A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF ELEMENTARY

SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY BLACK

AND WHITE PRINCIPALS

By

DEBORAH ANNETTE GUNTER-ELLIOTT

Bachelor of Science in Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1970

Master of Education
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1983

A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF ELEMENTARY

SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY BLACK

AND WHITE PRINCIPALS

Thesis Approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ii

1168756

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter   Page

LIST OF TABLES

FIGURE

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

The school principal, more than any other individual, is responsible for a school's climate. Griffiths (1956) believes the principal is the key figure within a school organization. In any social environment the perceived "leader," by virtue of ascribed or earned role, is the major determiner of the climate. Thus, a teacher's actions will be the single most important determinant of the climate in a classroom. Likewise, the principal has a comparable role in influencing the overall climate in the school building. The principalship remains the single most powerful role in the American school unit by virtue of the degree of visibility accorded to it on the school campus and in the school attendance area (Kelley, 1980).

The federal courts have played the major role in bringing about the desegregation of the nation's public schools since the Supreme Court ruled in 1954 that separate schools for black and white children were inherently unequal and violated the Constitution's guarantee that no person shall be denied the equal protection of the law (Wise, 1974).

Desegregation of public schools has changed the organizational make-up of schools and brought black and white teachers together with black and white principals. These changes from a segregated to a desegregated system have had effects upon the school's organization climate. Cultures

1

have been brought together, increasing the possibility of personality conflicts. Teachers and principals are now faced with finding solutions to problems resulting from cultural differences found among staff members. To deal effectively with these problems, school leaders must seek means to provide a more humane environment in which students and staff may work productively and with greater satisfaction (Owens, 1970).

The profile of a school (POS) has been utilized in public schools to measure the organizational climate and leadership patterns within schools or school systems. The POS questionnaires focus on current behavior and organization practices at various levels within a school system (Likert, 1978). The following study is focused on the description of climate of schools administered by black and white principals.

Statement and Purpose of the Problem

There has been a tremendous amount of research on the organizational climate of schools, but the studies are limited when comparing the perceptions of the organizational climate of teachers with black or white principals. Because of the increase in cultural interaction, a study of the organizational climate of black and white principals was deemed timely. The problem of this study was to determine if there is a significant difference in organizational climate in schools administered by black principals as compared with those administered by white principals as perceived by teachers.

The purpose of this study was to compare teachers' perceptions of the organizational climate in elementary schools which have black or white principals.

Significance of the Study

It is believed that this study will provide additional knowledge for school personnel regarding school climate. If the administrator is sufficiently knowledgeable about school climate, much can be done to maximize the integrative forces that exist in the organization. The results of the study may increase the understanding of the competencies of blacks for administrative work and for maintaining suitable organizational climate. It may further encourage more blacks to seek administrative positions.

For public school central office administrators to better utilize blacks in leadership positions, they must know if black administrators are perceived to be effective in fostering appropriate school climates. This information is vital for recruitment, training, and job placement.

Limitations

The study had the following limitations:

1. The study was limited to principals working in elementary schools in a large, urban, public school district.

2. The facets of organizational climate investigated were limited to interactions between the staff and the principal and among the staff.

3. Due to the nature of the study the sample population was fortuitous, and generalizations drawn from the findings should be limited to the response population or applied cautiously to schools similar to those in the sample.

4. No attempt was made to determine the reason(s) for the perceptions of those surveyed.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of understanding how they are used throughout the study:

Decision Process. The extent to which conflicts between departments are resolved; decisions are made at the appropriate level for effective performance, and decision makers have adequate information about the problems faced at lower levels (Likert, 1978).

Elementary School. A school that has grades K through 6.

Goal Commitment. The extent to which teachers perceive a general orientation to achieve excellence and high educational performance goals. Each member accepts willingly and without resentment the goals and expectations that he and his group establish for themselves (Likert, 1978).

Organizational Climate. A relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that: (1) is experienced by its members, (2) influences their behavior, and (3) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization (Tagiuri and Litwin, 1968).

Principal. Full-time chief building administrator.

System 1. An exploitative, authoritarian model--the most autocratic. This system hoards control and direction at the very top of the organization; decisions are made and orders are issued from the top (Likert, 1978).

System 2. A benevolent authoritarian model, improves somewhat upon System 1. Not all decisions are made at the very top of the organization (Likert, 1978).

System 3. A consultative model, improves upon System 2. In a

System 3 organization, broad policy only is determined at the top and more specific decisions are made at lower levels (Likert, 1978).

System 4. The most democratic on the System 1-4 continuum, it is a participative group model. In this system, decisions are made face-to-face by work groups (Likert, 1978).

Teacher. A state-certified, full-time classroom instructor.

Team Cooperation. The extent of cooperation and teamwork which work group members perceive within the work group and between depart-ments. It is the coordination of efforts by principal, teachers, and students (Likert, 1978).

Summary

Chapter I has provided the background of the study, a statement of the problem, and the significance of the study. Limitations of the study and definitions of terms were listed. Chapter II includes the review of related literature, the rationale, and a statement of the hypotheses.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter includes a review of selected sources of information
pertaining to organizational and school climate, and instruments used to
measure climate. The review of the literature precedes the rationale,
followed by the hypotheses.

Organizational Climate

Organizational climate is defined by Taguiri and Litwin (1968) as a
relatively enduring quality of an organization that: (1) is experienced
by its members, (2) influences their behavior, and (3) can be described
in terms of values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes)
of the organization.

Although the use of the term climate (as a label for a concern with
both productivity and satisfaction as well as the relationships which
exist between these two dimensions) does not appear in the research
literature until the mid-1950's, the development of climate as a concept
separate from morale is based on the work of Murray during the 1930's.
Murray (1938, p. 23) describes behavior as "a function of the relation-
ship between the person and his environment." Both the person and the
environment have needs or expectations. Murray described this relation-
ship as being that which exists between the "needs" of the individual

and the "press" (organizational needs and expectations) of the environment (Kelley, 1980).

Bloom (1964, p. 221) states, "The improvement of environment is in reality the only means available to a civilized society for the improvement of the conditions and future of man." Erikson (1950) believes that climate has a strong effect on the development of behavior.

Argyris (1957) indicates that the needs of the individual cannot be totally congruent with the demands of the organization, but suggests the importance of managing this inevitable conflict and keeping it within tolerable bounds.

Argyris (1958) used the term organizational climate in a discussion of research concerned with the role participants in a case study of a bank. He explained organizational climate in terms of the interaction among persons in the organization, and was concerned with interpersonal variables to determine climate. These variables were described as:

1. formal organizational variables such as policies, practices, and job descriptions inducing the members of the organization to behave as it desires in order that it may achieve its external environment, and maintain itself internally;

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

3. informal variables that have arisen out of the participants' continuing struggle to adapt to the formal organization so that the latter achieves its objectives while simultaneously the individuals obtain at least a minimal amount of self-expression (p. 501).

Cornell (1955) found that there was a significant difference among school districts with respect to organizational climate. The variables used by Cornell in his investigation were:

1. Teacher morale, more specifically the satisfaction of teachers with their relationships to the organization.

2. Teachers' perception of the degree of deconcentration of administrative power in the school system. (The extent to which teachers expect administration to share in policy making.)

3. The extent to which teachers feel they are given responsibility when they participate in policy making.

4. The extent to which teachers feel that their contribution to policy making is taken into account in final decisions.

5. The extent to which teachers interact directly with administrative personnel with respect to general school problems (p. 220).

Anyone who visits more than a few schools notes quickly how schools differ from each other in their "feel." Each appears to have a "personality" of its own. It is this "personality" that is described as the "organizational climate" of the school. Analogously, personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization (Halpin, 1966).

In a pilot study of the climate of 71 elementary schools, Halpin and Croft (1966) developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) which maps eight major dimensions of teacher-teacher and teacher-principal relations. From profiles of these climate dimensions, Halpin and Croft, through factor-analysis, identified profiles which were arranged along a continuum. They were identified by an "open climate" at one end and by a "closed climate" at the other end.

The terms "open" and "closed" used in Halpin and Croft's work result in part from Rokeach's (1960) study reported in <u>The Open and Closed Mind</u>. Even as one can regard minds as open or closed, so are organizational climates viewed as open or closed. Openness would be distinguished by a "functional flexibility" and "closed by a functional rigidity" (Halpin and Croft, 1963, p. 2).

Anderson (1964) found that there was a relationship between climate of schools and the personality characteristics of principals. Open school climates tended to have confident, self-secure, resourceful, and sociable principals, while administrators in the closed climate schools tended to be evasive, submissive, and easily frustrated. He concluded that teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in his interpersonal relationships are among the most important determiners of organizational climate.

Brown (1965) replicated Halpin and Croft's original work using the OCDQ. The findings indicated that the OCDQ is a reliable instrument, but dividing the climate continuum into discrete climates may cause researchers to become overly dependent on these classifications.

A study to determine if there was a difference between leader behavior of principals and organizational climates of the schools they administered was conducted by Cook (1965). He found that principals in schools having open climates were perceived to initiate structure significantly more frequently than principals in closed climates.

The middle classifications of the OCDQ were questioned by Watkins (1968). He concluded that the middle climate designations more or less developed out of a chaos of perception rather than from any clearly perceived organizational climate. The study further indicated a tendency for Negro schools as a group to have a more closed climate than white schools.

Several other research studies indicate that the ethnic composition of the faculty is related to school climate. Watkins (1966) and Flanders (1966) report that Negro staffs tend to perceive their schools to be more closed than do staffs of white schools. Gentry and Kenney (1965)

compared Negro and white schools of a large urban school system. There was evidence that Negro schools are seen as exhibiting primarily a closed climate and white schools as primarily an open climate. They described Negro faculties as having low morale, as being highly disengaged from their tasks, and the principal emphasizing production with a modest degree of consideration. White faculties were described as having high morale within the faculty group and the principal as being hard working and considerate. The leadership in Negro schools was found to be primarily centered in the principal, while the leadership in white schools arose from the principal and the faculty.

A study to determine whether innovative school districts were more open than non-innovative school districts was conducted by Hughes (1968). His conclusions indicated that innovative districts were more similar to the open climate than the closed. Conversely, non-innovative districts were more similar to the closed climate.

Climate effects on pupil achievement were investigated by Feldvebel (1964) and Millar (1965). The conclusions drawn from these studies were that the global concept of organizational climate had no direct relationship to student achievement. The subtests of Intimacy, Aloofness, Consideration, and Production Emphasis correlated positively with achievement.

McLeod (1969) found that the smaller the school, the more open the climate; the larger the school, the more closed the climate. Using a questionnaire developed by a factor analysis of the C.F.K. Ltd. School Climate Profile, Smith (1977) found the most positive perceptions of climate are most likely to be found in small schools of high socioeconomic level.

Heller (1968) explored the relationship of the informal organization and teachers' perceptions of the existing and desired organizational climate of a school. He concluded that the informal structure can detract from or contribute to the attainment of formal organizational goals. The total membership of the formal organizations and the members of the informal groups perceive both the existing and desired organizational climates in a similar way.

Appleberry (1969) conducted a study to determine the relationship between organizational climate and pupil control orientation of the school. Schools with more open climates were significantly more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than schools with more closed climates. Teachers in more open schools were significantly more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than teachers serving in more closed schools.

Comparing the organizational climate of schools administered by female elementary school principals with those administered by male elementary school principals as perceived by teachers, Kobayashi (1974) found no significant difference. It was concluded that females were perceived by teachers as being as competent in leadership roles in elementary schools as males.

Falls (1976) investigated and examined the school leadership climate factors in selected schools in the San Diego schools. The project used Likert's Profile of a School to analyze 18 school climate variables. The findings concluded that there was a significant discrepancy in the way teachers and principals perceived 15 of the 18 school climate variables, teachers rated themselves higher than students assessed them, and

parents' perceptions of the school climate and assessment of schools showed their perceived influence as the lowest rated item.

Measuring School Climate

The most widely used technique for measuring school climate has been the OCDQ developed by Halpin and Croft (1966). The OCDQ is designed to measure faculty perceptions of school climate. It consists of a 64-item questionnaire which provides for a four-point response scale: (1) rarely occurs, (2) sometimes occurs, (3) often occurs, and (4) very frequently occurs.

The OCDQ comprises eight subtests. Four describe facets of teacher behavior and four deal with the principal's behavior. The subtests are:

Teachers' Behavior:

1. Disengagement--teacher is "not with it" and not committed to the task.

2. Hindrance--feeling that the principal burdens teachers with unnecessary busy work.

3. Esprit--morale growing out of a sense of accomplishment.

4. Intimacy--friendly social relations with other teachers.

Principals' Behavior:

1. Aloofness--formal and impersonal behavior.

2. Production emphasis--close supervision of staff.

3. Thrust--efforts to try to "move the organization."

4. Consideration--warm, friendly behavior by the principal.

The questionnaire was originally administered to 1,151 teachers and principals in 71 elementary schools in various parts of the country. Wide differences emerged in perceptions of school climate as might be

expected. However, responses tended to cluster around six areas which Halpin and Croft arbitrarily identified as climate types. They are as follows: (1) open climate, (2) autonomous climate, (3) controlled climate, (4) familiar climate, (5) paternal climate, and (6) closed climate.

Owens (1970) reported the OCDQ was designed for use in elementary schools and is not well suited to large, urban, or secondary schools.

Working independently of Halpin, Stern and Steinhoff (1965) developed the Organizational Climate Index. They worked from the assumption that an analogy exists between human personality and personality of the institution. The OCI measures perceptions of faculty and employees. The original version contained 300 items and provided measures of 30 scales, 6 first-order factors and 2 second-order factors (Kelley, 1980). The first-order factors are: (1) intellectual climate, (2) achievement standards, (3) personal dignity, (4) organizational effectiveness, (5) orderliness, and (6) impulse control. These six factors, after further factor analysis and combination, yield two major dimensions of school environment as perceived by staff: development press and task effectiveness.

Likert (1961) developed a continuum along which organizations are placed according to the character of their superordinate-subordinate relationships. Most of the research findings had their origin in business organizations, but application of the theory is not limited to these enterprises. It is applicable to other kinds of organized human activity, such as schools, voluntary associations, unions, hospitals, governmental agencies, and professional organizations.

The Profile of Organizational Characteristics (POC) identifies eight organizational characteristics: (1) leadership processes, (2)

motivational forces, (3) communication process, (4) interaction-influence process, (5) decision making process, (6) goal setting, (7) control processes, and (8) performance goals and training (Likert, 1967). These characteristics can be used to map profiles for each organization along a system continuum of: (1) exploitive-authoritative, (2) benevolent-authoritative, (3) consultative, and (4) participative.

Likert (1978) used the POC variables to develop an instrument called Profile of a School (POS). The POS questionnaires are designed to record the actual human behavior that occurs within a school organization as viewed not only by its leaders, but also by other members of the school system. A series of ten questionnaires are available:

1. Student (grades 4-6)--measures the students' perceptions of the behavior of teachers and principals toward the students. Questions about student/teachers and student/student relations as well as student motivation and attitude are found in this form.

2. Student (grades 7-12)--in addition to the measures found in questionnaire 1, this form includes questions dealing with students' perceptions of the counseling services in their schools.

3. Teacher--covers in depth student/teacher, teacher/teacher, and teacher/principal relationships. It also includes questions about teacher/department head relations where there is an intermediate level of department heads, grade level chairpersons, or team leader.

A supplemental form measures department heads' perceptions of their relationship to teachers in their department.

4. Counselor--measures the counselors' perceptions of their relationships to students, teachers, and principals. In addition, this form

measures the counselors' perceptions of the head counselor's leadership (if such a position exists).

A supplemental form measures the head counselor's perceptions of their relationship to other counselors.

5. Principal--measures responses of the principal or assistant principal. It covers in detail teacher/principal, counselor/principal, student/principal, and principal/superintendent relationships. It also has questions dealing with some central staff relationships.

6. Central Staff--designed for use with the professional or certified staff in the central school system office. This questionnaire measures the relationships of the central staff to the superintendent, to principals, and to teachers. This form can also be used by non-certified central staff working directly for the superintendent or a professional department or division head.

7. Superintendent--contains items of a system-wide nature. Various measures are obtained regarding the working relationships between the superintendent and the school board.

8. School Board--same as item 7.

9. Parent--deals with parents' perceptions of how well the school helps their children acquire knowledge and develop working skills and responsible social behavior. It also covers the parents' views of their own relationships with the school leadership and their appraisal of overall school performance. On a sheet set aside for comments, parents have an opportunity to give additional written responses.

Field tests of the parents' questionnaire indicate that it can be answered wherever there is at least an elementary level of reading skill.

In some situations, it may be advisable for interviewers to ask the questions and record the answers.

10. Support Staff--available for clerical, maintenance, food service personnel, and bus drivers.

The questionnaires are not attitude survey instruments. The focus is on current behavior and organizational practices at various levels within a school system. They are designed to measure those variables that research has shown to be the most important in determining the quality of performance in school administration: leadership, decision making, problem solving, motivation, communication, conflict management, interaction, and the structure through which interaction occurs (Likert, 1978).

Such a wide battery of questions reveals several common properties. First, all of them clearly evoke perceptual rather than attitudinal or other types of responses: that is, they stimulate, or intend to stimulate, the responding participant to orient himself with specific facts and express his opinion as to how he perceives those facts, not whether he "likes" them or not. Second, they all limit the respondent's reaction to a set of conventional response categories (Taylor and Bowers, 1967).

The POS questionnaire selected for this study was Form 3--Teacher questionnaire. It was selected because of its suitability for the purpose of this study. The POS questionnaires measure three aspects of organizational climate:

1. The extent of goal commitment within the school--the extent to which teachers perceive a general orientation to achieve excellence and high educational goals. Each member accepts willingly and without

resentment the goals and expectations that he and his group establish
for themselves.

2. The decision-making process--the extent to which conflicts be-
tween departments are resolved; decisions are made at the appropriate
level for effective performance, and decision makers have adequate in-
formation about the problems faced at lower levels.

3. Team cooperation--the extent of cooperation and teamwork which
work group members perceive within the work group and between depart-
ments (Likert, 1978).

The review of the literature cited led the researcher to the ration-
ale, which supports the hypotheses in this study.

A Rationale

Analyses of the extensive data obtained by the Institute for Social
Research since 1946 reveal that the organizational climate experienced
by a particular work group or by a particular hierarchical level in an
organization is determined primarily by the leadership behavior or eche-
lons above it. The behavior of the leaders at the top exerts by far the
greatest influence (Samuel, 1970).

Recall that Negro staffs tended to perceive their schools to be
more closed than did staffs of white schools (Watkins, 1966; and Flanders,
1966). Gentry and Kenney (1965) found evidence that Negro schools are
seen as exhibiting primarily a closed climate and white schools as pri-
marily an open climate. They described Negro faculties as having low
morale, as being highly disengaged from their tasks, and the principal
emphasizing production with a modest degree of consideration. The lead-
ership in Negro schools was found to be primarily centered in the

principal compared to the leadership in white schools arising out of the principal and faculty.

Roberts (1976) investigated the impact of race on teachers' perception of leadership effectiveness of black principals. The findings suggest that racial perceptions are a major variable in the assessment of the perceived leadership effectiveness of black principals.

Based on the foregoing research findings, it appears reasonable to assume that there may be a significant difference in the climate of schools administered by black and white principals.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were derived for statistical treatment:

H.1. There is a significant difference in organizational climate between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

H.1.a. There is a significant difference in goal commitment between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

H.1.b. There is a significant difference in the decision process between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

H.1.c. There is a significant difference in team cooperation between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

Summary

Chapter II has presented the review of related literature and the

rationale, followed by the hypothesis which guided this study. Chapter

III includes information on the instrument used in the study, sample se-

lection, collection of data, scoring of the instrument, and data analy-

sis.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter includes information about the instrument used in the study, sample selection, collection of data, scoring of the instrument, and data analysis.

Instrumentation

The Profile of a School (POS) questionnaire Form 3 covers in depth student/teacher, teacher/teacher, and teacher/principal relationships (see Appendix B). It also includes questions about teacher/department head relations where there is an intermediate level of department heads.

The POS was selected because of the suitability of the index measures for the purpose of this study. The questionnaires are designed to measure school climate and the climate components--goal commitment, decision process, and team cooperation.

The questionnaire produces scores on specific factors in the school environment. Accuracy is achieved by clustering, wherever practicable, two to four questionnaire items to measure each index. The questionnaire measures three aspects of organizational climate: (1) the extent of goal commitment within the school, (2) the decision-making process, and (3) the extent of team cooperation among various groups within the school. Table I indicates the question number tapped by each index.

TABLE I

INDEX QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Index	Question Number
Goal Commitment	69, 70, 71, 72
Decision Process	54, 58, 63
Team Cooperation	56, 57

The index scores for any school or school system can be interpreted by comparing them with the System 1 through 4 model:

System 1--an exploitative-authoritarian model. Scores range from 1.0 to 2.0.

System 2--a benevolent-authoritarian model. Scores range from 3.0 to 4.0.

System 3--a consultative model. Scores range from 5.0 to 6.0.

System 4--a participative, most democratic model. Scores range from 7.0 to 8.0 (Likert, 1978).

Reliability

The POS teacher questionnaire, Form 3, has been found consistently to have a split-half reliability of 0.95 or higher. Questionnaire indexes of goal commitment and decision-making process have been found to have a split-half reliability of 0.62 to 0.80. Reliability for team cooperation index varies from approximately 0.65 to 0.88 (Likert, 1978).

POS Validity Studies

Since the development of the POS, the instrument has been used in

research projects and doctoral dissertations. A study conducted by Wag-
staff (1970) indicated that the closer to System 4, the greater the de-
gree of interpersonal needs satisfaction experienced by the teachers.
The findings indicated that a highly significant relationship existed be-
tween the administrative behavior of principals and the interpersonal
needs satisfaction of teachers. The more human relations oriented the
administrative behavior of principals, the greater was the degree of
interpersonal needs satisfaction experienced by the teachers. Converse-
ly, the less human relations oriented the administrative behavior of
principals, the lesser was the degree of interpersonal needs satisfac-
tion experienced by teachers.

Ferris (1965) explained and compared patterns of communication and
decision making, as well as attitudinal dimensions and interaction be-
tween superiors and subordinates on different levels of the hierarchi-
cal structure of two secondary schools. The data clearly showed that
the leadership in these schools had developed an atmosphere of support
in which the staff members on all levels felt a sense of importance and
worth, and were able to make important decisions affecting their work.

A comparison of Halpin and Croft's OCDQ with Likert's POS was con-
ducted by Hall (1972). The relationship found between organizational
climates classified by the OCDQ and organizational systems classified by
the POS supports the concept that the organizational model from which
the OCDQ was developed is comparable to that from which the POS was
developed.

Shaw (1976) analyzed in 40 secondary schools in Connecticut the re-
lationships between teachers' job satisfaction and the schools' organiza-
tional climate and the principals' leadership. The organizational

climate and leadership scores are based on the teachers' perceptions as measured by the POS. Job satisfaction was measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction questionnaire and separately by the one question on teacher satisfaction in the POS. He found that organizational climate and leadership had a marked relationship to the teachers' job satisfaction. Organizational climate correlated +0.86 with teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota questionnaire and +0.85 as measured by the POS. The principals' leadership correlated +0.72 with the Minnesota measured job satisfaction and +0.69 with the POS measured job satisfaction. The Minnesota job satisfaction scores correlated +0.79 with the POS measure of satisfaction.

Sample Selection

The number of schools in the current study was 22 (11 administered by black principals and 11 administered by white principals). Each elementary school in the school district with a black principal was selected for the study. Using the Profiles of the Tulsa Public Schools (McCloud, 1972), 11 elementary schools with white principals were selected. The profile was used to select schools that served areas of similar annual income of those schools administered by black principals. Through the use of a table of random numbers (Tuckman, 1978), half of each school's faculty was selected. Schools having an odd number population were rounded to the nearest whole number.

There were 96 questionnaires administered to schools with black principals and 60 returned (63%). Schools administered by white principals had 92 questionnaires administered and 53 returned (58%). There

were 113 respondents out of a possible 188 or approximately 60 percent of the sample population.

Since these schools were not selected at random, the sample is fortuitous. Conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data can safely be applied only to those schools comprising the sample or applied cautiously to schools similar to those in the sample.

Data Collection

A letter along with the questionnaire was sent to the home address of each person selected from the investigator eliciting his/her involvement and requesting candor in answers (see Appendix A). The questionnaire requested no information or identification in order for the respondents to remain anonymous (see Appendix B). If responses were to be unbiased, complete anonymity and confidentiality had to be assured.

The identity of the school was revealed by an alphabetical classification printed on the questionnaire. The schools referred to in the study were identified to as schools A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K for those administered by black principals, and AA, BB, CC, DD, EE, FF, FF, GG, HH, II, JJ, KK for those administered by white principals.

Analysis of Data

The program used to score the POS was based on the program from Rensis Likert Associates, Inc. The eight possible responses to each item in the POS questionnaire range across the four basic types of management styles: Systems 1, 2, 3, 4. There are four descriptive terms for each item. Beneath each term there are two choices, each ascending one point in value moving from left to right (Likert, 1978).

Nine items were scored from the 93-item questionnaire. The nine items measured the three aspects of organizational climate: (1) the extent of goal commitment within the school--the extent to which teachers perceive a general orientation to achieve excellence and high educational performance goals; (2) the decision-making process--the extent to which conflicts between departments are resolved; and (3) the extent of team cooperation--the extent of cooperation and teamwork which work group members perceive within the work group and between departments (Likert, 1978).

Scoring of the Instrument

The responses to each of the nine items were scored by adding each index score together, then tabulating an individual mean score for that index. School mean scores were derived by adding each individual mean score and dividing by the number of teachers representing a school.

Responses, along with other pertinent identification and demographic data, were punched on IBM cards. The program was written in FORTRAN language, using the SPSS system of computer programs (Nie et al., 1975).

A t-test was used in testing each hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. An analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there was any relationship of sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, and number of years at the present school to the total climate score and each climate component.

Summary

Chapter III has described the instrument and scoring procedure, including reliability and validity data. A description of the sample

selection and data collection was reported. Data from the study will be presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

As detailed in Chapter III, the sample population consisted of 11 elementary schools with black principals and 11 schools with white principals. Table II presents the data by respondent category, indicating the number of questionnaires administered to each school and the number and percentage of returns. There were 96 questionnaires administered to schools with black principals and 60 were returned (63%). Schools administrated by white principals had 92 questionnaires administered and 53 were returned (58%). There were 113 respondents out of a possible 188 or approximately 60 percent of the sample population.

Table III presents the data regarding respondents by sex, age, race, and years at the present school. Respondents were categorized as 99 female, 14 male, 22 black, 90 white, and 1 other. Table IV presents the race of respondents by schools. The school district in which the sample was selected has 17.26 percent black elementary teachers and 82.74 percent white elementary teachers, compared with the returned questionnaires of 19.46 percent black and 79.54 percent white teachers. Table V presents the sex of principals by schools. There were 4 black female principals, 7 black male principals, 4 white female principals, and 7 white male principals.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUMENTS RETURNED

School	Number Administered	Number Returned	Percentage
Black Principals			
A	9	5	56
B	6	5	83
C	5	3	60
D	10	7	70
E	8	4	50
F	14	10	72
G	5	3	60
H	12	7	58
I	8	4	50
J	10	7	70
K	9	5	56
	96	60	63
White Principals			
AA	10	6	60
BB	9	7	78
CC	4	2	50
DD	9	5	56
EE	9	5	56
FF	11	6	55
GG	8	4	50
HH	7	3	43
II	5	4	80
JJ	11	6	55
KK	9	5	56
	92	53	58

Total Number Administered	Total Number Returned	Percentage
188	113	60

TABLE III

CATEGORY OF RESPONDENTS

Category	Number
Sex	
Female	99
Male	14
Age	
25 years or under	4
26-35 years	45
36-45 years	31
46-55 years	18
56 or over	15
Race	
Black	22
White	90
Other	1
Years at Present School	
Less than 1 year	16
Between 1 and 5 years	52
Between 5 and 10 years	26
Between 10 and 15 years	16
More than 15 years	3

TABLE IV

RACE OF RESPONDENTS BY SCHOOLS

School	Black	White	Other
A	0	5	0
B	1	4	0
C	1	2	0
D	0	7	0
E	1	3	0
F	1	9	0
G	0	3	0
H	3	4	0
I	2	2	0
J	3	4	0
K	1	4	0
AA	1	5	0
BB	1	6	0
CC	0	2	0
DD	2	3	0
EE	0	5	0
FF	0	6	0
GG	0	4	0
HH	0	2	1
II	1	3	0
JJ	4	2	0
KK	0	5	0
Total	22	90	1

TABLE V

SEX OF PRINCIPALS BY SCHOOLS

Black Principals	White Principals
A--female	AA--male
B--female	BB--male
C--male	CC--female
D--male	DD--male
E--male	EE--female
F--male	FF--female
G--male	GG--female
H--female	HH--male
I--male	II--male
J--male	JJ--male
K--female	KK--male

Specifications of Climate

The climate of a school was defined by scores on the following in-
dexes: goal commitment, decision-making process, and team cooperation.
Items were scored using a 1-8 scale. The overall profile contrasting
the schools was noted in Figure 1, with means ranging between the low-4
and mid-5 range on the Likert scale. This pattern indicates Systems 2
and 3 practices in the Likert conceptual framework.

School mean scores were derived by adding each individual mean
score and dividing by the number of teachers representing a school. The
mean scores and standard deviations for each school are presented in
Tables VI and VII.

Testing the Hypotheses

The hypotheses were stated in the null for statistical testing. A
t-test was used in testing the null hypotheses. Each null hypothesis
was tested at the .05 level of significance.

H.1. There is no significant difference in organizational climate
between those schools administered by black principals and those schools
administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

The mean score for black principals on climate was 4.33 with a stan-
dard deviation of 1.4. The mean score for white principals was 4.95
with a standard deviation of 1.3 (see Table VIII).

A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t-value of
2.31 at the .02 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant
difference in climate between those schools administered by black princi-
pals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by
teachers, was rejected.

Variable   Likert Scale Value

Total Climate   1-- --4---------5---------6-- --7-- --8

Components:

  Goal Commitment   1-- --4---------5---------6-- --7-- --8

  Decision Process   1-- --4---------5---------6-- --7-- --8

  Team Cooperation   1-- --4---------5---------6-- --7-- --8

Schools administered by black principals ------

Schools administered by white principals ————

         Figure 1.   Profile of Mean Scores for Schools
                     Administered by Black Principals
                     and White Principals on Climate

TABLE VI

POS MEAN SCORES BY SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY BLACK PRINCIPALS

School	Variable	Mean	S.D.	School	Variable	Mean	S.D.
A	Total Climate	3.0	0.46	G	Total Climate	4.0	0.74
	Goal Commitment	3.5	0.97		Goal Commitment	4.6	1.74
	Decision Process	2.6	0.41		Decision Process	3.6	0.47
	Team Cooperation	2.9	0.75		Team Cooperation	3.8	0.85
B	Total Climate	3.5	1.56	H	Total Climate	4.2	1.27
	Goal Commitment	4.1	1.56		Goal Commitment	4.1	1.35
	Decision Process	3.1	1.58		Decision Process	4.4	1.22
	Team Cooperation	3.0	1.63		Team Cooperation	4.5	1.23
C	Total Climate	5.5	0.49	I	Total Climate	3.0	0.99
	Goal Commitment	6.2	1.07		Goal Commitment	3.6	1.01
	Decision Process	5.4	0.94		Decision Process	3.2	1.34
	Team Cooperation	5.0	0.40		Team Cooperation	2.3	1.03
D	Total Climate	6.1	0.57	J	Total Climate	3.9	0.75
	Goal Commitment	6.4	0.84		Goal Commitment	3.8	0.74
	Decision Process	6.0	0.57		Decision Process	4.0	0.78
	Team Cooperation	6.2	0.70		Team Cooperation	4.0	1.02
E	Total Climate	6.3	0.59	K	Total Climate	4.3	0.94
	Goal Commitment	5.9	0.40		Goal Commitment	4.3	0.47
	Decision Process	6.2	0.64		Decision Process	4.2	1.05
	Team Cooperation	6.7	1.09		Team Cooperation	4.3	1.50
F	Total Climate	3.3	1.51				
	Goal Commitment	4.5	1.33				
	Decision Process	3.7	1.59				
	Team Cooperation	3.6	1.86				

TABLE VII

POS MEAN SCORES BY SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY WHITE PRINCIPALS

School	Variable	Mean	S.D.	School	Variable	Mean	S.D.
AA	Total Climate	4.8	1.20	GG	Total Climate	4.1	0.47
	Goal Commitment	5.8	0.98		Goal Commitment	5.5	1.09
	Decision Process	4.5	1.55		Decision Process	3.2	0.71
	Team Cooperation	4.0	1.60		Team Cooperation	3.6	0.93
BB	Total Climate	4.2	1.38	HH	Total Climate	5.1	1.21
	Goal Commitment	5.1	1.19		Goal Commitment	5.7	1.67
	Decision Process	4.0	1.36		Decision Process	5.6	0.47
	Team Cooperation	3.5	2.11		Team Cooperation	3.8	1.02
CC	Total Climate	6.0	1.10	II	Total Climate	5.5	1.48
	Goal Commitment	6.2	1.00		Goal Commitment	5.5	1.22
	Decision Process	5.4	1.15		Decision Process	5.4	1.74
	Team Cooperation	6.0	1.50		Team Cooperation	5.6	1.54
DD	Total Climate	4.8	0.81	JJ	Total Climate	5.4	0.68
	Goal Commitment	5.8	0.76		Goal Commitment	5.8	0.68
	Decision Process	4.7	0.97		Decision Process	5.2	0.90
	Team Cooperation	3.7	1.72		Team Cooperation	5.2	1.03
EE	Total Climate	6.6	0.29	KK	Total Climate	4.4	1.22
	Goal Commitment	6.6	0.91		Goal Commitment	4.4	1.61
	Decision Process	6.3	0.54		Decision Process	5.1	0.77
	Team Cooperation	6.0	1.76		Team Cooperation	3.9	1.82
FF	Total Climate	4.0	1.39				
	Goal Commitment	4.4	2.40				
	Decision Process	4.7	1.68				
	Team Cooperation	2.9	1.74				

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY DATA AND t-TEST DATA FOR THE DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN CLIMATE SCORES OF SCHOOLS ADMINIS-
TERED BY BLACK AND WHITE PRINCIPALS

Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p*
Climate					
Black Principals	11	4.33	1.4	2.31	0.02
White Principals	11	4.95	1.3		

*Two-tailed test of significance.

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS ON THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN SEX, AGE OF TEACHER, RACE OF TEACHER,
NUMBER OF YEARS AT THE SCHOOL, AND CLIMATE

Source	SS	df	MS	F Ratio	P	
Sex	1.49	1	1.49	0.74	0.39	NS
Age	16.36	4	4.09	2.02	0.09	NS
Race	1.26	1	1.26	0.62	0.43	NS
Years	11.33	4	2.83	1.40	0.23	NS

An analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, or number of years at the present school tended to have an effect on the respondent's perception of climate (see Table IX, page 36). It was concluded that the variables of sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, and number of years did not tend to affect the perception of climate, since all probabilities exceeded the .05 level of significance.

H.1.a. There is no significant difference in goal commitment between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

Table X presents the t-test data for goal commitment. The mean score for black principals on goal commitment was 4.63 with a standard deviation of 1.5. The mean score for white principals was 5.49 with a standard deviation of 1.3. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t-value of 3.14, which is significant beyond the .01 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in goal commitment between those schools administered by black principals and those administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers, was rejected.

To determine whether sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, or number of years at the present school tended to affect the respondent's perception regarding goal commitment, an analysis of variance was conducted. The results are presented in Table XI. Since all probabilities exceeded the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that the variables of sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, and number of years did not have a significant effect on goal commitment.

H.1.b. There is no significant difference in the decision

TABLE X

SUMMARY DATA AND t-TEST DATA FOR THE DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN GOAL COMMITMENT SCORES OF
SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY BLACK
AND WHITE PRINCIPALS

Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p*
Goal Commitment					
Black Principals	11	4.63	1.5	3.14	0.002
White Principals	11	5.49	1.3		

*Two-tailed test of significance.

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS ON THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN SEX, AGE OF TEACHER, RACE OF TEACHER,
NUMBER OF YEARS AT THE SCHOOL,
AND GOAL COMMITMENT

Source	SS	df	MS	F Ratio	P	
Sex	0.47	1	0.47	0.21	0.64	NS
Age	16.97	4	4.24	1.91	0.11	NS
Race	3.82	1	3.82	1.73	0.19	NS
Years	13.83	4	3.45	1.56	0.19	NS

process between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

As shown in Table XII, the mean score for black principals on the decision process was 4.26 with a standard deviation of 1.5. The mean score for white principals was 4.87 with a standard deviation of 1.40. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t-value of 2.19 at the 0.03 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the decision process between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers, was rejected.

The results of an analysis of variance are presented in Table XIII. It was conducted to determine whether sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, or number of years at the present school tended to have an effect on respondent's perception of the decision process. It was concluded that the variables of sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, or number of years did not tend to have an effect on the respondent's perception of the decision process.

H.1.c. There is no significant difference in team cooperation between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

The mean score for black principals on team cooperation was 4.25 (see Table XIV). The standard deviation was 1.7. The mean score for white principals was 4.56 with a standard deviation of 1.9. A statistical test for difference of mean resulted in a t-value of 0.86 at the 0.38 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in team cooperation between those schools administered by black

TABLE XII

SUMMARY DATA AND t-TEST DATA FOR THE DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN DECISION PROCESS SCORES OF
SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY BLACK
AND WHITE PRINCIPALS

Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p*
Decision Process					
Black Principals	11	4.26	1.5	2.19	0.03
White Principals	11	4.87	1.4		

*Two-tailed test of significance.

TABLE XIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS ON THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN SEX, AGE OF TEACHER, RACE OF TEACHER,
NUMBER OF YEARS AT THE SCHOOL,
AND DECISION PROCESS

Source	SS	df	MS	F Ratio	P	
Sex	1.44	1	1.44	0.63	0.42	NS
Age	13.57	4	3.39	1.48	0.21	NS
Race	0.43	1	0.43	0.18	0.66	NS
Years	5.84	4	1.46	0.63	0.63	NS

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY DATA AND t-TEST DATA FOR THE DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN TEAM COOPERATION SCORES OF
SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY BLACK
AND WHITE PRINCIPALS

Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p*
Team Cooperation					
Black Principals	11	4.25	1.7	0.86	0.38
White Principals	11	4.56	1.9		

*Two-tailed test of significance.

TABLE XV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS ON THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN SEX, AGE OF TEACHER, RACE OF TEACHER,
NUMBER OF YEARS AT THE SCHOOL,
AND TEAM COOPERATION

Source	SS	df	MS	F Ratio	P	
Sex	3.21	1	3.21	0.93	0.33	NS
Age	17.32	4	4.33	1.25	0.29	NS
Race	0.85	1	0.85	0.24	0.62	NS
Years	20.58	4	5.14	1.48	0.21	NS

principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers, was accepted.

An ancillary investigation was conducted to determine whether sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, or number of years at the present school tended to have an effect on the variable of team cooperation (see Table XV, page 41). It was concluded that the variables of sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, or number of years did not tend to affect the respondent's perception of team cooperation, as all probabilities exceeded the .05 level of significance.

Summary

The major hypothesis and three minor hypotheses were tested and the results were summarized in this chapter. Each null hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance. Ancillary investigations were conducted and an analysis of the findings was presented. Chapter V presents the findings, implications, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This chapter concludes this research report with conclusions that may be drawn from the findings, implications, and suggestions for further research.

Summary of Findings

The question raised in this study pertains to the organizational climate of the schools administered by black principals as compared with those administered by white principals. In essence, this study was concerned with the question, "Is there a significant difference in organizational climate in schools administered by black principals as compared with those administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers?"

The sample population consisted of 22 elementary schools--11 schools with black principals and 11 schools with white principals; half of each faculty was randomly selected; 188 questionnaires were sent out and 113 were returned. The school district in which the sample was selected has 17.26 percent black elementary teachers and 82.74 percent white elementary teachers, compared with the returned questionnaires of 19.46 percent black teachers and 79.54 percent white teachers.

A t-test was used in testing each hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. An analysis of variance was conducted to determine if the

demographic variables of sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, or number of years at the present school tended to affect the respondent's perception of total climate and each climate component: (1) goal commitment-- the extent to which teachers perceive a general orientation to achieve excellence and high educational performance goals; (2) decision process --the extent to which conflicts between departments are resolved; decisions are made at the appropriate level for effective performance; and (3) team cooperation--the extent of cooperation and teamwork which work group members perceive within the work group and between departments (Likert, 1978).

The findings of the study are listed below:

1. Both the schools administered by black and white principals had mean climate scores ranging from 4.3 to 4.9, indicating a System 2.5-- characteristics of both Systems 2 and 3 (Likert, 1978).

2. The organizational climate of schools administered by black principals was significantly different from those administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

3. On the variable goal commitment, schools administered by black principals were significantly different from those administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

4. On the variable decision process, schools administered by black principals were significantly different from those administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers.

5. On the variable team cooperation, schools administered by black principals and white principals were not significantly different, as perceived by teachers.

6. The most influential variable included in the measure of climate was goal commitment. Schools administered by both black and white principals scored higher on this index than either of the other two components of climate: decision process and team cooperation.

7. The least influential variable included in the measure of climate was team cooperation. Schools administered by both black and white principals scored lower in this index than either of the other two components of climate: goal commitment and decision process.

8. The most significant difference between schools administered by black and white principals was in goal commitment.

9. The mean score of climate was lower in schools administered by black principals as compared with those administered by white principals.

10. The mean score of each component--goal commitment, decision process, and team cooperation--was lower in schools administered by black principals as compared with those administered by white principals.

11. Sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, and number of years at the present school had no significant effect on perceptions of climate.

12. Sex, age of teacher, race of teacher, and number of years at the present school had no significant effect on the climate components-- goal commitment, decision process, and team cooperation.

Implications

The conclusions that were drawn from the study are limited to the public elementary schools that participated in the study. The conclusions are further limited by the fact that the instrument used is perceptual and not a direct measure. Any perceptual survey of people reflects

the emotional and physical condition of the respondents at the time their responses were made.

External events also might have had an effect on data. Declining enrollment, teacher trims and transfers, budget cuts, and better integration of students may have had an effect on the data.

Implications for practice are listed below:

1. Climate is important to the school environment. A positive climate includes everyone striving to attain school goals. Therefore, administrators and faculty members could consider the possible impact of goal commitment--the extent to which teachers perceive a general orientation to achieve excellence and high educational performance goals; the decision process--the extent to which conflicts between departments are resolved and decisions are made at the appropriate level for effective performance; and team cooperation--the extent of cooperation and team-work which work group members perceive within the work group and between departments (Likert, 1978).

2. Educators should work toward consultative patterns. Schools seem best when broad policies are determined at the top and more specific decisions are made at lower levels. Goals are set after discussion with subordinates. Subordinates' attitudes are, therefore, usually favorable and there is little hostility.

Suggestions for improving school climate are listed below:

1. An examination and assessment of a school's climate is an initial step for improving a school climate. Careful assessment of school climate should precede any plans for improvement. The number of instruments available for the assessment of climate are extensive. Care should

be taken to select instruments that provide information which is desired
and usable for planning and improving climate.

2. Central administrators should support school principals in de-
veloping a step-by-step plan for climate change. Having support from
central administrators often increases the probability of acceptance and
teachers are more likely to approve of change.

3. Teachers should become involved and participate in decision mak-
ing. When teachers are involved in decision making, their attitudes are
usually favorable. Subordinates feel a responsibility for the welfare
of the organization and are less likely to resist the organization's
directives when they are involved in decision making.

4. School districts should provide in-service training for princi-
pals in developing and improving skills in supervision, leadership, and
communication skills. The crucial task of the principal in exercising
leadership for climate improvement is through effective supervision and
communication skills. The principal's major role is to provide the staff
with effective supervision, resulting in efficient performance.

5. School districts should provide in-service training for teach-
ers to help them better understand the process of supervision, leader-
ship styles, and communication skills. The more teachers understand
these processes, the more accepted they will be. School climates should
improve as knowledge and understanding of supervision, leadership, and
communication increase.

6. Principals should provide motivators and incentives to challenge
teachers to increase their performance. Special recognition, additional
responsibilities, and opportunities for advancement may increase teacher
performance. As knowledge, skill, and understanding increase, people

will desire differing needs for rewards or recognition. Through assessing and matching needs with rewards, teachers may increase their performance.

Considerable evidence exists that a school is the image of its administrator. The above suggestions are ways in which administrators may develop additional leadership skills, knowledge, and attitudes to improve school climate. Immediate effects of change are not likely, and sufficient time should be allowed before the full impact of change becomes apparent in the actual operation.

Suggestions for Further Research

The suggestions for further research are:

1. Most researchers found that the organizational climate of schools with black principals tends to be perceived by teachers as more closed than the organizational climate of schools with white principals. This study also supports these conclusions. The study was limited to 22 schools in one area. Further research using a larger sample area to identify differences in perception is needed.

2. The study revealed a significant difference in the perception of goal commitment and decision process between those schools administered by black principals and those schools administered by white principals, as perceived by teachers. Further research for substantiating those hypotheses that were significant in this study is recommended.

3. The various scales of the Profile of a School might be applied to the secondary schools with black and white principals in this area.

4. Research for the purposes of offering solutions to administrators for changing the organizational climate is needed.

Concluding Statement

Using the Likert Profile of a School, a comparison of the organiza-
tional climate of elementary schools administered by black and white

principals was made in the present study. The instrument measured cli-

mate and climate components--goal commitment, decision process, and team

cooperation. The sample population consisted of 22 elementary schools--

11 schools with black principals and 11 schools with white principals.

It is important to recall that the perceptions of this study are

applicable only to the schools included in the sample. The perceptions

reflected in the data are only those of teachers who chose to respond.

The present study may provide valuable insight into organizational

climate of schools administered by black and white principals. It may

provide for further study in this area. Researchers may be encouraged

to look at questions raised by this study and continue investigations in

this area.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Donald P. Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools. Re-
    search Monograph No. 1. Minneapolis: Educational Research and
    Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., 1964.

Appleberry, James B. The Relationship Between Organizational Climate
    and Pupil Control Ideology of Elementary Schools. (Unpublished
    doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, 1969.)

Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between the
    System and the Individual. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Argyris, Chris. Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate:
    A Case Study of a Bank. Administrative Quarterly, 1958, 2(4), 501-
    520.

Bloom, Benjamin. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics.
    New York: John Wiley, 1964.

Brown, Allen. Two Strategies for Changing Climate. The CSA Bulletin,
    1965, 4(5), 64-80.

Cook, Edward Vance. Leadership Behavior of Elementary School Principals
    and the Organizational Climate of the Schools Which They Administer.
    (Unpublished doctoral disseration, Rutgers State University, 1965.)

Cornell, Francis G. Socially Perceptive Administration. Phi Delta Kap-
    pan, 1955, 36(6), 219-223.

Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1950.

Falls, Otis A. Participatory Leadership: Influence and Satisfaction
    With Elementary School Climate as Perceived by Principals, Teachers,
    Students, and Parents. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, U.S.
    International University, 1976.)

Feldvebel, Alexander M. Organizational Climate, Social Class, Education-
    al Output. Administrator's Notebook, 1964, 12(8), 29-45.

Ferris, Alan Edward. Organizational Relationships in Two Selected Second-
    ary Schools: A Comparative Study. (Unpublished doctoral disserta-
    tion, Columbia University, 1965.)

Flanders, Robert Edward. The Relationship of Selected Variables to the
    Organizational Climate of the Elementary School. (Unpublished doc-
    toral dissertation, The University of Georgia, 1966.)

Gentry, Harold W., and Kenney, James B. A Comparison of the Organizational Climates of Negro and White Elementary Schools. The Journal of Psychology, 1965, 60, 171-179.

Griffiths, Daniel. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton, 1956.

Hall, John W. A Comparison of Halpin and Croft's Organizational Climates and Likert and Likert's Organizational Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 586-590.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Halpin, Andrew W., and Croft, Don B. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1963.

Heller, Robert W. Informal Organization and Perception of the Organizational Climate of Schools. The Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61(9), 405-411.

Hughes, Larry W. Organizational Climate--Another Dimension to the Process of Innovation? Administration Quarterly, 1968, 4(3), 17-28.

Kelley, Edgar. Improving School Climate. Reston, Va.: NASSP, 1980.

Kobayashi, K. Jessie. A Comparison of Organizational Climate of Schools Administered by Female and Male Elementary School Principals. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1974.)

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Likert, Rensis. The Profile of a School: A Resource for Improving School Administration. Ann Arbor: Rensis Likert Associates, Inc., 1978.

McCloud, Paul. Profiles of the Tulsa Public Schools. Tulsa: Tulsa Public Schools, 1972.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

McLeod, Ronald Keith. Relationship of Staff Size and Selected Staff Variables to the Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1969.)

Millar, Donald E. Organizational Climate and Achievement. The CSA Bulletin, 1965, 4(4), 36-39.

Murray, Henry A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Nie, Norman H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Null, Eldon J. Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools. Research Monograph No. 3. Minneapolis: Educational Research and Developmental Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., 1967.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Roberts, Sylvia Mae. Race, Values, and Pupil Control Ideology: An Analysis of the Relationship Among Some Variables Influencing Teachers' Perceptions of the Leadership Effectiveness of Black Principals. (Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, New York University, 1976.)

Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Book, Inc., 1960.

Samuel, Y. Organizational Climate: Concept and Measurement. In J. C. Taylor and D. G. Bowers (Eds.), The Survey of Organizations: Toward a Machine-Scored, Standardized Questionnaire Instrument. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, 1970.

Shaw, C. E. A Comparative Analysis of Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction at Selected Public and Catholic Secondary Schools in Connecticut. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1976.)

Smith, Gerald Blaine. A Comparative Study of School Climate as Perceived by Selected Students, Teachers, and Administrators in Junior High Schools. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tulsa, 1977.)

Steinhoff, Carl R. Organizational Climate in a Public School System. USOE Cooperative Research Contract No. OE-4-225. Project No. 5-083. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1965.

Tagiuri, R., and Litwin, G. H. Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Boston Division of Research, Harvard University, 1968.

Tuckman, Bruce. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1978.

Wagstaff, Lonnie. The Relationship Between Administrative Systems and Interpersonal Needs of Teachers. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.)

Watkins, James Foster. The Relationship Between the Principal and His Professional Staff in the Public School. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1966.)

Watkins, James Foster. The OCDQ--An Application and Some Implications. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1968, 4, 46-60.

Wise, Michael. School Desegregation: The Court, the Congress, and the President. School Review, 1974, 82(2), 155.

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE

1208 South Poplar
Broken Arrow, OK 74012
918/251-8345 or
918/425-5561

October 12, 1981

Rensis Likert Associates
630 City Center Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Gentlemen:

I am a graduate student at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,
Oklahoma, and a high school counselor. I am in the process of gathering
information for my dissertation. My major field is Educational Adminis-
tration. I am interested in comparing the school climate of schools ad-
ministered by black and white principals.

I would like to get a copy of the Profile of a School to compare it with
other instruments measuring climate. If I find your instrument appropri-
ate, I would like permission to use if for my research.

Enclosed is a self-stamped addressed envelope. If there is a fee, please
inform me.

Sincerely yours,

Deborah Gunter

Deborah Gunter

DG/cf

Encl.

RLA Rensis Likert Associates, Inc.

Consultants in Organization Diagnosis and Human Resource Development

November 6, 1981

Ms. Debbie Gunter
1208 South Poplar
Broken Arrow, OK 74012

Dear Ms. Gunter:

Enclosed are the questionnaires and information sheets you requested.

RLA can process the data if you use our standard answer sheet. You may score the results yourself, however.

In any event, you do have our permission to reproduce the POS question-naires for use in your dissertation. We would appreciate receiving a copy of your results.

Sincerely,

R. C. Seghers

Raymond C. Seghers
Associate

RCS/h

Encl.

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA

Dear Professional Colleague:

I need you! I am a High School Counselor for Tulsa Public Schools and a graduate student at Oklahoma State University. I am a doctoral student in the critical stage of preparation for my dissertation. There are promising data, composing the raw material for my research, which I can gather only with your help.

In order not to intrude on your teaching time, I have selected to send the questionnaires to your home. I recognize that you are busy and your time is valuable, but it is from efforts like this that we gain knowledge and insight into how to move toward improving existing situstions. It is for this reason that I request your participation in this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it within a week in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope.

The study is not concerned with individual responses, but with the scores derived from the composite responses of all participants. Therefore, be assured that you will be and remain an anonymous participant. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire. For this reason, your responses can be absolutely candid.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your time and effort in making this study possible.

Sincerely,

Deborah Gunter

Deborah Gunter

DG/cf

Encl.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT

PROFILE OF A SCHOOL, FORM III*

    This questionnaire is designed to learn more about how students, teachers, school principals, and others can best work together. The aim is to use the information to make your teaching more satisfying and productive.

    If the results are to be helpful, it is important that you answer each question as thoughtfully and frankly as possible. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

    To ensure complete confidentiality, please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire.

    Each question has eight possible responses. Please answer by encircling one of the numbers.

---

    *Copyright, Jane Gibson Likert and Rensis Likert, 1977. Used by permission.

1. How often is your behavior seen by students as friendly and supportive?	Rarely 1 2 Sometimes 3 4 Often 5 6 Very Often 7 8
2. How much confidence and trust do you have in students?	Very little 1 2 Some 3 4 Quite a bit 5 6 A very great deal 7 8
3. How much confidence and trust do you students have in you?	Very little 1 2 Some 3 4 Quite a bit 5 6 A very great deal 7 8
4. How much interest do students feel you have in their success as students?	Very little 1 2 Some 3 4 Quite a bit 5 6 A very great deal 7 8
5. How free do students feel to talk to you about school matters?	Not free 1 2 Somewhat free 3 4 Quite free 5 6 Very free 7 8
6. How often do you seek and use students' ideas about academic matters, such as their work, course content, teaching plans and methods?	Rarely 1 2 Sometimes 3 4 Often 5 6 Very often 7 8
7. How often do you seek and use students' ideas about non-academic school matters, such as student activities, rules of conduct, and discipline?	Rarely 1 2 Sometimes 3 4 Often 5 6 Very often 7 8
8. How much do students feel that you are trying to help them with their problems?	Very little 1 2 Some 3 4 Quite a bit 5 6 A very great deal 7 8

9. How much influence do students have on what goes on in your school?	Very little	1	2
	Some	3	4
	Quite a bit	5	6
	A very great deal	7	8
10. How much influence do you think students should have on what goes on in your school?	Very little	1	2
	Some	3	4
	Quite a bit	5	6
	A very great deal	7	8
11. How much are students involved in major decisions affecting them?	Very little	1	2
	Some	3	4
	Quite a bit	5	6
	A very great deal	7	8
12. What is the general attitude of students toward your school?	Dislike it	1	2
	Sometimes dislike it, sometimes like it	3	4
	Usually like it	5	6
	Like it very much	7	8
13. How much accurate information concerning school affairs is given to you by students?	Very little	1	2
	Some	3	4
	Quite a bit	5	6
	A very great deal	7	8
14. How do students view communications from you?	View with great suspicion	1	2
	Some view with suspicion, some with trust	3	4
	Usually viewed with trust	5	6
	Almost always viewed with trust	7	8
15. To what extent is the communication between you and your students open and candid?	Very little	1	2
	Some	3	4
	Considerable	5	6
	Very great	7	8

16. How do students view communications from the principal?

View with great suspicion	1	2
Some view with suspicion, some with trust	3	4
Usually viewed with trust	5	6
Almost always viewed with trust	7	8

17. How well do you know the problems faced by students in their work?

Not well	1	2
Somewhat well	3	4
Quite well	5	6
Very well	7	8

18. To what extent do students help each other when they want to get something done?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

19. To what extent do students look forward to coming to school?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

20. To what extent do students feel excited about learning?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

21. To what extent do you look forward to your teaching day?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

22. How often do you see the principal's behavior as friendly and supportive?

Rarely	1	2
Sometimes	3	4
Often	5	6
Very often	7	8

23. How much confidence and trust does the principal have in you?

Very little   1   2
Some   3   4
Quite a bit   5   6
A very great deal   7   8

24. How much confidence and trust do you have in the principal?

Very little   1   2
Some   3   4
Quite a bit   5   6
A very great deal   7   8

25. How free do you feel to talk to the principal about school matters?

Not free   1   2
Somewhat free   3   4
Quite free   5   6
Very free   7   8

26. How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to the principal?

Rarely   1   2
Sometimes   3   4
Often   5   6
Very often   7   8

27. How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to other teachers?

Rarely   1   2
Sometimes   3   4
Often   5   6
Very often   7   8

28. How often does the principal seek and use your ideas about academic matters?

Rarely   1   2
Sometimes   3   4
Often   5   6
Very often   7   8

29. How often does the principal seek and use your ideas about non-academic matters?

Rarely   1   2
Sometimes   3   4
Often   5   6
Very often   7   8

30. How much influence does the principal have on what goes on in your school?

Very little   1   2
Some   3   4
Quite a bit   5   6
A very great deal   7   8

31. How much influence do the teachers have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1 2
Some	3 4
Quite a bit	5 6
A very great deal	7 8

32. How much influence does the central staff of your school system have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1 2
Some	3 4
Quite a bit	5 6
A very great deal	7 8

33. How much influence do the students have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1 2
Some	3 4
Quite a bit	5 6
A very great deal	7 8

34. How much influence do you think the principal should have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1 2
Some	3 4
Quite a bit	5 6
A very great deal	7 8

35. How much influence do you think the teachers should have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1 2
Some	3 4
Quite a bit	5 6
A very great deal	7 8

36. How much influence do you think the central staff of your school system should have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1 2
Some	3 4
Quite a bit	5 6
A very great deal	7 8

37. How much influence do you think the students should have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1 2
Some	3 4
Quite a bit	5 6
A very great deal	7 8

38. How often are students' ideas sought and used by the principal about academic matters?

Rarely	1 2
Sometimes	3 4
Often	5 6
Very often	7 8

39.	How often are students' ideas sought and used by the principal about non-academic school matters?	Rarely	1 2
		Sometimes	3 4
		Often	5 6
		Very often	7 8
40.	In your job, is it worthwhile or a waste of time to do your best?	Usually a waste of time	1 2
		Sometimes a waste of time	3 4
		Often worthwhile	5 6
		Almost always worthwhile	7 8
41.	How much do you feel that the principal is interested in your success as a teachers?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Quite a bit	5 6
		A very great deal	7 8
42.	How often does the principal use small group meetings to solve school problems?	Rarely	1 2
		Sometimes	3 4
		Often	5 6
		Very often	7 8
43.	To what extent does the principal make sure that planning and setting priorities are done well?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8
44.	To what extent does the principal try to provide you with the materials, equipment and space you need to do your job well?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8
45.	To what extent does the principal give you useful information and ideas?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8

46. To what extent are you encouraged to be innovative in developing more effective and efficient educational practices?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

47. How satisfying is your work at your school?

Not satisfying	1	2
Somewhat satisfying	3	4
Quite satisfying	5	6
Very satisfying	7	8

48. What is the direction of the flow of information about academic and non-academic school matters?

From the bottom down	1	2
Mostly down	3	4
Down and up	5	6
Down, up, and laterally	7	8

49. How do you view communcations from the principal?

Viewed with great suspicion	1	2
Some viewed with suspicion, some with trust	3	4
Usually viewed with trust	5	6
Almost always viewed with trust	7	8

50. How accurate is upward communication to the principal?

Usually inaccurate	1	2
Often inaccurate	3	4
Fairly accurate	5	6
Almost always accurate	7	8

51. How well does the principal know the problems faced by the teachers?

Not well	1	2
Somewhat well	3	4
Quite well	5	6
Very well	7	8

52.	To what extent is communication open and candid between principal and teachers?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8
53.	To what extent is communication open and candid among teachers?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8
54.	In your school, how are conflicts between departments usually resolved?	Usually ignored	1 2
		Appealed but not resolved	3 4
		Resolved by principal	5 6
		Resolved by all those affected	7 8
55.	How much do teachers in your school encourage each other to do their best?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Quite a bit	5 6
		A very great deal	7 8
56.	In your school, is it "every man for himself" or do principals, teachers, and students work as a team?	Every man for himself	1 2
		Little cooperative teamwork	3 4
		A moderate amount of cooperative teamwork	5 6
		A very great amount of cooperative teamwork	7 8
57.	How much do different departments plan together and coordinate their efforts?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Quite a bit	5 6
		A very great deal	7 8

58.	Are decisions made at the best levels for effective performance?	At much too high levels	1 2
		At somewhat too high levels	3 4
		At quite satis-factory levels	5 6
		At the best levels	7 8
59.	How adequate are the supplies and equip-ment the school has?	Inadequate	1 2
		Somewhat inadequate	3 4
		Quite adequate	5 6
		Very adequate	7 8
60.	To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8
61.	How much does the principal try to help you with your problems?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Quite a bit	5 6
		A very great deal	7 8
62.	How much help do you get from the central staff of your school system?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Quite a bit	5 6
		A very great deal	7 8
63.	To what extent are decision makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8
64.	What is the administrative style of the principal?	Highly authori-tarian	1 2
		Somewhat authori-tarian	3 4
		Consultative	5 6
		Participative group	7 8

65. What is the administrative style of the superintendent of schools?

Highly authoritarian	1	2
Somewhat authoritarian	3	4
Consultative	5	6
Participative group	7	8

66. How competent is the principal as an administrator?

Not competent	1	2
Somewhat competent	3	4
Quite competent	5	6
Very competent	7	8

67. How competent is the principal as an educator?

Not competent	1	2
Somewhat competent	3	4
Very competent	5	6
Not competent	7	8

68. How high are the principal's goals for educational performance?

Low	1	2
About average	3	4
Quite high	5	6
Very high	7	8

69. To what extent does the principal feel responsible for seeing that educational excellence is achieved in your school?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

70. To what extent do department heads feel responsible for seeing that educational excellence is achieved in your school?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

71. To what extent do teachers feel responsible for seeing that educational excellence is achieved in your school?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

72.	To what extent do students accept high performance goals in your school?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Considerable	5 6
		Very great	7 8
73.	How often is the head of your department friendly and supportive?	Rarely	1 2
		Sometimes	3 4
		Often	5 6
		Very often	7 8
74.	How much confidence and trust do you have in your department head?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Quite a bit	5 6
		A very great deal	7 8
75.	How much confidence and trust does your department head have in you?	Very little	1 2
		Some	3 4
		Quite a bit	5 6
		A very great deal	7 8
76.	How free do you feel to talk to your department head about matters related to your work?	Not free	1 2
		Somewhat free	3 4
		Quite free	5 6
		Very free	7 8
77.	How often does your department head seek and use your ideas about academic matters?	Rarely	1 2
		Sometimes	3 4
		Often	5 6
		Very often	7 8
78.	How competent is your department head as an educator?	Not competent	1 2
		Somewhat competent	3 4
		Quite competent	5 6
		Very competent	7 8
79.	How often does your department head seek and use your ideas about non-academic school matters?	Rarely	1 2
		Sometimes	3 4
		Often	5 6
		Very often	7 8

80. How much influence do department heads have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Quite a bit	5	6
A very great deal	7	8

81. How much influence do you think department heads should have on what goes on in your school?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Quite a bit	5	6
A very great deal	7	8

82. How much do you feel that your department head is interested in your success as a teacher?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Quite a bit	5	6
A very great deal	7	8

83. How often does your department head use departmental meetings to solve work problems?

Rarely	1	2
Sometimes	3	4
Often	5	6
Very often	7	8

84. To what extent does your department head make sure that planning and setting priorities are done well?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

85. To what extent does your department head give you useful information and ideas?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

86. How do you view communications from your department head?

Viewed with great suspicion	1	2
Some viewed with suspicion, some with trust	3	4
Usually viewed with trust	5	6
Almost always viewed with trust	7	8

87. How well does your department head know the problems you face?

Not well	1	2
Somewhat well	3	4
Quite well	5	6
Very well	7	8

88. How much interaction is there between the department head and teachers in your department?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Quite a bit	5	6
A very great deal	7	8

89. To what extent is communication open and candid between the department head and teachers in the department?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

90. To what extent does your department head involve you in major decisions related to your work?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Considerable	5	6
Very great	7	8

91. How much does your department head try to help you with your problems?

Very little	1	2
Some	3	4
Quite a bit	5	6
A very great deal	7	8

92. How high are the goals of your department head for educational performance?

Low	1	2
About average	3	4
Quite high	5	6
Very high	7	8

93. How competent is your department head as an administrator?

Not competent	1	2
Somewhat competent	3	4
Quite competent	5	6
Very competent	7	8

The following questions are for grouping your responses with the responses of other persons of similar background and experience. Your answers will not be used to identify you individually.

94. Sex

Male	1
Female	2

95. Race	Black	1
	White	2
	Other	3
96. Age	25 years or under	1
	26-35 years	2
	36-45 years	3
	46-55 years	4
	56 years or over	5
97. When did you first come to this school?	Less than 1 year	1
	Between 1 and 5 years ago	2
	Between 5 and 10 years ago	3
	Between 10 and 15 years ago	4
	More than 15 years ago	5

VITA $\mathcal{V}$

Deborah Annette Gunter-Elliott

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY BLACK AND WHITE PRINCIPALS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Muskogee, Oklahoma, August 27, 1948, the daughter of Mr. Ned Elliott and Mrs. Rosa Willis.

Education: Graduated from Manual Training High School, Muskogee, Oklahoma, in 1966; received the Bachelor of Science in Education degree from the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, in 1970; received the Master of Education degree in Student Personnel and Guidance from Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, in 1974; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Junior High School Home Economics teacher, Wichita, Kansas, public schools, 1970-1974; High School Dean of Students, Tulsa, Oklahoma, public schools, 1975-1979; High School Academic Counselor, Tulsa, Oklahoma, public schools, 1979-1982.