

379
N811
10.1489

EVOLUTION OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF A NEWLY
ASSIGNED PRINCIPAL AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL
CLIMATE OF THE SCHOOL

DISSERTATION

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

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Robin W. Echols, B. S., M. A. T.

Denton, Texas

December, 1979

9814

Echols, Robin W., Evolution of the Leadership Behavior of a Newly Assigned Principal and the Organizational Climate of the School. Doctor of Philosophy (Administrative Leadership), December, 1979, 112 pp., 23 tables, bibliography, 97 titles.

The purposes of this study were to investigate the evolution of the school climate during the first year of a new principal's assignment to the school as perceived by the principal and the teachers; and to investigate the relationship between the school climate and the leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by the principal and the teachers. In addition, an investigation was made of the relationship between the teachers' perception of the principal's leadership behavior and the self-evaluated leadership behavior of the principal.

The data were obtained from twelve principals and 335 teachers in twelve elementary schools in four suburban, independent school districts. The subjects responded to the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Supervisor Behavior Description in September, January, and again in April-May.

The results from the three administrations of both instruments were analyzed by several techniques. A 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance for repeated measures

determined significant interaction between variables of the study, a correlation analysis determined significant relationships between the OCDQ and the SBD, and a z score was calculated to determine the significance of any increase in correlations. A one-way analysis of variance across difference scores was calculated for each subtest of the OCDQ and the SBD. When a significant F was found Newman-Keuls' and Tukey's products were calculated to determine where the difference lay. The .05 level was considered significant for all statistical tests.

A structured interview was conducted with each principal at the conclusion of the final round of data collection. The questions were designed to provide information related to changes in such areas as organization, schedules, assignments and policy that might have had an impact on climate.

Hypothesis 1 through 5 were rejected. There was no significant interaction between level of openness and repeated measures nor between level of consideration and repeated measures. There was no significant increase in correlation between openness and consideration nor was there a decrease in the difference between teachers' and principals' perceptions of climate or consideration. Hypothesis 6 was retained in the null form. There was no significant change in the difference between teachers' and principals' perceptions of structure.

The findings of this investigation support the following conclusions.

1. The theory of an internal generative effect remains inconclusive. The open climates did not become more open nor did the closed climates become increasingly more closed.

2. Schools with newly assigned principals can be differentiated on the basis of climate and leadership of the principal. This differentiation can be made anytime during the academic year.

3. A relationship exists between the leadership behavior of the newly assigned principal and the school climate which is established very early in the academic year and changes very little throughout the year.

4. It cannot be assumed that perceptions of teachers and newly assigned principals regarding climate and leadership become more similar over time.

5. Any change in school climate during the first year of a principal's incumbency must come from sources other than an evolutionary one: possibly as a consequence of the impact of first impressions, or as a result of a planned change process or some other procedure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Hypotheses	
Background and Significance of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
Basic Assumptions	
Procedures for Collection of Data	
Procedures for Analysis of Data	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	18
Organizational Climate	
Leadership of the School Principal	
Factors Related to Evolving Climate	
III. PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING AND TREATING DATA	46
Design of the Study	
Selection of Subjects	
Description of Instruments	
Procedures Used in Collection of Data	
Procedures for Analysis of Data	
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	60
Data Relative to Hypothesis 1	
Data Relative to Hypothesis 2	
Data Relative to Hypothesis 3	
Data Relative to Hypothesis 4	
Data Relative to Hypothesis 5	
Data Relative to Hypothesis 6	
Discussion of Principal Interviews	

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	84
Summary	
Findings	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
APPENDIX	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Means of Openness Scores as Perceived by Principals	62
II. Analysis of Variance of Openness Scores as Perceived by Principals	63
III. Means of Openness Scores as Perceived by Teachers	64
IV. Analysis of Variance of Openness Scores as Perceived by Teachers	64
V. Multiple Comparison of Openness Levels . . .	65
VI. Means of Openness Scores by Levels of Consideration as Perceived by Principals	66
VII. Mean Consideration Scores by Levels from Initial Measure as Perceived by Teachers	67
VIII. Analysis of Variance of Openness Scores by Levels of Consideration as Perceived by Principals	68
IX. Means of Openness Scores by Levels of Consideration as Perceived by Teachers	69
X. Analysis of Variance of Openness Scores by Levels of Consideration as Perceived by Teachers	70
XI. Multiple Comparison of Consideration Level	71
XII. Product-Moment Correlations between Openness and Consideration of Principals	72

Table	Page
XIII. Increase in Product-Moment Correlations of Principals	72
XIV. Product-Moment Correlations between Openness and Consideration of Teachers . .	73
XV. Increase in Product-Moment Correlations of Teachers	74
XVI. Mean Difference in Scores for <u>OCDQ</u>	75
XVII. Analysis of Variance of Difference Scores	76
XVIII. Mean Difference in Consideration Scores from Repeated Measures	77
XIX. Analysis of Variance of Differences between Consideration Scores	77
XX. Mean Difference in Structure Scores from Repeated Measures	78
XXI. Analysis of Variance of Differences between Structure Scores	79
XXII. Summary of Changes	80
XXIII. Summary of Communication Modes	81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of attention has been focused on the relationship between the leadership behavior of the principal and the influence, if any, on school climate. Relatively little of this attention, however, has been focused on the effect of a principal who has been newly assigned as chief building-level administrator. A limited number of investigators (12, 24) have noted trends related to years of experience of the principal and the effect on climate. Another (21) has investigated the changes that occur in the priorities of newly assigned principals. Others (2, 3, 5) have deliberately excluded the principals with less than one year of experience.

In spite of the fact (20) that there has been much research related to school climate and leadership behavior, Monahan (23) stated as recently as 1975 that the importance of the style of the administrator had not been given enough attention. Others have also suggested the need for further empirical research (2, 20, 30, 33). Specifically, Halpin and Croft (13) suggested the need for a study to determine the changes in school climate over time. Even after

longitudinal and cross-sectional studies this suggestion has been reiterated (2, 30, 33).

The present study monitored the evolution of the principal's leadership behavior and the organizational climate during the first year of a principal's assignment in a building. The specific attention to the first year of assignment by this in depth, year-long study was designed to provide additional information for educational administrators to use in management decisions related to personnel placement and control of the change process.

Statement of the Problem

This study analyzed the relationship between the principal's leadership behavior during the first year of assignment to a building and the climate of the elementary school as perceived by both the principal and the teachers.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were to investigate the evolution of the school climate during the first year of a new principal's assignment as perceived by the principal and teachers; and to investigate the relationship between the school climate and the leadership behavior of the newly assigned principal as perceived by the principal and teachers. In addition, an investigation was made of the relationship between the teachers' perception of the

principal's leadership behavior and the self-evaluated leadership behavior of the principal.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of the study, the following hypotheses were tested.

1. There will be a significant interaction between the level of openness scores on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and the initial, middle and final measures of organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ:

- a. For the principals
- b. For the teachers

2. There will be a significant interaction between the level of consideration scores on the Supervisor Behavior Description (SBD) and the initial, middle and final measure of openness as measured by the OCDQ:

- a. For the principals
- b. For the teachers

3. There will be an increase in the correlation between the openness score of school climate and the consideration score across the repeated measures as measured by the OCDQ and the SBD:

- a. For the principals
- b. For the teachers

4. There will be a significant decrease in the difference between the principals' scores and the teachers' scores across the three administrations of the OCDQ.

5. There will be a significant decrease in the difference between the consideration scores of the SBD as perceived by the principal and the consideration scores as perceived by the teachers across the three administrations.

6. There will be no significant change in the difference between the structure scores of the SBD as perceived by the principal and the structure scores as perceived by the teachers across the three administrations.

Background and Significance of the Study

Research and opinion have supported both the concept of the school as an influencing factor on principal behavior (2, 20, 21, 23, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36) and conversely, the principal as the influencing factor on the school climate (9, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24).

The generalization that the school is the dominant factor is found in Bridges' (2) studies of midwestern city schools. He suggested that, although initially, the style of the principal may influence leadership behavior, as the amount of experience increased the bureaucratic role was the major factor that molded behavior. Anderson and Brown (20) found that the leader behavior of principals is relatively unimportant. Haskey (22) reported that the

individual school determines the essence of the principalship. Wiggins (33, 34, 35, 36) found no significant correlation between principal behavior and organizational climate and that there was a compelling organizational climate stability even when the principal was replaced. Walden (30) found when he re-tested Halpin and Croft's original sample of schools that the schools had tended to become more closed regardless of the principal's leadership behavior.

In contrast to the premise that the school is the dominant factor in shaping principal behavior are findings supporting the principal as a major influencing factor on schools. These findings include Fox and others (9) who reported that a positive school climate is both a means and an end and the principal could bring about that desired state. Gross and Herriott (12) found positive correlations between the principal's leadership behavior and both staff performance and morale. Halpin and Croft (13, 15) reported that a principal's leadership style is reflected by the school climate. Lipham (20) reported that principals with high consideration scores had schools with no formal grievances. Owens' (24) National Principalship Study indicates that the principal's behavior does affect what occurs in the school. In addition, Hencley (17) stated that the principal influences climate more than anyone else. However,

no study dealt with the question of the first year of a principalship.

The evidence for suggesting that the school does the influencing was gathered over a period of time when desegregation was in the process of implementation in the schools under investigation (30), in post-hoc studies (2), or using questionable instruments (34). The theoretical assumption for the study was that if the principal's leadership behavior was going to have an effect on school climate, that influence should increase over time.

Climate has been a term used synonymously with atmosphere, milieu, morale, culture, and environment. Likert (27) refers to the condition or health of the organization's human fabric. Stern (24) applied Murray's concept of "environmental press" to school climate. Argyris (18) referred to the homeostatic state of structure, people, and job satisfaction. However, Halpin and Croft (13) put it most succinctly when they called school organizational climate the counterpart of individual personality. Maintaining an open climate in which subordinates feel free to state their opinion regarding a course of action is an important ability of an organizational leader. This open atmosphere is one of the most important conditions to establish in an organization (4).

A closed atmosphere and an attitude on the part of administrators of not involving teachers in decisions which

affect them have, along with other contributing factors, been responsible for increased teacher militancy across Texas and the nation (1, 20, 30). As changes occur such as intensified labor union efforts to organize teachers it becomes prudent for administrators to develop wholesome human relations in order to build better schools, to avoid detrimental actions and to reduce adversary relationships (26). There are implications that positive climate perceptions can minimize intergroup conflict (11). If educators are to improve the climate of a school they must first discover what factors affect that climate and under what circumstances (9).

According to Mascaro (21), first-year principals think that they will be able to effect change. However, Wiggins (34) found that the replacement of principals had little effect on climate. Those authors (2, 30, 36) that accept the premise that the school is the dominant factor indicate that any influence that the principal might exert will be most evident early in the incumbency. Research fails to focus explicitly on the developing, early influence that a principal might have on the climate. Bridges (2) has emphasized that whatever the consequence of experience on climate it must be tested through adequate empirical research.

The present study is significant in that it

1. Investigated the evolution of a newly assigned principal's leadership behavior and his influence on the

organizational climate of a school as it develops during the first year.

2. Analyzed the pattern of the newly assigned principal's influence as it emerged in the organizational climate of a school.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this proposed study the following terms were defined:

1. Organizational climate--the atmosphere created by the interaction of the characteristics of the teachers and the behavior of the principal, perceived by the employees, and assumed to influence their behavior (11, 13).

2. Newly assigned principal--any public school principal, regardless of prior experience and restricted for this study to the elementary level, who began as principal in an assigned building in the 1978-1979 school year.

3. Teachers--professional employees assigned to provide instructional or remedial services to students, excluding support staff such as counselors and diagnosticians, unless they are assigned to the building on a full-time basis.

Limitations

The limitations of this study included the following:

1. The scope of this investigation was limited to selected suburban districts [between 8,000 and 38,000

student enrollment] which had newly assigned elementary principals at the beginning of the 1978-1979 school year.

2. Since the nature of the instruments necessitated that the participants be acquainted with each other, data collection could not begin on the first day of school. In view of this, it is recognized that there may have been some perceptual changes made prior to the initial administration of the instruments at the end of September.

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions of this study were that

1. The population of elementary schools and newly assigned principals to be studied was representative of similar schools;

2. The responses received honestly reflected the perceptions of the subjects.

Procedures for Collection of Data

Suburban school districts were contacted to determine which ones met the criteria. In the districts willing to participate, the elementary schools with newly assigned principals were targeted for study. Subjects in the targeted schools completed the OCDQ and the SBD three times during the school year: once in early fall, again in mid-winter and finally in mid-spring. The instruments were administered to the subjects by the researcher or a representative of the researcher. The identities of the targeted buildings

and professional staff remained confidential in the study and were identified only by an assigned number.

Instruments

Two instruments were used to collect the data for this study.

1. Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ).--The OCDQ was developed by Andrew Halpin and Donald Croft at Ohio State University. The instrument consists of sixty-four items which are rated on a four-point scale indicating how frequently the described behavior occurs. The items are grouped into eight subsections which yield an organizational climate profile and an openness measure. The development of this assessment tool and the detailed factor analysis procedures are reported by Halpin (13).

Owens and Steinhoff (25) report acceptable reliability and validity testing of the OCDQ. Hayes (16) reported a reliability of .90 after extensive investigation of the instrument. Various other studies (14, 30, 31) involving as many as 165 schools have verified the appropriateness of this instrument for assessing school climate.

2. Supervisory Behavior Description (SBD).--This instrument developed at Ohio State University and based on efforts of Hemphill, Stogdill, Coons, Halpin and Fleishman, provides two scores: "consideration" and "structure," which

are related to the principal's emphasis on human relations and production. Research (7) has shown these to be independent dimensions. Internal consistency and test-retest reliabilities have yielded coefficients as high as .98 and .81 for consideration and structure, respectively (7). The SBD is a forty-eight-item instrument to which an individual responds in terms of how frequently his supervisor engages in the behavior described or which is completed by the supervisor as a self-description. Construct and empirical validity studies (6, 8, 28) have shown SBD to be an appropriate tool to measure these characteristics of leadership behavior.

According to Gibb (10) in Buros' Seventh Mental Measurements Year Book, there is support for Fleishman's claim that low consideration scores are often associated with an undesirable situation and that consideration is the more critical of the two dimensions. The SBD has most of the same items as the older Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire used by Halpin in a study of school administrators, and was selected because the shortened version was judged to be a priority in this study.

The Population

The North Central Texas area includes a number of suburban schools in a metropolitan area. With the population growth of this area, it was anticipated that there

would be a number of principals newly assigned to existing elementary buildings in the fall of 1978. Twelve elementary schools were selected during the late summer of 1978 for participation in the study.

Research Design

This study was an ex post facto, one-group, multiple-measurement design. Random assignment and experimental manipulation were not possible due to the nature of the study.

The study was designed to determine the evolution during the academic year of the school climate and the leadership behavior of the principal and to analyze the relationship between these two factors. The interpretation that was made of the results did not attempt to assign causality to school climate or to leader behavior.

At the conclusion of the data collection an interview was conducted with each principal. (See Appendix.) The information from these interviews was collected for the purpose of documenting any changes in areas such as scheduling, assignments or policy that occurred during the year, which might have affected the climate or leadership behavior of the principal.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

At the conclusion of each of the three testing cycles the data were punched into cards for automatic data

processing by the computer center at North Texas State University. Scoring for the OCDQ was completed by Don B. Croft at New Mexico State University and returned for analysis. A program for scoring the SBD was developed at North Texas State University.

Testing of Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b were tested using a 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance for repeated measures. Tests for main effects and simple effects for columns and rows were computed.

Hypothesis 3a and 3b were tested by computing a correlation coefficient for OCDQ and SBD for the initial, middle, and final measures and testing the significance of the differences among the correlation coefficients for the teacher and principal groups.

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 were tested using a one-way analysis of variance across difference scores.

The .05 level was considered significant for all statistical treatments used in this study.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Borland, David T., "Leadership Dilemma: Collective Bargaining or Positive Personnel Administration," Texas School Board Journal, 21 (December, 1975), 17-19.
2. Bridges, Edwin M., "Bureaucratic Role and Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Elementary Principal," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1 (Spring, 1965), 19-28.
3. Bukhair, Carolyn G., "A Comparative Study of School Climate and Leadership Behavior of Elementary and Secondary Principals," unpublished dissertation, Department of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1978.
4. Carlisle, Howard M., Management: Concepts and Situations, Chicago, Science Research Associates, Inc., 1976.
5. DeHart, James B., A Study of Executive Professional Leadership of Principals Within the Elementary Schools of Texas," unpublished dissertation, Department of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1976.
6. Fleishman, Edwin A., "Leadership Climate, Human Relations Training, and Supervisory Behavior," Personnel Psychology, 6 (Summer, 1953), 205-222.
7. _____, Manual for the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Washington, D. C., American Institutes for Research, 1972.
8. Fleishman, Edwin A. and E. F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology, 15 (Spring, 1962), 43-56.
9. Fox, Robert S., School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator, Englewood, Colorado, CFK, Occasional Paper, 1973.

10. Gibb, Cecil A., review in Oscar K. Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Handbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon, 1972, pp. 1149-1150.
11. Gibson, James L., John M. Ivancevich and James H. Donnelly, Jr., Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes, Dallas, Texas, Business Publications, Inc., 1976.
12. Gross, Neal and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
13. Halpin, Andrew W., Theory and Research in Administration, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1966.
14. _____, "Change and Organizational Climate," The Journal of Educational Administration, 5 (May, 1967), 5-25.
15. Halpin, Andrew W., and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," Administrators Notebook, 11 (March, 1963).
16. Hayes, Andrew E., "A Reappraisal of the Halpin-Croft Model of the Climate of Schools," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February, 1973.
17. Hencley, Stephen P., Lloyd E. McCleary and J. H. McGrath, The Elementary School Principal, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1970.
18. Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
19. Jones, Warren T. and Bobbie J. Jones, "The Use of a Discrete Digital Simulation for Assessing Administrative Performance," Behavioral Science, 23 (January, 1978), 45-48.
20. Lipham, James M. and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
21. Mascaro, Francis G., "Early On-the-Job Socialization of First Year Elementary School Principals," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April, 1976.

22. McIntyre, Kenneth E., editor, The Principalship in the 1970's, Austin, Texas, The Bureau of Laboratory Schools, The University of Texas at Austin, 1971.
23. Monahan, William G., Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration, New York, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.
24. Owens, Robert G., Organizational Behavior in Schools, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
25. Owens, Robert G. and Carl R. Steinhoff, "Techniques for Assessing Organizational Environments and Their Implications for Intervention Style," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1974.
26. Rhodes, Eric F. and Richard G. Neal, The Control of Teacher Militancy, Educational Service Bureau, Inc., Washington, D. C., 1968.
27. Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and David L. Elliott, Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
28. Skinner, E., "The Relationship Between Leadership Behavior Patterns and Organizational-Situational Variables," Personnel Psychology, 22 (Winter, 1969), 489-494.
29. Steinhoff, Carl R., Organizational Climate in a Public School System, USOE Cooperative Research Program Contract No. OE-4-225, Project No. S-083, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 1965.
30. Walden, John C., Thomas N. Taylor and J. Foster Watkins, "Organizational Climate Changes Over Time," The Educational Forum, 40 (November, 1975), 87-93.
31. Watkins, Foster J., "The OCDQ--An Application and Some Implications," Educational Administration Quarterly, 4 (Spring, 1968), 46-60.
32. Watson, Betty J., "A Study of the Relationships Among Selected Aspects of Administrative Behavior and Teacher Group Cohesiveness in the Elementary School," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, 1964 [Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1965].

33. Wiggins, Thomas W., "A Comparative Investigation of Principal Behavior and School Climate," The Journal of Educational Research, 66 (November, 1972), 103-105.
34. _____, "Leader Behavior Characteristics and Organizational Climate," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, February, 1969.
35. _____, "Principal Behavior on the School Climate: A Systems Analysis," Educational Technology, (September, 1971), 57-59.
36. _____, "The Influence of Role and Organizational Climate Upon Principal Behavior: A Systems Analysis," Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration, edited by William G. Monahan, New York, Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1975, pp. 348-360.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purposes of this study were to investigate the evolution of the school climate during the first year of a principal's new assignment, and to investigate the relationship between the school climate and the leadership behavior of the newly assigned principal. A review of the literature applicable to this study is arranged into the following sub-topics: Organizational Climate, Leadership of the School Principal, and Factors Related to an Evolving Climate.

Organizational Climate

Climate, as a term, has been used to describe the concept of atmosphere or setting or environment, since Lewin, Lippitt, and White (38) investigated the effect of "social climates" on children's behavior. Argyris (4) used climate to describe the interaction of organizational structure and individual personality. Tagiuri (58) referred to climate as the total environment that is experienced by individuals and which influences their behavior. Halpin and Croft (30) theorized that environmental climate was analogous to individual personality.

Objective, systematic measurements of climate are abundant (50). Included among the instruments to assess

organizational environment are Organizational Climate Index, by Stern and Steinhoff (57); Survey of Organizations, by Taylor (59); Organizational Climate Measure, by Litwin and Stringer (42); Profile of the School, by Likert and Likert, adopted from Likert's four system model (39); Organizational Grid, by Blake and Mouton (6); and Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, by Halpin and Croft (30).

According to Doak, "Organizational climate always exists. It is not either absent or present. It is good or bad, open or closed . . . Regardless of its state, it exists" (19, p. 368). The task, he says, is to define it, then to objectively examine it.

At the conclusion of their original study, Halpin and Croft (30) hypothesized that a longitudinal study would show an open climate becoming more open and a closed climate becoming increasingly more closed. Walden, Taylor and Watkins (60) implemented a combination of cross-sectional and longitudinal study of fifty-five elementary schools to investigate the effect of time on climate. The procedure included reassessing the schools that were in Halpin and Croft's original study. Between the 1966 study and the 1971 Walden Study, the schools which had previously been racially segregated [seventeen black and forty-eight white] were desegregated. Results of McNemar's test for the significance of changes, did not support the hypothesis of an internal generative effect, as Halpin and Croft

originally hypothesized. Walden suggests that one reason for this may be the lack of stability in the environment. The lack of stability resulted from desegregation and the general turmoil of the 1960s and early 1970s. Walden also suggested that the lack of congruence in principal-teacher perceptions could be a result of a massive teacher walkout during that period of time.

Another replication of Halpin and Croft's original work was by Brown (13), who studied eighty-one schools in the St. Paul-Minneapolis area. His results supported the thesis that it is possible to order climates along a continuum for comparisons from open to closed.

Andrews (3) studied 165 elementary and high schools in Alberta, Canada, and found a valid measure of climate to be the OCDQ. He reported that it measures important aspects of principal and staff interaction in elementary and other kinds of schools.

In a study of forty-five large [over thirty-five teachers each] secondary schools in New Jersey, Hoy (34) found that the original way of scoring the OCDQ resulted in all of the schools in the study being rated as more closed than those in the general population. However, the openness score provided an index for the relative degree of openness or closedness among the schools.

One of the conclusions that has surfaced from the data generated by the OCDQ is that urban-core schools are more

frequently "closed" than those in the general population. Nicholas, Virjo, and Wattenburg (49) found in a study of thirteen Detroit elementary schools that none of them could be classified as open. This study also gave support to the idea that larger schools have more closed climates than smaller schools in similar socio-economic areas.

In contrast to Nicholas' study, Hencley reported that "Elementary schools tend to function in a more informal fashion than do junior and senior high schools" (32, p. 148). He found that the principals tended to "operate in face-to-face relationships with pupils and staff " (32, p. 148), and that much of the communication is verbal. This face-to-face communication is compatible with the findings in more open climates (30).

In a study designed to investigate the relationship between informal group perceptions of climate and the group perceptions as a whole, Heller (31) collected data from ten elementary school staffs. Analysis of the data showed that few variations existed between climate perceptions of informal groups within the school and the whole staffs. An F test for degree of variance indicated homogeneity of variance of climate at the elementary level.

An alternate approach to the study of school characteristics was implemented by Bishop and Julius (5). They elected to view schools from a structural dimension rather than a process approach, through the use of the Structural

Properties Questionnaire (SPQ). Their concepts of "highly bureaucratic," "highly formalized," and "centralized schools" can be related to the concept of closedness as measured by the OCDQ. Their findings suggested that in the less structured school settings teachers tended to adopt a style of behavior concerned more with the individual student.

An investigation by Wiggins (64) of thirty-five randomly selected schools in an urban district of Southern California attempted to study organizational climate and leader behavior characteristics. Utilizing the OCDQ and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B), developed by W. C. Schuts, it was found that generally, organizational climate and principal behavior were not significantly related. The only significant relationship was between "interpersonal orientation" and the OCDQ. Evidence emerged from the study that teachers and principals perceived climate differently.

Studies have been conducted that correlate personality and personal value-patterns with the OCDQ. Both Anderson (2) and Plaxton (52) have found these variables to correlate with the OCDQ at a statistically significant level. This supports other studies reporting a relationship between principal's behavior and school climate.

Newell (48) concluded that an open climate is one in which members have high esprit, work is done effectively,

the organization is moving rather than stagnant, and the administrator provides clear leadership. A closed climate, on the other hand, is one in which members find very little satisfaction in task achievement or social relationships. In a closed climate the principal's leadership is ineffective. Other differences between open and closed climates can be explained by the concept of authenticity. Authenticity is reflected when people "do things in their own way within the requirements of their professional role" (48, p. 19). The subtests of Thrust and Esprit of the OCDQ are indexes of authenticity. Regarding openness and closedness, Newell reported that while many schools have open climates, there are thousands with unwholesome, closed climates which need desperately to be improved.

Leadership of the School Principal

Much of the recent research on leadership has centered around the two dimensions of organizational task and human considerations. Lipham and Hoeh (41) summarized that other bipolar conceptualizations of the relationships between organizations and individuals are included in the work of McGregor (44), Argyris (4), and Blake and Mouton (6). Lipham and Hoeh also pointed out that although the concepts of these different researchers are not precisely equivalent, they are phenotypically similar. The significant conclusion seems to be, as Newell pointed out, that organizational task

and human consideration are not "opposite ends of a continuum" (48, p. 231) but two different dimensions. These dimensions involve characteristics that are not mutually exclusive but are found in various quantities.

There have been two significant research efforts which have focused on the leadership role of the principal and have had as by-products the development of instruments for measuring principal behavior. The basic similarities between Gross and Herriott's research (26) using the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) questionnaire, and Halpin and Croft's work using the OCDQ intrigued Watkins (61). To investigate this he blended similar parts of both instruments and administered the revised instrument to seven public schools in Northern Alabama. The results indicated a positive relationship between OCDQ Thrust and EPL of $r = 0.88$ at the .01 level. Other statistical analysis supported the position that the alternating of items and a revision of the response scale did not damage the measurement procedures employed in the OCDQ. This indicates the strength of the OCDQ as a measure of climate.

Ray Cross concluded from the vast amount of research in educational administration in the past twenty years that "there is a widely held assumption that what administrators do has important consequences for schools" (18, p. 1). Although others (64) disagree, Litwin and Stringer reaffirm that premise by reporting that "the manager's leadership

style is a critical determinant of organizational climate" (42, p. 168).

In an investigation of fourteen metropolitan schools in Australia with 441 teacher responses, Grassie and Carss (25) administered the OCDQ along with four other instruments in an attempt to study leadership quality. Teachers with a "professional outlook" were reported to have expressed satisfaction with their work and colleagues where the setting was characterized by considerate and thrustful leadership. Satisfaction was enhanced by the opportunity to participate in decisions about policy and programs, and by the absence of a rigid hierarchy of authority. Another group of teachers in the study considered teaching as a mechanical skill best learned from experience rather than formal training. This latter group of teachers did not find satisfaction from participating in decision making.

Rasmussen (53) collected data from 996 elementary schools in California and used it to locate unusually successful and unsuccessful schools. It was found that 86 percent of between-school variance was due to students' socio-economic characteristics. Twenty-five schools were eventually selected in which the principal's leadership behavior was examined through questionnaire and interview data with teachers. No statistically significant relationship was found between principals' leadership behavior and elementary students' performance. But, magnitude and

direction of correlations between principal leadership behavior, teacher peer relations, and student achievement indicated a trend in that direction.

Using the LBDQ Form XII by Stogdill, Brown (11) studied 1,551 teachers in 170 schools in Alberta, Canada, in 1966. He reported that good leadership is "a necessary but not a sufficient condition" (11, p. 70) for high pupil performance. Such leadership is an organizational, not an educational, attribute. Good leadership facilitates the process of the organization, not its product. Brown concluded that good organizational dynamics facilitate successful implementation of institutional policies, whether they are good or bad. If the new method is good, then leadership correlates with high marks by the students; if the policy or methods are bad, then the leadership will correlate with low school marks. He warned that research that seeks to compare leadership styles against the criteria of educational outputs such as school marks and standardized test results becomes trapped in what may be termed "the cognitive fallacy" (11, p. 70).

Miller (45) reported that although good leadership could enhance the implementation of bad programs as well as good ones, in an open climate a poor decision would be recognized and reversed more swiftly than in a closed climate. He further concluded that evidence strongly

supports the concept that effective principal's behavior can lead to increased student productivity.

In the struggle to improve educational experiences for students, the key according to Leeper (37) is leadership. Many view this leadership to be a function rather than a status. For example, Fox (21) identified the school administrator as first of all a climate leader whose key function is the improvement of the school's climate. Improvement implies change, and Lipham's (40) view of the function of the leader is one of change agent. Bowers and Seashore (7) proposed that leader behavior also include support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis and work facilitation. These views of a leader's functions or behaviors have a different focus than one discussed by Carlisle (14). He described a traditional view of a leader from the perspective of leadership based on the use of legitimate authority derived from a position, not from an individual.

A study by Acton (1) of 35 elementary principals in Northwest Florida consisted of OCDQ responses from 689 teachers and on-site interviews with 16 of the principals in the participating schools. The school climate was more often classified as open in those schools where the principal's behavior was higher in consideration.

Responses from 160 principals and 966 teachers in 39 school districts in a Midwestern state were studied by Miskel (46) in order to evaluate the perceived performance

of the principals. Findings supported the theoretical generalization that if the interpersonal climate is positive, the teachers perceive the principal as being highly effective.

Mangee (43) attempted to assess the relationship between effective principal characteristics and the leadership of the principal and the climate of the school. Faculties in twenty elementary schools in the Metropolitan Detroit area responded to a questionnaire to measure organizational climate, leadership and helping behavior of the principals. The results indicated a high correlation between schools with healthy climates and principals who exhibited effective helping behavior.

The OCDQ was administered by French (22) to teachers and principals in twenty-five Indiana schools to determine the relative openness and closedness of the climates. A Q-Sort of Administrative Skills developed by Solbach and Nicholson in 1970 was used to measure principals' emphasis in technical, human and conceptual areas. In this study, French found that principals generally perceived the schools climate to be more open than the teachers do, but not significantly so. A significant relationship was found, however, between more open climates and principals who place high emphasis on humanism.

Related to the findings of perceptual differences, there is evidence (24) that expectations of how a principal

will behave differ, depending on whether the behavior is viewed by a superior or a subordinate. Subordinates generally expect greater emphasis to be placed on consideration types of behaviors.

In a study of principals and teachers in Grand Forks public schools, the OCDQ and LBDQ were used to measure climate and leadership respectively. Brickner (9) found no significant differences between principals' and faculties' perception of leaderships on the LBDQ. On the OCDQ the principals perceived higher Esprit and Consideration and lower Disengagement and Hindrance than did faculties. He concluded that leadership behavior was significantly related to climate but not to faculty size.

In an investigation of the perceptions of a principal's leadership orientation and the organizational climate of the school, Hall (28) collected data from twenty schools using the OCDQ and the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (LOQ). The findings revealed that principals tended to perceive their leadership orientations to be lower than that perceived by teachers. He also found that principals tended to perceive the school climate to be more open than the teachers' perception of the climate. In Hall's investigation, the percentage of open climates was greater than in any other recent study using the OCDQ, and the findings indicated that the organizational climate of the school is significantly related to the leadership orientation of the school

principal. Hall concluded that this has implications for anyone attempting to move a climate toward openness. He suggested selecting or modifying leadership behavior to approach a high level in both nomothetic and idiographic orientation. As Getzels and Guba (23) pointed out, the process of administration is a series of hierarchical relationships within a social community or system. The social system consists of institutions' role expectations (the nomothetic dimension) and the individual's personality needs (the idiographic dimension).

Although Hall (28) suggested that leadership behavior emphasized both institutional and individual needs, Fox (21) supported the premise that if the individual needs are met in a supportive, humane climate, the school's needs will be met as a consequence. There exists a battle, according to Kriss (36), between the old and new ethic. The old ethic supports the concept that progress and growth of the institution are important. The new ethic fosters an interest in personal relations, quality of life, and fulfillment.

Factors Related to Evolving Climate

Some researchers have expressed an interest in bringing about planned, rational change by evolution. According to Doak, "The climate of an organization is the first and most important concern in initiating and sustaining change" (19, p. 368). He concluded that in order to get people to

change, the climate must be nonthreatening and must be brought into a state of openness. Doak further stated that, "Leadership is a dimension which is crucial in development of a climate for change or, perhaps better stated, a climate for openness" (19, p. 369).

According to Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, "No aspect of the behavior of social systems is less well understood than the sources of change" (24, p. 150). Organizational change may come from altering values, from restructuring a role, or from placement of a new individual in a strategic role in the system.

It is conceivable that time is a significant factor in the study of change. In a study (62) of thirty-three elementary schools in New York the LBDQ-Ideal was administered to the teachers in September and June and the LBDQ-Real was administered in October and May. Administration of Attraction-People and Attraction-Benefit Scales was also done to determine group cohesiveness. Principals were asked to respond to the same instruments with modified instructions. The findings of this study revealed that leadership behavior is related to cohesiveness and that high cohesiveness is related to both high initiating structure and high consideration. Of interest also was the finding that principals (new principals were excluded from the study) tended to be judged less favorably in May than

in October. Correlation between scores of principals and staffs tended to be lower in May than in October.

Halpin (29) indicated that normal social change takes place slowly. To force its growth "out of phase" is to invite unanticipated social consequences. The critical factor is to determine when the growth is "in phase."

Bridges (10) studied twenty-eight elementary principals from a city school system in the Midwest. On the basis of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, one-half of the principals were classified as open-minded and one-half were classified as closed-minded. The principals were then grouped by categories of open-minded with more experience, open-minded with less experience, closed-minded with more experience, and closed-minded with less experience. The personal qualities and performance of these principals were then measured, using the Immediate Supervision section of the Organization Survey. Results of this study indicate that increased experience has a leveling effect on the performance and personal qualities of principals. In this particular cross-sectional survey, the less experienced principal's behavior was more influenced by his personality, whereas the more experienced principal's behavior was more influenced by the role expectations. This idea of role and personality blend is a reinforcement of Getzels and Guba's (23) model of social behavior. Although principals who had spent less than one full year in their present building assignment were

excluded from the study, there was no indication that any other criteria related to experience were used, such as experience in present building only, or experience in other buildings.

Other investigators have been intrigued by the analogy between Rokeach's analysis of open-minded and closed-minded individuals and Halpin and Croft's open and closed organizational climate. Farber (20) found that principals' dogmatism scores were significantly correlated only with the Production Emphasis scores on the OCDQ.

In a 1965 National Principalship Study (26) involving 501 principals who completed the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) questionnaire, all principals had been in their position at least two years. There was a negative trend in the correlation between the level of EPL score and years in their present principalship. This meant that the longer the principal held his position, the lower his scores on the EPL.

Wigging (63) reported that climates did not change when principals were replaced. In fact, principals were likely to be socialized by the schools. The longer the principals' incumbency, the more significantly related their behavior and organizational climate became. He also found that the length of a principal's incumbency is related to the harmony between the organizational climate and his leadership behavior. It was not found to be related to the agreement

between teachers' and principals' perceptions of the climate, however (64).

The findings of a study by Clear and Seager (16) revealed that educational administrators consistently had greater desires to initiate influence attempts on teachers than the teachers were willing to accept. This is consistent with the findings of Kast and Rosenzweig (35) that positive motivation for professionals is related to autonomy.

In a study of the school principalship after leader succession and the change in the leader as he moves to a new position, Petri (51) administered the OCDQ to fourteen elementary school faculties. He found significant changes in group behavior and all dimensions of leader behavior after leader succession. The conclusion was drawn that the group did affect the leader's behavior and that the principal's behavior was visible to the group and could be evaluated.

Napier (47) adapted the OCDQ for his study by making the items applicable to the school district level rather than to the individual schools. Three hundred fourteen respondents, including superintendents and their administrative and supervisory staff from thirty-six school districts, completed the questionnaires. The schools were analyzed based on the length of tenure of the superintendents with the district and whether they had been promoted to their position from within the district or from

outside the district. The results indicated that superintendents of outside origin with short tenure had more open school districts, followed by inside origin, short tenure; outside origin, long tenure and inside origin, long tenure.

In a similar study, Hall (27) investigated sixteen school districts consisting of sixty-eight schools in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties of California. He confirmed that the most desirable and therefore most open relationships were in school districts with superintendents of outside origin and short tenure. However, he found the least open to be those with superintendents of inside origin with short tenure. Schools with long-tenured superintendents are perceived as cautious, while those with short-tenured superintendents are perceived as more imaginative.

The implications of length of service on principals were analyzed by Chaplain (15) when he investigated twenty-five randomly selected elementary schools in Fairfax County, Virginia. Staffs in these schools were administered the OCDQ and the Index of Adjustment and Values. These instruments were analyzed along with certain biographical information. The findings indicated that the older principals have more open climates, and that the length of experience in education and administration as well as years in current position lead to a more open climate. Chaplain

also found that smaller enrollments and the principal's involvement in the selection of the teachers result in a more open climate.

Reitz (55) explored the possible relationships between organizational climate and personal orientations of principals. Seventy-seven elementary schools in Ohio participated in the study. The principals completed a Personal Orientation Inventory and 953 teachers completed the OCDQ. No statistically significant relationships were discovered between the POI and the OCDQ. However, more years of administrative experience in general and more years of experience in the present school were found to correlate with more open schools. Of the 77 schools, 9 were open, 28 were in mid-range and 40 were found to be closed.

The OCDQ was used by Raspa (54) to describe the relative openness of twenty-two elementary and secondary schools. Conclusions drawn from the responses of principals and 410 teachers who were involved in the study indicated that the more open climates were found in schools where the principal had fewer years of experience in the present assignment. This is in contrast to the study by Reitz (55). However, it is interesting to note that for teachers the characteristics of years of experience in education and years of experience in the present school were not significantly different between open and closed schools.

Reynolds (56) investigated the problems related to implementing organization-wide change in an elementary school. A plan was implemented which replaced the conventional self-contained classroom organization with a differentiated staffing plan. The reorganization involved the entire staff. It increased the size of the faculty and added new hierarchical positions. By the end of the first year the school retained many of the previous organization and curriculum characteristics. Reynolds suggests that the reason that much of the old program was retained was the inability of the staff to reach consensus with regard to their interpretation of the new program.

The concept that climate can be improved is supported by Breckenridge (8). She concludes that a school can grow from an autocratic leadership-dominated one with a closed climate, to one that is characterized by openness and trust. This can be accomplished if the style of leadership is modified. According to Doak (19), climate is the cornerstone of educational change but must be brought into a state of readiness for change through effective leadership. Brown (12) provided further support by indicating that change is a natural condition of an organization and the principal's role is to direct the change.

In a study of eleven middle-class schools in the Chicago area suburbs, Coughlan (17) investigated teacher work values and group development in closed and open schools. He

suggested that in moving from a relatively closed to a more open system the work relationships between the teachers who share responsibilities become more cooperative.

Howard (33) suggests that an open, humane climate can stimulate learners' initiative and creativity, and that therefore our schools must be deinstitutionalized by beginning a variety of climate-improving projects. He states, "I am convinced that it is now possible to build a school climate within which pupils and staff will be happier, more mentally healthy, more positive in their outlook on life, and more productive" (33, p. 13).

Although a need has been expressed for an objective measure of school climate when assessing growth, the major recognized techniques for assessing organizational climate are not used by individuals who describe themselves as engaged in organizational development work with public schools as consultants (50). Out of eighty-three responses to questions regarding assessment techniques, only seven indicated that they used an instrument with published reliability and validity data. The reliability and validity data for the instruments used in this study are reported in detail in the following chapter.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Acton, Milton Early, "The Organizational Behavior of Elementary Principals as Perceived by Teachers," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1976.
2. Anderson, Donald P., "Relationships Between Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools and Personal Variables of Principals," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1964.
3. Andrews, John H. M., "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1965.
4. Argyris, Chris, "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (March, 1958), 501-520.
5. Bishop, Lloyd K. and George R. Julius, "Organizational Structure: A Factor Analysis of Structural Characteristics of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Autumn, 1973), 66-80.
6. Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid, Houston, Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.
7. Bowers, David G. and Stanley E. Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (September, 1966), 238-263.
8. Breckenridge, Eileen, "Improving School Climate," Phi Delta Kappan, 58 (December, 1976), 314-318.
9. Brickner, Charles E., "An Analysis of Organizational Climate and Leader Behavior in a North Dakota School System," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota, 1971.

10. Bridges, Edwin M., "Bureaucratic Role and Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Elementary Principal," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1 (Spring, 1965), 19-28.
11. Brown, Alan F., "Reactions to Leadership," Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (Winter, 1967), 62-73.
12. _____, "Two Strategies for Changing Climate," CSA Bulletin, 4 (July, 1965), 64-80.
13. Brown, Robert J., "Identifying and Clasifying Organizational Climates in Twin Cities Area Elementary Schools," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1965.
14. Carlisle, Howard M., Management: Concepts and Situations, Chicago, Science Research Associates, Inc., 1976.
15. Chaplain, Oscar Stuart, "A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers, and Schools in Open and Closed Climate Elementary Schools in Fairfax County, Virginia," unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
16. Clear, Delbert K. and Roger C. Seager, "The Legitimacy of Administrative Influence as Perceived by Selected Groups," Educational Administrative Quarterly, 7 (Winter, 1971), 46-63.
17. Coughlan, Robert J., "Social Structure in Relatively Closed and Open Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, 6 (Spring, 1970), 14-35.
18. Cross, Ray, "The Effectiveness of School Principals: A Review of the Research," a paper presented to the Southwest Educational Research Association, Houston, Texas, February, 1979.
19. Doak, E. Dale, "Organizational Climate: Prelude to Change," Educational Leadership, 27 (January, 1970), 367-371.

20. Farber, B. E., "Organizational Climate of Public Elementary Schools as Related to Dogmatism and Selected Biographical Characteristics of Principals and Teachers and Selected School and School Community Characteristics," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1968.
21. Fox, Robert S. and others, School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator, Englewood, Colorado, CFK, Occasional Paper, 1973.
22. French, Denney Gerald, "The Relationships Between Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of Organizational Climate in Elementary Schools and Principals' Perceptions of Administrative Skills," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 1971.
23. Getzels, Jacob W., and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, 65 (Winter, 1957), 423-441.
24. Getzels, Jacob W., James M. Lipham and Ronald F. Campbell, Educational Administration As A Social Process: Theory, Research, Practice, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.
25. Grassie, McCrae C. and Brian W. Carss, "School Structure, Leadership Quality and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Winter, 1973), 15-26.
26. Gross, Neal and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
27. Hall, Clarence Luther, "Relationships of Origin and Tenure of Superintendents to the Organizational Climate and Adaptability of Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1966.
28. Hall, James P., "Explorations Among Perceptions of the Leadership Orientations of Secondary School Principals and the Organizational Climates of the Schools They Administer," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1970.

29. Halpin, Andrew, "Change and Organizational Climate," The Journal of Educational Administration, 5 (May 1967), 5-25.
30. Halpin, Andrew and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools, Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1963.
31. Heller, Robert W., "Informal Organization and Perceptions of the Organizational Climate of Schools," Journal of Educational Research, 61 (May/June, 1968), 405-411.
32. Hencley, Stephen P., Lloyd E. McCleary and J. H. McGrath, The Elementary School Principal, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1970.
33. Howard, Eugene R., "School Climate Improvement," The Education Digest, 39 (April, 1974), 10-13.
34. Hoy, Wayne K., "Some Further Notes on the OCDQ," The Journal of Educational Administration, 10 (May, 1972), 46-51.
35. Kast, Fremont E. and James E. Rosenzweig, Organization and Management, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
36. Kriss, Ronald P., "Leadership: The Biggest Issue," Time, 108 (November 8, 1976), 30-49.
37. Leeper, Robert R., "Leadership is the Key," Educational Leadership, 35 (October, 1977), 3-5.
38. Lewin, Kurt, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," Journal of Social Psychology, 10 (1939), 271-299.
39. Likert, Rensis, New Patterns of Management, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
40. Lipham, James M., "Leadership and Administration," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, edited by Daniel E. Griffiths, The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago, 1964.
41. Lipham, James M. and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.

42. Litwin, George H. and Robert A. Stringer, Jr., Motivation and Organizational Climate, Boston, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.
43. Mangee, Carl Peter, "A Study of the Perceived Behaviors of Elementary School Principals and the Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1975.
44. McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
45. Miller, William C., "Can a Principal's Improved Behavior Result in Higher Pupil Achievement?" Educational Leadership, 33 (February, 1976), 336-338.
46. Miskel, Cecil G., "Principals' Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation," Educational Administration Quarterly, 13 (Winter, 1977), 31-46.
47. Napier, Patrick Edward, "The Relationship of Origin and Tenure of Superintendents to the Organizational Climate of Selected School Districts in Kentucky," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, 1969.
48. Newell, Clarence A., Human Behavior In Educational Administration, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.
49. Nicholas, L. N., H. E. Virjo and W. W. Wattenberg, "Effect of Socio-Economic Setting and Organizational Climate on Problems Brought to Elementary School Offices," United States Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2394, College of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1965.
50. Owens, Robert G. and Carl R. Steinhoff, "Techniques for Assessing Organizational Environments and Their Implications for Intervention Style," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.
51. Petrie, Thomas Alan, "Change in Organizational Climate After Leader Succession," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1966.

52. Plaxton, R., "Principal Personality and School Organizational Climate," The CSA Bulletin, 4 (July, 1965), 21-35.
53. Rasmussen, Roger L., "The Principals' Leadership Behavior in Unusually Successful and Unsuccessful Elementary Schools," Educational Research Quarterly, 1 (Spring, 1976), 18-29.
54. Raspa, Salvatore L., "An Investigation of Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers and Schools in Open and Closed Climate Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in St. Mary's County, Maryland," unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
55. Reitz, Howard L., "Relationships Between the Personal Orientation of Elementary School Principals and the Organizational Climate of Schools Under Their Jurisdiction," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, 1973.
56. Reynolds, Larry J., "Problems of Implementing Organizational Change in the Elementary School: A Case Study," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1971.
57. Steinhoff, Carl R., Organizational Climate in a Public School System, Syracuse, New York, USOE Cooperative Research Program Contract No. OE-4-225, Project No. S-083, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 1965.
58. Tagiuri, Renate, "The Concept of Organizational Climate," Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept, edited by Renate Tagiuri and George H. Litwin, Boston, Harvard University Press, 1968, pp. 11-32.
59. Taylor, James C. and David G. Bowers, Survey of Organizations, Ann Arbor Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1972.
60. Walden, John C., Thomas N. Taylor and J. Foster Watkins, "Organizational Climate Changes Over Time," The Educational Forum, 40 (November, 1975), 87-93.

61. Watkins, J. Foster, "Gross and Herriott--Halpin and Croft: Two Research Teams on the Same Course?" Journal of Secondary Education, 45 (January, 1970), 27-30.
62. Watson, Betty J., "A Study of the Relationships Among Selected Aspects of Administrative Behavior and Teacher Group Cohesiveness in the Elementary School," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, 1964, [Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1965].
63. Wiggins, Thomas W., "A Comparative Investigation of Principal Behavior and School Climate," The Journal of Educational Research, 66 (November, 1972), 103-105.
64. _____, "Leader Behavior Characteristics and Organizational Climate," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, February, 1969.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING AND TREATING DATA

Design of the Study

This study was designed to determine the evolution during one academic year of the ratings of school climate and of the leadership behavior in schools with newly assigned principals, and to analyze the relationship between these scores. Random assignment and experimental manipulation were not possible, since appointment of principals to existing faculties were treatments which already existed in the real population. The criterion measurement or dependent variables were the teachers' scores and the principal's scores on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Supervisor Behavior Description. This study was therefore, considered to be an ex post facto, one-group, multiple-measurement design (3). Kerlington defines ex post facto research to be

. . . a systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of the independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable (14, p. 379).

Since randomization and experimental manipulation were not possible due to the nature of the study, results must be interpreted in view of these limitations. As Linquist

noted, the "interpretation of the results is usually more difficult in an observational study of effects already present than in a controlled environment" (15, p. 101).

The scope of this investigation was limited to four suburban districts which were willing to participate in the study and had newly assigned elementary principals at the beginning of the 1978-1979 school year. Subjects in the selected schools were assessed with the OCDQ and the SBD three times during the school year: once in early fall, again in mid-winter and finally in mid-spring. The individual building was the unit of evaluation.

At the conclusion of the data collection an interview was conducted with each principal. (See Appendix.) The information from the questions used during the structured interviews was collected for the purpose of documenting any changes in such areas as scheduling, assignment, or policy during the year which might have affected the climate or leadership behavior of the principal. The information is reported in Chapter IV as part of the discussion.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects of this study were from twelve elementary schools in four suburban school districts in the metropolitan area of North Central Texas. All elementary schools that met the criteria within a participating district were included in the investigation.

The four participating school districts had a total membership of from 9,300 to 37,000 students. The size of the individual schools ranged from approximately 350 membership to approximately 900 membership. A total of twelve schools participated in the study, with a total of twelve principals and 335 teachers. In every instance the principals were assigned to existing buildings.

During the summer of 1978 initial contact was made with the school districts in the metropolitan area of North Central Texas. The purpose of this initial contact was to determine whether or not the districts met the criteria of having a newly assigned principal in the fall of 1978. A second purpose was to determine whether the districts had a policy allowing them to participate in research projects.

Following the preliminary canvassing, five participating school districts were identified and contacted to determine the procedure for gaining local approval for the research. A summary letter and a copy of the research proposal was forwarded to each district. In some districts additional telephone communication and personal interviews were required before permission to contact individual principals was granted. Upon tentative approval at the central office level, five school districts granted permission to present the proposal to the newly assigned principals.

All of the school districts that originally met the criteria established in the research proposal tentatively

approved the project. However, one of the principals who was contacted declined to participate, thus reducing the number of school districts to four and the number of individual schools to twelve.

Arrangements were then made with the building principals to present an outline of the project to each full-time faculty member at a staff meeting. At this staff meeting the research instruments were distributed to the faculty along with detailed instructions for completing them. Depending on when the faculty meeting was scheduled, the teachers either completed the questionnaires then or took them to complete later. The first round of data collection was initiated three weeks after school started and was completed within a three-week period.

The procedure for both the second and the third round of data collection was to distribute the questionnaires in envelopes to the teachers' school mail boxes. Each envelope contained the questionnaires along with a cover letter with instructions to return the completed instruments to the school secretary in the sealed envelope. The instruments were coded so that it would be possible to match responses across the three administrations. The teachers were assured that their responses would be treated confidentially, and every effort was made to guarantee this.

The second data collection was made during the last two weeks in January. The third and final collection was

made during the last week in April and the first week in May. In scheduling all three rounds of data collection every effort was made to avoid peak work-load periods.

A follow-up contact was made with each potential participant who did not return the questionnaires. The contact was either face to face or by letter, depending on the policy of the building principal.

Description of Instruments

Two instruments were utilized to collect the data for this study. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was used to assess the school climate and provide the openness score. The Supervisory Behavior Description was used to determine leadership behavior and to provide the consideration and structure scores.

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)

In order to study the perceptions of the principals and teachers regarding the individual school climate, the OCDQ was utilized. The questionnaire, which was developed by Andrew Halpin and Donald Croft, consists of sixty-four items which are rated on a four-point scale indicating how frequently the described behavior occurs. The items are grouped into eight subsections, which yield an organizational climate profile and an openness measure. (See Appendix.)

The eight subsections are described as follows:

Teachers' Behavior

1. Disengagement indicates that the teachers do not work well together. They pull in different directions with respect to the task; they gripe and bicker among themselves.
2. Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary busy-work.
3. Esprit refers to "morale." The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.
4. Intimacy refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other.

Principal's Behavior

5. Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal with the teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation.
6. Production Emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive and task-oriented.
7. Thrust refers to behavior marked not by close supervision of the teacher, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets. He does not ask the teachers to give of themselves anything more than he willingly gives of himself; his behavior, though starkly task-oriented, is nonetheless viewed favorably by the teachers.
8. Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers "humanly," to

try to do a little something extra for them in human terms (10, p. 2).

This instrument for identifying climate openness was selected on the basis of current readings and research. Cross (5) in a review of research instruments currently used to assess climate indicated that the OCDQ was by far the most frequently used measure of school climate. There are published reliability coefficients as high as .90 (11) and construct validity correlation coefficients as high as .73 (18) for this instrument. Among the numerous studies utilizing the OCDQ, some of the more extensive ones have been by Andrews (2) in 165 schools; Brown (4) in 81 schools; Halpin and Croft (9) in 71 schools; Walden, Taylor and Watkins (20) in 55 schools; and Hoy (12) in 45 schools.

Andrews (1) undertook a rather extensive study of 165 schools in an attempt to analyze the construct validity of the OCDQ. He found intercorrelation scores among subtests and between subtests and climate scores to be as high as $r = .66$. He also found the correlation between the OCDQ and certain staff characteristics to be consistent with theory.

Schmidt (18) studied the correlation between the OCDQ and the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire in forty-seven schools. He found that significant relationships exist between the subtests of the two instruments. The highest correlations were between the Production

Emphasis subtests of each instrument, which yielded a Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient of .73; and also between the Production Emphasis score of the OCDQ and the Initiation of Structure score of the LBDQ, which yielded a coefficient of .60.

Owens and Steinhoff (16) found both the validity and reliability of the OCDQ to be acceptable. This was supported by Hayes (11) report of a reliability coefficient of .90.

Watkins studied the application of the OCDQ as a research tool, using data from forty-eight schools. He stated that "the OCDQ is a most promising research tool and has opened new directions in the study of school organizations" (21, pp. 59-60).

Supervisor Behavior Description (SBD)

The second instrument used in this study was selected to determine the leadership behavior of the principals. This instrument, which was developed at Ohio State University and refined by Edwin A. Fleishman, consists of forty-eight items which are rated on a five-point scale indicating how frequently the described behavior occurs. (See Appendix.) Two scores are provided by the SBD: one for consideration and another for structure.

Consideration reflects the extent to which one's supervisor exhibits behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust and respect, and good "human relations" toward the members of his group. A high score on this dimension indicates a climate of good rapport and two-way communication; a low score

indicates that the supervisor is seen to be more impersonal in his relations with group members.

Structure reflects the extent to which one's supervisor exhibits the behavior of a leader in organizing and defining the relationships between himself and the group, defining interactions among group members, establishing ways of getting the job done, scheduling, criticizing, etc. A high score on this dimension describes the supervisor who plays a very active role in directing group activities through planning, supplying information, trying out new ideas, criticizing, and so forth. A low score characterizes supervisors who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways (6, p. 1).

This instrument was selected partially on the basis of speed of administration, since time was considered a significant factor in the multiple measurements design. It takes approximately fifteen minutes to complete the SBD. The instrument, developed through a factor analysis approach, is one of several Leader-Behavior Description Questionnaires arising from the Ohio State Leadership Studies. It was designed to measure the behavior of management personnel on two major dimensions of leadership. The two dimensions were developed in order to maximize construct validity and concurrent validity (6). The content validity of the SBD has been supported by Gibb (8).

Internal consistency reliability coefficients have been reported at .98 for consideration and .81 for structure (6). Studies to determine test-retest reliability coefficients have sampled employees at eleven-month intervals and three-week intervals. The eleven-month-interval study

yielded slightly higher coefficients of .87 and .75 for consideration and structure, respectively.

Several studies have provided data for validity correlation coefficients. One study (7) reported a negative correlation of $-.69$ between consideration and turnover rates and a $.63$ between structure and turnover. In another study, Skinner (19) found that organizational variables such as low rate of employee grievances and low turnover correlated with high consideration.

The SBD has also been used in other research with educational supervisors, nurses, publishing firms, and research institutes. The findings (6) support the premise that low consideration is indicative of an undesirable situation and that a combination of above-average consideration and structure supports optimum effectiveness.

Principal Interview

A structured interview was conducted with each principal at the conclusion of the final round of data collection. (See Appendix.) The questions used in the interview were developed on the basis of input from classroom teachers, principals, central office administrators, and university professors. The questions were designed to gather information related to any change in such areas as scheduling, assignments, or policy, that occurred by design or circumstance during the year. No attempt was made to apply any

statistical treatment to the information. The results are used for discussion purposes in the analysis of the data.

Procedures Used in Collection of Data

The twelve elementary schools involved in the study were contacted in September of 1978 and appointments were made for the researcher to discuss the proposal with each principal involved. Arrangements were then made for the researcher to attend a staff meeting for the purpose of presenting the project to the faculty and collecting the first round of data. All full-time, certificated employees were included in the study. Each faculty member was assigned a code number so that matching of responses on each of the three administrations would be possible. Assurance was given that responses would remain confidential.

Subsequent rounds of data collection were made in January and in April-May. The researcher distributed the instruments directly to the faculty members' mailboxes during the second and third rounds of data collection. Additional staff meetings were not felt to be necessary. Every attempt was made to keep the time required for teachers' participation to a minimum.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The scores from the three administrations of both instruments were processed by the North Texas State University Computer Center using standardized statistical

packages. The program provided individual subject scores for each subtest, and the problem of missing data was handled at the individual respondent level.

Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b were tested by using a 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance for repeated measures. Tests for main effects and simple effects for columns and rows were computed (17).

Hypotheses 3a and 3b were tested by computing a correlation coefficient for OCDQ and SBD for the initial, middle, and final measures, and testing the significance of the differences among the correlation coefficients for the teacher and principal groups (17).

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 were tested using a one-way analysis of variance across difference scores (17).

The .05 level was considered significant for all statistical tests used in this study (13).

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Andrews, John H. M., "School Organizational Climate: Some Validity Studies," Canadian Education and Research Digest, 5 (December, 1965), 317-334.
2. _____, "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1965.
3. Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.
4. Brown, Robert J., "Identifying and Classifying Organizational Climates in Twin Cities Area Elementary Schools," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1965.
5. Cross, Ray, "The Effectiveness of School Principals: A Review of the Research," a paper presented to the Southwest Educational Research Association, Houston, Texas, February, 1979.
6. Fleishman, Edwin A., Manual for the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Washington, D. D., American Institutes for Research, 1972.
7. Fleishman, Edwin A. and E. F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology, 15 (Spring, 1962), 43-56.
8. Gibb, Cecil A., review in Oscar K. Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Handbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon, 1972, pp. 1149-1150.
9. Halpin, Andrew and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools, Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1963.
10. _____, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," Administrators Notebook, 11 (March, 1963), 1-4.

11. Hayes, Andrew E., "A Reappraisal of the Halpin-Croft Model of the Climate of Schools," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February, 1973.
12. Hoy, Wayne K., "Some Further Notes on the OCDQ," The Journal of Educational Administration, 10 (May, 1972), 46-51.
13. Huck, Schuyler W., William H. Cormier and William G. Bounds, Jr., Reading Statistics and Research, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
14. Kerlington, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed., New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.
15. Lindquist, E. F., Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953.
16. Owens, Robert G. and Carl R. Steinhoff, "Techniques for Assessing Organizational Environments and Their Implications for Intervention Style," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1974.
17. Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.
18. Schmidt, Werner G., "Relationships Between Certain Aspects of Teacher Behavior and Organizational Climate," unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, 1965.
19. Skinner, E., "The Relationship Between Leadership Behavior Patterns and Organizational-Situational Variables," Personnel Psychology, 22 (Winter, 1969), 489-494.
20. Walden, John C., Thomas N. Taylor and J. Foster Watkins, "Organizational Climate Changes Over Time," The Educational Forum, 40 (November, 1975), 87-93.
21. Watkins, J. Foster, "The OCDQ--An Application and Some Implications," Educational Administration Quarterly, 4 (Spring, 1968), 46-60.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In order to investigate the six hypotheses, data were obtained from principals, teachers, and other full-time, certified staff members in twelve elementary schools. The data collected in this study were analyzed in order to determine the evolution of the school climate during the first year of a principal's assignment to a building and to investigate the relationship between the school climate and the leadership behavior of the newly assigned principal.

Twelve principals participated in the study. The demographic data that was collected revealed that exactly 50 percent of the principals were female and 50 percent were male. As a group, the men were younger and had fewer years of experience in education than the women: 83 percent of the women had between ten and nineteen years of experience in education, whereas 83 percent of the men had nine years or less.

There were 341 potential teacher respondents in September, when the first round of data was collected. A total of 335 teachers responded to the instruments during at least one or more of the administrations. Thirteen of the teachers either moved during the year or were on

temporary leave of absence during one of the data collection periods. Only six of the teachers did not participate in any of the administrations. There were 302 complete sets of usable teacher responses. This represents 92 percent of the April-May potential respondents and 89 percent of the potential September respondents.

All statistical treatments were considered significant at the .05 level. The findings of the analyses of these data are presented in this chapter. The presentation and discussion relative to each hypothesis are presented in order.

Data Relative to Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be significant interaction between the level of openness scores on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and the initial, middle, and final measures of organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ (a) for the principals and (b) for the teachers. Data in Table I presents the means of the openness scores as perceived by the principals.

The stratification of openness was based on the initial assessment of openness as perceived by the teachers. The largest four scores were considered high; the smallest four scores were considered low. Croft (2) reported that scores above fifty indicated a school is above average and

scores below fifty indicated less than average occurrence of an attribute, in this instance that of openness.

TABLE I
MEANS OF OPENNESS SCORES AS PERCEIVED
BY PRINCIPALS

Level of Openness	Measurement over Time		
	Initial	Middle	Final
High	51.25	50.25	50.75
Average	47.75	51.75	47.75
Low	45.00	52.00	52.75

An analysis of variance was calculated for openness scores as perceived by the principals. The data in Table II present the statistics relative to the analysis of Hypothesis 1a.

This analysis employed a 3 x 3 factorial design, with level of openness scores (high, average and low) as one variable and repeated measures over time (initial, middle and final) as the other. The results of the analysis disclosed that the F test did not reach the required level of significance for any of the sources of variation. Therefore Hypothesis 1a was rejected.

The concept of internal generative effect (an open climate becoming more open and a closed climate becoming increasingly more closed) as originally hypothesized by

Halpin and Croft (3) was not supported. The principals in schools with open climates did not perceive the open climates as becoming more open, nor did those in closed climates perceive the climates as becoming more closed.

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OPENNESS SCORES
AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Levels of Openness	2	16.67	8.33	0.29	0.755
Between Measurements	2	71.17	35.58	2.90	0.080
Interaction	4	119.67	29.92	2.44	0.084
Error	27	479.25	17.75
Total	35	686.75

Hypothesis 1b predicted a significant interaction between the level of openness and measures over time, based on the openness scores as perceived by the teachers. Table III presents the means of the openness scores as perceived by the teachers and used in the calculation of the analysis.

The stratification of openness was again based on the initial assessment of openness as perceived by the teachers. The same assignment to high, average, or low was made as in Hypothesis 1a.

TABLE III
MEANS OF OPENNESS SCORES AS PERCEIVED
BY TEACHERS

Level of Openness	Measurement over Time		
	Initial	Middle	Final
High	53.75	52.25	52.5
Average	48.35	49.25	47.25
Low	44.75	44.0	44.75

An analysis of variance was calculated for openness scores as perceived by the teachers. The data in Table IV present the statistics relative to the analysis of Hypothesis 1b.

TABLE IV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OPENNESS SCORES
AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Levels of Openness	2	418.06	209.03	15.22*	0.001
Between Measurements	2	3.39	1.69	0.54	0.592
Interaction	4	11.28	2.82	0.90	0.486
Error	27	180.25	6.68
Total	35	612.97

*P > 0.05

The results of the analysis disclosed that there was significant variation between levels of openness. To locate where the significant difference lay, Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference) was calculated. Table V presents the statistics relative to the calculation of the multiple comparisons.

TABLE V
MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF OPENNESS LEVELS

Group Comparisons	Mean Difference	Tukey's HSD Product
High with Low	8.33	3.73*
High with Average	4.58	3.41*
Average with Low	3.75	3.41*

* $p < 0.05$

The results of Tukey's HSD indicated that there was a significant difference between the means of openness for all three groups. This supports the concept that schools do differ in level of openness. However, since there was no significant interaction between the level of openness scores and the repeated measures, Hypothesis 1b was rejected.

Data Relative to Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be a significant interaction between the level of consideration scores on

the Supervisor Behavior Description (SBD) and the initial, middle, and final measures of openness as measured by the OCDQ (a) for the principals and (b) for the teachers. Data in Table VI present the means of openness scores as perceived by the principals and stratified on the basis of level of consideration.

TABLE VI
MEANS OF OPENNESS SCORES BY LEVELS OF
CONSIDERATION AS PERCEIVED
BY PRINCIPALS

Level of Consideration	Measurement over Time		
	Initial	Middle	Final
High	50.00	51.75	50.25
Average	50.00	49.50	48.75
Low	44.00	52.75	52.25

The stratification of openness this time was based on the initial assessment of consideration as perceived by the teachers. The four highest consideration scores were rated as high, the four middle consideration scores were rated as average, and the four lowest consideration scores were rated as low.

Table VII shows the mean consideration scores calculated from the teachers' perceptions on the initial round of data collection. According to norms established

by Fleishman (5), a consideration score for educational supervisors of between ninety-nine and eighty-six is rated high, between eighty-four and seventy-three is rated average, and between seventy-one and fifty-six is rated low. The mean consideration scores for the schools rated as having high, average, and low levels of consideration are reported in Table VII. It can be noted that the consideration means in the present study fall well within the limits for high and average consideration and on the upper end for low consideration.

TABLE VII
MEAN CONSIDERATION SCORES BY LEVELS
FROM INITIAL MEASURE AS PERCEIVED
BY TEACHERS

Mean Consideration	High	Average	Low
Initial Measure for Teachers	90	82	71

An analysis of variance was calculated for openness scores as perceived by the principals and stratified on the level of consideration. The data in Table VIII present the statistics relative to the analysis of Hypothesis 2a.

This analysis employed a 3 x 3 factorial design, with level of consideration scores (high, medium, and low) as one variable and repeated measures over time (initial,

middle, and final) as the other. The results of the analysis disclosed that the F test did not reach the required level of significance for any of the sources of variation. Therefore, Hypotehsis 2a was rejected.

TABLE VIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OPENNESS SCORES BY
LEVELS OF CONSIDERATION AS PERCEIVED
BY PRINCIPALS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Levels of Consideration	2	10.50	5.25	0.18	0.839
Between Measurements	2	71.17	35.58	3.08	0.070
Interaction	4	132.33	33.08	2.87	0.053
Error	27	472.75	17.51
Total	35	686.75

Evidence suggests that the level of consideration of the principal does not significantly affect the openness of the school as the principal perceives openness, during the first year of assignment. There was a trend for the principals who were rated low on consideration to see their schools as becoming more open as time passed. This perception of a move towards openness was not supported by the teachers' perceptions.

Hypothesis 2b predicted a significant interaction between the levels of consideration and measures over time of the openness scores, based on the teachers' perceptions. Table IX presents the means of the openness scores as perceived by the teachers and stratified on the basis of level of consideration.

TABLE IX
MEANS OF OPENNESS SCORES BY LEVELS OF
CONSIDERATION AS PERCEIVED
BY TEACHERS

Level of Consideration	Measurement over Time		
	Initial	Middle	Final
High	53.00	52.50	51.75
Average	49.00	48.50	48.75
Low	44.75	44.50	44.00

An analysis of variance was calculated for openness scores as perceived by the teachers and stratified on the level of consideration. The data in Table X present the statistics relative to the analysis of Hypothesis 2b.

This analysis employed a 3 x 3 factorial design with level of consideration scores (high, medium and low) as one variable and repeated measures over time (initial, middle and final) as the other. The results of the analysis disclosed that there was significant variation in openness

between levels of consideration. To locate where the significant difference lay, multiple comparisons were made using two techniques: Newman-Keuls and Tukey's HSD.

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OPENNESS SCORES BY
LEVELS OF CONSIDERATION AS PERCEIVED
BY TEACHERS

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Levels of Consideration	2	384.89	192.44	11.05*	0.003
Between Measurements	2	3.39	1.70	0.46	0.639
Interaction	4	1.44	0.36	0.10	0.982
Error	27	223.25	8.26
Total	35	612.97

*P < 0.05

Table XI presents the statistics relative to the calculation of the multiple comparisons.

Although the more conservative Tukey's HSD did not show a significant difference between the scores for schools who rated principals high and average on levels of consideration, all three comparisons were significant when calculated by the use of the Newman-Keuls test. This supports the concept that schools whose principals have high levels of consideration do differ in openness from schools whose principals have low levels of consideration. However, since

there was no significant interaction between the level of consideration scores and the repeated measures of openness, Hypothesis 2b was rejected.

TABLE XI
MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF CONSIDERATION LEVEL

Group Comparisons	Mean Difference	Newman-Keuls Product	Tukey's HSD Product
High with Low	8.00	4.20*	4.20*
High with Average	3.67	3.48*	3.84
Average with Low	4.33	3.48*	3.84*

* $P < 0.05$

Data Relative to Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that there would be an increase in the correlation between the openness score of school climate and the consideration score across the repeated measures as measured by the OCDQ and the SBD (a) for the principals and (b) for the teachers. Data in Table XII present the correlation coefficients for the initial, middle, and final administrations of the OCDQ and the SBD as measured by the principals.

The correlation for each data collection was significant at the .05 level of confidence. However, the premise of the hypothesis was that correlations would become increasingly larger with each subsequent data collection.

TABLE XII
 PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OPENNESS
 AND CONSIDERATION OF PRINCIPALS

	Initial	Middle	Final
Correlation Coefficient	r = 0.53*	r = 0.66*	r = 0.69*

*P > 0.05

Table XIII presents the data relative to the significance of the increase of the correlations.

TABLE XIII
 INCREASE IN PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS
 OF PRINCIPALS

	Between Initial & Middle	Between Middle & Final	Between Initial & Final
Amount of Change	0.13	0.03	0.16
z Score	0.43	0.12	0.55
P	0.333	0.452	0.291

The results of the analysis disclosed that there was no significant increase in the correlation between openness and consideration as the principals perceive these attributes. It was found, however, that the correlations between the OCDQ and the SBD of principals reported in Table XII were actually significant at .04 for the initial measurement, .01 for the middle measurement, and .007 for the final

measurement. This indicates that there may be a trend towards larger correlation coefficients; however, since the coefficients did not reach the level required to be statistically significant, Hypothesis 3a was rejected.

Hypothesis 3b predicted an increase in the correlation between openness and consideration as measured by the teachers. Table XIV presents the correlation coefficients for openness and consideration as measured by teachers.

TABLE XIV
PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OPENNESS
AND CONSIDERATION OF TEACHERS

	Initial	Middle	Final
Correlation Coefficient	$r = .77^*$	$r = .84^*$	$r = .85^*$

*P 0.05

The correlation for each data collection was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The data relative to the significance of the increase of the correlations over time are presented in Table XV.

The results of the analysis disclosed that, as with the principals, the correlation between openness and consideration as perceived by the teachers tended to increase over time. The calculated levels of significance for the correlation coefficients were .002 for the initial measurement, .001 for the middle measurement, and .001 for the

final measurement. However, the increase in the correlation coefficient did not reach the required level to be statistically significant; therefore, Hypothesis 3b was rejected.

TABLE XV
INCREASE IN PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS
OF TEACHERS

	Between Initial & Middle	Between Middle & Final	Between Initial & Final
Amount of Change	.07	.01	.08
z Score	.43	.07	.50
P	.334	.472	.308

Data Relative to Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be a significant decrease in the difference between the principal's scores and the teachers' scores across the three administrations of the OCDQ. Table XVI presents the mean difference for each group on each of the repeated measures.

A one-way analysis of variance across difference scores was calculated for each subtest of the OCDQ and for the openness score. The data in Table XVII present the statistics relative to the analysis of Hypothesis 4.

The results of the analysis disclosed that there were no significant F's for any of the variations in differences. The concept that teachers' and principals' perceptions of

climate will become more similar during the year was not supported by this study. Hypothesis 4 was therefore rejected.

TABLE XVI
MEAN DIFFERENCE IN SCORES FOR OCDQ

Subtest	Initial Mean Absolute Difference	Middle Mean Absolute Difference	Final Mean Absolute Difference
Disengagement	4.83	6.17	6.00
Hindrance	5.08	6.33	5.83
Esprit	4.75	7.42	7.67
Intimacy	4.58	7.67	5.50
Aloofness	7.33	8.50	8.33
Production	6.42	5.83	5.83
Thrust	6.17	6.25	7.08
Consideration	6.67	6.17	5.75
Openness	3.41	4.67	5.25

Data Relative to Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that there would be a significant decrease in the difference between the consideration scores as perceived by the principals and as perceived by the teachers across the three administrations of the SBD. Table XVIII presents the mean difference scores for each group on each of the repeated measures.

TABLE XVII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENCE SCORES

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between differences in Disengagement	2	12.67	6.33	0.64	0.535
Error	33	347.33	10.53
Total	35	360.00
Between differences in Hindrance	2	9.50	4.75	0.50	0.613
Error	33	627.25	19.01
Total	35	636.75
Between differences in Esprit	2	62.72	31.36	2.59	0.097
Error	33	789.83	23.93
Total	35	852.56
Between differences in Intimacy	2	60.17	30.08	1.37	0.274
Error	33	838.58	25.41
Total	35	898.75
Between differences in Aloofness	2	9.56	4.78	0.40	0.677
Error	33	1008.33	30.56
Total	35	1017.89
Between differences in Production	2	2.72	1.36	0.13	0.875
Error	33	478.25	14.49
Total	35	480.97
Between differences in Thrust	2	6.17	3.08	0.17	0.847
Error	33	612.83	18.57
Total	35	619.00
Between differences in Consideration	2	5.06	2.53	0.13	0.875
Error	33	704.58	21.35
Total	35	709.64
Between differences in Openness	2	21.06	10.53	0.81	0.455
Error	33	443.83	13.45
Total	35	464.89

TABLE XVIII
MEAN DIFFERENCE IN CONSIDERATION SCORES
FROM REPEATED MEASURES

<u>SBD</u> Subtest	Initial Mean Absolute Difference	Middle Mean Absolute Difference	Final Mean Absolute Difference
Consideration	7.83	6.83	7.0

A one-way analysis of variance across difference scores was calculated from the consideration scores. The data in Table XIX presents the statistics relative to the analysis of Hypothesis 5.

TABLE XIX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
CONSIDERATION SCORES

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between differences in Consideration	2	6.89	3.44	0.20	0.816
Error	33	1303.33	39.49
Total	35	1310.22

The results of the analysis disclosed that there was no significant variation in the differences between principals' and teachers' perceptions of consideration over time. Principals and teachers do not develop more similar perceptions

of consideration as the year progresses. Since no significant F was attained, Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

Data Relative to Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be no significant change in the difference between the structure scores as perceived by the principal and as perceived by the teachers across the three administrations of the SBD. Table XX presents the mean difference scores for each group on each of the repeated measures.

TABLE XX
MEAN DIFFERENCE IN STRUCTURE SCORES
FROM REPEATED MEASURES

<u>SBD</u> Subtest	Initial Mean Absolute Difference	Middle Mean Absolute Difference	Final Mean Absolute Difference
Structure	4.83	3.83	2.75

A one-way analysis of variance across difference scores was calculated from the structure scores of the two groups. The data in Table XXI present the statistics relative to the analysis of Hypothesis 6.

The results of the analysis disclosed that there was no significant variation in the differences between principals' and teachers' perceptions of structure over time. Principals and teachers do not develop more similar

perceptions of structure as the year progresses. Since no significant variation was found, Hypothesis 6 was retained in the null form.

TABLE XXI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN STRUCTURE SCORES

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between differences in Structure	2	26.06	13.03	1.34	0.281
Error	33	373.58	11.32
Total	35	399.64

Discussion of Principal Interviews

The structured interviews that were conducted with each principal revealed that even though they said that it was not their intent to make changes the first year, changes were made. Table XXII presents a summary of the results of the answers to the interview questions related to change.

Although most of the classroom and teaching assignment changes were made at the beginning of school, some of them, as well as the other changes, took place throughout the year. Since the school climates did not change significantly during the study, the changes made by the principals must not be perceived as affecting climate. Apparently, the climate that prevails during the first year of a principal's incumbency is established very early in the academic year

and remains essentially the same throughout the school year. Sebald (7) reported similar findings from his research. He found that selective distortion takes place to screen out features which distort preconceived ideas, and that image-maintaining mechanisms function to preserve the prior image.

TABLE XXII
SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Change Area	Number of Principals who made changes	Number of Principals who made no changes
Building Schedule	10	2
Classroom Assignment	9	3
Teaching Assignment	8	4
Organization	8	4
Policy	11	1
Faculty Meeting	11	1
Teacher Evaluation	4	8

Even though improved communication was apparently considered an important goal by the newly assigned principals (seven specifically mentioned it as either a goal for their first year or a need for the future), it did not lead to greater similarities in teachers' and principals' perceptions. Table XXIII presents a summary of the types of communication in which principals and teachers engaged.

TABLE XXIII
SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION MODES

Type of Communication	Number of Schools Using the Method
Advisory/Decision Group	5
Planning/Recommendation Group	11
Faculty Meeting, Written Memos, Calendars, Announcements	11
Suggestion Box	1
Primarily Informal	2
Largely Informal	2

The groups that participated in planning or recommending courses of action dealt primarily with the business of the school and rarely with matters related to interpersonal communication.

The principals' goals, which they had established for their first year (1978-1979), and their projected needs for the future, reflect a concern for both the intellectual and interpersonal areas. Intellectual goals and needs include such areas as curriculum expansion and improvement, physical plant improvement, professional growth for teachers, organization revision, individualized instruction, expansion of materials library, and adherence to district policies. Interpersonal goals and needs include such areas as improvement of school image, development of positive approaches to discipline, development of a sense of family and cooperation, communication improvement, development of morale, spirit, and pride, and development of positive relationships

with staff, students, and community. Ten of the principals identified these interpersonal goals and needs as being important to successful operation of the school and as being more difficult to achieve.

Chaplain (1) reports that individual schools become more open as tenure of the principal increases. Perhaps with more time to concentrate on the interpersonal areas, gains are made in levels of openness.

Possibly the acquaintanceship process between a principal and teachers is not a gradual, evolutionary one, but one whereby strong, initial impressions are formed at first meeting. Powell (6) suggests that once an initial impression has been made, we tend to screen future information and admit to consciousness only that which tends to confirm that which we believe. Research by Sebald (7) supports this concept, and concludes that the effectiveness of communication is limited due to the existence of prior images. Festinger (4) referred to the human tendency to convince ourselves that our decisions are correct as an effort to reduce cognitive dissonance.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Chaplain, Oscar Stuart, "A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers, and Schools in Open and Closed Climate Elementary Schools in Fairfax County, Virginia," unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
2. Croft, Don B., Enclosure in letter dated February 4, 1979, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
3. Festinger, Leon, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1968.
4. Fleishman, Edwin A., Manual for the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Washington, D. C., American Institutes for Research, 1972.
5. Halpin, Andrew and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools, Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1963.
6. Powell, James D., "Actual Versus Attributed Values in the Superior-Subordinate Relationship," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1977.
7. Sebald, Hans, "Limitations of Communication: Mechanisms of Image Maintenance in Form of Selective Perception, Selective Memory and Selective Distortion," The Journal of Communication, 12 (September, 1962), 142-149.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of this study were to investigate the evolution of the school climate during the first year of a new principal's assignment to the school as perceived by the principal and teachers; and to investigate the relationship between the school climate and the leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by the principal and the teachers. In addition, an investigation was made of the relationship between the teachers' perception of the principal's leadership behavior and the self-evaluated leadership behavior of the principal.

The hypotheses were stated as follows:

1. There will be significant interaction between the level of openness scores on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and the initial, middle, and final measures of organizational climate as measured by the OCDQ
 - a. For the principals,
 - b. For the teachers.

2. There will be a significant interaction between the level of consideration scores on the Supervisor Behavior Description (SBD) and the initial, middle and final measure of openness as measured by the OCDQ

- a. For the principals,
- b. For the teachers.

3. There will be an increase in the correlation between the openness score of school climate and the consideration score across the repeated measures as measured by the OCDQ and the SBD

- a. For the principals,
- b. For the teachers.

4. There will be a significant decrease in the difference between the principals' scores and the teachers' scores, across the three administrations of the OCDQ.

5. There will be a significant decrease in the difference between the consideration scores of the SBD as perceived by the principal and the consideration scores as perceived by the teachers, across the three administrations.

6. There will be no significant change in the difference between the structure scores of the SBD as perceived by the principal and the structure scores as perceived by the teachers, across the three administrations.

Twelve elementary schools with newly assigned principals from four different school districts and their full-time, certified staff of 335 participated in the study.

The OCDQ and the SBD were administered during the 1978-1979 academic year in September, January and in April-May.

Data were treated using a 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance for repeated measures for Hypotheses 1 and 2; product-moment correlation coefficient with a z test to determine the significance of difference between the coefficients for Hypothesis 3; and a one-way analysis of variance across difference scores for Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6.

Findings

From the analysis of the statistical data, the following results were found at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 1 was rejected. There was no significant interaction between the level of openness and the repeated measures of the OCDQ for the principals or teachers.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected. There was no significant interaction between the level of consideration and the repeated measures of the OCDQ for the principals or teachers.

Hypothesis 3 was rejected. There was no significant increase in the correlation between openness and consideration during the academic year for the principals or the teachers.

Hypothesis 4 was rejected. There was not a significant decrease in the difference between teachers' and principals' perception of climate during an academic year.

Hypothesis 5 was rejected. There was not a significant decrease in the difference between teachers' and principals' perceptions of consideration during the academic year.

Hypothesis 6 was retained. The null hypothesis that there would be no significant change in the difference between teachers' and principals' perception of structure during the academic year was held to be true.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn.

1. The theory of an internal generative effect remains inconclusive. The open climates did not become more open nor did the closed climates become increasingly more closed.

2. Schools with newly assigned principals can be differentiated on the basis of climate and leadership of the principal. This differentiation can be made at any time during the academic year.

3. A relationship exists between the newly assigned principal's behavior and school climate, which is established very early in the academic year and changes very

little throughout the year. Future relationships are based on screening and perceiving only those messages which reinforce the prior image.

4. It cannot be assumed that perceptions of teachers and newly assigned principals regarding climate and leadership become more similar over time.

5. Any change in school climate during the first year of a principal's incumbency must come from sources other than an evolutionary one; possibly as a consequence of the impact of first impressions, or as a result of a planned change process or some other procedure.

Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions the following recommendations are offered. It is recommended that

1. Further studies concentrate on the phenomenon of the impact of first impressions.

2. Further analysis be made to determine the factors which influence perceptions of climate and leadership including school-community relationships, economic level of the community, and academic level of the students.

3. Follow-up be made of the schools in the study to determine whether changes occur over a longer time period.

4. An investigation be made of the impact of the superintendent and other direct line supervisory personnel on the school climate.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

School ID # _____

1. Was it necessary to change the building schedule this year? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please explain: _____
Reactions: _____
2. Was it necessary to move any teachers from the classrooms they occupied last year? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please explain: _____
Reactions: _____
3. Was it necessary to change the assignment of any teacher this year? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please explain: _____
Reactions: _____
4. Was it necessary to change the organization of the school? (Departmentalize, team teaching, ability grouping, etc.) Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please explain: _____
Reactions: _____
5. Was it necessary to implement any policy changes this year? (Reporting to parents, duties, etc.) Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please explain: _____
Reactions: _____

6. Was it necessary to change the number or time of faculty meetings this year? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, please explain:_____

Reactions:_____

7. Was it necessary to change any of the formal communication systems this year? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, please explain:_____

Reactions:_____

8. Was it necessary to change the teacher evaluation procedure? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, please explain:_____

Reactions:_____

9. What were your goals for the year?

10. What do you see as your needs for next year?

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

A. W. Halpin and D. B. Croft

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Printed below is an example of a typical item found in the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire:

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

Teachers call each other by their first names. 1 2 3 4

In this example the respondent marked alternative 3 to show that the interpersonal relationship described by this item "often occurs" at his school. Of course, any of the other alternatives could be selected, depending upon how often the behavior described by the item does, indeed, occur in your school.

Please mark your response clearly, as in the example.
PLEASE BE SURE THAT YOU MARK EVERY ITEM.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

5-7. Code: _____

Please place a check mark to the right of the appropriate category.

- | | | |
|--------------|------------|--------|
| 8. Position: | Principal | 1. ___ |
| | Teacher | 2. ___ |
| | Other | 3. ___ |
| 9. Sex: | Man | 1. ___ |
| | Woman | 2. ___ |
| 10. Age: | 20-29 | 1. ___ |
| | 30-39 | 2. ___ |
| | 40-49 | 3. ___ |
| | 50-59 | 4. ___ |
| | 60 or over | 5. ___ |

11. Years of experience in education: 0-9 1. _____
 10-19 2. _____
 20-29 3. _____
 30 or more 4. _____
12. Years at this school: 0-4 1. _____
 5-9 2. _____
 10-19 3. _____
 20 or more 4. _____

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

13. Teachers' closest friends are other
 faculty members at this school. 1 2 3 4
14. The mannerisms of teachers at this school
 are annoying. 1 2 3 4
15. Teachers spend time after school with
 students who have individual problems. 1 2 3 4
16. Instructions for the operation of teaching
 aids are available. 1 2 3 4
17. Teachers invite other faculty to visit
 them at home. 1 2 3 4
18. There is a minority group of teachers who
 always oppose the majority. 1 2 3 4
19. Extra books are available for classroom
 use. 1 2 3 4
20. Sufficient time is given to prepare
 administrative reports. 1 2 3 4
21. Teachers know the family background of
 other faculty members. 1 2 3 4
22. Teachers exert group pressure on non-
 conforming faculty members. 1 2 3 4
23. In faculty meetings, there is a feeling
 of "let's get things done." 1 2 3 4

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

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. Teachers seek special favors from the principal. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28. Student progress reports require too much work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31. Most of the teachers here accept the fault of their colleagues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32. Teachers have too many committee requirements. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35. Custodial service is available when needed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 38. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 39. Teachers at this school show much school spirit. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

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

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40. | The principal goes out of his way to help teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 41. | The principal helps teachers solve personal problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42. | Teachers at this school stay by themselves. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 43. | The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44. | The principal sets an example by working hard himself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45. | The principal does personal favors for teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 46. | Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 47. | The morale of the teachers is high. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 48. | The principal uses constructive criticism. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 49. | The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 50. | Teachers socialize together in small select groups. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 51. | The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 52. | Teachers are contacted by the principal each day. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 53. | The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 54. | The principal helps staff members settle minor differences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 55. | The principal schedules the work for the teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

	1.	2.	3.	4.
	1. Rarely occurs 2. Sometimes occurs 3. Often occurs 4. Very frequently occurs			
56. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.	1	2	3	4
57. The principal criticizes a specific act rather than a staff member.	1	2	3	4
58. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.	1	2	3	4
59. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.	1	2	3	4
60. The principal talks a great deal.	1	2	3	4
61. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.	1	2	3	4
62. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.	1	2	3	4
63. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.	1	2	3	4
64. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.	1	2	3	4
65. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.	1	2	3	4
66. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use.	1	2	3	4
67. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference.	1	2	3	4
68. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.	1	2	3	4
69. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.	1	2	3	4
70. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.	1	2	3	4
71. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.	1	2	3	4

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

72.	The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.	1	2	3	4
73.	Teachers talk about leaving the school system.	1	2	3	4
74.	The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.	1	2	3	4
75.	The principal is easy to understand.	1	2	3	4
76.	Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.	1	2	3	4
77.	Grading practices are standardized at this school.	1	2	3	4
78.	The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.	1	2	3	4
79.	Teachers leave the building as soon as possible at day's end.	1	2	3	4
80.	The principal clarifies wrong ideas a teacher may have.	1	2	3	4



ADVANCED
RESEARCH
RESOURCES
ORGANIZATION

98

4330 East-West Highway, Washington, D. C. 20014 ■ 202 / 986-9000

July 30, 1979

Ms. Robin W. Echols
2202 Crooked Oak Court
Arlington, Texas 76012

Dear Ms. Echols:

Thank you for your letter of July 20. You have my permission to include a copy of the SBD in the appendix of your dissertation.

I would appreciate more information on your results, including a description of the OCDQ and the Openness score. The number of supervisors describing and described and normative data on content and structure would be very helpful.

Congratulations on completion of your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Edwin A. Fleishman
President

SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION

by

Edwin A. Fleishman, Ph.D.

Name _____ Date _____
 _____ (Last) _____ (First) _____ (Middle)
 Company _____ Position _____

Raw Score	Percentile	Other
<input type="checkbox"/> a		
<input type="checkbox"/> b		

Description of Norm Group

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have observed your own supervisor and probably you know pretty well how he operates. In this questionnaire, you are simply to *describe* some of the things your own supervisor does with your group.

For each item, choose the alternative which best describes how often your supervisor does what that item says. Remember...there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. The items simply *describe* the behavior of the supervisor over you; they do not judge whether his behavior is desirable or undesirable. Everyone's supervisor is different and so is every work group, so we expect differences in what different supervisors do.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the box (a, b, c, d or e) next to each item to indicate your choice.

1. HE IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
2. HE ENCOURAGES OVERTIME WORK. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
3. HE TRIES OUT HIS NEW IDEAS. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly much c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
4. HE BACKS UP WHAT PEOPLE IN HIS WORK GROUP DO. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
5. HE CRITICIZES POOR WORK. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
6. HE DEMANDS MORE THAN WE CAN DO. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
7. HE REFUSES TO GIVE IN WHEN PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP DISAGREE WITH HIM. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
8. HE EXPRESSES APPRECIATION WHEN ONE OF US DOES A GOOD JOB. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
9. HE INSISTS THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOLLOW STANDARD WAYS OF DOING THINGS IN EVERY DETAIL. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
10. HE HELPS PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP WITH THEIR PERSONAL PROBLEMS. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
11. HE IS SLOW TO ACCEPT NEW IDEAS. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
12. HE IS FRIENDLY AND CAN BE EASILY APPROACHED. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
13. HE GETS THE APPROVAL OF THE WORK GROUP ON IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
14. HE RESISTS CHANGES IN WAYS OF DOING THINGS. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
15. HE ASSIGNS PEOPLE UNDER HIM TO PARTICULAR TASKS. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
16. HE STRESSES BEING AHEAD OF COMPETING WORK GROUPS. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
17. HE CRITICIZES A SPECIFIC ACT RATHER THAN A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never

35. HE REJECTS SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES.
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
 a b c d e
36. HE CHANGES THE DUTIES OF PEOPLE UNDER HIM WITHOUT FIRST TALKING IT OVER WITH THEM.
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
 a b c d e
37. HE DECIDES IN DETAIL WHAT SHALL BE DONE AND HOW IT SHALL BE DONE.
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
 a b c d e
38. HE SEES TO IT THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM ARE WORKING UP TO THEIR LIMITS.
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
 a b c d e
39. HE STANDS UP FOR PEOPLE UNDER HIM EVEN THOUGH IT MAKES HIM UNPOPULAR.
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
 a b c d e
40. HE MAKES THOSE UNDER HIM FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING WITH HIM.
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
 a b c d e
41. HE PUTS SUGGESTIONS THAT ARE MADE BY THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM INTO OPERATION.
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
 a b c d e
42. HE REFUSES TO EXPLAIN HIS ACTIONS.
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
 a b c d e
43. HE EMPHASIZES THE QUANTITY OF WORK.
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
 a b c d e
44. HE ASKS FOR SACRIFICES FROM HIS PEOPLE FOR THE GOOD OF THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT.
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
 a b c d e
45. HE ACTS WITHOUT CONSULTING THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM FIRST.
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
 a b c d e
46. HE "NEEDLES" PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOR GREATER EFFORT.
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
 a b c d e
47. HE INSISTS THAT EVERYTHING BE DONE HIS WAY.
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
 a b c d e
48. HE ENCOURAGES SLOW-WORKING PEOPLE TO GREATER EFFORT.
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
 a b c d e

18. HE LETS OTHERS DO THEIR WORK THE WAY THEY THINK BEST. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
19. HE DOES PERSONAL FAVORS FOR THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
20. HE EMPHASIZES MEETING OF DEADLINES. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
21. HE SEES THAT A WORKER IS REWARDED FOR A JOB WELL DONE. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
22. HE TREATS PEOPLE UNDER HIM WITHOUT CONSIDERING THEIR FEELINGS. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
23. HE INSISTS THAT HE BE INFORMED ON DECISIONS MADE BY THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
24. HE OFFERS NEW APPROACHES TO PROBLEMS. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
25. HE TREATS ALL WORKERS UNDER HIM AS HIS EQUALS. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
26. HE IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
27. HE ASKS SLOWER PEOPLE TO GET MORE DONE. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
28. HE CRITICIZES PEOPLE UNDER HIM IN FRONT OF OTHERS. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
29. HE STRESSES THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH MORALE AMONG THOSE UNDER HIM. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
30. HE TALKS ABOUT HOW MUCH SHOULD BE DONE. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
31. HE "RIDES" THE PERSON WHO MAKES A MISTAKE. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
32. HE WAITS FOR PEOPLE UNDER HIM TO PUSH NEW IDEAS BEFORE HE DOES. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
33. HE RULES WITH AN IRON HAND. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
34. HE TRIES TO KEEP THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM IN GOOD STANDING WITH THOSE IN HIGHER AUTHORITY. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid, Houston, Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.
- Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.
- Carlisle, Howard M., Management: Concepts and Situations, Chicago, Science Research Associates, Inc., 1976.
- Festinger, Leon, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1968.
- Fleishman, Edwin A., Manual for the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Washington, D. C., American Institutes for Research, 1972.
- Fox, Robert S., School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator, Englewood, Colorado, CFK, Occasional Paper, 1973.
- Getzels, Jacob W., James M. Lipham and Ronald F. Campbell, Educational Administration As a Social Process: Theory, Research, Practice, New York, Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.
- Gibson, James L., John M. Ivancevich and James H. Donnelly, Jr., Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes, Dallas, Texas, Business Publications, Inc., 1976.
- Gross, Neal and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Halpin, Andrew W., Theory and Research in Administration, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Halpin, Andrew and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools, Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1963.

- Hencley, Stephen P., Lloyd E. McCleary and J. H. McGrath, The Elementary School Principal, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1970.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Huck, Schuyler W., William H. Cormier and William G. Bounds, Jr., Reading Statistics and Research, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Kast, Fremont E. and James E. Rosenzweig, Organization and Management, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- Kerlington, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed., New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Likert, Rensis, New Patterns of Management, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Lindquist, E. F., Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953.
- Lipham, James and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions, New York, Harper and Row Publishers, 1974.
- Litwin, George H. and Robert A. Stringer, Jr., Motivation and Organizational Climate, Boston, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.
- McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E., editor, The Principalship in the 1970's, Austin, Texas, The Bureau of Laboratory Schools, The University of Texas at Austin, 1971.
- Monahan, William G., Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration, New York, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.
- Newell, Clarence A., Human Behavior in Educational Administration, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

- Owens, Robert G., Organizational Behavior in Schools, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Rhodes, Eric F. and Richard G. Neal, The Control of Teacher Militancy, Educational Service Bureau, Inc., Washington, D. C., 1968.
- Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and David L. Elliott, Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Taylor, James C. and David G. Bowers, Survey of Organizations, Ann Arbor Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1972.

Articles

- Andrews, John H. M., "School Organizational Climate: Some Validity Studies," Canadian Education and Research Digest, 5 (December, 1965), 317-334.
- Argyris, Chris, "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (March, 1958), 501-520.
- Bishop, Lloyd K. and George R. Julius, "Organizational Structure: A Factor Analysis of Structural Characteristics of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Autumn, 1973), 66-80.
- Borland, David T., "Leadership Dilemma: Collective Bargaining or Positive Personnel Administration," Texas School Board Journal, 21 (December, 1975), 17-19.
- Bowers, David G. and Stanley E. Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (September, 1966), 238-263.
- Breckenridge, Eileen, "Improving School Climate," Phi Delta Kappan, 58 (December, 1976), 314-318.

- Bridges, Edwin M., "Bureaucratic Role and Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Elementary Principal," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1 (Spring, 1965), 19-28.
- Brown, Alan F., "Reactions to Leadership," Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (Winter, 1967), 62-73.
- _____, "Two Strategies for Changing Climate," CSA Bulletin, 4 (July, 1965), 64-80.
- Clear, Delbert K. and Roger C. Seager, "The Legitimacy of Administrative Influence as Perceived by Selected Groups," Educational Administrative Quarterly, 7 (Winter, 1971), 46-63.
- Coughlan, Robert J., "Social Structure in Relatively Closed and Open Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, 6 (Spring, 1970), 14-35.
- Doak, E. Dale, "Organizational Climate: Prelude to Change," Educational Leadership, 27 (January, 1970), 367-371.
- Fleishman, Edwin A., "Leadership Climate, Human Relations Training, and Supervisory Behavior," Personnel Psychology, 6 (Summer, 1953), 205-222.
- Fleishman, Edwin A. and E. F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology, 15 (Spring, 1962), 43-56.
- Getzels, Jacob W. and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, 65 (Winter, 1957), 423-441.
- Gibb, Cecil A., review in Oscar K. Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Handbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon, 1972, pp. 1149-1150.
- Grassie, McCrae C. and Brian W. Carss, "School Structure, Leadership Quality and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Winter, 1973), 15-26.
- Halpin, Andrew, "Change and Organizational Climate," The Journal of Educational Administration, 5 (May, 1967), 5-25.

- Halpin, Andrew W. and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," Administrators Notebook, 11 (March, 1963).
- Heller, Robert W., "Informal Organization and Perceptions of the Organizational Climate of Schools," Journal of Educational Research, 61 (May/June, 1968), 405-411.
- Howard, Eugene R., "School Climate Improvement," The Education Digest, 39 (April, 1974), 10-13.
- Hoy, Wayne K., "Some Further Notes on the OCDQ," The Journal of Educational Administration, 10 (May, 1972), 46-51.
- Jones, Warren T. and Bobbie J. Jones, "The Use of a Discrete Digital Simulation for Assessing Administrative Performance," Behavioral Science, 23 (January, 1978), 45-48.
- Kriss, Ronald P., "Leadership: The Biggest Issue," Time, 108 (November 8, 1976), 30-49.
- Leeper, Robert R., "Leadership is the Key," Educational Leadership, 35 (October, 1977), 3-5.
- Lewin, Kurt, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," Journal of Social Psychology, 10 (1939), 271-299.
- Lipham, James M., "Leadership and Administration," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, edited by Daniel E. Griffiths, The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago, 1964.
- Miller, William C., "Can a Principal's Improved Behavior Result in Higher Pupil Achievement?" Educational Leadership, 33 (February, 1976), 336-338.
- Miskel, Cecil G., "Principals' Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation," Educational Administration Quarterly, 13 (Winter, 1977), 31-46.
- Plaxton, R., "Principal Personality and School Organizational Climate," The CSA Bulletin, 4 (July, 1965), 21-35.

- Rasmussen, Roger L., "The Principals' Leadership Behavior in Unusually Successful and Unsuccessful Elementary Schools," Educational Research Quarterly, 1 (Spring, 1976), 18-29.
- Sebald, Hans, "Limitations of Communication: Mechanisms of Image Maintenance in Form of Selective Perception, Selective Memory and Selective Distortion," The Journal of Communication, 12 (September, 1962), 142-149.
- Skinner, E., "The Relationship Between Leadership Behavior Patterns and Organizational-Situational Variables," Personnel Psychology, 22 (Winter, 1969), 489-494.
- Tagiuri, Renate, "The Concept of Organizational Climate," Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept, edited by Renate Tagiuri and George H. Litwin, Boston, Harvard University Press, 1968, pp. 11-32.
- Walden, John C., Thomas N. Taylor and J. Foster Watkins, "Organizational Climate Changes Over Time," The Educational Forum, 40 (November, 1975), 87-93.
- Watkins, J. Foster, "Gross and Herriott--Halpin and Croft: Two Research Teams on the Same Course?" Journal of Secondary Education, 45 (January, 1970), 27-30.
- _____, "The OCDQ--An Application and Some Implications," Educational Administration Quarterly, 4 (Spring, 1968), 46-60.
- Wiggins, Thomas W., "A Comparative Investigation of Principal Behavior and School Climate," The Journal of Educational Research, 66 (November, 1972), 103-105.
- _____, "Principal Behavior on the School Climate: A Systems Analysis," Educational Technology (September, 1971), pp. 57-59.
- _____, "The Influence of Role and Organizational Climate Upon Principal Behavior: A Systems Analysis," Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration, edited by William G. Monahan, New York, Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1975, pp. 348-360.

Unpublished Materials

- Acton, Milton Early, "The Organizational Behavior of Elementary Principals as Perceived by Teachers," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1976.
- Anderson, Donald P., "Relationships Between Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools and Personal Variables of Principals," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1964.
- Andrews, John H. M., "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1965.
- Brickner, Charles E., "An Analysis of Organizational Climate and Leader Behavior in a North Dakota School System," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota, 1971.
- Brown, Robert J., "Identifying and Classifying Organizational Climates in Twin Cities Area Elementary Schools," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1965.
- Bukhair, Carolyn G., "A Comparative Study of School Climate and Leadership Behavior of Elementary and Secondary Principals," unpublished dissertation, College of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1978.
- Chaplain, Oscar Stuart, "A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers, and Schools in Open and Closed Climate Elementary Schools in Fairfax County, Virginia," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
- Croft, Don B., Enclosure in letter dated February 4, 1979, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
- Cross, Ray, "The Effectiveness of School Principals: A Review of the Research," a paper presented to the Southwest Educational Research Association, Houston, Texas, February, 1979.

DeHart, James B., "A Study of Executive Professional Leadership of Principals Within the Elementary Schools of Texas," unpublished dissertation, College of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1976.

Farber, B. E., "Organizational Climate of Public Elementary Schools as Related to Dogmatism and Selected Biographical Characteristics of Principals and Teachers and Selected Schools and School Community Characteristics," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1968.

French, Denney Gerald, "The Relationships Between Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of Organizational Climate in Elementary Schools and Principals' Perceptions of Administrative Skills," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 1971.

Hall, Clarence Luther, "Relationships of Origin and Tenure of Superintendents to the Organizational Climate and Adaptability of Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1966.

Hayes, Andrew E., "A Reappraisal of the Halpin-Croft Model of the Climate of Schools," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February, 1973.

Mangee, Carl Peter, "A Study of the Perceived Behaviors of Elementary School Principals and the Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1975.

Mascaro, Francis G., "Early On-the-Job Socialization of First Year Elementary School Principals," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April, 1976.

Napier, Patrick Edward, "The Relationship of Origin and Tenure of Superintendents to the Organizational Climate of Selected School Districts in Kentucky," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, 1969.

- Owens, Robert G. and Carl R. Steinhoff, "Techniques for Assessing Organizational Environments and Their Implications for Intervention Style," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1974.
- Petrie, Thomas Alan, "Change in Organizational Climate After Leader Succession," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1966.
- Powell, James D., "Actual Versus Attributed Values in the Superior-Subordinate Relationship," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Business, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1977.
- Raspa, Salvatore L., "An Investigation of Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers and Schools in Open and Closed Climate Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in St. Mary's County, Maryland," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
- Reitz, Howard L., "Relationships Between the Personal Orientation of Elementary School Principals and the Organizational Climate of Schools Under Their Jurisdiction," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, 1973.
- Reynolds, Larry J., "Problems of Implementing Organizational Change in the Elementary School: A Case Study," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1971.
- Schmidt, Werner G., "Relationships Between Certain Aspects of Teacher Behavior and Organizational Climate," unpublished master's thesis, College of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, 1965.
- Watson, Betty J., "A Study of the Relationships Among Selected Aspects of Administrative Behavior and Teacher Group Cohesiveness in the Elementary School," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, 1964, [Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1965].
- Wiggins, Thomas W., "Leader Behavior Characteristics and Organizational Climate," a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, February, 1969.

Reports

Nicholas, L. N., H. E. Virjo and W. W. Wattenberg, "Effect of Socio-Economic Setting and Organizational Climate on Problems Brought to Elementary School Offices," United States Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2394, College of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1965.

Steinhoff, Carl R., Organizational Climate in a Public School System, Syracuse, New York, USOE Cooperative Research Program Contract No. OE-4-225, Project No. S-083, Syracuse University, 1965.