it is also true, but to a lesser extent, of girls. Students with negative self images of ability rarely perform well in school, as the research of Brookover, Erickson, and Joiner (1967) has indicated.

Several studies have concluded that self concepts stand in a causal relationship to academic achievement. In an investigation of the relationship between children's perceptions of themselves and their world while in kindergarten and their subsequent achievement in reading in the first grade, Lamy (1965) found that these perceptions, obtained from inferences made by trained observers, gave as good a prediction of later reading achievement as intelligence test scores. When IQ and self evaluations were combined, the predictive power was even greater. In concluding her study, Lamy suggested that the perceptions of a child about himself and his world are not only related to but may, in fact, be causal factors in his subsequent reading achievement.

A similar study was done by Wattenberg and Clifford (1964). They obtained measures of the self concepts of kindergarten children based on self-referent statements obtained as the children drew pictures of their family and as they responded to incomplete sentences. The scores obtained by the researchers were seen as representing two dimensions of the self concept: competence and goodness. These scores were then related to beginning achievement in reading during the second grade. The results indicated that measures of the self concept appear to be antecedent to and predictive of reading achievement in the second grade.

The conclusion seems unavoidable: a student carries with him certain attitudes about himself and his abilities which play a primary role in how he performs in school.

Impact of Parents and Teachers

People learn who they are and what they are from the ways in which they have been treated by those who surround them in the process of their growing up. This is what Harry Sullivan called "learning about self from the mirror of other people" (p. 147).

Recent research (Brookover et al., 1965; Thomas, 1966; Coopersmith, 1967) has shown that parents play an extremely

important role in the development of the self concepts of their children.

Coopersmith, in <u>The Antecedents of Self-esteem</u> (1967) lists three conditions which lead the developing individual to value himself and regard himself as an object of worth. These are "(1) parental warmth; (2) respectful treatment; and (3) clearly defined limits." Together these three conditions make up a generally prevailing parental attitude of positive regard and affection.

So it happens that the child enters school "with his psychological bags packed" with all kinds of ideas about himself and his abilities. However, in spite of this tremendous influence of the primary home environment, the school has a great role to play. "Next to the home, the school is the single most important force in shaping the child's self concept" (Purkey, p. 39).

Morse (1964) measured the shifts in self concept of elementary and secondary students and found a gradual decrease in professed self-regard with age. "Eighty-four percent of the third graders were proud of their work in school, compared to only fifty-three percent of the eleventh graders." Similar findings were reported by Brookover et al. (1965) and Yamamoto, Thomas, and Karnes (1969).

These studies seem to indicate that the image of the school grows gradually less positive with time and communicates a sense of personal inadequacy to many students.

Staines (1958) investigated the relationship of the teacher to a child's self concept and found that

changes in the child's self concept do occur as an outcome of the learning situation, and that self must be recognized as an important factor in learning. Teaching methods can be adapted so that definite changes of the kind sought will occur in the self without injury to the academic program in the process.

The significant research of Aspy and Roebuck (1976) measured the correlation between student achievement and the humane characteristics of a teacher in a learning environment. Specifically, they began their work by testing the formulations of Carl Rogers, using Rogers' contention that learning will be enhanced when the helper (teacher, counselor) provides high levels of empathy (E), congruence (C), and positive regard (PR). Translating this formulation into a testable hypothesis, it became, "The higher the levels of understanding, genuineness, and respect a teacher gives to her students, the more they will learn."

The method used was first to obtain tape-recorded hours of classroom instruction. The <u>Flanders' Categories for</u> <u>Interaction Analysis</u> and the <u>Cognitive Functioning Categories</u> rating scales were used to assess various degrees of these primary attitudes and behaviors, ranging from low to high. Using these scales, unbiased raters measured the "facilitative conditions" as exhibited by each teacher. These ratings were then correlated with achievement test scores, IQ, number of absences from class. Their final report indicates that they recorded and assessed nearly 3,700 hours of classroom instruction, from 550 elementary and secondary teachers, in forty-two states and seven foreign countries.

The results of Aspy's findings indicate the following:

- 1. There was a clear correlation between the facilitative conditions provided by the teacher and the academic achievement of students. This finding has been repeatedly confirmed. Students of "highlevel" teachers (those high in the facilitative conditions) tended to show the greatest gains in learning. A sobering finding was the students of "low-level" teachers may actually be retarded in their learning by this deficiency.
- 2. The situation most conducive to learning was when teachers who exhibited high levels of the conditions were backed up and supervised by principals with similarly high levels. Under these conditions, students not only showed greater gains in school subjects but other positive gains as well.

Examples of other positive gains in students include:

-more positive self concept than was found in other groups;

-more initiated behavior in the classroom;

-fewer discipline problems;

-lower rate of absence from school.

⁻more adept use of higher cognitive processes
 such as problem solving;

In one exciting study, they even showed an increase in IQ. In this study, 25 black first graders with "high-level" teachers and 25 with "low-level" teachers were given individual intelligence tests nine months apart. The first group showed an average IQ increase from 85 to 94. The figures for the second group were 84 and 84--no change whatsoever.

- 3. Teachers can improve in the level of facilitative conditions with as little as 15 hours of carefully planned intensive training, involving both cognitive and experiential learning. Considering the demonstrated influence of these attitudinal conditions, it is highly important to know that they can be increased.
- 4. Of significance for all of education is the finding that teachers improve in these attitudes only when their trainers exhibit a high level of these facilitative conditions. In ordinary terms, this means that such attitudes are "caught," experientially, from another. They are not simply intellectual learnings.
- 5. Teachers exhibiting high levels of facilitative conditions tend to have other characteristics. They have a more positive self concept than low level teachers.

They are more self-disclosing to their students.

They respond more to student's feelings.

They give more praise.

They are more responsive to student ideas.

They lecture less often.

6. Neither geographical location of the classes, racial composition, nor race of the teacher altered these findings. Whether we are speaking of black, white, or Chicano teachers; black, white, or Chicano students; or classes in the North, the South, the Virgin Islands, England, Canada, or Israel, the findings are essentially the same.

Aspy and Roebuck conclude as follows after analyzing their mountains of data:

The results are by and large supporting our original findings, though we have been able to sharpen them greatly. That is, the measures of the conditions (E, C, PR) continue to relate positively and significantly to positive student growth. Additionally, they relate negatively and significantly to student deterioration such as discipline problems and negative attitudes about school." ("Beyond the Watershed," 1977, pp. 627-628)

The research of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) has found that when the teacher believes that his students can achieve, the students appear to be more successful; when the teacher believes the students cannot achieve, then it influences their performance negatively.

The basic hypothesis was that "students, more often than not, do what is expected of them." To test this hypothesis, the two researchers conducted an experiment in a

public elementary school of 650 students. The teachers were told that, on the basis of ability tests administered the previous spring, approximately one-fifth of the students could be expected to evidence significant increases in mental ability during the year. The teachers were given the names of the high potential students. In reality, the names had been chosen at random by the experimenters. When intelligence tests and other measures were administered some months later, those identified as potential spurters tended to score significantly higher than the children who had not been identified. Also, Rosenthal and Jacobson found that these children were later described by their teachers as happier, more curious, more interesting, and as having a better chance of future success than other children. They summarized their study by stating that the evidence suggests strongly that "children who are expected by their teachers to gain intellectually in fact do show greater intellectual gains after one year than do children of whom such gains are not expected."

Summary

In summarizing the literature reviewed in school climate and self concept, the following statements can be made:

 Education should have as one of its major goals helping students become more fully functioning, self-actualizing individuals.

- Self concept is the way one perceives himself, and this perception determines one's behavior.
- 3. Research evidence clearly shows a persistent and significant relationship between positive self concept and academic achievement and negative self concept and nonachievement or underachievement, and this relationship may be causal.
- Research studies confirm that both the home and the school have a great influence on the self concept of the child.
- 5. Teachers who provide high facilitative conditions (empathy, congruence, positive regard) in the classroom can improve the academic achievement of their students.
- 6. In several climate studies, a significant relationship was found between leadership style, organizational climate and motivation and behavior of organization members.
- School climate/Organizational climate refers to the personality or character of the school.
- Open climate refers to a dynamic, healthy organization; closed climate describes a stagnant, sick organization.
- Because the student spends most of his day in a classroom, it is essential that the atmosphere be warm, accepting and encouraging.

- 10. The physical environment of the school directly and/or indirectly reflects the school's educational goals and philosophy.
- 11. Research studies conclude that when employers are employee-centered, productivity increases and worker attitude improves.
- 12. The principal is a key person in the school and greatly influences school climate.
- 13. There are several instruments which measure aspects of school climate, each with its strengths and weaknesses.

Given the above statements, school climate is an important topic to explore. It seems the more one learns about school climate, the more helpful it will be to the people in the school community, adults and children alike.

Based upon relevant literature related to school climate and self concept, the researcher developed an instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven-</u> <u>tory</u>, which is designed to be used by elementary school staffs as an initial assessment of their school climate. The five areas it seeks to measure are: physical facilities, positive atmosphere, human interaction, individualized learning, and principal/teacher relationships.

Buckminster Fuller has cautioned us that "changing the environment is better than trying to change the students." By environment, Fuller means more than just the physical nature of the classroom. He is referring to "all the forces in the school that affect the student." In this study, it is hoped that some of these forces will be determined by the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>, specific areas and activities will be identified to improve the quality of a school's environment, and our understanding of school climate will be enhanced.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The procedures employed in the implementation of the research design used in this study are described in this chapter. Initially, an overview of the research design is presented. In the second section, the pilot study that was conducted to determine the reliability of the researcherdeveloped instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>, is described, including selection of schools, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis and discussion. The following sections include: a description of the selection of schools for the main study and the instruments that were used, a discussion of the data collection, data analysis and the limitations of the methodology, and a presentation of the hypotheses that were investigated in the research study. A summary concludes the chapter.

Research Design

The method of research used in this study was descriptive. The purpose of the research study was to:

 Investigate the climate of elementary schools designated as open and those designated as closed.

- Determine the describable, observable factors which discriminate between open climate and closed climate elementary schools.
- 3. Develop an <u>Inventory</u> of describable, observable factors of an open climate elementary school.

Pilot Study

In order to determine the reliability of the researcherdeveloped instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>, a pilot study was conducted.

Selection of Schools

The principals and staffs of six elementary schools agreed to participate in the pilot study. These schools were in a district of moderate size (6,700 students), with a mixed student, teacher, administrator racial composition, and the community is generally made up of blue collar workers. The school district was chosen because it was in close proximity to the researcher's office, and she has been involved with the school district as a general education consultant for several years.

The researcher called the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction and explained her study and the need to have a minimum of six staffs from the elementary schools participate in a pilot study to determine the reliability of the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Prelimi</u>nary Elementary School Climate Inventory. He agreed to have the request presented by the researcher at the next regularly scheduled elementary principal's meeting. After the pilot study was explained to the elementary principals, six principals consented to discuss it with their staffs. The staffs of all six elementary schools agreed to participate in the pilot study.

Instrumentation

The researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>, consisted of three parts and forty items. Part One (eighteen items) dealt with <u>Unobtrusive Data</u> and was divided into two sections: <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u> (Attractive, colorful bulletin boards and display cases) and <u>General Observations</u> (Students and teacher talking to one another in small groups). Part Two (eight items) gathered <u>General Data About School</u> (Teachers work together cooperatively, share ideas and materials). Part Three (fourteen items) gathered <u>Quantitative Data</u> (Average number of children absent per day).

Observers, who were experienced teachers and trained in observation techniques by the researcher, gathered data on Part One. Teachers were asked to complete Parts One and Two. Principals completed all three parts.

For each item in Parts One and Two, a rating scale was used, ranging from one (not evident) to four (very evident). For Part Three, the principals were asked if this information was available to them. An answer of Yes or No was filled in.

Data Collection

The researcher delivered the instruments and cover memos, explaining the purpose of the instrument and directions for its completion, in unmarked envelopes to each school secretary. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured each participant. The school secretary distributed the envelopes to the principal and staff.

Staffs were asked to complete Part One: <u>Unobtrusive</u> <u>Data</u> and Part Two: <u>General Data About School</u>. The principals were asked to complete Parts One, Two and Three: <u>Quantitative Data</u>. Each person was asked to complete the instrument individually. Upon completion, each person was asked to return the instrument, indicating the name of the school and his/her position, in a sealed envelope within the next two days to the school secretary. The researcher returned to each school on this day to pick up the instruments from the school secretary.

A second component of the pilot study involved observations. Each school was to be visited by three observers who were to collect data on Part One of the instrument.

In selecting the observers, the researcher used the following criteria: someone who (1) was knowledgeable about elementary schools, preferably someone who was or had been an elementary teacher; (2) had a pleasant personality and could relate to principals and teachers; and (3) was generally well-groomed and attractive.

The researcher had recently taught a class to elementary teachers (full time and substitute). There were a few substitute teachers who met the above criteria and would have the time to visit schools. Three observers were selected from this group.

The researcher provided an intensive training session for the three observers. The general overall research design was explained to them so that they would understand how their role related to the entire study. The observation form was discussed with the observers, and each item was explained in great detail to develop a thorough understanding of what was to be observed and how it was to be rated. Many specific examples were presented to the observers and how that situation should be scored. Because all three of the observers had previous experience as elementary school teachers, they easily grasped what was being asked of them.

Each observer was given a schedule of the six schools they were to visit. Only one observer was in a school at one time. They were to spend about an hour in each school, visiting as many classrooms as possible, as well as the library/media center, teachers' room, students' lavatories, and observe the general appearance of the building, inside and out. The teachers were aware of the presence of the observers in the school, and that their role was to gather general data on the school. It was made clear that the observers were not evaluating individual teachers. Three observations were done each day by each observer. If, for any reason, a teacher did not want the observer to visit his/her classroom, his/her wish was honored.

Each observer was given the names of two principals and asked to spend a few minutes with him/her sometime during the visit gathering the data for Part Three. At this point, the researcher was only interested in knowing whether these data were easily available to the principal.

Data Analysis

The instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> Climate Inventory was analyzed to determine its reliability.

To determine interrater reliability, the extent to which the three observers agree in their ratings of the same school, The Kruskal-Wallis test, a nonparametric one-way analysis of variance, was used. See Table 1.

A probability value of .8054 for the total score indicates no significant difference between the ratings of the three observers.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to measure the reliability of the instrument for teachers and principals. This information is presented in Table 2.

Table 1

Interrater Reliability (Pilot Study)

Part	Obsrv.	Obsrv. N Avg. Rank P-		<u>p</u> -value
I. Phys.	1	6	8.167	.7508
	2	6	10.333	
	3	6	10.000	
I. GObs.	1	6	9.083	.5263
	2	6	8.000	
	3	6	11.417	
I. Tot.	1	6	8.833	.8054
	2	6	9.000	
	3	6	10.667	

Table :	2
---------	---

Reliability of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> <u>Inventory</u>, Using Cronbach's Alpha; Teachers and Principals; Principals Only; Teachers Only (Pilot Study)

A. Total Population (teachers and principals, N=99)

Part	Alpha Coefficient
I. Unobtrusive	.88346
II. General	.80420
Total	.91404

The reliability coefficient of .914 for the total score indicates a high degree of internal consistency across the total population.

B. Principals Only (N=6)

Part	Alpha Coefficient
I. Unobtrusive	.87155
II. General	.80942
Total	.90268

The reliability coefficient of .903 for the total score indicates a high degree of internal consistency for principals.

C. Teachers Only (N=89)

Part	Alpha Coefficient
I. Unobtrusive	.88706
II. General	.80854
Total	.91667

The reliability coefficient of .917 for the total score indicates a high degree of internal consistency for teachers.

Discussion

The results of the pilot study allowed the researcher to assume that the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>, was sufficiently reliable to use in the main study.

Originally, the design of the main study included all three of the observers collecting data on Part I. <u>Unobtru-</u> <u>sive Data</u> in all schools in the sample. However, in analyzing the ratings of the three observers for each school in the pilot study, the results showed that there were no significant differences between the observers' ratings of each school. Thus, it would not be necessary to have all three observers rate each school; one rating for each school would be sufficient.

After discussing the observations with the observers, several recommendations were made which refined the wording of some of the items on the instrument, deleted a few items which seemed difficult to measure because of several uncontrollable variables (Open classroom doors) and added a few items which seemed significant to the observers (Classrooms and hallways well-lighted).

Selection of Schools

A Panel of Experts was identified by the researcher as individuals who: (1) were knowledgeable about the topic of the research study; (2) were familiar with elementary schools throughout the county in which the study was done; and (3) had worked extensively in elementary schools in the county as educational consultants.

The Panel of Experts was represented by the deputy superintendent from the Intermediate School District, two professors of education from two area universities, and two general education consultants from the Intermediate School District.

Each panel member was given a folder containing:

- 1. A memo from the researcher
 - explaining the purpose of the planned research project;
 - b. defining their task of providing the researcher with a list of "most open" and "most closed" elementary schools in Wayne County. They were asked to rate each school, using a 0-100 scale; 0=most closed, 100=most open. The sample would

be selected from the ratings of all of the panel members;

- c. asking the panel members to consider the following in selecting the schools:
 - cooperation. The panel member should be reasonably sure the nominated school would agree to participate.
 - size of school. The panel members were asked to avoid recommending schools with a student population under 300 or over 1,000.
- A composite definition of open climate schools and closed climate schools, based upon readings in the literature.
- 3. The two instruments to be used in the research study:
 - a. The <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> Questionnaire (OCDQ);
 - b. The <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> Inventory.

The Panel of Experts provided the researcher with a final list of twenty-eight open climate and twenty-five closed climate elementary schools. The target number of schools was twelve open climate and twelve closed climate elementary schools.

A letter was sent to the principals of all fifty-three elementary schools, inviting them to participate in a study

of school climate. The letter indicated that their school had been nominated for inclusion in this study of school climate, defined what the expectations of each staff and school would be, the approximate time commitment, and a guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity. The letter then indicated that each principal would receive a follow-up telephone call from the researcher within the next few days to answer questions and determine their interest in participating in the study.

Several of the nominated schools were in a large school district that had a policy which required all research projects to be submitted to the Research and Development Department for review. The process involved about a three month period. The researcher was unaware of this policy, and this requirement interfered with the established time line for the implementation of the research project. Consequently, all of the nominated schools in this school district, with the exception of one, could not participate.

Several other schools did not want to participate because of the time of year. Data were scheduled to be gathered during the month of May. Many principals and teachers felt there were too many other end-of-the-year responsibilities.

Still other schools were rather suspicious about gathering data in their schools and refused to participate. A few other schools would not participate because of contract problems.

Of the original fifty-three schools nominated by the Panel of Experts, nineteen schools agreed to participate. Eleven of these schools had been identified as open climate schools and eight were identified as closed climate schools by the Panel of Experts.

In order to make up the balance of schools needed for the study, the researcher contacted superintendents and assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum and instruction of schools that had been nominated for the study but had not agreed to participate for a variety of reasons, among them being time of year, bad experience with researchers in the past, suspicion of the topic, school climate. She explained the nature of the study to them and asked if they would talk to their principals. They, then, called their principals, explained the nature of the study in greater detail, the commitment of the researcher to sound research, and requested that they participate in the study. The researcher made a follow-up telephone call to these principals, answered any further questions and obtained their commitment to participate in the study. Six open climate and nine closed climate schools additionally agreed to participate. The total sample consisted of seventeen open climate and seventeen closed climate elementary schools. This information is presented in Table 3.

IGOIC J	Ta	.bl	е	3
---------	----	-----	---	---

Sample Schools

	Open	Closed
Original schools rec. by Panel of Experts	28	25
Original number that agreed to partic.	11	8
Schools requested by their Superintendents	6	9
Total number of Schools-Final Sample	17	17

The sample schools represented the diversity of school districts in the county, ranging from a small rural school district, a large urban school district, a small suburban school district, to a large suburban school district. The schools also represented low, middle and high socio-economic status as well as a wide range of racial mix in student and staff populations. The schools were not aware of the open/ closed climate identification; they were only aware that they were schools selected to participate in a study of school climate.

Instrumentation

The research instruments employed in this study included the <u>Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire</u> and the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory. Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Andrew Halpin, 1966 (Appendix B).

Permission was granted to use this instrument from the Macmillan Company in New York.

The <u>OCDQ</u> consists of 64 Likert-type items, each of which is assigned to one of eight subtests. Four of the subtests measure the characteristics of the teachers as a group: <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Esprit</u> and <u>Intimacy</u>. The other four subtests pertain to the characteristics of the principal as leader: <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production Emphasis</u>, <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u>. For a more detailed description, see pages 35-36, Chapter II.

Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory, Karen Roth, 1979 (Appendix C).

Based upon relevant literature related to school climate and self concept, the researcher developed an instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>. It is designed to be used by elementary school staffs as an initial assessment of their school climate. The general areas it seeks to measure are: physical facilities; positive atmosphere; human interaction; individualized learning; and principal/teacher relationships.

Below is a summary of relevant literature that supports the inclusion of these five areas on the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven</u>tory. Following each section is a listing of the specific items on the <u>Inventory</u> that relate to that area. If an item is included in more than one area, this is indicated by an asterisk.

Physical Facilities

John Holt sees the physical space of a school as a motivator for children. He says that color, space and lighting in a school can make a difference in a child's attitude about school. Brightly colored walls, lots of light, open space for children to move around in, these are some of the external factors that can "turn children on to school."

Thomas David, educational psychologist, University of Chicago, sees a school building as more than just a "neutral shelter from the elements." It is a place that should reflect the interests and goals of the people who live there. Therefore, no two schools will ever be exactly alike. When one enters a school building, it should say something to the visitor about its occupants, their beliefs, their educational goals.

J. W. Getzels, Department of Education and Psychology, University of Chicago, said that our visions of human nature find expression in the buildings we construct, and these constructions in turn do their silent yet irresistible work of telling us who we are and what we must do. Our habits impel our habitations and habitations impel our lives. Winston Churchill's observation during the debate on rebuilding the House of Commons after the war holds for the common school as well: "We shape our buildings and afterwards our buildings shape us."

Inventory Items

- Warm, pleasant decor (bright walls, inviting pictures, murals).
- *2. Students' work (art, compositions, special projects) displayed in classrooms and hallways.
 - 3. Attractive, colorful bulletin boards and display cases in classrooms and hallways.
- *4. Flexible classroom arrangements (small groups of chairs, seating in a circle, etc.).
- 5. Space to "move around" in every classroom.
- *6. School grounds (inside and outside) free of litter and grafitti.
- *7. Lavatories in good condition (no signs of vandalism).
- *8. A library with an abundance of books and other materials.
 - 9. Classrooms and hallways well-lighted.
- Easy access to all classrooms, media center, special service rooms.
- *11. Faculty lounge reflects professional involvement
 of staff (notices of seminars, conferences,

*Indicates item included in more than one area.

workshops, graduate classes posted).

Positive Atmosphere

Halpin says that when one enters a school building, one becomes quickly aware of a "feel." This "feel" has been identified as the personality or the climate of the school. The open climate school is one in which teachers, principals and staff are happy to be there. There is a mutual respect and trust for each other. This atmosphere is reflected by the smiles one sees, the laughter one hears, and the warmth one feels in this building.

In an open, positive climate school, there is also a feeling of pride and appreciation. Evidence of school pride can be seen and heard. Teachers and students may be wearing school sweatshirts, posters proclaiming the school as "the greatest" are seen throughout the building, children have good things to say about their teachers and the school, and the building is clean and in good order. Parents act as volunteers and actively support the school. Outsiders are readily made a part of the group within the building and are made to feel welcome both through overt action and general attitude (Kelley, Combs, Dillon).

Inventory Items

*2. Students' work (art, compositions, special projects)
displayed in classrooms and hallways.

- *6. School grounds (inside and outside) free of litter and grafitti.
- *7. Lavatories in good condition (no signs of vandalism).
- 14. Secretary greets visitors, students and faculty in a warm, friendly manner.
- 15. Smiling teachers.
- 20. Principal is warm and friendly.
- 24. Visitors (other educators, parents, community members) greeted in a friendly manner by students.
- 25. Visitors (other educators, parents, community members) greeted in a friendly manner by staff.
- 26. Students, teachers and parents displaying symbols of school pride.
- 30. Active parent, community participation in classrooms, school activities, resolution of school problems.
- 31. Children freely move about the building without passes.
- 35. Other educators visit the school.

Human Interaction

Much has been written about the impact significant others have on the development of self concept. Combs says that "a person learns his self concept from the way he is treated by significant people in his life." Purkey enforces this view when he states that "next to the home, the school is the single most important force in shaping the child's self concept."

"Learning will be enhanced when the helper (teacher, counselor) provides high levels of empathy, congruence and positive regard," according to Carl Rogers. David Aspy's findings support this statement. He found a clear correlation between the facilitative conditions provided by the teacher and academic achievement of students. Students of high facilitative level teachers tended to show greatest gains in learning. Students of low level teachers may actually be retarded in their learning by this deficiency. Aspy found that teachers with high levels of facilitative conditions respond more to students' feelings, give more praise and lecture less often. Teachers are key people in providing an atmosphere of warmth and acceptance.

Inventory Items

- 16. Students and teachers interacting with one another in small groups.
- 19. An absence of negative comments to students by teachers.
- 21. Students doing helpful, responsible jobs in the classroom, office, media center (answering the telephone, delivering AV equipment).
- 22. Students readily assisting and sharing with other students.

- 23. Teachers interacting with students in a positive manner (verbally, "Keep up the good work!" and nonverbally, showing affection, sensitivity to their students).
- *37. Teachers spend some of their unscheduled time with students.
 - 39. Principal spends some of his/her time working with students.

Individualized Learning

A correlation has been found between the successful student and a positive self concept and the unsuccessful student and a negative self concept (Ringness, 1961; Brookover, 1964, 1965, 1967). Several other studies have concluded that self concept stands in a causal relationship to academic achievement (Lamy, 1965; Wattenberg & Clifford, 1962). This research seems to emphasize the importance of having children experience success in school. This can happen when children's individual differences are taken into account. Not all children will read at the same time, nor will they master long division in the third week in February. The teacher who treasures his/her students' individual differences also provides for them by individualizing their learning experiences and by providing an accepting classroom atmosphere that is both challenging and free from threat.

Inventory Items

- *4. Flexible classroom arrangements (small groups of chairs, seating in a circle, etc.).
- *8. A library with an abundance of books and other materials.
- 12. Students involved in discovery and "hands on" activities.
- 13. Interest/learning centers being used with purpose.
- *16. Students and teachers interacting with one another in small groups.
 - 17. Students working in a variety of organizational patterns (independent, small groups, large groups).
- 18. Students working in areas other than the classroom (media center, hallways, outdoors).
- *22. Students readily assisting and sharing with other students.
- 28. Students do some of the teaching and other leadership tasks.
- 31. Individualized grading practices (progress measured in accordance with children's abilities).
- 32. Students have opportunities to choose various methods of learning.
- 34. Awards, citations, honors available to all students.
- *37. Teachers spend some of their unscheduled time with students.

38. Media center, special activity rooms (art, music), and recreational areas available to students after school hours.

Principal/Teacher Relationships

In an open climate school, not only are relationships between educators and students positive and supportive, but between the teachers and principal as well. There is a feeling of collegiality between staff and administration. The teachers nurture and support each other, and there is much enthusiastic sharing of ideas and materials (Dillon, 1978).

Likert says that the most successful supervisors are employee-centered, attempting to build effective work groups and fostering a climate of favorable attitudes toward each other. McGregor reinforces this idea in his Theory Y, the central principle being the concept of "integration, the creation of conditions such that members of the organization can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise."

Halpin describes the open climate as "an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals, and which provides satisfaction for the group members' socialneeds. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately from both the group and the leader." Halpin further states that "Esprit is the best single indicator of morale. . . . High 79

Esprit reflects an effective balance between task-accomplishment and social-needs satisfaction."

Inventory Items

- *11. Faculty lounge reflects professional involvement of staff (notices of seminars, conferences, workshops, graduate classes posted).
 - 29. Teachers involved in decision making (choosing texts, selecting topics for staff meetings, determining school procedures).
 - 33. Teachers work together cooperatively, share ideas and materials.
 - 40. The staff gets along well together.
 - 41. The staff participates in continuing professional development (inservice, seminars, workshops, conferences, graduate classes).
 - 42. Discussions in the faculty lounge usually result in gripe sessions. (Note: This is the only item which is stated in a negative manner.)
 - 43. Principal and staff work as a team.
 - 44. Principal is an instructional leader.
- 45. Teacher morale is high.

The <u>Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire</u> and the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> were printed together in a booklet, providing a professional touch as well as ease in scoring for respondents and researcher. All participants completed the <u>OCDQ</u> (64 items) and the three sections of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> <u>Inventory</u> (45 items). The observers completed Section I: <u>Unobtrusive Data</u> (<u>Physical Facilities</u> and <u>Interaction</u>, 26 items) on the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory.

Data Collection

The two components of the main study consisted of: (1) an observer visiting each school and rating the school, using Section One of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>; (2) principal and teachers of each school completing both the <u>Organizational Climate Description Ques</u>tionnaire and the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> Inventory.

The order in which these two components occurred was considered significant. The observation should occur first, so that there was little chance to alter any variables of the school environment. Then, the principal and staff would complete the two instruments.

Basically, the same format was used as in the pilot study. Because of the high interrater reliability of the three observers in the pilot study, only one observer visited each building. Two of the original three observers did the observations in the main study. One observer visited twenty-one schools; the second observer visited fourteen schools. The only deciding factor of which observer visited which school was their availability and desire to have them visit approximately the same number of schools. The observers did not know if a school had been designated open or closed.

The researcher or observer called each principal to schedule a date for the observation. The observation was to take about an hour and the observer would gather data on Section One: <u>Unobtrusive Data</u> of the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u>. She would visit classrooms, library/media center, teachers' room, student lavatories and generally survey the entire building, inside and out. The teachers were aware of the presence of the observer, and that she was gathering objective data on the building. This knowledge seemed to allay some of the anxieties teachers may have had about personal evaluations.

Some time after the observation, but usually two to three days later, the researcher delivered the instruments to the school, met with the principal to answer any questions he/she might have, and asked that the school secretary distribute the instruments to the teachers.

The teachers and principal were asked to complete both instruments, indicating the name of the school and their position on the cover of the booklet. They returned the booklet in a sealed envelope to the school secretary, not longer than one week later. The researcher then returned to the school, picked up the instruments, and told the principal

that the results of the instruments for his/her school would be shared with him/her when the data was available.

In almost all instances, this procedure went very smoothly, but there were some exceptions.

At the last minute one open climate school decided not to participate. The principal had been very willing, but the staff decided they did not want to participate.

In another open climate school, the principal had been most willing to participate in the study, seemed interested in the nature of the study, the observer ranked it as 3 of 14 of the schools she felt had a positive environment. Yet, when the researcher went to pick up the instruments, less than half of the teachers had returned the instruments to the school secretary. Of those that had been returned, several were not completed, but notes had been written to the researcher, giving her their opinions of the study and the instruments.

One of the closed climate schools that had agreed to participate in the study was in a school district that had not had a contract in three years, and a recent millage election had been defeated. The researcher impressed upon the principal the importance of total staff participation. Yet, when the researcher went to collect the instruments from this school, not one teacher had completed the instruments. It was in this same school that several teachers requested that the observer not visit their classrooms. A

comment from the observer seemed to sum up the climate in this school: "They even stopped watering the plants!"

In another closed climate school that volunteered to participate in the study, the principal insisted that he see everything that was written about his school. When the researcher returned to pick up the completed instruments, they had not been completed. It seems that the principal and staff had changed their minds about being a part of the study.

Four other schools (one open, three closed) had to be dropped from the study because less than half of the staff had completed the instruments.

The final number of schools that provided the researcher with the appropriate data was fifteen open climate and thirteen closed climate elementary schools.

Data Analysis

A <u>t</u>-test was used to analyze the data from Hypotheses I, II, VI and VII. The difference between the two sample means of the open climate and closed climate elementary schools was considered statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Chi-square and contingency coefficient test statistics were used to analyze the data from Hypothesis III.

The correlation coefficient was used to analyze the data from Hypotheses IV and V.

Limitations

Some of the limitations in the implementation of the research project were:

- 1. The topic of the study. The topic, school climate, caused several of the school principals and staffs to be suspicious about the nature of the study. Many people in the nominated schools seemed to feel that it was an invasion of their privacy and, therefore, refused to participate. Understandably, it was more difficult identifying an adequate number of closed climate schools for the study.
- 2. Time of year. The research project was implemented during the month of May, 1979. At this time of year, principals and teachers feel burdened with many end-of-the-year duties and reports. It also seems that as the school year progresses, enthusiasm and morale decline.
- 3. Contact with schools. Because the researcher was operating within a specific time line, some of the "ideal" procedures were not used. One that now seems very significant is the personal contact with principal and staff by the researcher. The procedure that the researcher used was discussing the study with the principal and asking him/her to discuss it with his/her staff. The study would have taken several months longer to schedule presentations at monthly or biweekly staff meetings.

- 4. Superintendent intervention. In order to have a significant number of schools in the study, the researcher contacted superintendents and assistant superintendents in charge of curriculum and instruction of schools nominated by the Panel of Experts, but the principal and/or staff had been reluctant to participate. The superintendents/assistant superintendents were asked to encourage the principal(s) and staff(s) to participate in the study. These principals and staffs may have felt pressured to participate. This circumstance may have impacted the participants' responses to the instruments, and altered the environments of the schools being rated by the observer.
- 5. Individual completion of instrument. Again, because of timing, principal and staff were asked to complete both instruments "at their convenience" but within a time frame designated by the researcher. Even though the booklet contained specific instructions, more variables can be controlled in group administration with one test administrator.
- 6. Focusing on Teachers Only. Because of the nature of the study and the methods used to analyze the data, attention was given to the responses of teachers only. The principals' responses were considered equally important, but, because of the

small number (28), the results of their responses could not be included in the data analysis. However, information about the principals was collected from the staffs' responses to the questions on both instruments that dealt with the principal.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were investigated in the present study:

- There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, on the <u>Organizational Climate</u> <u>Description Questionnaire</u> subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> Emphasis, Thrust and Consideration.
- 2. There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the <u>Organizational Climate Description Question-</u> <u>naire</u>, on the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, and <u>Total</u> <u>Score</u> on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> Inventory.
- 3. There will be a positive relationship between the classification of elementary schools as open or closed by the Panel of Experts and by the <u>Organi-</u> <u>zational Climate Description Questionnaire</u>.

- 4. There will be a positive relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Consideration</u>, on the <u>Organizational Climate Description Question</u>naire.
- 5. There will be no relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General</u> <u>Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, on the <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> Questionnaire.
- 6. There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, and the ratings of the observers.
- 7. There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the OCDQ, and the ratings of the observers.

Summary

An overview of the research design was presented in Chapter III. The pilot study, conducted to determine the reliability of the researcher-developed instrument, the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory, was described, including selection of schools, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis and discussion.

The following sections included: a discussion of how the schools were selected for the main study; a brief description of the <u>Organizational Climate Description Ques</u>-<u>tionnaire</u>, a detailed description of the researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven-</u> <u>tory</u>, and how the two instruments were used in the study; a description of the data collection and data analysis; a discussion of the limitations of the methodology; and the hypotheses that were investigated in the study were presented.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The hypotheses under investigation are isolated, and statistical results for each are reported in this chapter. Additional analyses that are considered significant and related to the present study are also presented. A summary concludes Chapter IV.

Test of Hypotheses

A <u>t</u>-test was used to analyze the data from the <u>Organiza-</u> <u>tional Climate Description Questionnaire</u> and the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>. The difference between the two sample means of the open climate and closed climate elementary schools was considered statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Hypothesis I

There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire subtests, Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust and Consideration. The mean scores of open climate and closed climate elementary schools identified by the Panel of Experts on the eight subtests of the <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> Questionnaire are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Eight Subtests of the OCDQ, Comparing Mean Scores of the Open Climate and Closed Climate Schools, Identified by the Panel of Experts, Teachers Only

OCDQ Subtests	Ope N=15 sc	en chools	Closed N=13 schools		<u>t</u> -test Significance
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Disengage- ment	1.68	.43	1.75	.47	.1005-NS
Hindrance	2.23	.62	1.999	.55	.0002-Sig.
Esprit	2.95	.51	2.7	.55	.0000-Sig.
Intimacy	2.61	.49	2.43	.52	.001-Sig.
Aloofness	2.11	.37	2.15	.35	.318-NS
Production Emphasis	2.12	.5	2.1	.51	.704-NS
Thrust	2.83	.66	2.79	.69	.54-NS
Considera- tion	2.11	.67	2.09	.61	.74-NS

Results indicated that the mean scores of the open climate and closed climate schools were significantly different on the subtests, <u>Hindrance</u> (.0002), <u>Esprit</u> (.0000), and <u>Intimacy</u> (.001). The mean scores of the open climate and closed climate schools were not significantly different on the subtests, <u>Disengagement</u> (.1005), <u>Aloofness</u> (.318), <u>Production Emphasis</u> (.704), <u>Thrust</u> (.54), and <u>Consideration</u> (.74). Thus, Hypothesis I was accepted for the subtests, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Esprit</u> and <u>Intimacy</u>; Hypothesis I was rejected for the subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, Thrust and Consideration.

Although not all of the subtests proved to be statistically significant, it is interesting to note that the subtest <u>Esprit</u>, which Halpin identified as "the best single indicator of morale," has a significance level of .0000, indicating a very significant difference between the open climate and closed climate schools.

It is also interesting to note that on the subtests where there were significant differences, they were the subtests that measure teacher behavior, and these scores reflect the perceptions of teachers only.

Hypothesis II

There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, on the three sections, Physical Facilities, Interaction, General Data About School, and Total Score on the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory.

The mean scores of open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, on the three sections and total score of the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> School Climate Inventory are summarized in Table 5.
Table 5

Elementary	y School Climate	Inventory, Compa	ring Mean
Scores of t	the Open Climate	and Closed Clima	te Schools,
Ic	lentified by the	OCDQ, Teachers O	mly
Inventory	Open N=13 schools Mean SD	Closed N=15 schools Mean SD	<u>t</u> -test Significance

3.15

3.0

2.69

2.91

.36

.26

.32

.27

.10-NS

.005-Sig.

.005-Sig.

.005-Sig.

.29

.21

.27

.23

Three Sections and Total Score of the Preliminary

Results indicated that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the open climate and closed climate schools on Physical Facilities. But there were significant differences beyond the .005 level for Interaction, General Data About School and Total Score. Thus, Hypothesis II was partially accepted.

The researcher-developed instrument, the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory significantly discriminated between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools in this study, identified by the OCDQ, on three of the four sections measured.

Additional Analyses

Physical

Facilities

Interaction

General Data

Total Score

3.27

3.28

3.05

3.19

In order to determine the open climate and closed climate elementary schools identified by the OCDQ, the raw scores for each subtest of the OCDQ for each school,

teachers only, were converted to double-standardized scores, both normatively and ipsatively, using a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of ten (Appendix D).

The double-standardized scores of the eight <u>OCDQ</u> subtests for each school were compared to Halpin's Prototypic Profiles for Six Organizational Climates Ranked in Respect to Openness Vs. Closedness (Appendix E). Discrepancy scores were computed for the six organizational climates for each school. The organizational climate for each school was determined by the lowest discrepancy score on the six organizational climate profiles. The identification of each school as <u>Open</u>, <u>Autonomous</u>, <u>Controlled</u>, <u>Familiar</u>, <u>Paternal</u> and <u>Closed</u> is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Ranking of the Twenty-Eight Schools, Using Halpin's Prototypic Profiles for Six Organizational Climates Ranked in Respect to Openness Vs. Closedness

	Climate	Schools	Total
0	Open	6, 13, 14, 16, 21	5
r E	Autonomous	3, 4, 23	3
IN	Controlled	1, 8, 12, 19, 22	5
C	Familiar	2, 15	2
	Paternal	9, 10, 11, 25, 26	5
E D	Closed	5, 7, 17, 18, 20, 24, 27, 28	8

In order to classify each school as open or closed, <u>Open, Autonomous</u> and <u>Controlled</u> were identified as open organizational climates; <u>Familiar</u>, <u>Paternal</u> and <u>Closed</u> were identified as closed organizational climates. Thus, there are 13 open climate elementary schools and 15 closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the <u>Organizational</u> <u>Climate Description Questionnaire</u>.

Hypothesis III

There will be a positive relationship between the classification of elementary schools as open or closed by the Panel of Experts and by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

The ratings of the schools as open or closed by the Panel of Experts and the <u>Organizational Climate Description</u> <u>Questionnaire</u> are presented in Table 7. In addition, a third category, Schools Identified as Open or Closed by the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>, is included. The fourth category is Schools the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u> Disagree Upon.

Table 7

Schools Identified as Open or Closed by the Panel of Experts, the OCDQ, Schools Both the Panel of Experts and the OCDQ Agree Upon, and Schools the Panel of Experts and the OCDQ Disagree Upon

Identification	Schools	Total
Open-Panel	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15	15
Open- <u>OCDQ</u>	1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23	13
Open-Both	1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14	8
Open-Disagreement	16, 19, 21, 22, 23	5
Closed-Panel	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28	13
Closed- <u>OCDQ</u>	2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28	15
Closed-Both	17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28	8
Closed-Disagree.	2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15	7

By using the <u>OCDQ</u> to identify the schools as open or closed, several things occurred. The number of open schools decreased from 15, as identified by the Panel of Experts, to 13; the number of closed schools increased from 13, as identified by the Panel of Experts, to 15. The individual schools which made up each category of open or closed changed somewhat. In the <u>OCDQ</u> rating of open climate schools, 8 of the schools were also rated open by the Panel of Experts; 5 of the schools had been identified as closed by the Panel of Experts. In the OCDQ rating of closed climate schools, 8 of The schools were also rated closed by the Panel of Experts; but 7 of the schools had been identified as open by the Panel of Experts. This information is presented in a contingency table (Table 8).

Table 8

Comparison Between Open Climate and Closed Climate Elementary School Ratings by the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>

0000

		Open	Closed	Totals				
E X	0pen	8	7	15				
P E R	Closed	5	8	13				
T S	Totals	13	15	28				

A chi-square of 1.3615 was computed to determine the relationship between the ratings of the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>. Using this chi-square, a contingency coefficient of .2153 was computed to indicate the degree of association.

The contingency coefficient of .2153 indicated a very slight relationship between the ratings of the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u> but not enough to be considered significant. Thus, Hypothesis III was rejected.

Additional Analyses

Noting the change in composition of schools, identified by the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>, in the open climate and closed climate categories, the mean scores of the three sections and the total score of the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> School Climate Inventory are compared in Table 9.

Results indicated that there was a statistical difference beyond the .0000 level between the means of the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the Panel of Experts, on the three sections and the total score of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>.

The results were not as significant for the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>. There was no significance between open climate and closed climate schools for <u>Physical Facilities</u>. But a significant difference beyond the .005 level was realized on <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u> and <u>Total Score</u>.

Hypothesis IV

There will be a positive relationship between the three sections, Physical Facilities, Interaction, General Data About School, on the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory and the four subtests, Esprit, Intimacy, Thrust, Consideration, on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

Halpin considered <u>Esprit</u> and <u>Intimacy</u> positive characteristics of a group's behavior. The higher the scores on

Table 9

Three Sections and the Total Score on the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> School Climete Inventory, Comparing Mean Scores of Open and Closed Climete Schools Identified by the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCD0</u>, reachers Only

	Panel of	Experts			OCDQ	
Inventory	Open N=15 Mean	Closed N=13 Mean	t-test Sig.	Open N=13 Mean	Closed N=15 Mean	t-test Sig.
Physical Facilities	3.4	3.02	.0000-Sig.	3.27	3.15	.10-NS
Interaction	3.26	2.99	.0000-Sig.	3.28	3.0	.005-Sig.
General Data	3.02	2.69	.0000-Sig.	3.05	2.69	.005-Sig.
Total Score	3.2	2.88	.0000-Sig.	3.19	2.91	.005-Sig.

<u>Esprit</u> and <u>Intimacy</u> on the <u>OCDQ</u>, the more open the climate. The same was true of <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u>, positive characteristics of the principal's behavior as leader.

The relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Consideration</u>, on the <u>Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire</u> is presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Correlation Between Three Sections of the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the Four Positive Subtests of the <u>OCDO</u>, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Consideration</u>

		Esprit	Intimacy	Thrust	Considera- tion
I N V	Physical Facilities	.586	.429	.196	.286
E N T	Interaction	.846	.672	.558	.606
O R Y	General Data	.839	.524	.628	.709

OCDQ

The general relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Consideration</u>, on the <u>OCDQ</u> was positive. The most significant positive relationship existed between <u>General Data</u> and the four subtests. <u>Interaction</u> and the four subtests also indicated a very positive relationship. A slight positive relationship existed between <u>Physical Facilities</u> and the four subtests. Within this relationship, <u>Esprit</u> and <u>Intimacy</u> indicated a positive relationship, but <u>Thrust</u> indicated no relationship (.196) and <u>Consideration</u> indicated only a slight positive relationship (.286).

<u>Esprit</u> had the most positive relationship with the three sections of the <u>Inventory</u>. <u>Thrust</u> had the least significant relationship. <u>Intimacy</u> and <u>Consideration</u> had a moderately positive relationship with the Inventory.

The most significant correlations existed between <u>Interaction</u> and <u>Esprit</u> (.846) and <u>General Data</u> and <u>Esprit</u> (.839). There was a 72% and 70% variance in common respectively, indicating a close relationship between the two variables. High <u>Esprit</u> (morale) was evident in both <u>Inter-</u> action and General Data.

The lowest relationships existed between <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u> and <u>Thrust</u> (.196) and <u>Physical Facilities</u> and <u>Consideration</u> (.286). These correlations indicated no relationship between <u>Physical Facilities</u> and <u>Thrust</u> and a slight positive relationship between <u>Physical Facilities</u> and Consideration.

The general direction of the relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General</u>

<u>Data</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Considera</u>-<u>tion</u>, on the <u>Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire</u> was positive. Thus, Hypothesis IV was accepted.

Hypothesis V

There will be no relationship between the three sections, Physical Facilities, Interaction, General Data About School, on the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory and the four subtests, Disengagement, Hindrance, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

Halpin considered <u>Disengagement</u> and <u>Hindrance</u> negative characteristics of a group's behavior and <u>Aloofness</u> and <u>Production Emphasis</u> negative characteristics of the principal as leader's behavior. According to Halpin, the higher the scores on these four subtests, the more closed the school; the lower the scores, the more open the school.

The relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, on the <u>Organizational Climate Description Ques</u>tionnaire is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Correlation Between the Three Sections of the	
Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory and	f
the Four Negative Subtests of the OCDQ, Disengagement	nt,
Hindrance, Aloofness, Production Emphasis	

				•	
		Disengage- ment	Hindrance	Aloof- ness	Prod. Emphasis
I N V	Physical Facilities	 329	.115	174	.145
E N T	Interaction	 566	 350	314	.074
O R Y	General Data	095	- .206	369	008

OCDQ

Generally, the relationship that existed between the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General</u> <u>Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production Emphasis</u>, on the <u>OCDQ</u> was negative. The most significant negative relationship existed between <u>Interaction</u> and the four subtests. Not as great but still significant was the relationship between <u>General Data</u> and the four subtests. No relationship existed between Physical Facilities and the four subtests.

Within each subtest, <u>Disengagement</u> had the highest negative relationship with the three sections of the <u>Inven</u>tory, Aloofness indicating a slight negative relationship. <u>Production Emphasis</u> was the only subtest that showed any relationship with the <u>Inventory</u> in a positive direction, but this was only a slight relationship.

The highest negative relationship existed between <u>Interaction</u> and <u>Disengagement</u> with a correlation of -.566. A significant negative relationship also existed between <u>Interaction</u> and <u>Hindrance</u> (-.35) and <u>Aloofness</u> and <u>General</u> <u>Data</u> (-.369). All of the other relationships between each subtest on the <u>OCDQ</u> and each section on the <u>Inventory</u> indicated no relationship or only a slight relationship. Thus, Hypothesis V was accepted.

Hypothesis VI

There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, and the ratings of the observers.

The observers were blind in that they did not know if they were rating an open climate or closed climate elementary school. They were not even aware of the terms open and closed or that the schools had been classified in any way. The results of their ratings of the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the Panel of Experts, is presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Comparison of the Me	ean Scores of Open Climate and Closed
Climate Elementary	Schools, as Identified by the Panel
of Experts, on the	two sections, Physical Facilities,
Interaction, and	the Sub Total of the Preliminary
Elementary School	Climate Inventory, Observers Only

Inventory	Ope N=] Mean	en 5 SD	Clos N=1 Mean	sed 3 SD	<u>t</u> -test Sig.
Physical Facilities	3.4	.55	2.75	. 52	.003-Sig.
Interaction	3.17	.35	2.5	.46	.000Sig.
Sub Total	2.83	.31	2.42	.39	.0001-Sig.

Results indicated that there were statistical differences beyond the .05 level between the mean scores of the open climate and closed climate schools on <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>Sub Total</u>. The observers were able to determine significant differences between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the Panel of Experts, using the two sections, <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u> and <u>Interaction</u>, of the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u>. Thus, Hypothesis VI was accepted.

Hypothesis VII

There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the OCDQ, and the ratings of the observers. In analyzing the observers' ratings of the schools that were identified as open and closed by the <u>OCDQ</u>, the findings were quite different from the observers' ratings of the open climate and closed climate schools identified by the Panel of Experts. The results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Comparison of the Mean Scores of Open Climate and Closed Climate Elementary Schools, as Identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, on the two sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, and the <u>Sub Total</u> of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>, Observers Only

Inventory	Ope N=1 Mean	en L3 SD	Clos N=] Mean	sed 5 SD	<u>t</u> -test Sig.
Physical Facilities	3.13	.62	3.08	.63	.203-NS
Interaction	2.88	.32	2.85	.17	.141-NS
Sub Total	2.99	.40	2.95	.59	.186-NS

Results indicated no significant difference between the two means on the two sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, or the <u>Sub Total</u>. Thus, Hypothesis VII was rejected.

Summary

The status of each hypothesis is presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Hypothesis	Accepted	Rejected	Accepted in Part
I			x
II			X
III		X	
IV	Х		
V	Х		
VI	Х		
VII		x	

Summary of the Status of Each Hypothesis

Hypothesis I was accepted in part. The three subtests, <u>Hindrance, Esprit</u> and <u>Intimacy</u> were significant beyond the .05 level. The remaining subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production Emphasis</u>, <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u>, showed no significant difference. Thus, a significant difference was shown between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the Panel of Experts, on three of the eight subtests of the <u>OCDQ</u>.

Hypothesis II was accepted in part. There was no significant difference (.10) between the mean score of the open and closed schools, identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, on <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u>. But there were significant differences beyond the .005 level for <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u> and <u>Total Score</u>. Thus, significant differences were shown between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, on three of the four sections on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>.

In Additional Analysis, the raw scores of each subtest on the <u>OCDQ</u> for each school were double-standardized, normatively and ipsatively (Appendix D). Discrepancy scores were computed for the six organizational climates, using Halpin's Prototypic Profiles (Appendix E). The schools were then classified as open or closed.

Hypothesis III was rejected. A chi-square of 1.3615 was computed to determine the relationship between the ratings of the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>. A contingency coefficient of .2153 was computed to determine the degree of association. The C=.2153 indicated a very slight relationship between the ratings of the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>.

In comparing the open climate and closed climate elementary schools identified by the Panel of Experts and the OCDQ, there was a change in the composition of schools. Table 9 compared the mean scores of the three sections and total score of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> <u>Inventory</u> for the two groups. The greatest difference (significant beyond the .0000 level) on all four sections was realized in the schools identified by the Panel of Experts. In the schools identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, there was no significant difference between the mean score of the open climate and closed climate elementary schools on <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u>. But significant differences (beyond the .005 level) were found between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools on <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About</u> School and Total Score.

Hypothesis IV was accepted. The general direction of the relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Consideration</u>, on the OCDQ was positive.

Hypothesis V was accepted. The general direction of the relationship between the three sections, <u>Physical Facil-</u> <u>ities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Pre-</u> <u>liminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, on the <u>OCDQ</u> was negative.

Hypothesis VI was accepted. There were significant differences between the mean scores of the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the Panel of Experts, on the observers' ratings of <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction and Sub Total</u> of the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u>. Hypothesis VII was rejected. There were no significant differences between the mean scores of the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, on the observers' ratings of <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Inter-</u> <u>action and Sub Total</u> of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In Chapter I, the Problem was presented. Because there is a significant relationship betweel self concept and academic achievement, as found in major studies by Brookover (1964, 1965, 1967) and Aspy (1976), and because there is a significant relationship between school climate and self concept, as found in studies by Purkey (1970), Combs (1975), Hinojosa (1974) and Staines (1958), it is essential that ways be found to help educators study the climate of their schools and bring about the necessary changes.

The problem that was addressed in this research study was: The determination and identification of describable, observable factors that distinguish between open climate and closed climate elementary schools.

The purpose of the research study was to:

- Investigate the climate of elementary schools designated as open and those designated as closed by the Panel of Experts.
- Determine the describable, observable factors which discriminate between open climate and closed climate elementary schools.

3. Develop an <u>Inventory</u> of describable, observable factors of an open climate school.

A conceptual framework for the study was presented in Chapter II. School climate and self concept were the two major areas of emphasis.

The procedures employed in the implementation of this study were described in Chapter III. It included: an overview of the research design, a summary of the pilot study, a description of the selection of schools, instrumentation and data collection, a discussion of the limitations of the methodology and a presentation of the hypotheses that were tested in the study.

In Chapter IV, each hypothesis and the statistical results that test each hypothesis were presented. Hypotheses I and II were accepted in part; Hypotheses III and VII were rejected; Hypotheses IV, V and VI were accepted.

Conclusions

In investigating Hypothesis I: <u>There will be a difference between open climate and closed climate elementary</u> <u>schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, on the</u> <u>Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire subtests,</u> <u>Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness,</u> <u>Production Emphasis, Thrust and Consideration</u>, it was assumed that significant differences would be found between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the Panel of Experts, on the eight subtests of the OCDQ.

However, there were no significant differences on the subtests <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production Emphasis</u>, <u>Thrust and Consideration</u>.

<u>Disengagement</u> focuses upon the teachers' behavior in a task-oriented situation. From the results, it would seem that there were no significant, measurable differences in the task-oriented behavior of teachers in open climate or closed climate elementary schools in this study. Thus, it would seem that productivity was not affected by the climate of the school.

It must be remembered that the data which were analyzed were collected from teachers only. It is possible that in responding to the items on the <u>OCDQ</u>, some teachers answered "what should be" rather than "what is."

<u>Aloofness</u> refers to the principal's formal and impersonal behavior. <u>Production Emphasis</u> refers to behavior which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. <u>Thrust</u> refers to the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers by personal example. <u>Consideration</u> refers to the principal's positive, "human" treatment of the teachers.

The fact that there were no significant differences between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools on these four subtests which measure principal's behavior was a surprising finding. It was assumed that there would be greater discrepancies between the perceptions of the teachers in the open climate and closed climate

schools toward their principals. This may suggest that the behavior of the principal does not have as much impact on the school climate of the sample schools as might have been thought, based on research that indicates that the principal is a key figure in a school's climate.

But it may also suggest that <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u> are only some of the determiners of the principal's behavior as open or closed. It must be remembered that the <u>OCDQ</u> only measures principal/ teacher relationships, and there may be other important factors that determine a principal's behavior as open or closed.

There were significant differences between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools on the subtests Esprit and Intimacy.

<u>Esprit</u> refers to the morale of the teachers, their social-needs satisfaction and their sense of accomplishment on the job. Halpin indicated that the subtest <u>Esprit</u> is the "best single indicator of morale," and in comparing mean scores of open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the Panel of Experts, the greatest difference (.0000) between the two groups of schools was indicated by this subtest. So, teachers in the open climate sample schools have a higher level of morale, accomplishment and satisfaction than teachers in the closed climate sample schools.

Intimacy refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social-needs satisfaction but is not necessarily associated with task-accomplishment. It seems that the teachers in the open climate sample schools have a more friendly relationship with their peers than the teachers in the closed climate sample schools. It follows that if the teachers have a high level of job satisfaction, that this is reflected in their interactions with their peers.

Perhaps the most puzzling finding in Hypothesis I was on the subtest <u>Hindrance</u>. <u>Hindrance</u> refers to the teachers' feelings that the principal burdens them with unnecessary "busy work," that he/she is hindering rather than facilitating their work. There was a significant difference between open climate and closed climate schools at the .0002 level; but the open climate schools' mean of 2.23 was higher than the mean of 1.99 for the closed climate schools, exactly the opposite of what was expected. The questions must be asked: Do the teachers in the open climate schools attain a high level of productivity and job satisfaction in spite of their principal rather than because of their principal? Does high <u>Esprit</u> and <u>Intimacy</u> within a staff offset high <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production Emphasis</u>, low <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u>?

In answer to both of these questions, the assumption is only in the rarest of circumstances. There must be other factors operating above and beyond the eight subtests identified by Halpin.

Because the <u>OCDQ</u> has been used for a number of years in school climate studies, and its reliability and validity have been established, it was used to identify the sample open climate and closed climate elementary schools which were used in determining the significance of the researcherdeveloped instrument, the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>. The assumption was that if there were statistically significant differences between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, of the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u> and the <u>Total Score</u> on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>, these differences would be strengthened because the schools had been identified as open or closed by a reliable and valid instrument, the OCDQ.

This assumption was investigated in Hypothesis II: <u>There will be a difference between open climate and closed</u> <u>climate elementary schools, as identified by the Organiza-</u> <u>tional Climate Description Questionnaire, on the three sec-</u> <u>tions, Physical Facilities, Interaction, General Data About</u> <u>School, and Total Score on the Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>. The only section in which there were no <u>significant differences beyond the .005 level was Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u>. The <u>t</u>-test of significance was .10. The test items in <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General Data About School</u> significantly discriminate between open climate and closed climate <u>elementary schools, but items in Physical Facilities</u> do not.

The researcher believes that the reason there were no significant differences between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, on <u>Physical Facilities</u> is because what was being measured was not a criteria in determining the openness or closedness of the sample schools. The <u>OCDQ</u> was only using staff interpersonal relationships as criteria. If one studies the results of the three sections and total score on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>, using the sample schools identified by the Panel of Experts, significant differences beyond the .0000 level existed on each section and the total score. The Panel of Experts were considering much more than interpersonal staff relationships in their selection of open climate and closed climate elementary schools.

In order to classify the schools as open or closed, using the <u>OCDQ</u>, the raw scores for each subtest of the <u>OCDQ</u> for each school were converted to double-standardized scores. These scores were then compared to Halpin's Prototypic Profiles, and schools were classified as <u>Open</u>, <u>Autonomous</u>, <u>Controlled</u>, <u>Familiar</u>, <u>Paternal</u> or <u>Closed</u>. The determining factor was the lowest profile score. Because the profiles were rank ordered, the schools identified as <u>Open</u>, <u>Autonomous</u>, or <u>Controlled</u> were classified as open climate schools by the researcher; the schools identified as <u>Familiar</u>, Paternal, or Closed were classified as closed climate schools.

In most instances, a school was clearly in one category, but a few schools had very close scores and an arbitrary decision had to be made. School 25 had the following profile scores: 9.21 (Paternal); 9.27 (Familiar); 9.43 (Open). There was only .23 difference between identifying this school as an open climate or a closed climate school. Because a decision had to be made, it was classified as a closed climate school (Paternal). There were three other schools that had similarly close scores. The questions that have to be raised are: How really open or really closed are the schools identified by the OCDQ? Does the OCDQ accurately discriminate between open climate and closed climate elementary schools? The researcher believes that the narrow focus of the OCDQ may limit its ability to determine a school as wholly open or closed. Perhaps in classifying schools as open or closed, some qualifications must be made.

The relationship between the ratings of the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u> was investigated in Hypothesis III: <u>There will be a positive relationship between the ratings of</u> <u>open climate and closed climate elementary schools by the</u> <u>Panel of Experts and the Organizational Climate Description</u> <u>Questionnaire</u>. The findings revealed that the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u> agreed upon eight open schools and eight closed schools, but disagreed upon five open schools and seven closed schools. Using a chi-square statistic of 1.3615 and a contingency coefficient of .2153, it was determined that almost no relationship existed between the ratings of the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u>.

Perhaps one reason for a lack of relationship was that the Panel of Experts were identifying these schools based upon an "outsider's" point of view, "what seems to be," and the OCDQ was measuring internal relationships which are not always evident to an outsider. But another reason may be, as suggested above, that the Panel of Experts were using a broader meaning for open and closed, including physical facilities, student/teacher relationships, educational goals, curriculum practices, as well as principal/teacher relationships; and the OCDQ was only measuring principal/ teacher relationships. As an example, School 2 was rated as an open school by the Panel of Experts, the observer's combined mean score on Physical Facilities and Interaction of the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory was 3.81, and, yet, using the OCDQ, the school was rated Familiar, classifying it as closed.

School 23 had been rated as closed by the Panel of Experts, received a mean score of 2.23 from the observer, but was rated open by the <u>OCDQ</u>. The school was identified as Autonomous, classifying it as an open climate school.

From the above examples, it can be concluded that there is no general agreement as to what an open climate and a closed climate school is. Perhaps in identifying a school as open or closed, it is important to use criteria which are uniform and clearly understood. Four of the eight <u>OCDQ</u> subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Consideration</u>, were considered positive by Halpin. The relationship between these four subtests and the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General Data</u> <u>About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> <u>Inventory</u>, was investigated in Hypothesis IV: <u>There will be</u> <u>a positive relationship between the three sections</u>, <u>Physical</u> <u>Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory and the four</u> <u>subtests</u>, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Consideration</u>, <u>on the</u> Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

The strongest relationships existed between <u>Esprit</u> and <u>Interaction</u>, <u>Esprit</u> and <u>General Data</u>, <u>Consideration</u> and <u>General Data</u>. No relationship existed between <u>Thrust</u> and <u>Physical Facilities</u>, and only a very slight relationship existed between <u>Consideration</u> and <u>Physical Facilities</u>.

Generally, a positive correlation existed between the three sections on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate</u> <u>Inventory</u> and the four <u>OCDQ</u> subtests, <u>Esprit</u>, <u>Intimacy</u>, <u>Thrust</u>, <u>Consideration</u>, Specifically, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>Esprit</u>, <u>General Data</u> and <u>Esprit</u> and <u>General Data</u> and <u>Consideration</u> are measuring related areas. It is important to note that <u>Esprit</u> is a part of <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General Data</u>, <u>Consideration</u> is a part of <u>General Data</u>. Both of these sections are also measuring other factors. Four of the eight <u>OCDQ</u> subtests, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production Emphasis</u>, are considered negative by Halpin. The relationship between these subtests and the three sections of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u> was investigated in Hypothesis V: <u>There</u> will be no relationship between the three sections, Physical <u>Facilities</u>, Interaction, General Data About School, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory and the four</u> <u>subtests</u>, <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u>, <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u>, on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that there is no relationship between the three sections on the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> and the four <u>OCDQ</u> subtests. The items in <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General Data</u> move in a positive direction; the items that measure <u>Disengagement</u>, <u>Hindrance</u>, <u>Aloofness</u> and <u>Production</u> <u>Emphasis</u> move in a negative direction. This finding was expected.

Hypotheses VI and VII investigated the relationships between the ratings of the observers and the schools identified by the Panel of Experts and the schools identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>. Hypothesis VI: <u>There will be a difference between</u> <u>open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the Panel of Experts, and the ratings of the</u> <u>observers</u>. Hypothesis VII: <u>There will be a difference</u> between open climate and closed climate elementary schools, as identified by the OCDQ, and the ratings of the observers.

There was a positive relationship between the ratings of the observers and the Panel of Experts and a negative relationship between the ratings of the observers and the <u>OCDQ</u>. Again, it appears that the perceptions of the two outsiders (Observers and Experts) agree, but there is disparity between the external (Expert) and internal (OCDQ) rating.

It is important to point out the following:

- The <u>OCDQ</u> measures the internal relationships of principal and teachers within a school.
- 2. The Panel of Experts were not limited to rating the principal/teacher relationships but were considering the "gestalt" of the school.
- 3. The researcher-developed instrument, the <u>Prelimi-nary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>, focuses upon the physical environment, student/teacher relationships, educational goals, curriculum practices and principal/teacher relationships.

There was another section, <u>Quantitative Data</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> which has not previously been mentioned (Appendix F). This section was to have been completed by each principal. It was to have measured such differences as: Average number of children absent per day, Average number of teachers absent per day, Total number of school rules, Total number of forms which are sent home that report something positive (Happy Grams, Progress Reports, Improvement Reports). It was assumed that there would be a higher percentage of absences in the closed climate schools, there would be fewer rules in the open climate schools, more positive forms would be sent home in the open climate schools.

However, no such pattern occurred. Some of the information was obviously not accurate. It seemed absences and tardies were reported at lower levels in the closed schools than in the open schools. A random check of some of the data was done, and most of the discrepancies occurred with the schools identified as closed. The records of the open schools were more accurate. Consequently, this section of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> could not be included in the research findings.

There may have been several reasons for these discrepancies. Specific data was requested which required a check of the records. Perhaps, because of the busy time of year, some principals "estimated" these figures. Another reason may have been what was thought to have occurred in other sections of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven-</u> tory and the <u>OCDQ</u>; items were answered as "what should be" rather than "what is."

In reviewing the remarks of the observers, certain comments seem important to mention. In certain schools, they

felt very welcome; in others they felt like intruders. Two of the common factors they identified in the open climate schools were: 1) there was an atmosphere of constructive busyness; and 2) there was evidence of creativity and unusual activities (i.e., students working out in the halls, children dressed as clowns).

After visiting many schools, the observers made the following observations. The time of day one visits a school is significant; there are more structured activities in the morning. Informing the staff of the presence of the observer in the school and the purpose of the observation is essential. This allays the anxiety level of some staff members who may have the feeling that they are being evaluated.

Summary

The following statements summarize the above conclusions:

1. There is a significant relationship on <u>Interaction</u>, <u>General Data About School</u> and <u>Total Score</u> but no relationship on <u>Physical Facilities</u> on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> with the eight subtests of the <u>OCDQ</u>. The researcher-developed instrument does distinguish between open climate and closed climate elementary schools on three of the four sections.

- 2. The positive relationships between the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Elementary School Climate Inventory</u>, the Panel of Experts and the observers were not surprising. In determining the climate of a school, all three considered a larger framework than interpersonal staff relationships.
- 3. In determining the significance of the mean scores on the three sections, <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Inter-</u> <u>action</u>, <u>General Data About School</u>, and <u>Total Score</u> of the <u>Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inven-</u> <u>tory</u>, the higher the mean scores, the more open the school; the lower the mean scores, the more closed the school.

Discussion

The researcher questions the wisdom of her choice of the <u>OCDQ</u> with which to correlate the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u>. One of the reasons for choosing the <u>OCDQ</u> was that it has been used in the majority of school climate studies in the last ten years. But as one examines its focus, it becomes clear that it is measuring the behavior of teachers and principal and their relationship within the school. Within the present study, a larger scope of school climate was investigated, of which principal/teacher relationships were a part. The <u>OCDQ</u> didn't seem to be as germane to the study as originally thought. Because of the nature of the study, schools were classified as open or closed. However, this is an artificial dichotomy. Schools usually are not either one or the other but are on a continuum with open and closed being the polar extremes. Halpin points this out in his ranking of the six organizational climates from open to closed. It may even be more accurate to refer to schools as more open and less open rather than open and closed.

There is still much work that needs to be done in the area of school climate. It is hoped that the present study will be a small step forward in understanding some of the factors that determine the climate of a school, in assessing these factors, and in improving the quality of a school's climate.

Recommendations

Next Steps

As a result of this study, some thought has been given to what might happen next because of the present research study. Some of these thoughts follow:

 Investigate more closely the relationship of <u>Physical Facilities</u> to school climate. Even though a significant difference was not found between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools identified by the <u>OCDQ</u>, a significant difference was found between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools identified by the Panel of Experts. This relationship needs further investigation and clarification.

- Refine the wording of <u>General Data About School</u> to more closely reflect what the section focuses upon.
- 3. Reword Item 42 (Discussions in the faculty lounge usually result in gripe sessions) so that a high score reflects an open school and a low score reflects a closed school.
- 4. Investigate more closely the differences between the mean scores of open climate and closed climate elementary schools for each item on the Inventory.
- 5. Work closely with a staff in the use of the <u>Prelimi</u>-<u>nary Elementary School Climate Inventory</u> by implementing the following steps:
 - a. Administer the instrument.
 - b. Score the instrument.
 - c. Provide results to the staff.
 - d. With the help of the staff, determine priorities.
 - e. With the help of the staff, set goals.
 - f. Assist in implementation of goals (inservice, materials).
 - g. Assist in evaluation of goal completion.
 - h. Re-administer the instrument.
- 6. Have students and parents rate school, using the Preliminary Elementary School Climate Inventory.

Suggestions for Further Research

Other research possibilities have surfaced that related to the purpose of this study. Possible future studies include:

- Investigating more completely the schools that both the Panel of Experts and the <u>OCDQ</u> agreed upon as open or closed.
- Replicating the present study with an attempt to eliminate some of the limitations of the study and of the methodology.
- 3. Replicating this study at the secondary level.
- 4. Replicating this study, using another instrument that measures more dimensions of school climate with which to correlate the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u>.
- Investigating more closely the relationships between <u>Physical Facilities</u>, <u>Interaction</u> and <u>General</u> <u>Data About School</u> and school climate.
- 6. Investigating more closely other factors (those not identified on the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>) which may determine the climate of a school.
- 7. Identifying other factors (those not measured by the <u>OCDQ</u> or the <u>Preliminary Elementary School</u> <u>Climate Inventory</u>) which may determine a principal's behavior as open or closed.
- 8. Comparing the academic progress of students in an elementary school that has actively begun to improve their school climate with a control group.
- 9. Studying (pre/post) the self concepts of children in an elementary school that is actively involved in school climate improvement.
- 10. Investigating more closely items from the section, <u>Quantitative Data</u>, on the <u>Preliminary Elementary</u> <u>School Climate Inventory</u>, to determine if these items discriminate between the open climate and closed climate elementary schools.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

To: Panel of Experts

From: Karen Roth

Re: Selection of "Most Open Climate" Elementary Schools and "Most Closed Climate" Elementary Schools

In pondering the selection of a school as "most open" or "most closed," please consider the following composite definitions:

"Open Climate"

Characterized by

- A caring, accepting, honest atmosphere in which a child can develop affectively and cognitively.
- 2. Goals of the school are clear, and each person is working toward these goals.
- 3. Energetic, lively, flexible organization.
- 4. Democratic decision making.
- 5. Mutual trust and shared responsibility with all people.
- 6. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately, as they are required.
- 7. The group shows a balance in concern for task achievement and social-needs satisfaction. Satisfaction on both counts seems to be obtained easily and almost effortlessly.
- 8. High morale evidenced by principal, staff, parents, and children.

"Closed Climate"

Characterized by

1. A confining, concealing, restricting atmosphere. School is sterile, rigid, uncreative and dull. Concern is for order and quiet, and less interest is evidenced in children's development.

- 2. The school seems to be stagnant and goals are unclear.
- 3. High degree of apathy on the part of the majority of the members of the school.
- 4. Principal is an authoritarian, utilizing one-way communication. He/she seems to be highly aloof and impersonal and is not concerned with the needs of his/her teachers.
- 5. Lack of trust and shared responsibility.
- 6. Teacher leadership is not fostered by the principal, and evidences of adequate leadership are minimal.
- Members of the staff exhibit a high degree of anxiety and low job satisfaction.
- 8. Low morale evidenced by principal, staff, parents, and children.

APPENDIX B

ORG / NIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE*

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

MARK YOUR ANSWERS AS SHOWN IN THE EXAMPLE BELOW.



"Reprinted by permission of the publisher, from Andrew W. Halpin, <u>Theory and Research in Administration</u> (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), pp. 148-150.

		Rarely Occurs	Sometimes Occurs	Often Occurs	Very Frequently Occurs
1.	Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this schooll.				
2.	The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying2.			 	
3.	Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems3.				
4.	Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available4.				
5.	Teachers invite other faculty mem- bers to visit them at home5.				
6.	There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority6.				
7.	Extra books are available for classroom use7.				
8.	Sufficient time is given to pre- pare administrative reports8.				
9.	Teachers know the family back- ground of other faculty members9.				
10.	Teachers exert group pressure on nonconforming faculty members10.				
11.	In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."ll.				
12.	Administrative paper work is bur- densome at this school12.				
13.	Teachers talk about their per- sonal life to other faculty members				

		Rarely Occurs	Sometimes Occurs	Often Occurs	Very Frequently Occurs
14.	Teachers seek special favors from the principal14.				
15.	School supplies are readily avail- able for use in classwork15.				
16.	Student progress reports require too much work16.				
17.	Teachers have fun socializing together during school time17.				
18.	Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings18.				
19.	Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues19.				
20.	Teachers have too many committee requirements20.				
21.	There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally21.				
22.	Teachers ask nonsensical ques- tions in faculty meetings22.				
23.	Custodial service is available when needed23.				
24.	Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching24.				
25.	Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves25.				
26.	Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings26.				
27.	Teachers at this school show much school spirit27.				

		Rarely Occurs	Sometimes Occurs	Often Occurs	Very Frequently Occurs
28.	The principal goes out of his way to help teachers28.				
29.	The principal helps teachers solve personal problems29.				
30.	Teachers at this school stay by themselves30.				
31.	The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure31.				
32.	The principal sets an example by working hard himself32.				
33.	The principal does personal favors for teachers33.				
34.	Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms				
35.	The morale of the teachers is high35.				
36.	The principal uses constructive criticism				
37.	The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work				
38.	Teachers socialize together in small select groups				
39.	The principal makes all class- scheduling decisions				
40.	Teachers are contacted by the principal each day40.				
41.	The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions41.				

		Rarely Occurs	Sometimes Occurs	Often Occurs	Very Frequently Occurs
42.	The principal helps staff members settle minor differences42.				
43.	The principal schedules the work for the teachers43.				
44.	Teachers leave the grounds during the school day44.				
45.	Teachers help select which courses will be taught45.				
46.	The principal corrects teachers' mistakes46.				
47.	The principal talks a great deal47.				
48.	The principal explains his rea- sons for criticism to teachers48.				
49.	The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers49.				
50.	Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously50.				
51.	The rules set by the principal are never questioned51.				
52.	The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers52.				
53.	School secretarial service is available for teachers' use53.				
54.	The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference54.				
55.	The principal is in the building before teachers arrive55.				

		Rarely Occurs	Sometimes Occurs	Often Occurs	Very Frequently Occurs
56.	Teachers work together preparing administrative reports56.				
57.	Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda57.				
58.	Faculty meetings are mainly principal report meetings58.				
59.	The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across59.				
60.	Teachers talk about leaving the school system60.				
61.	The principal checks the subject- matter ability of teachers61.				
62.	The principal is easy to under- stand62.				
63.	Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit63.				
64.	The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity64.				

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C

PRELIMINARY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLIMATE INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS:

Printed below is an example of a typical item.



4 A. Music can be heard in the hallways.

In this example, the respondent marked alternative "4" to show that this term was "very evident" in this school. Of course, any of the other alternatives could be selected, depending upon how evident the respondent perceives this item to be in his/her school.

<u>Directions</u>: Using the scale at the top of each page, rate each of the items with respect to your school. Write the number in the space to the left of each item.

[PLEASE BE SURE THAT YOU MARK EVERY ITEM.]



- Section I: Unobtrusive Data
 - A. Physical Facilities
 - 1. Warm, pleasant decor (bright walls, inviting pictures, murals).
 - 2. Students' work (art, compositions, special projects) displayed in classrooms and hallways.
 - 3. Attractive, colorful bulletin boards and display cases in classrooms and hallways.
 - 4. Flexible classroom arrangements (small groups of chairs, seating in a circle, etc.).
 - 5. Space to "move around" in every classroom.
 - 6. School grounds (inside and outside) free of litter and grafitti.
 - 7. Lavatories in good condition (no signs of vandalism).
 - 8. A library with an abundance of books and other materials.
 - 9. Classrooms and hallways well-lighted.
 - _____10. Easy access to all classrooms, media center, special services rooms.
 - 11. Faculty lounge reflects professional involvement of staff (notices of seminars, conferences, workshops, graduate classes posted).
 - B. Interaction
 - 12. Students involved in discovery and "hands on" activities.
 - 13. Interest/learning centers being used with purpose.



- _____14. Secretary greets visitors, students and faculty in a warm, friendly manner.
- 15. Smiling teachers.
- 16. Students and teachers interacting with one another in small groups.
 - _____17. Students working in a variety of organizational patterns (independent, small groups, large groups).
- 18. Students working in areas other than the classroom (media center, hallways, outdoors).
- _____19. An absence of negative comments to students by teachers.
- 20. Principal is warm and friendly.
 - 21. Students doing helpful, responsible jobs in the classroom, office, media center (i.e., answer-ing telephone, in charge of delivering AV equipment).
- _____ 22. Students readily assisting and sharing with other students.
 - 23. Teachers interacting with students in a positive manner (verbally, "Keep up the good work!" and nonverbally, showing affection, sensitivity to their students).
 - 24. Visitors (other educators, parents, community members) greeted in a friendly manner by students.
- 25. Visitors (other educators, parents, community members) greeted in a friendly manner by staff.
- 26. Students, teachers, and parents displaying symbols of school pride.



- Section II: General Data About School
 - 27. Teachers greet students entering and leaving classroom.
 - 28. Students do some of the teaching and other leadership tasks.
 - 29. Teachers involved in decision making (choosing texts, selecting topics for staff meetings, determining school procedures).
 - 30. Active parent, community participation in classrooms, school activities, resolution of school problems.
 - 31. Individualized grading practices (progress measured in accordance with children's abilities).
 - _____ 32. Students have opportunities to choose various methods of learning.
 - 33. Teachers work together cooperatively, share ideas and materials.
 - _____ 34. Awards, citations, honors available to <u>all</u> students.
 - 35. Other educators visit the school.
 - _____ 36. Children freely move about the building without passes.
 - _____ 37. Teachers spend some of their unscheduled time with students.
 - 38. Media center, special activity rooms (art, music), and recreational areas available to students after school hours.
 - _____ 39. Principal spends some of his/her time working with students.



THANK YOU!

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX D

				,				
School	Diseng.	Hindr.	Esprit	Inti.	Aloof.	Pro.Em.	Thrust	Consid.
1	39	65	46	58	50	58	37	45
2	55	51	50	66	32	41	51	55
3	37	46	47	72	53	46	49	51
4	42	37	51	60	49	39	60	62
5	48	65	48	53	62	48	37	38
6	37	40	52	54	43	48	63	64
7	57	52	48	40	61	63	44	35
8	46	66	53	52	50	53	50	30
9	64	48	56	33	45	56	41	56
10	59	52	47	54	27	56	52	54
11	59	53	51	33	50	37	61	56
12	40	57	40	48	58	66	51	40
13	42	38	48	59	39	49	61	63
14	33	60	62	58	45	42	51	49
15	52	56	54	59	33	36	52	59
16	36	46	55	53	47	39	58	66
17	69	44	40	45	61	50	44	48
18	67	53	57	38	55	47	40	43
19	44	44	45	37	63	66	53	48
20	59	53	51	54	59	55	32	37
21	46	40	51	46	38	51	66	62
22	39	45	54	53	52	71	43	42
23	43	30	49	59	52	48	61	56
24	49	70	47	55	46	36	53	44
25	49	54	52	57	28	49	49	62
26	67	39	55	39	41	57	53	51
27	63	53	51	32	63	45	47	46
28	69	58	50	39	55	41	44	44

Double Standardized Scores for Eight OCDQ Subtests, Sample Schools

APPENDIX E

Climate	Disen.	Hindr.	Esp.	Inti.	Aloof.	Pro.E	Thr.	Consid.
Open	43	43	63	50	42	43	61	55
Autonomous	40	41	55	62	61	39	53	50
Controlled	38	57	54	40	55	63	51	45
Familiar	60	42	50	58	44	37	52	59
Paternal	65	46	45	46	38	55	51	55
Closed	62	53	38	54	55	54	41	44

Prototypic Profiles for Six Organizational Climates Ranked in Respect to Openness Vs. Closedness APPENDIX F

Section	III.	Quantitative Data (To be gathered by Principal)
	46.	Average number of children absent per day.
	47.	Average number of children tardy per day.
	4 8.	Average number of teachers absent per day.
	49.	Average number of teachers tardy per day.
	50.	Average number of children referred to the office per day.
	51.	Dollar amount for vandalism last school year.
	52.	Total number of suspensions last school year.
	53.	Total number of retentions last school year.
	54.	Total number of children who went on field trips last school year.
	55.	Number of staff meetings contracted for February, 1979.
	56.	Actual number of staff meetings held during February, 1979.
	57.	Total amount of time spent on curriculum in staff meetings during February, 1979.
	58.	Total amount of time spent in staff meetings during February, 1979.
	59.	Total number of students participating in extra- curricular activities last school year.
	60.	Total number of school rules.
	61.	Total number of forms which are sent home that report something <u>positive</u> to parents (Ex. Happy Grams, Progress Reports, Improvement Reports, etc.).
	62.	Total number of children enrolled this school year.
	63.	Total number of children enrolled last school year.
	64.	Total number of teachers employed this school year.
	65.	Total school budget for last school year (operating budget).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aspy, D., & Roebuck, F. <u>A lever long enough</u>. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1976.
- Brookover, W. B. et al. Self-concept of ability and school achievement. Sociology of Education, 1964, 37, 271-78.
- Brookover, W. B. et al. <u>Self-concept of ability and school</u> <u>achievement: Improving academic achievement through</u> <u>students' self-concept enhancement.</u> U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1636. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Brookover, W. B., Erickson, E. L., & Joiner, L. M. <u>Self-</u> <u>concept of ability and school achievement in high school</u>. U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2831. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Brookover, W. B. et al. <u>Elementary school climate and</u> <u>achievement: A brief report.</u> National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Grant NIE-G-74-0020. East Lansing: College of Urban Development, Michigan State University, May, 1976.
- Caplin, M. D. The relationship between self concept and academic achievement and between level of aspiration and academic achievement. <u>Dissertation Abstracts</u>, 1966, <u>27</u>, 979-A.
- Clute, M. <u>The basis for humanistic education</u>. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Troy, Michigan, October, 1977.
- Combs, A. W. (Ed.). <u>Perceiving</u>, <u>behaving</u>, <u>becoming</u>: <u>A new</u> <u>focus for education</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.
- Combs, A. W. A perceptual view of the adequate personality. In A. W. Combs (Ed.), <u>Perceiving, behaving, becoming:</u> <u>A new focus for education</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.

Combs, A. W. <u>The human side of learning</u>. Gainesville, Florida: <u>The University of Florida</u> Press, 1975.

- Combs, A. W. (Chairperson). <u>Humanistic education:</u> <u>Objectives and assessment</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1978.
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1967.
- David, T. G., & Wright, B. D. (Eds.). Learning environments. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- David, T. G. Environmental literacy. In T. G. David & B. D. Wright (Eds.), <u>Learning environments</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Davidson, H. H., & Greenberg, J. W. School achievers from a deprived background. U.S. Office of Education, Project No. 2805, Contract No. OE-5-10-132. New York: The City College of the City University of New York, 1967.
- Dillon, B. Staff development ---- climate. In B. Howell & B. Grahlman (Eds.), <u>School climate: Evaluation and</u> <u>implementation</u>. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Allied Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1978.
- Dittes, J. E. Effects of changes in self-esteem upon impulsiveness and deliberation in making judgments. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 348-56.
- ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. School climate. <u>Research Action Brief</u>, 4 (February 1978), 1-4.
- Fiedler, F. E. <u>A theory of leadership effectiveness</u>. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Fink, M. B. Self-concept as it relates to academic achievement. <u>California Journal of Educational Research</u>, 1962, <u>13</u>, 57-62.
- Fox, R. S. (Chairperson). <u>School climate improvement: A</u> <u>challenge to the school administrator</u>. Denver: CFK Ltd. Publications, 1973.
- Fuller, B. Letter to Doxiadis. <u>Main Currents in Modern</u> <u>Thought</u>, March-April, 1969, 87-97.
- Getzels, J. W. Images and visions. In T. G. David & B. D. Wright (Eds.), <u>Learning environments</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

- Gill, M. P. Pattern of achievement as related to the perceived self. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Convention, Los Angeles, February, 1969.
- Halpin, A. W. Theory and research in administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Hinojosa, D. <u>A study of the relationships between the</u> organizational climate, the pupil control ideology and the self-esteem and power dimensions of the student's self concept in selected elementary schools in the Corpus Christi Independent School District. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1974.
- Holland, W. R. School climates: What makes them click? School and Community, 1969, <u>56</u>, 20-28.
- Holt, J. Children are sensitive to space. In T. G. David & B. D. Wright (Eds.), <u>Learning environments</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Howell, B., & Grahlman, B. (Eds.). <u>School climate: Evalua-</u> <u>tion and implementation</u>. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Allied Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1978.
- Howell, B. The essence of school climate. In B. Howell & B. Grahlman (Eds.), <u>School climate: Evaluation and</u> <u>implementation</u>. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Allied Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1978.
- Kelley, E. C. The fully functioning self. In A. W. Combs (Ed.), <u>Perceiving</u>, <u>behaving</u>, <u>becoming</u>: <u>A few focus</u> <u>for education</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for <u>Supervision and Curriculum Development</u>, 1962.
- Lamy, M. W. Relationship of self-perceptions of early primary children to achieve in reading. In I. J. Gordon (Ed.), <u>Human development: Readings in research</u>. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created 'social climates.' Journal of Social Psychology, 1939, <u>10</u>, 271-299.
- Lewin, K. Field theory in social science. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Likert, R. <u>New patterns of management</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

- Lippett, R., & White, R. K. An experimental study of leadership and group life. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), <u>Readings in social</u> psychology. New York: Henry Holt Publishing Company, 1958.
- Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. Jr. <u>Motivation and</u> organizational climate. Boston: <u>Harvard University</u> Press, 1968.
- McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Maccoby, E. E., Newcomb, T. M., & Hartley, E. L. (Eds.). <u>Readings in social psychology</u>. New York: Henry Holt Publishing Company, 1958.
- Maslow, A. H. Some basic propositions of a growth and selfactualization psychology. In A. W. Combs (Ed.), <u>Per-</u> ceiving, behaving, becoming: A new focus for education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.
- Maslow, A. H., & Chiang, H. (Eds.). The healthy personality readings. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1969.
- Maslow, A. H. A theory of metamotivation: The biological rootings of the value-life. In A. H. Maslow & H. Chiang (Eds.), <u>The healthy personality readings</u>. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1969.
- Mehra, N. Standardized versus unstandardized factor analysis in a study of 'organizational climate.' <u>Journal of</u> <u>Experimental Education</u>, 1977, <u>46</u>, 58-71.
- Morse, W. C. Self concept in the school setting. <u>Child-hood Education</u>, 1964, <u>41</u>, 195-98.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. <u>Policies</u> and standards for the approval of optional schools and <u>special function schools booklet</u>, 1974-75.
- Pino, E. Improving classroom climate. In B. Howell & B. Grahlman (Eds.), <u>School climate: Evaluation and</u> <u>implementation</u>. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Allied Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1978.
- Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. <u>Teaching as a subversive</u> <u>activity</u>. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1969.

Postman, N. The ecology of learning. English Journal, April 1974, 58-64.

- Proshansky, E., & Wolfe, M. The physical setting and open education. In T. G. David & B. D. Wright (Eds.), <u>Learning environments</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Purkey, W. W. <u>Self concept and school achievement</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Ringness, T. A. Self concept of children of low, average, and high intelligence. <u>American Journal of Mental</u> <u>Deficiency</u>, 1961, 65, 453-61.
- Rogers, C. R. Some observations on the organization of personality. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 1947, <u>2</u>, 358-68.
- Rogers, C. R. Toward becoming a fully functioning person. In A. W. Combs (Ed.), <u>Perceiving</u>, <u>behaving</u>, <u>becoming</u>: <u>A new focus for education</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.
- Rogers, C. R. Freedom to learn. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.
- Rogers, C. R. Beyond the watershed: And where now? Educational Leadership, May 1977, 623-31.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. <u>Pygmalion in the classroom:</u> <u>Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual develop-</u> <u>ment.</u> New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Sa'ad, F., & Hamm, R. Teacher autonomy and/or administrative leadership: Myth or reality. <u>Contemporary</u> <u>Education</u>, 1977, <u>48</u>, 225-27.
- Shaw, M. C., Edson, K., & Bell, H. The self-concept of bright underachieving high school students as revealed by an adjective checklist. <u>Personnel and Guidance</u> Journal, 1960, 39, 193-96.
- Sherif, M. Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflicts. <u>American Sociologist</u>, 1958, <u>63</u>, 349-56.
- Silverblank, F. Creating the climate for successful innovation. Clearinghouse, 1973, 48, 230-41.

- Smith, B. Applying a school climate assessment instrument. In B. Howell and B. Grahlman (Eds.), <u>School climate:</u> <u>Evaluation and implementation</u>. Tulsa, Oklahoma: <u>Allied Printers and Publishers</u>, Inc., 1978.
- Staines, J. W. The self-picture as a factor in the classroom. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 28, 97-III.
- Sullivan, H. Conceptions of modern psychiatry. Washington, D.C.: William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, 1947.
- Taylor, R. G. Personality traits and discrepant achievement: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, <u>11</u>, 76-81.
- Thomas, S. An experiment to enhance self-concept of ability and raise school achievement among low-achieving ninth grade students. <u>Dissertation Abstracts</u>, 1966, 26, 4870.
- Vandenberg, D. Openness: The pedagogic atmosphere. In D. Nyberg (Ed.), <u>The philosophy of open education</u>. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Yamamoto, K., Thomas, E., & Karnes, E. School-related attitudes in middle-school age students. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 191-206.
- Wallin, W. H. Stragegies for a good school environment. Instructor, 1967, 79, 58.
- Wattenberg, W. W., & Clifford, C. <u>Relationship of self-</u> <u>concept to beginning achievement in reading</u>. U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 377. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1962.
- Webb, E. J. et al. <u>Unobtrusive measures: Non-reactive</u> research in the social sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Karen Patricia Roth was born in Detroit, Michigan on July 26, 1943. She attended the University of Detroit, received a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in English, minors in Philosophy and French, and a teaching certificate in secondary education in 1965. She earned her Master of Arts in English from Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, in 1972.

She taught reading and English at the junior high level for four years. At the high school level, Mrs. Roth taught English and humanities and was English Department Chairperson.

After eight years of teaching, Mrs. Roth became a Staff Development Consultant with a substance abuse prevention program at an Intermediate School District in the Midwest. The Intermediate School District is a service agency that provides consultative and data processing services to local school districts in the county. During her four years with the substance abuse prevention program, Mrs. Roth worked with administrators and teachers, providing inservice experiences in Values Clarification, Magic Circle, Educating for Success, Positive Classroom Discipline, Decision Making, Problem Solving and School Climate.

151

In 1978, Mrs. Roth became a General Education Consultant with the Intermediate School District. Her responsibilities included affective education, gifted education and mainstreaming for general educators. Presently, she works in these three areas with administrators and teachers in local school districts in the county in program planning, implementation and evaluation.