



1992

A Study of the School Climate of Iowa Schools

Robert L. Pilcher
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pilcher, Robert L., "A Study of the School Climate of Iowa Schools" (1992). *Dissertations*. 3183.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3183

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1992 Robert L. Pilcher

A STUDY OF THE SCHOOL CLIMATE
OF IOWA SCHOOLS

by

Robert L. Pilcher

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Education of Loyola University Chicago in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

January

1992

Robert L. Pilcher

Loyola University of Chicago

A STUDY OF THE SCHOOL CLIMATE OF IOWA SCHOOLS

The purpose of this study was to assess the school climate of Iowa schools; determine how students, community members, administrators, and teachers perceive school climate; determine if a difference existed between the climate of Iowa school districts with more than 600 students and Iowa school districts with fewer than 600 students; and to determine the implications of the study for superintendents of Iowa school districts and Iowa legislators.

The climate of Iowa school districts was determined by the NASSP School Climate Survey (SCS). Data were collected from fifty-seven randomly selected school districts in Iowa. An analysis of the data and the use of the t-test determined that the climate of Iowa school districts was high. This was indicated by a score of 3.933 on the SCS. A five-point Likert scale with 5 being high was used. The data indicated that students, community members, administrators, and teachers all perceived school climate as high with no significant differences between the groups. The data also indicated that when comparing small Iowa school districts to large Iowa school districts, the perceptions of school climate were similar. The implications of the study for Iowa superintendents and legislators were that the people of Iowa felt they had good, quality schools, that a strong

basis for additional financial support existed, and that the climate was positive in both small and large school districts.

Further analysis of the data indicated significant differences on sixty-two different subscales when comparing students, community members, administrators, and teachers in each quadrant of the state between school districts with more than 600 students and school districts with fewer than 600 students. Significant differences were also revealed on six comparisons of total scores of all respondents between schools with more than 600 students and schools with fewer than 600 students.

Recommendations for further research include studies to determine if school climate can be changed once a need to do so is established, determine the relationship of school climate and performance on standardized tests, and determine perceptions of school climate based on grade level, sex, tenure, and age.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Prof. Max Bailey, for his assistance and direction in writing this dissertation. His guidance and encouragement have been greatly appreciated, both in writing this dissertation and in completing the educational requirements for this degree. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Prof. Philip Carlin and Prof. Art Safer, for their constructive suggestions pertaining to this dissertation.

I want to extend my sincere appreciation to all the respondents across the state of Iowa to the survey that was an integral part of this study.

Finally, I want to thank my wife, Kathy, for her understanding and moral support during the process of completing the requirements for this degree. She was always a positive influence and I know it was not always easy.

VITA

The author, Robert Lynn Pilcher, is the son of D. Fred Pilcher and Margaret (McCrea) Pilcher. He was born January 1, 1949, in Anamosa, Iowa.

His secondary education was completed in 1967 at the Anamosa Community High School, Anamosa, Iowa.

In September 1967, Mr. Pilcher entered Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa. In 1971, he graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in psychology. He continued at Loras and in 1973 completed his Master of Arts degree in guidance and counseling. Mr. Pilcher attended Northeast Missouri State University in Kirksville, Missouri, and received an Education Specialist degree in administration in 1980.

Mr. Pilcher has been a teacher, coach, guidance counselor, assistant principal, principal, and superintendent in Iowa schools. He is married and has four children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	ix
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES	x
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
New Standards	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Organizational Climate	3
The NASSP School Climate Survey	6
Purpose of the Study	8
Need for the Study	10
Limitation of the Study	10
Design of the Study	11
Collection of Data	13
Survey Returns	13
Treatment of the Data	14
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
NASSP School Climate Survey	27
Summary	30
III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	32
Research Questions	32
Selection of Subjects	32
Procedures for Data Collection	34
Instrumentation	34
Reliability	36
Validity	37
Statistical Treatment of the Data	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CON'T)

	Page
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	40
Preparing the Data for Analysis	40
The NASSP School Climate Survey	40
Presentation and Analysis of the Data	41
Implications of Data: Superintendents and Legislators	62
Summary	68
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	72
Summary of Procedures	72
Conclusions	73
Recommendations	76
Recommendations for Further Study	76
REFERENCES	78
APPENDIX A	81
APPENDIX B	83
APPENDIX C	86
APPENDIX D	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Public School Districts in Iowa Selected by Size Within Quadrants to Participate in Survey	12
II. Selection of Sample	12
III. School Districts in Iowa that Completed and Returned the Survey Instrument, by Number and Percent	14
IV. Selection of Sample	33
V. Distribution Response of Completed Surveys . .	34
VI. School Climate Survey--Internal Consistency Estimates of Reliability	37
VII. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant I	43
VIII. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Community Members from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Community Members from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant I	44
IX. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Administrators from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Administrators from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant I	45
X. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant I	46

LIST OF TABLES (CON'T)

Table	Page
XI. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students-- Quadrant II	48
XII. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Community Members from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Community Members from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant II	49
XIII. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Administrators from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Administrators from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant II	50
XIV. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students-- Quadrant II	51
XV. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students-- Quadrant III	52
XVI. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Community Members from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Community Members from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant III	54
XVII. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Administrators from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Administrators from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant III.	55

LIST OF TABLES (CON'T)

Table	Page
XVIII. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students-- Quadrant III	56
XIX. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students-- Quadrant IV	57
XX. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Community Members from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Community Members from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant IV	58
XXI. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Administrators from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Administrators from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students--Quadrant IV	59
XXII. Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students-- Quadrant IV	61
XXIII. Comparison of All Respondents from Schools with More than 600 Students to All Respondents from Schools with Fewer than 600 Students	62
XXIV. Mean Climate Scores of All Respondents as Measured by the NASSP School Climate Survey . .	63

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Iowa Quadrants	42

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A Letter to Principals	82
APPENDIX B Instructions to Principals	84
APPENDIX C School Climate Survey	87
APPENDIX D Questionnaire to Superintendents and Legislators	92

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The report called "A Nation at Risk" sent shock waves through the educational community and made national headlines by stating that the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity (1983, p. 3). This report was the culmination of twenty months of work by the National Commission of Excellence in Education.

Since "A Nation at Risk", several other reports called for educational reform. "First in the Nation in Education" (FINE) was Iowa's response to the education concern. The FINE report stated that the present educational system was good, but by implementing a considerable number of changes it could be excellent.

New Standards

When the FINE report was released, fifty-four percent of Iowa's 436 public school districts had fewer than 600 students and three-fourths of the districts had fewer than one thousand students. As a result of the FINE report, the Iowa legislature updated the development of new educational standards. The new standards were developed, passed by the legislature, and signed by the Governor of Iowa in 1988.

School districts and schools must have met the new standards by July 1, 1989. Each school or school district meeting these standards will be appropriately accredited by the Department of Education. The use of the standards in the accreditation process is meant to assure the long tradition of equity and quality in Iowa schools.

Implementing the new standards is a concern for all school districts and meeting the standards is difficult for school districts with fewer than 600 students. Financial concerns have been numerous. The cost of employing additional personnel in administration, guidance, talented and gifted, and media have been major concerns. Increasing the required course offerings from 27 to 41 is extremely difficult to meet. Schools need students to generate money for the districts and they need students to take the required courses. With small student numbers, districts do not generate the money needed for staff requirements and to compound the situation, there are not enough students to take the necessary courses. As Wayne Ledders said in a recent Iowa Association of School Board Journal, "to survive into the year 2000, a school district needs 1000 students" (IASB, 1988, p. 4).

Small schools in Iowa are in jeopardy. Whether the loss of smaller schools impacts the effectiveness of schools is unknown. The research of Asick, 1984; Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Hunter, 1984, indicated that no single factor accounted for school success in generating effective schools. Their

research showed that effective schools resulted from many policies, behaviors, and attitudes that together shape the environment/climate.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was to determine the school climate of schools in Iowa. To assess the school climate, teachers, students, administrators, and community members were surveyed.

The study focused on these questions:

1. What is the climate of Iowa schools as measured by the NASSP School Climate Survey (grades 6-12)?
 - A. How do students, community members, administrators, and teachers in Iowa perceive school climate?
 - B. How does school climate in small Iowa school districts differ from that of large Iowa school districts?
2. What are the implications of the data for superintendents of Iowa school districts and Iowa legislators?

Organizational Climate

The concept of organizational climate has been studied since the mid 1950's. Argyris attempted to order the complex, reciprocal network of variables that comprise organizations and contribute to climate (1958, p. 501-520).

The concept of climate was soon extended to the school as an organization. Halpin stated:

As any teacher or school executive moves from one school to another, he is inexorably struck by the difference he encounters in organizational climates. He voices his reaction with such remarks as "you don't have to be in school very long before you feel the atmosphere of the place" (Halpin and Croft, 1963, p. 4).

Experienced educators can sense the individuality of a school. "Sometimes this individuality is called the atmosphere of the school; other labels include the tone of the school, the school's climate, or the school's personality" (Owens, 1970, p. 167). Whatever term was used, the reference was to the intangible quality that lets one know that every school was different from every other school just as people differ from one another. Halpin states that "Personality is to the individual what organization climate is to the organization" (Halpin, 1966, p. 131).

Most of the research and administrative discussions focused on the social aspects which appear to be the major contributions to climate. Phi Delta Kappa released a study in 1973 on School Climate Improvement. The editors suggested factors which compromise school climate and determine its quality. "The results form an interaction of the school's programs, processes, and physical conditions" (Fox, 1973, p. 7).

Hoy and Miskel stated that organizational climate is a broad term that refers to perceptions of the general work environment of the school; it is influenced by the formal organization, informal organization, personalities of participants, and organizational leadership. It is the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from

another and influences the behavior of its members (Hoy and Miskel, 1987, p. 225).

Jorde stated that "organizational climate can also be viewed as both a process and an end product that climate is something to work toward achieving as well as the means by which that goal is reached" (1985, p. 4).

Norton has advocated that several considerations serve to underline the paramount importance of organizational climate in the school. These considerations included the concepts that the climate of a school sets the tone for the approach that the school uses to achieve its goals and solve its problems as well as determine effective communication. In a direct way, the school environment serves a crucial role in determining what the school is and what it might become (Norton, 1984, p. 43).

Research has supported the fact that it is important for administrations to be able to "determine what the staff feels about other people in the school and how they feel about the management of the school" (Zigarmi, 1981, p. 100). Coughlan found in 1978 that there is a strong relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction (pp. 130-139).

Climate is also a key factor which influences the acceptance of innovations as well as the motivation of participants (Berman, et al., 1975). Schmuck and Runkle found that climate assessment is important in order to more effectively solve problems and handle conflicts, the school

must have a climate which supports open communications (1972).

The NASSP School Climate Survey

Perceptions held by stakeholder groups (e.g., students, parents, teachers) about the physical, social, and learning environments of a school may influence both the processes and outcomes that occur. Unlike measures of satisfaction in which each individual as respondent is asked to give a personal effective reaction, climate is measured by asking each individual to serve as an informant; i.e., to respond to each item in terms of what he or she believes most people hold to be true about that characteristic of the school's environment.

The shared perceptions of climate represent what most people believe, not the individual's personal reaction to the environment. These shared perceptions tend to be persistent and stable over time. Just as meteorological climate is largely unaffected by daily shifts in temperature, the climate of the school is a relatively stable phenomenon (Kelley, 1989, p. 77).

Measurement of climate solely by what most people believe, rather than as a collection of climate and individual satisfaction responses, is the primary difference between the NASSP School Climate Survey and most other measures of climate. A second difference is the emphasis in the NASSP Model on the collection of perceptions of climate from all major stakeholder groups. A third difference is the description of climate as a mediating variable rather than as

an outcome measure (Kelley and Keefe, 1989, p. 5).

The NASSP School Climate Survey is normed for use with students in grades 6-12, and for use with teachers, and parent or citizen groups. Instrument readability is rated at grades 5-6. Assessment of all major stakeholder groups, rather than a single group, is recommended. Broader assessment allows for comparison of perceptions between and among groups. These comparisons can be useful in discerning and planning for appropriate interventions to improve school environments.

The NASSP School Climate Survey collects data about perceptions on 10 subscales.

- Teacher Student Relationships. Perceptions about the quality of the interpersonal and professional relationships between teachers and students.
- Security and Maintenance. Perceptions about the quality of maintenance and the degree of security people feel at the school.
- Administration. Perceptions of the degree to which school administrators are effective in communicating with different role groups and in setting high performance expectations for teachers and students.
- Student Behavioral Values. Perceptions about student self-discipline and tolerance for others.
- Guidance. Perceptions of the quality of academic and career guidance and personal counseling

services available to students.

- Student-Peer Relationships. Perceptions about students' care and respect for one another and their mutual cooperation.
- Parent and Community-School Relationships. Perceptions of the amount and quality of involvement in the school of parents and other community members.
- Instructional Management. Perceptions of the efficiency and effectiveness of teacher classroom organization and use of classroom time.
- Student Activities. Perceptions about opportunities for and actual participation of students in school-sponsored activities.

Purpose of the Study

Through the "New Education Standards" in Iowa, school districts with fewer than 600 students are facing severe financial constraints. The New Standards require all districts to provide a minimum educational program that smaller schools presently do not offer. Programs such as K-12 Guidance and Counseling, K-12 Talented and Gifted, Staff Development for all employees, Superintendent cannot also serve as a building principal, etc. All school districts are required to meet these standards without receiving additional funding.

The existence of small school districts in Iowa is in

jeopardy. In addition to the "New Education Standards", Iowa has initiated a new funding formula for school districts which will be based on true enrollments instead of "phantoms" now used to cushion declining enrollments, and reapportionment in 1992 which will decrease the number of state legislatures from rural Iowa.

People United for Rural Education (PURE) and Rural Schools of Iowa, two politically active organizations in Iowa, maintain that rural Iowa schools have something special to offer. That something special is the smallness of the school that allows a climate conducive to education. Many rural Iowans feel the same way.

The research (Asick, 1984; Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Hunter, 1984) has indicated that no single factor accounts for school success in generating effective schools. The research has shown that effective schools result from many policies, behaviors, and attitudes that together shape the learning environment/climate.

Iowa presently has 429 school districts. There are 202 school districts with 600 or more students and 227 school districts with fewer than 600 students. Using a school district enrollment of 600 students, this represents a fairly equal division of school districts in the state.

Based on "climate", is bigger than 600 students better and do smaller schools have something special to maintain?

The study focused on these questions:

1. What is the climate of Iowa schools as measured by the NASSP School Climate Survey (grades 6-12)?
 - A. How do students, community members, administrators, and teachers in Iowa perceive school climate?
 - B. How does school climate in small Iowa school districts differ from that of large Iowa school districts?
2. What are the implications of the data for superintendents of Iowa school districts and Iowa legislators?

Need for the Study

The new educational standards in Iowa were designed to continue to provide equity and quality in all schools and school districts in Iowa. Through the process of implementing the standards, smaller school districts are finding meeting the standards very difficult to impossible. Iowa has a tradition for excellence in education. The delivery system as attested by ACT and SAT scores was an indication of that excellence. Will something be lost when smaller schools are forced to merge to become bigger simply to meet the standards and receive state department accreditation?

Limitation of the Study

The study involved the analysis of the NASSP School Climate Survey as responded by randomly selected teachers,

students, administration, and community members in Iowa. The restriction of the populations of the study was a limiting factor. However, the responses from the public school districts in Iowa provided an adequate cross-section of the state.

Design of the Study

The subjects in this study were from randomly selected school districts in Iowa. Prior to selection, the state was geographically divided into quadrants. School districts were identified by size (plus or minus 600) within each quadrant.

For the purpose of this study, 429 school districts in Iowa were identified. Within each quadrant, the school districts were grouped into two categories, fewer than 600 and more than 600. Because quadrants differed in the number of school districts, numbers were converted to percents to reflect proper sampling from each quadrant of the state. The Iowa Educational Directory, 1988-1989 School Year and the Iowa Department of Education Enrollment Map were used to determine the enrollment and location of the school districts. Refer to Table I.

Table I

Public School Districts in Iowa Selected by Size
Within Quadrants to Participate in Survey

PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS						
Quadrant	Number of Schools		Percent of Schools in Each Category		Number of Randomly Selected Schools by Category	
	Fewer than 600	More than 600	Fewer than 600	More than 600	Fewer than 600	More than 600
I	33	41	14	21	5	7
II	55	68	24	34	11	21
III	78	35	34	17	20	6
IV	63	56	28	18	14	16
V	63	56	28	18	14	16
Total	229	200	100	100	50	50

Within the randomly selected school districts, the subject population were randomly selected students in grades 6-12, all administrators, randomly selected community and faculty members. Table II indicates the selection process:

Table II

Selection of Sample		
K-12 Enrollment		
	600 or less	600 or more
Number of respondents:		
Students (6-12)	5%	5%
Teachers	10%	10%
Administrators	All	All
Community Members	15	25

The NASSP Climate Survey was sent to each randomly selected school district. The high school principal in each district served as the contact person.

Collection of Data

A packet of materials containing surveys for all respondents, answer sheets, directions for selecting respondents, and instructions to administer the survey were mailed to the school districts during the week of April 24, 1989. A reply envelope addressed to the investigator was also sent with the survey packet. Respondents were asked to return the completed surveys by the end of May. The investigator called each principal the day after the surveys were mailed.

Survey Returns

The surveys were sent to the 100 randomly selected public school districts. The number of surveys returned by school districts fewer than 600 students numbered 30 or 60 percent response. The number of surveys returned by school districts more than 600 students numbers 27 or 54 percent response. The numbers and percent of surveys by quadrant are shown in Table III.

Table III

Public School Districts in Iowa that Completed and Returned
the Survey Instrument, by Number and Percent

PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Quadrant	Number Surveyed		Number Returned		Percent	
	Fewer than 600	More than 600	Fewer than 600	More than 600	Fewer than 600	More than 600
I	5	7	3	4	60	57
II	11	21	7	12	64	57
III	20	6	11	4	55	67
IV	14	16	9	7	64	44
Totals	50	50	30	27	60	54

Treatment of the Data

The school climate survey was scored in a two stage process: 1) generating subscale raw scores and 2) determining subscale standard scores.

The school climate survey employed a six-response Likert scale. Items received score values of 1 (strongly disagree, very dissatisfied) to 5 (strongly agree, very satisfied). The respondent's score on each item was the same as the Likert response value (1 to 5). All items were regularly scored. Items marked 6 "don't know" were not included in the scoring. Individual item totals were not used in reprinting data. The survey was designed and validated using score groups.

To generate subscale raw scores for each respondent, the values on each subscale for those items with a 1 to 5 response were added. This number was then divided by the number of items used in the computation. This result was the average item raw score for that subscale. The average item raw score

was multiplied by the actual number of items on the subscale and rounded to the nearest whole number for the adjusted individual subscale raw score.

Each subscale was scored for all role group respondents. Individual raw scores on each subscale were added to produce group subscale values. The results were divided by the number of individuals responding to that subscale and rounded to the nearest whole number for the group subscale average raw score. This score was used in determining standard scores. Using a school climate conversion chart, group raw scores were converted to standard scores. Subscale scores were standardized as T-scores, a linear standard score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. The school climate survey was divided into 10 separate, independent subgroups. The t-test was used to see if a difference existed between how administrators, teachers, students, and community members perceived the climate in Iowa schools; and to determine if a difference in school climate existed between the two groups studied.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Introduction

Climate seems to be a determining factor in a school's success or failure (Brookover et al., 1982; Perkey and Smith, 1982; Sweeney, 1982; Dwyer, 1984; Sizer, 1984; and Andrews, 1987). School climate has a direct bearing on student achievement (Brookover, 1979); effective schools share a climate that is instructionally effective for all of their students (Edmonds, 1979); and effective schools appear to be characterized by a positive climate which is conducive to learning (Sizer, 1984).

This chapter presents an overview of the studies conducted on school climate and also examines the relationship between school climate and school success or failure.

Halpin and Croft (1963) were the recognized pioneers in the field of school climate. Their Organization Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) categorized school climate into six areas along a continuum: closed, paternal, familiar, controlled, autonomous, and open. Halpin and Croft claimed that the open climate was most desirable; the least desirable was a closed climate. Each category of climate was described

by the following characteristics which were rated high, average, or low: esprit, disengagement, hindrance, intimacy, aloofness, consideration, thrust, and production emphasis. The questions on the OCDQ were divided into these eight categories.

Most of the research focused on the social aspects which appear to be the major contributors to climate. Phi Delta Kappa released a study in 1973 on School Climate Improvement. The editors suggested eight factors which comprise school climate and determine its quality. "The results form an interaction of the school's programs, processes, and physical conditions: (Fox, 1973, p. 7).

Ideally, there should be evidence of: respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for input, continuous academic and social growth, cohesiveness, school renewal, caring with centrality of school goals of productivity and satisfaction (p. 10).

Basic to these goals and school climate indicators were the school climate determinants of program, process, and material.

Hoy and Miskel have stated that:

Organizational climate is a broad term that refers to perceptions of the general work environment of the school; it is influenced by the formal organization, informal organization, personalities of participants, and organizational leadership. It is the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of its members (Hoy and Miskel, 1987, p. 225).

Jorde states that "organizational climate can also be viewed as both a process and an end product" (1985, p. 4). Climate was something to work toward achieving as well as the means by which that goal was reached. She also discussed the

conceptual dimensions of climate in three domains: the interpersonal relations among the people, those factors which measure the professional growth and work orientation, and the structure of the work environment itself. The sum total of these conceptualized factors formed the climate of the school or organization.

Positive and healthy organizational climates are most often characterized by high energy, openness, trust, a collective sense of confidence, and a shared vision; unhealthy, negative climates are characterized by poor communication, divisiveness, conflict, and low staff morale (p. 4).

This environment has had a profound effect upon both the satisfaction and achievement of both teachers and students.

Schools with positive climates are places where the school projects a feeling that fosters both caring and learning; people exhibit a strong sense of pride, ownership, and personal productivity that comes from helping to make the school a better place (Keefe, Kelly & Miller, 1985, p. 70).

Norton has advocated that several considerations serve to underline the paramount importance of organizational climate in the school. These considerations included the concepts that the climate of a school sets the tone for the approach that schools used to achieve its goals and solve its problems as well as to determine effective communication. Climate also determines the direction of creativity and personal growth and development. "In a direct way, the school environment serves as a crucial role in determining what the school is and what it might become" (Norton, 1984, p. 43).

Climate was also a key factor which influenced the

acceptance of innovations as well as the motivation of participants. "Key elements to an innovation's success are higher teacher morale, support from the principal and direct administrators, and teachers' willingness to make extra efforts" (Berman, et al., 1975). Schmuck and Runkle found that climate assessment was important because in order to more effectively solve problems and handle conflicts, the school must have a climate which supported open confrontation of differences, receiving and giving feedback, and generally fosters an atmosphere that invited open interaction and discussion (1972). As further support for the importance of climate research, Brookover found when he and others studied elementary school achievement by students and school climate, that more of the differences in achievement could be attributed to the differences found in school climate than could be attributed to differences in socio-economic status or racial composition (1976).

Wiggins has implied that "social systems theory represents the theoretical framework from which one can derive a conceptualization of the climate of a school" (1971, p. 57). Lonsdale used the terms task-achievement dimension and need-satisfaction dimension synonymously with the terms nomothetic and ideographic when he wrote of organizational climate:

Indeed, organizational climate might be defined as the global assessment of the interaction between the task-achievement dimension and the need-satisfaction dimension within the organization or in other words, of the extent of the task-needs integration (1964, p. 166).

Wall focused on the congruence of principals' predictions of teachers' perceptions of actual and ideal situations, teacher personal characteristics, and the ability of superintendents to identify relative standings of schools in their districts on the openness continuum. In thirteen of the sixteen cases, the latter hypothesis was accepted. Principals of more open climates were better able to predict how their teachers would respond than those in more closed climates. No relationships were found in the personal characteristics. Ranyard postulated in his research that the organizational structure of a school would co-vary with the climate of that school. He found no significant relationship in this hypothesis, nor did he find a correlation between the number of rules of a school and the closedness of the climate. Notovney applied the OCDQ to parochial schools. He found that "the large percentages of the parochial schools fell into open categories which may suggest that the traditional ecclesiastical concept of authority may be undergoing a transition on the parish-school level" (p. 111).

Studies relating organizational climate to student achievement revealed that no statistically significant relationships were found between the separate organizational climate dimensions and the achievement of pupils; however, there was some evidence that open schools tend to be more related to high achievement (Miller, 1968; Alkin, 1968; Pumphrey, 1968).

Studies linking teachers' perceptions of organizational climate to informal organization and successful change found that there was no statistical relationship between the two variables (Heller, 1968; Helsel, 1968).

Leader behavior was related to organizational climate in studies completed by Owenby and by Wiggins in 1968. Generally, these researchers found that leader behavior and organizational climate were not related. Wiggins did find, however, that there was a significant relationship between the interpersonal orientation of the principal and the climate of the school.

The findings of this investigation clearly indicate the presence of a compelling organizational climate stability with the principal's behavior becoming more significantly related to the climate as the length of his (or her) incumbency increased (Wiggins, 1972, p. 105).

Owenby found certain personality factors of the principal to be correlated with climate, particularly openness.

Studies relating climate to students were undertaken by Braden, Panushka, Allen, and Hartley. Braden found that teachers and principals in more open schools held more positive attitudes about their students. Students' attitudes did not differ in open and closed climates. Similarities between the teachers' and principals' attitudes toward their students were more similar in those groups which held similar views of their respective climates. Panushka found no significant relationship between organizational climate and student achievement. There was some correlation between the

school size and student morale when Boyd completed his research. Allen studied the sense of alienation of both teachers and students and found that the general expectation that openness would be inversely related to a sense of alienation was supported by the teacher data, but not among the students. When Hartley studied student alienation, he did find some support for his hypothesis that alienation would be greater in closed climate schools. "The inauthenticity of behavior which pervades schools with closed climates appears to provide a school atmosphere which is highly conducive to a sense of normlessness among the students" (Hartley & Hoy, 1972, p. 22).

In 1970 Roberts attempted to relate perceptions of parents and elementary staff attitudes toward students and organizational climate and income. He found that staffs in the high and low socioeconomic areas in open and closed schools possessed similar attitudes towards students and teaching. Parents underestimated the attitudes of all staffs; those in high socioeconomic areas expected better attitudes than they felt the teachers possessed. Gilman studied perceptions of support and climate found no significant differences existing in the three climates in all teacher-perceived factors of support for the teachers' control of their authority spheres (1970).

Farinola (1971) tried to determine the relationship between the belief systems of faculty association leaders and

organizational climate. He did find a significant relationship between the open-mindedness of the chief negotiators and the openness of their respective organizational climate. He did not find such a relationship with the association presidents. He did not find significant relationships in the size of the school and climate although larger schools tended to be more open. When Melnick studied dogmatism and organizational climate in 1970, he found no significant relationship between the two. Nortman (1970) thought that there might be a relationship between climate and short stimulation type games in interaction and group dynamics. He found no significant relationships but did stress the value of such exercises in assessing climate and organizational behavior.

Studies relating climate to leadership or leader behavior revealed these findings. Principals who placed high evidence on human skills often had schools with more open climates (French, 1971). Directional relationships were noted between principal technical task emphasis and hindrance scores, and between principal human task emphasis and esprit scores of schools on opposite ends of the subtest score continuum (French, 1971). Schools scoring above the medium on the open climate scale had principals who scored higher in administrative decision-making, instructional leadership, and general administrative effectiveness (Casey, 1971).

Prenoveau (1971) found evidence in his study to confirm

that behaviors in the classroom are linked to social interactions in the school. Further, he concluded that the level of morale in an elementary school is related to organizational climate of that school. DeAngelis (1971) found a positive relationship between a staff member's perception of climate and his or her philosophy of human nature as measured on the substantive dimension, but he found no such relationship among the principals. Rank (1971) found that staff perceptions of climate were not related to student perceptions of environment.

Jaworowicz (1971) tried to determine if open-space school design altered the patterns of social interaction between teachers and the principals. He noted no significant divergence in teacher perception of climate changes in the open-space schools with the traditional schools. A significant relationship was found between increases in principal dogmatism-opinionation and decreases in the social needs satisfaction of the teachers.

Adelson found a significant relationship between teachers' manner of participation in decision making and the openness of the climate. Berstein found that within a given school, there were significant relationships among individual teachers' perceptions of their participation in decision-making, their perceptions of climate, and their perceptions of organizational output. Nelson found that the correlations between teachers within schools suggested that a portion of

the variance of the measure of this perception of climate and reinforcement could be attributed to the personality of the teacher. Age of the teacher was also a characteristic that affected perception of certain climate factors and principal reinforcement behavior.

Maggard (1972) compared the perceptions of teachers with those of principals. He found that these two groups differed significantly in how they viewed their respective climates; and there was a strong tendency for the principals to perceive climate in a more open direction. Climate did not seem to be related to socioeconomic status or to school size although teachers in smaller schools seemed to score higher on certain subtests such as intimacy. More openness of climates was found among male principals, young principals, and the least experienced principals. Knodt (1972) concluded that the OCDQ incorporated factors which can and do have an effect upon the perceptions which elementary teachers hold with regard to the role of the elementary teacher. When Moffett (1972) investigated the changes occurring in the perceptions of teachers of climate as a result of the implementation of a system of instructional evaluation, he found no significant differences. The study found no insufficient evidence to justify principal avoidance of the use of instructional evaluation on the grounds that it has an undesirable effect upon the organizational climate.

In 1977 Rohr directed a study to compare selected

characteristics of teachers, principals, and schools. He found that these characteristics could not be used to predict climate nor did the characteristics affect climate. Wide variations of age, experience, and sex were found in both open and closed schools, and climates were similar for urban and rural areas. Magee found that as the school size increased, the climate became more closed. He found that rural schools tended to be more open than urban schools. The more closed the school, the more the teachers viewed structure as being a constraint on climate. Crum studied self-concept of the principal as related to climate; he found no relationships between the two variables.

Several studies completed in 1979 were directed at leader behavior and climate. Kneale found that leader behavior indexes appeared to be congruent with the types of climate perceived by each faculty. Differences in descriptions of climate and leader behavior were found among the schools. She also found that teachers desired to participate in the decision making process in both types of climate. Haggerty studied leader situation and Machiavellianism and found that the Machiavellian orientation of principals was negatively related to climate. He also found that the degree of structure in leader situation did not account for the variation in climate.

Boyles (1979) studied personality characteristics of teachers and climate. She found that there were significant

correlations between personality factors and climate. There was a negative correlation between tenseness and openness in climate. She also found a correlation between thrust and an autonomous climate. Deck (1979) found that in elementary schools with other than closed climates, there was a significantly greater congruence between the teachers' and the principals' perception of the teachers' responsibilities. The same finding was true in the relationship with the subtest of esprit.

Plimpton (1979) studied student morale judgment as related to climate. He did not find higher levels of moral judgment in open climates, but he did find a statistical significance to the subtest of aloofness when lower levels were found.

Kabiry (1980) found no relationship between the school's organizational climate and the students' perceptions of classroom climate. A study of climate changes as a result of desegregation of staffs was conducted by Simon (1980). He found that desegregation did not affect the climate of the schools but did affect the teachers' perceptions of their working conditions and morale.

Agnew (1981) found significant relationships between student achievement and openness of climate. Esprit was the climate dimension correlating most frequently.

NASSP School Climate Survey

Of the hundreds of studies which have been conducted

about climate, most were based on the social-psychological perspective stated in Kurt Lewin's dictum: "Behavior is a function of personality and environment" (Marrow, 1969, p. 34). The Comprehensive Assessment of School Environment (CASE) Model of Effective School Environments (the sponsoring organization of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) School Climate Survey) shared that perspective.

The NASSP School Climate Survey was developed at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Funds to support the development effort were provided by NASSP, by the Teachers College, and the Layman Fund (a university research grant) of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Work was begun by Edgar A. Kelley and continued by John Glover. An item bank was generated by a comprehensive review of both the climate and effective schools literature and from an analysis of existing climate instruments used by researchers and practitioners.

The short definition of climate in the Interactive Model of the School Environment was "the relatively enduring pattern of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members". The climate survey asked residents how they think **most people** characterize various dimensions of the organization. The instrument aimed to measure shared perceptions rather than individual reactions, to capture an "image" of the organization rather than anyone's day-to-day response to it.

After initial pilot tests among various stakeholder groups, two forms of the climate instrument were subjected to a national pilot study. A second national study collected normative data for Form A of the instrument (the final version).

The NASSP School Climate Survey was designed for use with students as well as with adults. The reading level has been rated at grades 5-6. The survey was normed for students in grades 6-12, for teachers, and for parents. Assessment of all major stakeholder groups was recommended rather than a single group. Multiple groups allow for comparisons between and among their differing perceptions. These comparisons were useful in discerning anomalies and planning appropriate interventions to improve the school environment.

The NASSP School Climate Survey collected data about perceptions on 10 subscales:

- * Teacher-Student Relationships. Perceptions about the quality of the interpersonal and professional relationships between teachers and students.
- * Security and Maintenance. Perceptions about the quality of school building maintenance and the degree of the security people feel at the school.
- * Administration. Perceptions of the degree to which school administrators are effective in communicating with different role groups and in setting high performance expectations for teachers and students.

- * Student Academic Orientation. Perceptions about student attention to task and concern for achievement at school.
- * Student Behavioral Values. Perceptions about student self-discipline and tolerance for others.
- * Guidance. Perceptions of the quality of academic and career guidance and personal counseling services available to students.
- * Student-Peer Relationships. Perceptions about students' care and respect for one another and their mutual cooperation.
- * Parent and Community-School Relationships. Perceptions of the amount and quality of involvement in the school by parents and other community members.
- * Instructional Management. Perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher classroom organization and the use of classroom time.
- * Student Activities. Perceptions about opportunities for, and actual participation by students, in school-sponsored activities.

Summary

A review of the literature indicated the extensive research completed in school climate. Climate was determined to be a factor in schools success or failure. School climate had a direct bearing on student achievement and effective schools shared a climate that was instructionally effective for all of their students. Effective schools appeared to be

characterized by a positive climate which was conducive to learning.

Of the many studies which were conducted about climate, most were based on the social-psychological perspective stated by Kurt Lewin: "Behavior is a function of personality and environment". The NASSP School Climate Survey showed that perspective. The survey was designed for use by students, teachers, and parents. Multiple groups allowed for comparisons between and among their differing perceptions. The analysis of the differing perceptions was a major focus of this study.

CHAPTER III

Methodology and Procedures

This chapter includes the research questions, selection of subjects, the procedures for data collection, a description of the instrument, and the statistical technique used to analyze the data.

Research Questions

The study focused on these questions:

1. What is the climate of Iowa schools as measured by the NASSP School Climate Survey (grades 6-12)?
 - A. How do students, community members, administrators, and teachers in Iowa perceive school climate?
 - B. How does school climate in small Iowa school districts differ from that of large Iowa school districts?
2. What are the implications of the data for superintendents of Iowa school districts and Iowa legislators?

Selection of Subjects

The state of Iowa was geographically divided into

quadrants. School districts were identified by size (plus or minus 600 students) within each quadrant. Using the Iowa Educational Directory and the Iowa Department of Education Enrollment Map, 429 school districts were identified. Because quadrants differed in the number of school districts, numbers were converted to percents to reflect equal sampling from each quadrant of the state. For the purpose of this study, the sample size was limited to 100 school districts. School districts were then randomly selected from each quadrant totalling 50 schools with fewer than 600 students and 50 schools with more than 600 students.

The NASSP School Climate Survey was sent to the high school principal in each of the randomly selected school districts. The subject population within each school district were randomly selected students in grades 6-12, all administration, randomly selected faculty and community members. Table IV indicates the selection process:

Table IV

 SELECTION OF SAMPLE

K-12 ENROLLMENT

600 or less

600 or more

Number of respondents:

Students (6-12)	5%	5%
Teachers	10%	10%
Administrators	All	All
Community Members	15	25

Procedures for Data Collection

The NASSP School Climate Survey (SCS) was sent to the high school principal in the 100 randomly selected school districts. A cover letter (see Appendix A) was sent to each principal along with instructions (see Appendix A and B), and the SCS (see Appendix C). Fifty-seven school districts completed and returned the survey. Table V indicates the distribution of the surveys by quadrant.

Table V

Distribution Response of Completed Surveys

Quadrant	Students	Teachers	Comm Members	Admin	Total
1	248	52	145	46	491
2	520	148	405	134	1207
3	344	84	265	62	755
4	479	106	310	88	983
Total	1591	390	1125	330	3436

Instrumentation

The NASSP School Climate Survey was developed at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Funds to support development were provided by NASSP and by Teachers College and the Layman Fund (a university research grant) of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. An item bank was created for the development of this instrument. This item bank was generated from a comprehensive review of both the climate and effective schools literature and an analysis of existing climate instruments used by both researchers and practitioners.

After initial pilot tests, two forms of the instrument

were further refined in a national pilot study. A second national study was conducted to collect normative data for Form A of the instrument (the final version). These two national studies and related data analyses were conducted at Western Michigan University. Both studies were supported by NASSP and by the College of Education at Western Michigan University.

The NASSP School Climate Survey was normed for use with students in grades 6-12, and for use with teachers, and parent or citizen groups. Instrument readability was rated at grades 5-6. Assessment of all major stakeholder groups, rather than a single group, was recommended. Broader assessment allows for comparison of perceptions between and among groups. These comparisons can be useful in discerning and planning for appropriate interventions to improve school environments.

The NASSP School Climate Survey collected data about perceptions on 10 subscales.

- * Teacher-Student Relationships. Perceptions about the quality of the interpersonal and professional relationships between teachers and students.
- * Security and Maintenance. Perceptions about the quality of maintenance and the degree of security people feel at the school.
- * Administration. Perceptions of the degree to which school administrators are effective in communicating with different role groups and in setting high performance

expectations for teachers and students.

- * Student Academic Orientation. Perceptions about the student attention to task and concern for achievement at school.
- * Student Behavioral Values. Perceptions about student self-discipline and tolerance for others.
- * Guidance. Perceptions of the quality of academic and career guidance and personal counseling services available to students.
- * Student-Peer Relationships. Perceptions about students' care and respect for one another and their mutual cooperation.
- * Parent and Community-School Relationships. Perceptions of the amount and quality of involvement in the school by parents and other community members.
- * Instructional Management. Perceptions of the efficiency and effectiveness of teacher classroom organization and the use of classroom time.
- * Student Activities. Perceptions about opportunities for and actual participation by students in school-sponsored activities.

Reliability

For the School Climate Survey, internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) have been calculated for each subscale based on data collected in pilot and normative studies. These indices provide an estimate of the degree to

which items on a given subscale are similar in meaning. The average internal consistency reliability of the climate subscales is 0.81, with a range from 0.67 to 0.92. Table VI lists these subscale reliabilities.

Table VI

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY
Internal Consistency Estimates of Reliability

Subscale Name	Number of items	STUDENTS		TEACHERS		PARENTS	
		n	Cronbach's alpha	n	Cronbach's alpha	n	Cronbach's alpha
Teacher-Student Relationships	12	5220	.87	1442	.87	2078	.92
Security and Maintenance	7	3946	.84	1595	.85	2198	.88
Administration	6	4710	.82	1585	.85	2222	.90
Student Academic Orientation	4	6088	.75	1643	.83	2928	.81
Student Behavioral Values	3	6865	.67	1611	.73	2089	.79
Guidance	4	5612	.78	1588	.84	2607	.88
Student-Peer Relationships	4	6315	.80	1624	.80	2961	.85
Parent & Community-School Relat.	4	4640	.74	1431	.79	2463	.79
Instructional Management	7	6173	.79	1578	.79	1957	.85
Student Activities	4	5373	.72	1479	.79	2565	.78

Validity

Validity is the extent to which an instrument actually measures what it purports to measure. Evidence of content validity and construct validity are discussed.

Content validity is the extent to which items on a scale are representative of the domain(s) of interest. The climate was developed by task force members after an extensive review of literature. A data bank of items was generated, based on the review and on existing measures of climate and satisfaction. The task force acted as an expert panel in the development and selection of items.

In pilot studies, climate items were listed at random for purposes of exploratory factor analysis. Climate items were

field tested and subjected to factor analysis. Redundant and ambiguous items were revised or excluded. Pilot testing of the instruments offered several opportunities for input and feedback from school personnel. Both empirical data from the field studies and rational considerations guided the formulation of subsequent drafts of each instrument.

Construct validity is an abstraction, not directly observable, that attempts to account for measured behaviors. Construct validity is concerned with the meaningfulness of a test, whether it really measures the underlying trait or characteristic that gives it meaning. Climate and role group satisfaction are such constructs. Climate and satisfaction represent perceptions and attitudes that can be measured. The construct validity of the School Climate Survey is the indicator of how well each instrument measures school climate of the target role group.

During the development of the instruments, the task force placed great emphasis on scale and item conceptualization in order to support strong construct validity. Task force members produced position papers and reviews of instrumentation keyed to the pertinent variables of the Interactive Model of the School Environment. Extensive use of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis in field testing the instruments ensured that only concepts and items with strong factor loadings were retained.

Factor analysis is a computerized statistical technique

used to identify the basic relationships among sets of test scores. Factor analysis confirms the existence of **a priori** clusters of items, allowing the researcher to judge whether the measured dimensions of a test are those predicted by the theory (the model in this instance). Factor analysis of the climate and satisfaction instruments identified both the intercorrelated items and the underlying factors (subscales) that seemed to account for the correlations. These analyses confirmed the conceptualization of the scales and guided the revision of the instruments.

Task force review and factor analyses both support a strong construct validity for the climate instrument.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

The NASSP School Climate Survey (SCS) was used to determine the school climate of Iowa schools. The SCS used a five-point Likert scale to determine school climate. The t-test was used to determine if differences existed between the means (\bar{x}) of the subgroups on the SCS when comparing the responses from schools with more than 600 students to the responses from schools with fewer than 600 students.

CHAPTER IV

Presentation and Analysis of Data

This chapter includes the preparation of data for analysis, the NASSP School Climate Survey, presentation and analysis of data, and school climate of Iowa schools.

Preparing the Data for Analysis

The data were processed at the Data Entry Department of the Department of Education and Administration at the University of Northern Iowa.

The NASSP School Climate Survey

The NASSP School Climate Survey (SCS) consisted of fifty-five questions and ten subscales. The questions by subscales were as follows:

	<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Number of Items</u>
I.	Teacher-Student Relationships questions 1-12	12
II.	Security and Maintenance questions 13-19	7
III.	Administration questions 20-25	6
IV.	Student Academic Orientation questions 26-29	4
V.	Student Behavioral Values questions 30-32	3

VI.	Guidance questions 33-36	4
VII.	Student-Peer Relationships questions 37-40	4
VIII.	Parent & Community-School Relat. questions 41-44	4
IX.	Instructional Management questions 45-51	7
X.	Student Activities questions 52-55	4

The questions were rated on a five-point Likert scale: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) neither agree nor disagree; (4) agree; (5) strongly agree.

Presentation and Analysis of the Data


The study focused on these questions:

1. What is the climate of Iowa schools as measured by the NASSP School Climate Survey (grades 6-12)?
 - A. How do students, community members, administrators, and teachers in Iowa perceive school climate?
 - B. How does school climate in small Iowa school districts differ from that of large Iowa school districts?
2. What are the implications of the data for superintendents of Iowa school districts and Iowa legislators?

The perceptions of climate of students, community members, administrators, and teachers was determined by using

the SCS. For the purpose of this study, the state of Iowa was divided into quadrants. The map in Figure 1 illustrates the division of the state.

Figure 1
Iowa Quadrants



Data were collected from a random sample of fifty-seven school districts. The t-test was used to determine whether significant differences existed between the ten subscales of the SCS. When referring to the analysis of data in Tables VII-XXII, the following abbreviations were used.

<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
I+ Students	Quadrant I, more than 600 students
I- Students	Quadrant I, fewer than 600 students
I+ Community Member	Quadrant I, more than 600 students
I- Community Member	Quadrant I, fewer than 600 students
I+ Administrator	Quadrant I, more than 600 students
I- Administrator	Quadrant I, fewer than 600 students
I+ Teachers	Quadrant I, more than 600 students

I- Teachers

Quadrant I, fewer than 600 students

The same pattern was used for II+, II-, III+, III-, IV+, and IV-.

The analysis of data for each subscale follows:

Table VII

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students
from School Districts with More than 600 Students to
Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	I+ Students*			I- Students**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.437	0.547	201	4.181	0.622	38	0.10	237	-7.52	.001
2	4.053	0.602	201	4.214	0.599	38	0.11	237	-1.51	
3	2.895	0.398	201	4.083	0.727	38	0.08	237	-14.44	.001
4	3.062	0.521	201	4.041	0.518	38	0.09	237	-10.63	.001
5	2.625	0.425	201	4.013	0.468	38	0.08	237	-18.16	.001
6	3.262	0.407	201	4.072	0.675	38	0.08	237	-9.97	.001
7	3.843	0.552	201	3.791	0.723	38	0.10	237	0.51	
8	3.906	0.588	201	3.821	0.516	38	0.10	237	0.83	
9	3.750	0.663	201	3.714	0.446	38	0.11	237	0.32	
10	3.625	0.493	201	3.583	0.638	38	0.09	237	0.46	
all	3.511	0.505	201	3.981	0.553	38	0.09	237	-5.18	.001

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 201 I+ students had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.511 with a standard deviation of 0.505 while the 38 I- students had a mean score of 3.981 with a standard deviation of 0.553. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.09 and with 237 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -5.18. The t-ratio of -5.18 was significant at the .001 confidence level.

The data reveal that the students in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than do

students in large school districts. Statistically this difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Analyzing by subscale, the data indicate that students in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than students in large school districts for Teacher-Student Relationships, Administration, Student Academic Orientation, Students Behavioral Values, and Guidance.

Table VIII

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Community Members from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Community Members from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	I+ Comm Members*			I- Comm Members**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.380	0.517	84	4.567	0.621	44	0.10	126	-11.50	.001
2	4.040	0.528	84	4.613	0.541	44	0.10	126	-5.78	.001
3	3.452	0.662	84	4.867	0.801	44	0.13	126	-10.67	.001
4	3.678	0.419	84	4.352	0.624	44	0.09	126	-7.26	.001
5	2.857	0.441	84	4.267	0.643	44	0.10	126	-14.60	.001
6	4.214	0.757	84	4.512	0.558	44	0.13	126	-2.30	
7	3.571	0.606	84	4.731	0.674	44	0.12	126	-9.89	.001
8	4.321	0.612	84	4.356	0.745	44	0.12	126	-0.28	
9	3.693	0.481	84	4.371	0.712	44	0.11	126	-6.39	.001
10	3.714	0.594	84	4.226	0.588	44	0.11	126	-4.65	.001
all	3.672	0.514	84	4.509	0.682	44	0.11	126	-7.80	.001

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 84 I+ community members had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.672 with a standard deviation of 0.514 while the 44 I- community members had a mean score of 4.509 with a standard deviation of 0.682. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.11 and with 126 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -7.80. The t-

ratio of -7.80 was significant at the .001 confidence level. An analysis of the data indicate that Community Members in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than do Community Members in large school districts. Statistically the difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The data also reveal that Community Members in small school districts perceive school climate to be significantly higher than Community Members in large school districts on all subscales with the exception of Guidance and Parent and Community-School Relationships.

Table IX

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Administrators from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Administrators from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	I+ Admins.*			I- Admins.**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.512	0.486	33	4.472	0.642	6	0.23	37	-4.24	.001
2	4.761	0.711	33	4.927	0.778	6	0.32	37	-0.52	
3	4.883	0.751	33	4.278	0.534	6	0.32	37	1.88	
4	4.508	0.619	33	4.252	0.564	6	0.27	37	0.94	
5	3.445	0.428	33	4.112	0.728	6	0.21	37	-3.13	
6	2.753	0.552	33	4.416	0.603	6	0.25	37	-6.70	.001
7	3.916	0.463	33	4.167	0.559	6	0.21	37	-1.19	
8	3.696	0.505	33	4.158	0.491	6	0.22	37	-2.16	
9	4.238	0.583	33	4.142	0.756	6	0.27	37	0.36	
10	4.252	0.616	33	4.583	0.508	6	0.27	37	-1.24	
all	4.012	0.568	33	4.363	0.617	6	0.26	37	-1.38	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 33 I+ administrators had a mean score on all ten

subscales of 4.012 with a standard deviation of 0.568 while the 6 I- administrators had a mean score of 4.363 with a standard deviation of 0.617. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.26 and with 37 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -1.38. The t-ratio of -1.38 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data reveal no significant difference between the perception of school climate for Administrators in small school districts to Administrators in large school districts when comparing all subscales. Further analysis of the data indicate that Administrators in small school districts perceive climate higher than do Administrators in large school districts for Teacher-Student Relationships and Guidance.

Table X

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	I+ Teachers*			I- Teachers**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.797	0.526	38	3.867	0.412	12	0.17	48	-0.42	
2	4.408	0.772	38	3.821	0.583	12	0.24	48	2.42	
3	3.928	0.737	38	4.083	0.508	12	0.23	48	-0.68	
4	3.428	0.492	38	3.312	0.417	12	0.16	48	0.74	
5	3.285	0.501	38	2.916	0.634	12	0.18	48	2.09	
6	3.821	0.517	38	4.010	0.538	12	0.17	48	-1.09	
7	3.714	0.434	38	3.562	0.483	12	0.15	48	1.03	
8	3.678	0.713	38	2.751	0.606	12	0.23	48	4.06	.001
9	3.653	0.485	38	3.714	0.522	12	0.16	48	-0.37	
10	4.214	0.649	38	4.125	0.614	12	0.21	48	0.42	
all	3.833	0.738	38	3.659	0.483	12	0.23	48	0.76	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 38 I+ teachers had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.833 with a standard deviation of 0.738 while the 12 I- teachers had a mean score of 3.659 with a standard deviation of 0.483. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.23 and with 48 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of 0.26. The t-ratio of 0.26 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data reveal no significant difference between the perception of school climate for Administrators in small school districts to Administrators in large school districts when comparing all subscales. Further analysis of the data indicate that Administrators in small school districts perceive climate higher than do Administrators in large school districts for Teacher-Student Relationships and Guidance.

Table XI

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students
 from School Districts with More than 600 Students to
Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	II+ Students*			II- Students**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	4.041	0.566	612	3.901	0.450	81	0.07	691	2.14	
2	4.452	0.678	612	4.216	0.668	81	0.08	691	2.95	
3	4.194	0.508	612	3.814	0.511	81	0.06	691	6.32	.001
4	3.196	0.493	612	4.202	0.723	81	0.06	691	-16.21	.001
5	3.166	0.724	612	3.627	0.493	81	0.08	691	-5.56	.001
6	4.176	0.404	612	4.144	0.626	81	0.05	691	0.62	
7	3.875	0.648	612	4.018	0.533	81	0.08	691	-1.90	
8	4.083	0.788	612	3.863	0.749	81	0.09	691	2.37	
9	4.119	0.431	612	4.124	0.588	81	0.05	691	-0.09	
10	4.208	0.616	612	4.637	0.508	81	0.07	691	-6.00	.001
all	4.075	0.519	612	4.083	0.535	81	0.06	691	-0.13	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 612 II+ students had a mean score on all ten subscales of 4.075 with a standard deviation of 0.519 while the 81 II- students had a mean score of 4.083 with a standard deviation of 0.535. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.06 and with 691 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -0.13. The t-ratio of -0.13 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data reveal that Teachers in small school districts perceive climate about the same as Teachers in large school districts. On the subscale of Parent and Community-School Relationships, Teachers in large school districts perceive school climate significantly more positive than Teachers in small school districts.

Table XII

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Community Members from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Community Members from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	II+ Comm Members*			II- Comm Members**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.875	0.067	268	4.181	0.604	103	0.07	369	-4.35	.001
2	4.023	0.444	268	4.432	0.848	103	0.07	369	-6.04	.001
3	3.861	0.534	268	4.603	0.592	103	0.06	369	-11.62	.001
4	3.167	0.782	268	4.214	0.581	103	0.08	369	-12.34	.001
5	2.611	0.489	268	3.522	0.507	103	0.06	369	-15.91	.001
6	4.250	0.534	268	4.029	0.810	103	0.07	369	3.06	
7	3.791	0.482	268	4.364	0.617	103	0.06	369	-9.45	.001
8	3.083	0.465	268	4.185	0.434	103	0.05	369	-20.82	.001
9	3.738	0.694	268	4.101	0.623	103	0.08	369	-4.64	.001
10	3.833	0.411	268	3.963	0.468	103	0.05	369	-2.62	
all	3.715	0.493	268	4.208	0.614	103	0.06	369	-8.04	.001

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 268 II+ community members had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.715 with a standard deviation of 0.493 while the 103 II- community members had a mean score of 4.208 with a standard deviation of 0.614. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.06 and with 369 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -8.04. The t-ratio of -8.04 was significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data, when comparing all subscales, reveal no significant difference between the perception of school climate for Students from small school districts to Students from large school districts. Further analysis of the data indicate that Students from large school districts have a higher perception of school climate than do Students from

small school districts on the subscale Administration. The data also indicate that Students in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than Students from large school districts for Student Academic Orientation, Student Behavioral Values, and Student Activities.

Table XIII

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Administrators from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Administrators from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	II+ Adms.*			II- Adms.**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	4.138	0.482	114	4.147	0.553	13	0.14	125	-0.06	
2	4.476	0.728	114	4.781	0.618	13	0.21	125	-1.45	
3	4.361	0.527	114	4.443	0.522	13	0.15	125	-0.53	
4	3.834	0.787	114	4.083	0.561	13	0.22	125	-1.11	
5	3.511	0.406	114	3.728	0.744	13	0.13	125	-1.65	
6	3.843	0.447	114	4.317	0.593	13	0.14	125	3.50	.001
7	4.017	0.539	114	4.134	0.608	13	0.16	125	-0.73	
8	3.583	0.730	114	4.228	0.559	13	0.21	125	-3.08	
9	3.809	0.662	114	3.911	0.433	13	0.19	125	-0.54	
10	4.102	0.548	114	4.503	0.603	13	0.16	125	-2.47	
all	4.024	0.477	114	4.239	0.588	13	0.14	125	-1.50	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 114 II+ administrators had a mean score on all ten subscales of 4.024 with a standard deviation of 0.477 while the 13 II- administrators had a mean score of 4.239 with a standard deviation of 0.588. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.14 and with 125 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -1.50. The t-ratio of -1.50 was not significant at the .001 confidence

level.

An analysis of the data indicate that Community Members in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than do Community Members in large school districts. Statistically the difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The data also reveal that Community Members in small school districts perceive school climate to be statistically higher than do Community Members in large school districts on all subscale except Guidance.

Table XIV

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	II+ Teachers*			II- Teachers**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.854	0.557	107	3.884	0.624	27	0.12	132	-0.24	
2	4.214	0.781	107	4.408	0.631	27	0.16	132	-1.19	
3	4.458	0.610	107	4.201	0.507	27	0.13	132	2.02	
4	3.014	0.422	107	3.428	0.427	27	0.09	132	-4.45	.001
5	3.069	0.673	107	2.661	0.593	27	0.14	132	2.88	
6	4.375	0.704	107	3.983	0.434	27	0.14	132	2.76	
7	3.812	0.491	107	3.447	0.564	27	0.11	132	3.35	.001
8	3.312	0.678	107	3.165	0.702	27	0.15	132	1.00	
9	4.071	0.433	107	3.778	0.439	27	0.09	132	3.13	
10	4.437	0.646	107	4.316	0.541	27	0.13	132	0.90	
all	3.881	0.521	107	3.757	0.484	27	0.11	132	1.12	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 107 II+ teachers had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.881 with a standard deviation of 0.521 while the 27 II- teachers had a mean score of 3.757 with a standard deviation of 0.484. A comparison of the two groups revealed

a standard error of difference of 0.11 and with 132 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of 1.12. The t-ratio of 1.12 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

Based upon an analysis of the data, no significant difference was revealed between the perception of school climate for Teachers in small school districts to Teachers in large school districts. Further analysis reveal that Teachers in small school districts perceive climate higher than Teachers in large school districts for Student Academic Orientation. Teachers in large school districts perceive climate higher than Teachers in small school districts for Student-Peer Relationships.

Table XV

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	III+ Students*			III- Students**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.742	0.445	194	3.812	0.453	124	0.05	316	-1.36	
2	4.273	0.581	194	4.178	0.510	124	0.06	316	1.49	
3	3.701	0.737	194	3.875	0.472	124	0.07	316	-2.34	
4	3.625	0.632	194	4.252	0.664	124	0.07	316	-8.46	.001
5	2.863	0.348	194	3.255	0.525	124	0.05	316	-8.01	.001
6	4.118	0.468	194	4.312	0.581	124	0.06	316	-3.28	
7	3.926	0.493	194	4.437	0.689	124	0.07	316	-7.70	.001
8	3.886	0.739	194	4.187	0.479	124	0.07	316	-4.03	.001
9	3.943	0.475	194	4.107	0.428	124	0.05	316	-3.12	
10	4.351	0.604	194	5.014	0.717	124	0.07	316	-8.87	.001
all	3.872	0.477	194	4.100	0.563	124	0.06	316	-3.87	.001

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 194 III+ students had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.872 with a standard deviation of 0.477 while

the 124 III- students had a mean score of 4.100 with a standard deviation of 0.563. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.06 and with 316 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -3.87. The t-ratio of -3.87 was significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data indicate that Students in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than do Students in large school districts. Statistically the difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The data also reveal that Students in small school districts perceive school climate to be statistically higher than do Students in large school districts for Student Academic Orientation, Student Behavioral Values, Student-Peer Relationships, Parent and Community-School Relationships, and Student Activities.

Table XVI

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Community Members from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Community Members from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	III+ Comm Members*			III- Comm Members**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.508	0.716	92	4.021	0.674	149	0.09	239	-5.60	.001
2	4.216	0.623	92	4.857	0.723	149	0.09	239	-7.04	.001
3	3.801	0.438	92	4.208	0.501	149	0.06	239	-6.42	.001
4	3.445	0.703	92	4.375	0.582	149	0.08	239	-11.12	.001
5	2.243	0.537	92	2.752	0.386	149	0.06	239	-8.54	.001
6	4.037	-.627	92	3.871	0.545	149	0.08	239	2.17	
7	3.661	0.488	92	4.042	0.573	149	0.07	239	-5.30	.001
8	3.779	0.532	92	4.062	0.484	149	0.07	239	-4.24	.001
9	3.621	0.730	92	4.178	0.610	149	0.09	239	-6.38	.001
10	3.918	0.513	92	4.187	0.496	149	0.07	239	-4.04	.001
all	3.713	0.564	92	4.122	0.607	149	0.08	239	-5.22	.001

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 92 III+ community members had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.713 with a standard deviation of 0.564 while the 149 III- community members had a mean score of 4.122 with a standard deviation of 0.607. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.08 and with 239 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -5.22. The t-ratio of -5.22 was significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data reveal that Community Members in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than do Community Members in large school districts. The difference was significantly higher at the .001 level of confidence. Significant differences were also revealed on all subscales with the exception for Guidance.

Table XVII

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Administrators from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Administrators from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	III+ Admins.*			III- Admins.**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.824	0.473	34	4.027	0.571	21	0.14	53	-1.43	
2	4.628	0.483	34	4.857	0.749	21	0.17	53	-1.38	
3	4.566	0.715	34	4.556	0.627	21	0.19	53	0.05	
4	4.118	0.655	34	3.916	0.558	21	0.17	53	1.17	
5	3.398	0.503	34	3.343	0.757	21	0.17	53	0.91	
6	3.558	-0.567	34	3.916	0.425	21	0.14	53	-2.49	
7	3.138	0.720	34	3.947	0.543	21	0.18	53	-4.42	.001
8	4.065	0.476	34	4.345	0.762	21	0.17	53	-1.68	
9	4.034	0.401	34	3.809	0.537	21	0.13	53	1.77	
10	4.437	0.693	34	4.668	0.670	21	0.19	53	-1.22	
all	4.106	0.448	34	4.230	0.646	21	0.15	53	-0.84	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 34 III+ administrators had a mean score on all ten subscales of 4.106 with a standard deviation of 0.448 while the 21 III- administrators had a mean score of 4.230 with a standard deviation of 0.646. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.15 and with 53 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -0.84. The t-ratio of -0.84 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data indicate no significant difference between the perception of school climate for Administrators in small school districts to Administrators in large school districts.

The data also reveal that Administrators in small school

districts perceive school climate to be statistically higher than do Administrators in large school districts for Student-Peer Relationships.

Table XVIII

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	III+ Teachers*			III- Teachers**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	4.274	0.621	39	4.208	0.578	42	0.13	79	0.50	
2	4.558	0.548	39	4.752	0.636	42	0.13	79	-1.47	
3	3.647	0.503	39	3.252	0.577	42	0.12	79	3.27	
4	3.212	0.718	39	3.561	0.429	42	0.13	79	-2.68	
5	3.158	0.463	39	2.255	0.315	42	0.09	79	10.33	.001
6	4.269	0.634	39	4.041	0.493	42	0.13	79	1.81	
7	3.514	0.392	39	3.312	0.408	42	0.16	79	0.50	
8	3.883	0.522	39	3.687	0.560	42	0.12	79	1.63	
9	3.962	0.713	39	3.535	0.702	42	0.16	79	2.71	
10	4.010	0.648	39	4.257	0.584	42	0.14	79	-1.80	
all	3.872	0.603	39	3.818	0.488	42	0.12	79	0.44	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 39 III+ teachers had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.872 with a standard deviation of 0.603 while the 42 III- teachers had a mean score of 3.818 with a standard deviation of 0.488. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.12 and with 79 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of 0.44. The t-ratio of 0.44 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data reveal that Teachers in small school districts perceive school climate about the same as Teachers in large school districts. On the subscale Student Behavioral Values, Teachers in large school districts perceive

school climate significantly higher than do Teachers in small school districts.

Table XIX

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Students from School Districts with More than 600 Students to Students from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	IV+ Students*			IV- Students**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	4.103	0.607	342	4.017	0.569	102	0.07	442	1.27	
2	4.164	0.452	342	4.051	0.602	102	0.06	442	2.04	
3	3.671	0.413	342	3.962	0.487	102	0.05	442	-5.98	.001
4	3.817	0.763	342	4.123	0.527	102	0.08	442	-3.79	.001
5	3.041	0.559	342	3.323	0.473	102	0.06	442	-4.62	.001
6	3.843	0.520	342	4.226	0.740	102	0.07	442	-5.88	.001
7	3.721	0.478	342	4.185	0.595	102	0.06	442	-8.11	.001
8	4.210	0.569	342	3.984	0.616	102	0.07	442	3.45	.001
9	3.817	0.481	342	3.928	0.481	102	0.05	442	-2.05	
10	4.063	0.612	342	4.483	0.639	102	0.07	442	-6.02	.001
all	3.877	0.446	342	3.818	0.622	102	0.06	442	1.06	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 342 IV+ students had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.877 with a standard deviation of 0.446 while the 102 IV- students had a mean score of 3.818 with a standard deviation of 0.622. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.06 and with 442 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of 1.06. The t-ratio of 1.06 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data, when comparing all subscales, reveal no significant difference between the perception of school climate for Students from small school districts to students from large school districts.

Further analysis indicate that Students from small school

districts have a significantly higher perception of school climate than do Students from large school districts for the subscales Administration, Student Academic Orientation, Student Behavioral Values, Guidance, and Student Activities.

Students from large school districts have a higher perception of school climate than do Students from small school districts for Student-Peer Relationships.

Table XX

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Community Members from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Community Members from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	IV+ Comm Members*			IV- Comm Members**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.624	0.718	165	4.226	0.724	124	0.09	287	-7.03	.001
2	4.213	0.502	165	4.538	0.688	124	0.07	287	-4.64	.001
3	4.293	0.621	165	4.408	0.619	124	0.07	287	-1.56	
4	3.578	0.494	165	4.126	0.733	124	0.07	287	-7.58	
5	2.556	0.406	165	3.607	0.498	124	0.05	287	-19.75	.001
6	3.904	-0.753	165	4.146	0.505	124	0.08	287	-3.09	
7	3.775	0.662	165	4.237	0.583	124	0.07	287	-6.18	.001
8	3.707	0.514	165	3.882	0.617	124	0.07	287	-2.63	
9	3.857	0.477	165	4.256	0.808	124	0.08	287	-5.24	.001
10	3.806	0.492	165	4.065	0.564	124	0.06	287	-4.16	.001
all	3.789	0.611	165	4.174	0.564	124	0.07	287	-5.48	.001

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 165 IV+ community members had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.789 with a standard deviation of 0.611 while the 124 IV- community members had a mean score of 4.174 with a standard deviation of 0.564. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.07 and with 287 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -5.48. The t-

ratio of -5.48 was significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data reveal that Community Members in small school districts perceive school climate to be higher than do Community Members in large school districts. Statistically the difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The data also reveal that Community Members in small school districts perceive school climate to be statistically higher than do Community Members in large school districts for Student-Teacher Relationships, Security and Maintenance, Student Academic Orientation, Student Behavioral Values, Student-Peer Relationships, Instructional Management, and Student Activities.

Table XXI

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing
Administrators from School Districts with
 More than 600 Students to Administrators from
 School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	IV+ Admins.*			IV- Admins.**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.996	0.466	62	4.293	0.618	17	0.14	77	-2.16	
2	4.536	0.482	62	4.667	0.684	17	0.15	77	-0.90	
3	4.308	0.619	62	4.404	0.843	17	0.18	77	-0.52	
4	4.273	0.743	62	4.114	0.595	17	0.20	77	0.81	
5	4.073	0.624	62	3.828	0.536	17	0.17	77	1.47	
6	3.738	0.446	62	4.275	0.738	17	0.14	77	-3.77	.001
7	4.118	0.768	62	4.206	0.661	17	0.20	77	-0.43	
8	3.883	0.499	62	4.026	0.769	17	0.15	77	-0.92	
9	3.927	0.585	62	4.129	0.608	17	0.16	77	-1.25	
10	4.382	0.591	62	4.607	0.583	17	0.16	77	-1.39	
all	4.152	0.635	62	4.607	0.738	17	0.18	77	-0.69	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 62 IV+ administrators had a mean score on all ten subscales of 4.152 with a standard deviation of 0.635 while the 17 IV- administrators had a mean score of 4.277 with a standard deviation of 0.738. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.18 and with 77 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of -0.69. The t-ratio of -0.69 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

An analysis of the data reveal no significant difference between the perception of school climate for Administrators in small school districts to Administrators in large school districts when comparing all subscales.

Further analysis of the data indicate that Administrators in small school districts perceive climate higher than do Administrators in large school districts for the subscale of Guidance.

Table XXII

Statistical Analysis of Ten Subscales Comparing Teachers
from School Districts with More than 600 Students to
Teachers from School Districts with Fewer than 600 Students

Subscales	IV+ Teachers*			IV- Teachers**			Estimated Stand. Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	signif.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
1	3.903	0.588	64	3.883	0.557	34	0.12	96	0.16	
2	4.382	0.618	64	4.121	0.588	34	0.13	96	2.02	
3	4.161	0.539	64	3.814	0.725	34	0.13	96	2.68	
4	3.258	0.467	64	3.627	0.637	34	0.11	96	-3.27	
5	3.341	0.482	64	3.214	0.477	34	0.10	96	1.25	
6	3.987	0.606	64	3.762	0.492	34	0.12	96	1.86	
7	3.634	0.477	64	3.475	0.713	34	0.12	96	1.32	
8	3.583	0.641	64	3.369	0.481	34	0.13	96	1.71	
9	4.161	0.755	64	3.812	0.733	34	0.16	96	2.20	
10	4.283	0.603	64	4.114	0.726	34	0.14	96	1.23	
all	3.904	0.523	64	3.749	0.526	34	0.11	96	1.39	

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

The 64 IV+ teachers had a mean score on all ten subscales of 3.904 with a standard deviation of 0.523 while the 34 IV- teachers had a mean score of 3.749 with a standard deviation of 0.526. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of differences of 0.11 and with 96 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of 1.39. The t-ratio of 1.39 was not significant at the .001 confidence level.

No subscales were significant at the .001 confidence level.

Combined Responses

The analysis of data was used to determine if a difference existed between all respondents (students, community members, administrators, and teachers) of school

districts with more than 600 students and school districts with fewer than 600 students. Refer to Table XVII.

Table XXIII

Comparison of All Respondents from Schools with More than 600 Students to All Respondents from Schools with Fewer than 600 Students

Total + *	Mean	SD	N	Total - **	Mean	SD	N	Est S Error	Degrees of Freedom	t	sig.
Students	3.910	0.490	1349	Students	4.000	0.570	345	0.03	1692	-2.86	
Comm Memb	3.729	0.539	609	Comm Memb	4.199	0.604	420	0.04	1027	-13.09	.001
Admin	4.067	0.526	243	Admin	4.260	0.675	57	0.08	298	-2.38	
Teachers	3.878	0.568	248	Teachers	3.767	0.498	115	0.06	361	1.81	
Total	3.851	0.528	2449		4.043	0.551	937				

* + designated school districts with more than 600 students.

** - designated school districts with fewer than 600 students.

A comparison of the two groups revealed significant difference for community members. The + community members had a mean score of 3.729 with a standard deviation of 0.539 while the - community members had a mean score of 4.199 with a standard deviation of 0.604. A comparison of the two groups revealed a standard error of difference of 0.04 and with 1027 degrees of freedom resulted in a t-ratio of 13.09. The t-ratio of 13.09 was significant at the .001 confidence level.

Table XXIV

Mean Climate Scores of All Respondents as Measured
by the NASSP School Climate Survey

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	Signif.
Students	1694	3.929	0.509	No
Community Members	1029	3.921	0.565	No
Administrators	300	4.103	0.551	No
Teachers	363	3.843	0.546	No
Total	3386	3.933	0.534	No

A comparison of the mean scores for all respondents on the SCS was demonstrated on Table XXIV. The combined scores for all students, community members, administrators, and teachers produced individual group means of 3.929, 3.921, 4.103, and 3.843, respectively. An average mean score for all respondents was 3.933. No significant difference existed between the individual group means.

Implications of Data: Superintendents and Legislators

The second question presented by the study was to determine the implications of the data for superintendents of Iowa school districts and Iowa legislators. A questionnaire (see Appendix D) was sent to representatives of these two groups. The respondents included nine superintendents and six legislators. The superintendents and legislators were selected based on their willingness to participate. Representative responses to the questionnaire are provided in this section.

Question 1: The results of the study indicated that the

climate of schools in Iowa was high. As a person in a position to affect the educational program in Iowa, what are some implications for you of this high score on school climate?

Superintendent's responses:

Iowa education is viewed in a positive light. The quality of education is probably equally as high. Most persons feel that their school is special and that is probably good. I would guess, however, that in some of the schools which were rated high that the climate was actually not high.

Schools will continue to need financial support. Positive climate could indicate a willingness to continue local programs.

We have done a good job in public relations.

People in the state feel good about the schools. They are involved and care about the quality the schools offer.

Legislator's responses:

I am not surprised. People tend to rank their own schools higher than school in general.

Iowans tend to appreciate their schools and probably have greater involvement with them than does the average American.

A high score in climate would indicate a willingness to offer necessary financial support for which we will be increasingly dependent upon with the state's economic condition.

In general, teachers like what they are doing and find it rewarding.

The leadership in Iowa schools is pretty good at meeting the needs of the community.

Efforts to improve school climate in Iowa may have only marginal results given the high current ratings. A high score indicates that Iowans feel good about their schools.

The responses to question 1 indicated similarity between superintendents and legislators. Both groups felt that Iowa education was perceived positively. The superintendents and legislators felt the study implied that Iowa had good, quality schools. Both groups stated an increasing need to help finance the local schools. The results indicated, through a high climate score, a supportive basis for additional funding. Iowans are involved with their schools, appreciate, and care about quality of education.

Question 2: A comparison of the perceptions of students, community members, administrators, and teachers on school climate were also determined. The results were as follows:

Students	3.9
Community members	3.9
Administrators	4.1
Teachers	3.8

What do these numbers imply to you?

Superintendent's responses:

The perceptions are uniform.

Community members are probably relating what they hear from students.

Administrators view climate more positively than do other professionals.

Not much statistical significance between the different groups.

It doesn't surprise me that administrators would tend to be higher because of their personal investment in the whole enterprise and their conscious and unconscious desire to see things in a good light. Teachers may rate climate lower due to a lesser sense of control or ability to affect change. Increased teacher involvement could improve their perception of climate.

Legislator's responses:

Teachers seem to rate school climate lower than students, community members, and administrators. Efforts to improve school climate should target teachers.

The perceptions of the climate in Iowa schools does not differ greatly.

It is difficult to respond to such a vague term as climate.

There doesn't seem to be much difference between the different groups.

In response to question 2, the superintendents and legislators felt the perceptions of all groups involved in the study were similar. Both groups indicated a need to improve teachers' perception of school climate. Legislators felt efforts should be made to increase the climate score for teachers. Superintendents felt that if teachers were more involved in the "total picture" of the operation of a school, their scores would increase.

Question 3: A comparison was also made between the perceptions of school climate in Iowa school districts with fewer than 600 students and Iowa school districts with more than 600 students. The results indicated that the small school districts had an average score of 4.0 and the large school districts had an average score of 3.85.

Much has been said about maintaining small schools because of the smaller class size and rural atmosphere carried over to the school system. However, based on the findings of this study, there was a difference in the perceptions of

school climate between small and large, yet not much of a difference. What does this imply to you?

Superintendent's responses:

The slight difference might be attributable to the fact that small schools generally have a higher level of involvement by all concerned than do larger ones.

The similarity in perceptions is probably related to the importance Iowans place on education.

I believe that the large schools may be somewhat more objective about the climate in their schools. They perhaps are further removed from the school.

The survey suggests that most persons have a sense of pride about "their" school and think that climate in their school is just fine, even though they may have little or no basis for comparison with other schools. The closeness of the numbers suggest Iowans feel good about their schools regardless of size.

Perhaps the size of school is not as important as the educational program of the school.

The study indicates that size is not a factor.

Legislator's responses:

Smaller schools will tend to have a higher rating because of a common culture, strong interpersonal relationships, and a more effective channel for communication.

Based on at least this study, people should be hesitant to differentiate between small and large schools on the condition of climate.

Climate is more a factor of style, mode, and skills of leadership than the size of a school.

High climate can be achieved in any school district. A school district of 600 is not large.

I suspect the small difference is not statistically significant which renders any generalization meaningless.

Iowa schools are first in the nation in education. This results from the combined efforts of all schools.

When asked in question 3 about maintaining small schools because of a rural atmosphere, both groups failed to support small over large. The superintendents and legislators felt that the climate was good in both small and large school districts and that Iowans felt good about their schools regardless of size.

Iowa school districts are going through a period of transition. Many small school districts are involved in sharing programs with other school districts. Because of the new standards of Iowa schools and the new finance formula to finance Iowa schools, changes in the structure of Iowa school districts is mandatory. Based on the results of the questionnaire, superintendents and legislators (two influential groups in policy development for Iowa schools), felt that all Iowa schools were perceived as having positive climate and did not support the maintenance of small school districts. Without the support of superintendents and legislators, small school districts will continue to merge with other school districts.

Summary

Based upon the data presented in this chapter, the following conclusions and implications were determined in relationship to the questions of the study.

Question 1: What is the climate of Iowa schools as

measured by the NASSP School Climate Survey (SCS), grades 6-12?

Table XXIV indicated that the climate of Iowa schools was perceived positively. This was determined by an average score on the SCS of 3.933. The questions on the SCS were rated on a five-point Likert scale with a numerical average of 4 being an indication of positive school climate.

In relation to question 1, the study answered the following sub-questions: (a) How do students, community members, administrators, and students in Iowa perceive school climate? (b) How does school climate in small Iowa school districts differ from that of large Iowa school districts?

In response to these two questions, refer to Table XXIV. The mean scores for students, community members, administrators, and teachers were 3.929, 3.921, 4.103, and 3.843, respectively. Again, based on a five-point Likert scale, an average score of 4 indicated a positive perception of school climate by all groups. There was no significant difference between the groups at the .001 confidence level.

A comparison of the school climate in small Iowa school districts to large Iowa school districts can be found on Table XXVIII. Table XXVIII indicated a total mean score for small Iowa schools of 4.043 and a total mean score for large Iowa schools of 3.851. The mean scores indicated positive school climate in both groups. There was no significant difference at the .001 confidence level.

Further analysis of the perceptions of school climate between small and large school districts can be found on Tables VII - XXII.

An analysis of Tables VII-XXII indicated several significant differences on subscales when comparing larger school districts with smaller school districts. All ten subscales showed significant differences when compared on an individual basis. The study compared sixteen separate group responses. Of those sixteen group responses, a significant difference existed nine times on the subscales Student Academic Orientation and Student Behavioral Values; eight times on the subscale Student-Peer Relationships; six times on the subscales Teacher-Student Relationships and Administration; five times on the subscales Guidance, Parent and Community-School Relations, and Student Activities; four times on subscales Security and Maintenance and Instructional Management. The significant differences all indicated school climate was more positive in smaller schools than larger schools in Iowa.

Analysis of the data indicated that significant differences only existed in Tables VII, VIII, XII, XV, XVI, and XX when combining all ten subscales. Tables VIII, XII, XVI, and XX compared community members and Tables VII and XV compared students perceptions of school climate. However, when comparing all community members perceptions, large to small and all student perceptions, large to small, only

community members indicated a significant difference as a group to group comparison. This was demonstrated in Table XXIII.

Students, administrators, and teachers in Iowa perceived school climate about the same, which was positive. There was no significant difference between perceptions of school climate among these groups when comparing larger school districts to smaller school districts. The only group that demonstrated a significant difference when comparing large to small school districts in Iowa was community members.

The data do not support a significant difference, based upon school climate, between larger and smaller school districts in Iowa. The data support positive school climate in all Iowa school districts.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The study focused on these questions:

1. What is the climate of Iowa schools as measured by the NASSP School Climate Survey (grades 6-12)?
 - A. How do students, community members, administrators, and teachers in Iowa perceive school climate?
 - B. How does school climate in small Iowa school districts differ from that of large Iowa school districts?
2. What are the implications of the data for superintendents of Iowa school districts and Iowa legislators?

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize, draw conclusions, and make recommendations based on the statistical analysis of the data.

Summary of Procedures

The purposes of the study were to assess the school climate of school districts in the state of Iowa; determine if perceptions of school climate differ between students, community members, administrators, and teachers; determine if

a difference existed between the school climate of Iowa school districts with more than 600 students and Iowa school districts with fewer than 600 students; and determine the implications for superintendents and legislators in Iowa.

The climate of Iowa schools was determined by the NASSP School Climate Survey (SCS). The SCS was designed to collect data about perceptions of school climate on ten subscales to be used individually or collectively. The SCS was administered to fifty-seven randomly selected school districts in Iowa. The data collected were used as a basis for this study.

Conclusions

Based upon the analysis of the data, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The perception of climate in Iowa school districts is positive.

Data from the NASSP School Climate Survey (SCS) indicate that the climate of Iowa school districts is perceived as positive. This was determined by an average score on the SCS of 3.933.

2. There is no significant difference between small school districts and large school districts in the perception of school climate.
3. Community members in the small Iowa school districts perceive school climate significantly higher than community members in large Iowa school

districts.

4. Students, administrators, and teachers perceive school climate about the same when compared as groups on a large school - small school basis.

Based upon the data presented in Table XXIII, the mean score for small districts was 4.043 and the mean score for large districts was 3.851 with no significant difference. The mean scores for students, community members, administrators, and teachers in small schools were 4.000, 4.199, 4.260, and 3.767, respectively. The mean scores for students, community members, administrators, and teachers in large school districts were 3.910, 3.719, 4.067, and 3.878. The mean scores for community members, 4.199 for small schools and 3.729 for large schools, was significant.

5. Even though there were several significant differences on individual subscales, when using combined scores for all subscales, only students in quadrant I and III and community members in all quadrants showed significant differences.

Based upon the data presented in Tables VII - XXIII, significant differences existed on all 10 subscales of the SCS when comparing individual subscale scores. However, when combining the scores for all subscales, significant differences existed for students in quadrant I and quadrant III. The combined mean scores in quadrant I were 3.511 and 3.981. The combined mean scores in quadrant III were 3.871

and 4.100. The combined mean scores were significant.

The combined mean scores for community members in all quadrants was 3.719 for large schools and 4.199 for small schools. This difference was significant.

6. As individual groups, students, community members, administrators, and teachers perceive positive climate in Iowa school districts.
7. Administrators perceive school climate the highest while teachers perceive it the lowest. Students and community members perceive climate about the same.

The data indicate the mean scores for all students, community members, administrators, and teachers on the SCS were 3.929, 3.921, 4.103, and 3.843, respectively. Based upon a five-point Likert scale with 5 being high, all groups indicated a positive perception of school climate. Administrators perceived climate the highest, community members and students about the same, and teachers the lowest.

8. Iowa superintendents and legislators perceive schools with a positive climate regardless of size and indicate a willingness to financially support school districts.

Based upon the responses from the questionnaire, superintendents and legislators felt the data from the SCS indicated that Iowans felt they had good, quality schools, that a strong basis for additional financial support existed,

and that climate was positive in both small and large school districts.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Additional data gathered to support reorganization of school districts.
2. Community members and school board members support quality education, not maintenance of local school districts at all costs.
3. Legislators and educators work together to provide quality educational programs that are fiscally responsible.
4. All groups involved in this study need to continue the support and encouragement towards their local school district.

Recommendations for Further Study

Further study in school climate might be conducted in the following areas:

1. Studies need to be conducted to determine if school climate can be changed once a decision is made to do so.
2. Studies could determine the relationship of school climate and performance on standardized tests.
3. The study should be replicated to determine

perception based on grade level, sex, tenure, age, etc.

4. Further studies conducted using the NASSP School Climate Survey in Iowa would indicate school climate during the restructuring period for Iowa school districts.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. S. "The Search for School Climate: A Review of Research." Review of Educational Research 52 (June 1982): 368-420.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Partners: Parents and Schools. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD, 1979.
- Brookover, W.; Beady, C.; Flood, P.; Schweitzer, J.; and Wisenbaker, J. School Social Systems and Student Achievement. New York: Praeger, 1979.
- Cusick, P. A. Inside High School: The Student's World. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- Drexler, J. A. "Organizational Climate: Its Homogeneity Within Organizations." Journal of Applied Psychology 62 (December 1977): 38-42.
- ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Research Action Brief on School Climate, February 1978, Number 4.
- Field, R. H. G., and Abelson, M. A. "Climate: A Reconceptualization and Proposed Model." Human Relations 35 (August 1982): 181-201.
- Fox, Robert S. School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1973.
- Gavin, J. F., and Howe, J. G. "Psychological Climate: Some Theoretical and Empirical Considerations." Behavioral Science 10 (May 1975): 228-240.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York, Macmillan, 1966.
- Hellriegel, D., and Slocum, J. W. "Organizational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies." Academy of Management Journal 17 (June 1974): 225-280.

- Hoy, W. K., and Miskel, L. G. Educational Administration. New York: Random House, 1982.
- Hoyle, J. R.; English, F. W.; and Steffy, B. E. Skills for Successful School Leaders. American Association of School Administrators. Arlington, Virginia.
- Hoyle, J. R.; English, F. W.; and Steffy, B. E. Skills for Successful School Leaders. Arlington, Virginia: AASA, 1985.
- James, L. R., and Jones, A. P. "Organizational Climate: A Review of Theory and Research." Psychological Bulletin 81 (December 1974): 1096-1112.
- Joyce, W. F., and Slocum, J. W. "Collective Climate: Agreement as a Basis for Defining Aggregate Climates in Organizations." Academy of Management Journal 27 (December 1984): 721-742.
- Kelley, Edgar A. Case Studies and an Analysis of the Role of Morale, Organization Climate, and Conflict in the Study of Secondary School Environments. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- Lightfoot, S. L. The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Peters, T. J., and Austin, N. K. A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Difference. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Peters, T. J., and Waterman, R. H. In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies. New York: Warner, 1982.
- Pettigrew, A. M. "On Studying Organizational Cultures." Administrative Science Quarterly 24 (December 1979): 570-581.
- Schmuck, Richard A., and Miles, Matthew B. Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1971.
- Schmuck, R. A., and Runkel, P. J. The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield, 1977.

- Stockard, J., and Mayberry, M. Learning Environments: A Review of the Literature on School Environments and Student Achievement. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1985.
- Sweeney, J. "Developing a Strong Culture - The Key to School Improvement." National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal 3 (November 1987): 134-143.
- Trickett, E. J., and Moos, R. H. "The Social Environment of Junior High and High School Classrooms." Journal of Educational Psychology 65 (June 1973): 93-102.

APPENDIX A

Dear High School Principal,

I am trying to complete my doctorate from Loyola University of Chicago. I am one of those who has everything completed but the dissertation. Now I am trying to get that accomplished and I need your help.

The research being conducted involves the NASSP School Climate Survey. This survey was selected because of the broad base of respondents—students, parents, teachers, and administrators. The purpose of the study will be to see if differences exist between perceptions of school climates in large and small schools in Iowa.

Here is what you need to do to help:

1. Randomly select 5% of your 6-12 grade students.
2. Send the Parent or Guardian Consent form home with the selected students and make sure all are returned.
3. Randomly select 10% of your teaching staff.
4. Survey all administrators.
5. Randomly select community members using the following criteria:

K-12 enrollment	# of Comm. Members
600 or less	15
600 or more	25

Administer the survey to the population selected in 1, 3, 4, and 5. There is no time limit in the survey.

6. Return the completed survey forms to:

Robert L. Pilcher, Sup't.
 North Kossuth Schools
 Box B
 Swea City, Iowa 50590

In the past, I have had the opportunity to conduct research for other "students". I guess I felt research in education was important and that if schools didn't participate, little would be done in our areas. I hope you feel the same way.

Thanks,

Note: I will reimburse your district for the return postage.

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

Directions

This survey asks different groups in a school and community what **most people** think about the school. These groups include students, teachers, school administrators, other school workers, school board members, and parents or other members of the community.

The survey has a number of statements that describe situations found in many schools. Most of these statements will fit your school, but for those that do not, mark the "don't know" answer.

Please mark your answers on the separate answer sheet. Use only No. 2 pencil. Before you begin the survey, you will be asked to fill in the following information on the answer sheet about yourself and your school:

1. **Grade.** (If you are a student.) 6 = 6th grade; 7 = 7th grade; 8 = 8th grade; 9 = 9th grade; 10 = 10th grade; 11 = 11th grade; 12 = 12th grade
2. **Role.** 1 = Student; 2 = Teacher; 3 = School Staff other than Teacher or Administrator; 4 = School Administrator; 5 = Parent; 6 = Community Member other than Parent
3. **Sex.** 1 = Female; 2 = Male
4. **Race.** 1 = American Indian; 2 = Asian American; 3 = Black; 4 = Hispanic; 5 = White; 6 = Other

Do not mark in this booklet or write your name on the answer sheet (your answers are confidential). Mark only one answer for each statement. Choose the answer that you think **most people** in your school and community would pick. Use the following scale for your answers.

- 1 = Most people would strongly disagree with this statement.
- 2 = Most people would disagree with this statement.
- 3 = Most people would neither agree nor disagree with this statement.
- 4 = Most people would agree with this statement.
- 5 = Most people would strongly agree with this statement.

There is no time limit. Be sure to fill in the circle completely with the No. 2 pencil. You may begin.

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

KEY: MOST PEOPLE

- 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE
- 2 = DISAGREE
- 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
- 4 = AGREE
- 5 = STRONGLY AGREE
- 6 = DON'T KNOW

TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

- 1. Teachers in this school like their students.
- 2. Teachers in this school are on the side of their students.
- 3. Teachers give students the grades they deserve.
- 4. Teachers help students to be friendly and kind to each other.
- 5. Teachers treat each student as an individual.
- 6. Teachers are willing to help students.
- 7. Teachers are patient when a student has trouble learning.
- 8. Teachers make extra efforts to help students.
- 9. Teachers understand and meet the needs of each student.
- 10. Teachers praise students more often than they scold them.
- 11. Teachers are fair to students.
- 12. Teachers explain carefully so that students can get their work done.

SECURITY AND MAINTENANCE

- 13. Students usually feel safe in the school building.
- 14. Teachers and other workers feel safe in the building before and after school.
- 15. People are not afraid to come to school for meetings and programs in the evening.
- 16. Classrooms are usually clean and neat.
- 17. The school building is kept clean and neat.
- 18. The school building is kept in good repair.
- 19. The school grounds are neat and attractive.

GO TO THE NEXT PAGE

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

KEY: MOST PEOPLE

- 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE
- 2 = DISAGREE
- 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
- 4 = AGREE
- 5 = STRONGLY AGREE
- 6 = DON'T KNOW

ADMINISTRATION (Principal, Assistant Principal, etc.)

- 20. The administrators in this school listen to student ideas.
- 21. The administrators in this school talk often with teachers and parents.
- 22. The administrators in this school set high standards and let teachers, students, and parents know what these standards are.
- 23. Administrators set a good example by working hard themselves.
- 24. The administrators in this school are willing to hear student complaints and opinions.
- 25. Teachers and students help to decide what happens in this school.

STUDENT ACADEMIC ORIENTATION

- 26. Students here understand why they are in school.
- 27. In this school, students are interested in learning new things.
- 28. Students in this school have fun but also work hard on their studies.
- 29. Students work hard to complete their school assignments.

STUDENT BEHAVIORAL VALUES

- 30. If one student makes fun of someone, other students do not join in.
- 31. Students in this school are well-behaved even when the teachers are not watching them.
- 32. Most students would do their work even if the teacher stepped out of the classroom.

GO TO THE NEXT PAGE

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

KEY: MOST PEOPLE

- 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE
- 2 = DISAGREE
- 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
- 4 = AGREE
- 5 = STRONGLY AGREE
- 6 = DON'T KNOW

GUIDANCE

- 33. Teachers or counselors encourage students to think about their future.
- 34. Teachers or counselors help students plan for future classes and for future jobs.
- 35. Teachers or counselors help students with personal problems.
- 36. Students in this school can get help and advice from teachers or counselors.

STUDENT-PEER RELATIONSHIPS

- 37. Students care about each other.
- 38. Students respect each other.
- 39. Students want to be friends with one another.
- 40. Students have a sense of belonging in this school.

PARENT AND COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONSHIPS

- 41. Parents and members of the community attend school meetings and other activities.
- 42. Most people in the community help the school in one way or another.
- 43. Community attendance at school meetings and programs is good.
- 44. Community groups honor student achievement in learning, music, drama, and sports.

GO TO THE NEXT PAGE

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

KEY: MOST PEOPLE

- 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE
- 2 = DISAGREE
- 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
- 4 = AGREE
- 5 = STRONGLY AGREE
- 6 = DON'T KNOW

INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

- 45. There is a clear set of rules for students to follow in this school.
- 46. Taking attendance and other tasks do not interfere with classroom teaching.
- 47. Teachers spend almost all classroom time in learning activities.
- 48. Students in this school usually have assigned schoolwork to do.
- 49. Most classroom time is spent talking about class work or assignments.
- 50. Teachers use class time to help students learn assigned work.
- 51. Outside interruptions of the classroom are few.

STUDENT ACTIVITIES

- 52. Students are able to take part in school activities in which they are interested.
- 53. Students can be in sports, music, and plays even if they are not very talented.
- 54. Students are comfortable staying after school for activities such as sports and music.
- 55. Students can take part in sports and other school activities even if their families cannot afford it.

END OF SURVEY

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO IOWA SUPERINTENDENTS AND LEGISLATORS

I am conducting a study on the school climate of Iowa school districts and I need your help. School climate has been determined to have a direct impact on the quality of education. The data for this study were collected from fifty-seven Iowa school districts. Surveyed were students, community members, administrators, and teachers. The data were divided into two parts: school climate for Iowa schools and school climate of large Iowa school districts compared to small Iowa school districts. Large school districts were defined as having more than 600 students and small school districts were defined as having fewer than 600 students.

The results of the study indicated that the climate of schools in Iowa was high. This was determined by a school climate survey producing an average score of 4 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being high. As a person in a position to affect the educational program in Iowa, what are some implications for you of this high score on school climate:

A comparison of the perceptions of students, community members, administrators, and teachers on school climate were also determined. The results were as follows:

Students	3.9
Community members	3.9
Administrators	4.1
Teachers	3.8

What do these numbers imply to you?

A comparison was also made between the perceptions of school climate in Iowa school districts with fewer than 600 students and Iowa school districts with more than 600 students. The results indicated that the small school districts had an average score of 4.0 and the large school districts had an average score of 3.85.

Much has been said about maintaining small schools because of the small class size and rural atmosphere carried over to the school system. However, based on the findings of this study, there is a difference in the perceptions of school climate between small and large, yet not much of a difference. What does this imply to you?

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. If you would be interested in additional information concerning this study, please let me know.

Respectfully,

Robert L. Pilcher, Sup't.
North Kossuth School
Swea City, Iowa
50590

Note: Use additional pages or the back of this letter for responses requiring additional space. Also, please return as soon as possible.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Robert L. Pilcher has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and
Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Philip Carlin
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and
Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. L. Arthur Safer
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and
Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December 6, 1991
Date

Max Bailey
Director's Signature