THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHERS' PUPIL-CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL SCHOOL CLIMATE

By

JOHN THOMAS WARD

Bachelor of Science
Northeastern State College
Tahlequah, Oklahoma
1964

Master of Arts
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1985

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHERS' PUPIL-CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL SCHOOL CLIMATE

Thesis Approved:

A. Kenneth Stew
Thesis Adviser

Kenneth St. Clair

Judith E. Dobson

W. Dale Johnson

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This endeavor has not been the sole accomplishment of a single individual, but rather has involved the aid and cooperation of a number of people. Throughout the study and the many prerequisites to this undertaking, I was encouraged and supported by my wife, Gay. Her assistance and positive attitude were the main ingredients which motivated the completion of this study. Sincere appreciation is expressed to our parents and to our sons Shawn, Jared, and Stan, for the vital encouragement and necessary sacrifices which helped make it possible to complete this investigation.

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. A. Kenneth Stern, thesis adviser, for his patience and guidance; to Dr. J. Kenneth St. Clair, committee chairman; and to committee members Dr. Judith Dobson and Dr. W. Deke Johnson, for their generous advice and counsel. Similarly, gratitude is expressed to Dr. Carla Thompson for sharing her statistical knowledge with me.

Acknowledgments cannot be completed without expressing appreciation to the teachers who participated in the investigation, to the building principals for their time, and to the district superintendent for allowing this study to be conducted. Finally, to the staff and students of the school from which the theme for this study emerged--thank you for your loyalty and your continued cooperative efforts to provide an improved instructional environment at Jane Phillips Elementary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

In a social system, climate describes the behavioral processes which are characteristic of the particular organization. These processes occur as a result of the members' values, attitudes, and beliefs. Therefore, climate is influenced by the perceptions of the organization's members.

The concept of organizational climate is not a new one. Koffka (1935) described the difference between the geographical environment, which consisted of physical and objective factors, and the social environment, which consisted of factors perceived by and responded to by members of the organization. The terms "atmosphere" and "climate" were introduced by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) in a study of leadership style in groups. They indicated that the atmosphere which developed in a group was related to the style of leadership displayed by the group's leader. In discussing the concept from a psychological perspective, Lewin (1951, p. 241) proposed that "psychological atmospheres are empirical realities and are scientifically describable." With reference to schools, Cornell (1955, p. 222) discussed the organizational climate as: ". . . a delicate blending of interrelationships by persons in the organization of their jobs, or roles, in

relationship to others, and their interpretations of the roles of others in the organization."

Organizational climate is a universal phenomenon--every organization has a climate which is made up of a unique set of characteristics that can be perceived by those who work within the organization. In schools, there are recognizable differences among the climates of individual schools (Halpin and Croft, 1963). From the bulk of research and literature reviewed dealing with the concept of climate, both researchers and practitioners concur that climate is important.

In recent years, school administrators have taken an increased interest in the body of knowledge developed by behavioral scientists regarding organizations. The concepts of the complex organization, the social system, and the bureaucracy have enabled the school administrator to survey his/her organization with reference to certain fundamental principles which are useful in directing his/her actions. The organizational climate concept has provided useful information to the school administrator when viewing the organization in its totality.

Goodlad (1983) concluded from his research, which involved over 1,000 K-12 classrooms, that:

> . . . we are prone to regard schools as goal-oriented factories engaged in processing human materials . . . the most important thing about school for children, and youth who go there, is the living out their daily personal and social lives, not academics. Schools do not deliberately seek to promote antisocial behavior. On the other hand, they appear to do little to promote the prosocial behavior many of our goals for schools espouse (p. 241).

Problem

The public is asking the schools to solve problems relating to

poor student attitudes, lack of discipline, and low achievement scores. As a partial solution, many schools are seeking to resolve this dilemma through the development and implementation of school climate improvement plans. These efforts, in many instances, appear to be the results of the numerous studies which indicate that a significant positive relationship exists between school climate and student attitude, discipline, and achievement (Trickett and Moos, 1973; Hyman, 1974; Miller, 1975; Brookover and Schneider, 1975; Kronick, 1972; Mealor, Perkins, and Reeves, 1975; Brimm and Bush, 1978).

There are numerous variables which have been credited with influencing building climate, including principal leadership, school size, class size, socioeconomic status, building characteristics, race, teacher-pupil control ideology, instructional program, grouping pattern, peer norms, and teacher attitudes, values, and personality (Anderson, 1982). Some of these variables can be manipulated while others remain relatively constant. As suggested by McPartland, Epstein, Karweit, and Slavin (1976), efforts to improve climate should focus on variables that are most open to purposeful change. Anderson (1972) noted that policymakers who cannot change classrooms or school membership patterns need causal information on variables that can be changed.

Therefore, individual buildings and/or school districts desiring to improve climate should first establish a baseline, examining where they are in relation to where they would like to be. Next, the information should be analyzed, examining the areas which reflect a need for change, concluding by identifying those pertinent variables which are changeable. With this information in hand, a building or district

administrator would be in a position to assess the existing climate and more effectively make alterations which would enhance the organizational climate within the building/district.

The problem inherent in seeking to improve school climate is identifying the influence of key variables on the various climate factors, then determining if and how they can be manipulated to enhance the climate. Many investigations have been made which reflect pupil-control ideology as being a significant influence on school climate (Hoy and Appleberry, 1970; Anderson, 1971; Multhauf, Licata, and Willower, 1978). Studies have also shown that teachers' perceptions of the climate within a building are highly correlated with the building's actual climate (Getzels, 1958; Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974). Since pupil-control ideology influences climate, there is a need to examine the relationship of teachers' pupil control ideology and their perceptions of school climate as part of a school climate improvement plan.

In the district investigated, the pupil-control ideology of the elementary teachers was unknown, as were their perceptions of actual and ideal climate factors. Consequently, the relationship which exists between teachers' pupil-control ideology and school climate factor perceptions was also unknown. These unknown relationships constituted the need for this study.

Theoretical Framework

School Climate

School climate focuses on sociopsychological behavior of the

staff, as opposed to an emphasis on the specific activities of administrators and teachers. The tone or climate of an organization has been described by a number of theorists and writers concerned with explanations of phenomena associated with complex organizations. Cornell (1955) is credited with the first use of the term "organizational climate." In his four-year study of four schools, he investigated teachers' satisfaction and perceptions of school climate. He concluded that school systems differ in their organizational climate, teachers react differently to organizational relationships, and climate may be more important than specific administrative activity.

Halpin and Croft (1963) sought to map the domain of organizational climate. The major impetus for their research came from the observation that schools differed from each other in their "feel." Halpin and Croft conceived of the organizational climate of a school as analogous to the personality of an individual. Halpin (1966), in describing climate, noted that:

> . . . as one moves to other schools, one finds that each has a 'personality' of its own. It is this personality that we describe here as the 'organizational climate' of the school. Analogous, personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization (p. 131).

Owens (1970) provided evidence of the sociopsychological differences between schools with his research. This research involved observation of the behavior of individuals within the schools. He noted that in one school teachers may appear relaxed and friendly with each other, while in another school teachers may appear more tense, as manifested by their manner of speech and their methods of teaching and interacting with students. Owens emphasized that differences which

characterize the sociopsychological environment of each school are what constitutes the organizational climate.

Climate is discussed in the literature as being on a continuum from open to closed. Appleberry and Hoy (1969) conceptualized these two basic characteristics of organizational climate: (1) "open," evidenced by authentic, "for real," or genuine behavior; and (2) "closed," reflecting inauthentic behavior (engendered by fear of criticism and strained personal relations).

> The open climate is portrayed as an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals while simultaneously providing satisfaction for the group members' social needs. Leadership acts emerge from both the group and the leader. Group members do not overemphasize either task achievement or social needs satisfaction, but in both instances satisfaction seems to be easily obtained and almost effortless. The closed climate is characterized by a high degree of apathy among all organizational members. The school seems stagnant; morale is low because satisfaction is obtained from neither task achievement nor fulfillment of social needs (Appleberry and Hoy, 1969, pp. 75-76).

Coughlan (1971) proposed that the relatively open school tends to allow teachers who have dominant professional, social, or organizational values to derive different levels of job satisfaction. He noted that openness not only encourages job autonomy and freedom valued by professionals, but it also stimulates formal interactions and sociability. He concluded that in an open climate individuals are given opportunities to work closely with administrators, internalize bureaucratic values, and develop supervisory skills.

Pupil Control Ideology

Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) adapted a typology employed by Gilbert and Levinson (1957) in their study of the control ideology of

mental hospital staff members concerning patients. They conceptualized a continuum of control ideology, ranging from custodialism at one extreme to humanism at the other. In adapting Gilbert and Levinson's typology to public schools, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy developed prototypes of custodial and humanistic orientations toward pupil control.

Custodial Orientation. Teachers with a custodial pupil control orientation view maintenance of order as the prime goal of the classroom. They stereotype students in terms of their appearance, behavior, and parents' social status. Students are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions. Due to this rigidly held mental set, teachers do not attempt to understand student behavior or misbehavior; rather, they view them in moralistic terms, treating misbehavior as a personal affront. Therefore, pessimism and mistrust infiltrate the custodial viewpoint, and relationships with students are maintained on as impersonal a basis as possible. In a custodial environment, both power and communication flow downward and students are expected to accept and follow the direction of teachers without question (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967).

Humanistic Orientation. In contrast to the custodial orientation, teachers having a humanistic pupil-control ideology conceive of the school as an educational community in which students' learning and behavior are viewed in psychological and sociological rather than moralistic terms. The withdrawn child is seen as a problem equal to his overactive, troublesome classmate. Rather than viewing children as generally troublesome, the humanistically oriented teacher

optimistically conceives of students as responsible, trustworthy beings who, through close personal relations with himself and the positive aspects of friendship and respect, will be self-disciplining rather than "disciplined." The humanistic teacher desires a democratic classroom climate with its attendant flexibility in status and rules, open channels of two-way communication, and increased student self-determination. This leads to minimization of sanctions in both frequency and intensity as both teachers and pupils alike are willing to act upon their own volition and to accept responsibility for their actions (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967).

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and perceptions of actual and ideal school climate. More specifically, the study examined for possible existing relationships between: (1) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of actual school climate factors; (2) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of ideal school climate factors; (3) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceived differences between the actual and ideal school climate factors; and (4) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceived differences between the composite actual and composite ideal school climate factors.

This study focused on selected elementary schools within one public school district with a K-12 enrollment of approximately 6,600. These were schools which had principals who were in at least their second year as principal at that site. The pupil-control ideology of

76 teachers in grades K-6 from 6 of the 10 elementary schools was compared with their perception of the various climate indexes, both actual and ideal, as measured by the CFK, Ltd. Climate Profile. Teachers' pupil-control ideology was assessed on a scale ranging from humanistic to custodial by the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) Form. These instruments are discussed in detail in Chapter III; copies may be found in Appendix A.

Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was accomplished by testing the following four null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of actual school climate factors.

2. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of ideal school climate factors.

3. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of the difference between the actual and ideal school climate factors.

4. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of the difference between the composite actual and composite ideal school climate factors.

Definition of Terms

The following are terms used in this study:

Organizational Climate: ". . . can be construed as the

organizational personality of a school; figuratively, personality is to the individual what climate is to the organization" (Halpin and Croft, 1962, p. 1). As described by Tagiuri and Litwin (1968):

> . . . the relatively enduring quality of the total environment that (a) is experienced by the occupants, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics of the environment (p. 25).

Open Climate:

> . . . portrayed as an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals while simultaneously providing satisfaction for the group members' social needs. Leadership acts emerge from both the group and the leader. Group members do not overemphasize either task achievement or social needs satisfaction, but in both instances satisfaction seems to be easily obtained and almost effortless (Appleberry and Hoy, 1969, p. 75).

Closed Climate:

> . . . characterized by a high degree of apathy among all organizational members. The school seems stagnant; morale is low because satisfaction is obtained from neither task achievement nor fulfillment of social needs (Appleberry and Hoy, 1969, p. 76).

Actual Climate: climate conditions as perceived to presently exist.

Ideal Climate: climate conditions as individuals would like them to be.

Pupil Control Ideology: teachers' pupil control ideology can be assessed by the PCI Form, which is an attitude measure of one's orientation towards pupil control. A total PCI score is summed from item responses and reflects the teacher's ideological orientation toward pupil control. The score is interpreted on a continuum with extremes of "humanistic" to "custodial" orientation (Hoy, 1967).

Humanism: a democratic atmosphere in which students are thought to be capable of self-discipline. Behavior is viewed in psychological and sociological terms rather than in moralistic terms. Students are perceived as reasonable, trustworthy persons needing sympathetic understanding and permissive controls (Hoy, 1967).

Custodialism: a highly controlled setting concerned with the maintenance of order. Students are viewed as irresponsible, untrustworthy persons, lacking obedience and needing firmness, strictness, and punishment (Hoy, 1967).

Limitations

This investigation involved the teachers of kindergarten through the sixth grades in 6 of the 10 elementary schools within a single public school district of approximately 6,600 K-12 students. Seventy-six usable instruments were returned and included in this study. Generalizations drawn from this study may not be applicable to school districts other than the one used in the study. Thus, care and caution should be used in applying interpretations from this study to other districts or making broad assumptions regarding the relationship of teachers' pupil-control ideology and the organizational climate of schools across a large demographic area.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

A review of the literature revealed many articles and numerous empirical investigations regarding the organizational climate of schools, both as an independent variable and as a dependent variable. Teacher-pupil control ideology has received considerable attention during the past one and one-half decades. This chapter includes a compilation and review of selected articles which are relevant to the scope and purpose of this study and is organized in the following manner: (1) background and exploration of the organizational climate concept; (2) examination of the interrelationships of climate, student achievement, and student behavior; (3) scrutinization of several variables which interact with school climate, including a detailed look at the studies relating to pupil-control ideology; (4) relationship of pupil control ideology and school climate; (5) measurement of pupil control ideology; and (6) measurement of a school's organizational climate.

Organizational Climate Background

While looking at schools across the country, one finds that they differ markedly. Not only do they differ from state to state and district to district, but are surprisingly different within a single

district. These differences go beyond the realm of such physical characteristics as architectural design and size, and such demographic areas as ethnic and socioeconomic characteristics. These differences also include the sociopsychological environment. The sociopsychological environment of a school takes on its own individuality. Sometimes this individuality is called the atmosphere of a school; other popular labels include the tone of the school, the school's climate, or the school's personality (Owens, 1970).

Cornell (1955) is credited with the first use of the term "organizational climate." He concluded from his four-year study that school systems do differ in their organizational climate, and that teachers react differently to organizational relationships.

A few years later, Argyris (1958) used the term "organizational climate" to describe the factors which make up the organizational climate in an investigation of organizational relationships in a bank. He viewed the problem of researching human behavior in organizations as including three interrelated systems of variables. These mutually interacting variables are described as: (1) formal organizational variables, policies, and practices to meet the organization's objectives; (2) informal variables resulting from members struggling to adapt to the formal organization; and (3) personality variables such as individual needs, abilities, values, and philosophies. These variables are mixed and form a pattern in which each plays an interrelated feedback function. Argyris (1958) concluded that administrators should recognize that conflict is present within organizations and, having acknowledged its presence, should make a concerted effort to reduce its causes.

Cornell (1955) and Argyris (1958) made significant contributions to the development of the organizational climate concept. They identified variables that were to be recognized as valid in later studies. Organizational climate remained a somewhat obscure concept until Halpin and Croft (1962) achieved their major breakthrough. They sought to map the domain of organizational climate. Their efforts resulted in the development of what became a widely used organizational climate measurement instrument, the Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire (OCDQ). This instrument was used in several investigations from which background information was gathered for this study. It is described in more detail in a later portion of this chapter.

During the late 1960's, Tagiuri and Litwin (1968) edited a series of essays written about organizational climate by prominent social scientists who were working independently. The basis of their explorations was the simple but key idea that "the way an individual carries out a given task depends upon what kind of person he is, on the one hand, and the setting in which he acts, on the other" (p. 11).

According to Tagiuri and Litwin (1968), the term "organizational climate" can be defined as:

> . . . the relatively enduring quality of the total environment that (a) is experienced by the occupants, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the environment (p. 27).

Carver and Sergiovanni (1969) noted that schools may be viewed as "living organisms having a composite of characteristics much as people have a variety of personality traits" (p. 2). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) viewed climate as representing "a composite of mediating variables which intervene between the structure of the organization

and the style and other characteristics of leaders, and teacher performance and satisfaction" (p. 70). Mediating variables would include, by Sergiovanni and Starratt's definition, "members' attitudes, level of commitment to organizational goals, group loyalty and commitment, and levels of performance goals" (p. 27).

These definitions of organizational climate require that attention be given to the organization as a whole and place emphasis on the perception of the members of the organization. They also stress the idea that organizational climate connotes that the environment is interpreted by the members of the organization which can affect personal attitudes and motivation.

Organizational Climate and Pupil Achievement

There is ample evidence that the level of academic achievement varies from one school to another. As previously noted, there also is ample evidence to support the concept that individual school climates differ from each other. However, the evidence that a relationship exists between the level of achievement and the climate of schools is often contradictory. Jencks (1972) posited that school environments could make little difference in achievement. Gies, Leonard, Madden, and Denton (1973) concluded from their study that there was no significant relationship between organizational climate and student level of achievement. Reilly (1973), using the OCDQ, investigated 41 elementary schools in Michigan. He concluded that, although several organizational climate subscales were found to be significantly related to achievement, the meaningfulness of the findings was doubtful. Some social scientists have concluded that this is a fruitless area of

research and that school social systems cannot produce differences in the academic achievement of students (Hauser, Sewell, and Alwin, 1976).

These conclusions are not universally accepted. Panushka (1970) studied 26 elementary schools in the St. Paul, Minnesota, metropolitan area. The 447 teachers were administered the OCDQ. Pupil achievement data were based on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills for grades five and six. He concluded that a relationship existed between climate openness and pupil achievement in language, and that teachers' behavior was more important to pupil achievement than was principals' behavior.

Smith (1973), in his investigation of organizational climate and morale, suggested that perceptions of the school may contribute significantly to the variation in achievement. The student's self-concept, as well as the teacher's perception of the nature of the school, seemed to contribute significantly to the variations in student achievement. O'Reilly (1975) indicated that, although student personal and social characteristics are important correlates of achievement, climate in some instances is a more important factor. He also noted that education included social-psychological factors as well as academic factors, and that the two are related.

Leedy (1975) investigated 34 elementary schools with enrollments of between 300 and 730 students. His study focused upon the organizational climate and teacher morale in elementary schools and their combined affect upon student academic achievement. Academic achievement and ability scores were determined by use of the Ohio Survey Test. The OCDQ was used to measure climate and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was used to measure teacher morale.

Leedy (1975) concluded from the statistical analysis of the data collected that the openness of a school's climate and the level of teacher morale have a significant positive relation with the academic achievement of students within a building. He found that schools having a high degree of openness and teacher morale exhibited higher levels of student academic achievement than those schools with lower levels of openness and morale.

There is some disagreement in the literature regarding the influence of organizational climate on student achievement, yet it seems apparent that school climates which tend to be "open" also tend to result in higher levels of achievement.

Organizational Climate and Pupil Behavior

Researchers have attempted to identify features of an environment which are thought to be related to the development of pupil behavior. For example, Lewin, Lippit, and White (1939) found that the same group changed markedly (from apathy to aggression or vice-versa) when the leadership atmosphere was changed. Their data indicated also that under democratic leadership the subjects in their study were more friendly, showed more initiative, and indicated a higher frustration tolerance than did other leadership groups. Lewin (1951) suggested also that an individual's conduct may change drastically, depending on the social atmosphere of the group. He concluded that changing group climates may have important effects on changing individual behavior.

Nicholas, Virjo, and Wattenberg (1965) studied the relationship of the climate of the school and the problems brought to the elementary school offices. In their investigation, case studies were made of

four elementary schools in contrasting socioeconomic settings. Both direct observation and organizational climate questionnaires were employed. They found that organizational climate, rather than socioeconomic setting, was more closely related to the number of problems brought to the school offices. In fact, closed organizational climates showed a significant relationship to the number of problems which involved student classroom disturbances and misbehaviors that occurred in the school buildings or grounds.

In a similar investigation, Berk and Lewis (1977) studied the relationship between organizational climate and student behavior in four elementary schools. They concluded that the student behaviors observed may be less a product of individual characterization and development patterns than they are an outcome of the school environmental conditions. Wayson (1976) supported these findings and added that school climates constituted norms that strongly influence what people do in schools.

Variables Affecting School Climate

Numerous investigations have been carried out in response to the expectations that certain characteristics of schools may influence climate. Opinions on which variables work together to create the building's climate have been discussed and debated at length. Most researchers agree that outcomes stem from the combined characteristics of interacting variables. The difficulty comes in choosing the variables that best explain climate. The research tends to be inconclusive and contradictory; however, the evidence indicates a relationship between certain variables and school climate.

School Size

Flagg (1964) found that as school size increased, the climate tended to be more closed. Creaser's (1966) survey of nine suburban elementary schools produced the same findings; namely, the larger the school, the less open it tended to be. Gentry and Kenney (1967) also found that as size of the school increased, so too did the likelihood that the climate of the school would fall at the closed end of the continuum. Morocco (1978) noted that smaller elementary schools were perceived by students as friendlier and more cohesive. Weeks (1978), while analyzing climate data from 33 schools in two Texas school districts, found a negative correlation between climate as perceived by teachers and school size. He noted that as campus size increased, teachers tended to view organizational climate as less open.

Against this array of evidence, Winters' (1968) study of 30 Tennessee elementary schools failed to support the conclusion that size was significantly related to climate. Other studies have been done and opinions have been offered which conclude that school size does not have an effect on climate (Weber, 1947; McDill and Rigsby, 1973; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith, 1979). Thus, the results of empirical studies regarding school size and climate remain somewhat inconclusive.

Teacher Tenure

Kalis (1980) conducted a study to determine differences in climate as perceived by untenured teachers (two years or less in their present positions) and climate perceptions held by tenured teachers

(three or more years in their present positions). This investigation studied teachers during and after a teachers' strike and found that teacher morale was associated with changes in their perceptions of climate. Kalis found that untenured teachers had a different view of the school climate than that of tenured teachers. Generally, the perceptions of untenured teachers were more positive.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) found that research on climate measures such as job satisfaction and performance indicates that there is some commonality on which to build tentative integrative conclusions. They determined that job satisfaction varied according to the individual's perception of the organization's climate. Litwin (1974) indicated that climate is related to job satisfaction in terms of interpersonal relations, group cohesiveness, task involvement, and other dimensions of organizational environments.

Hoy, Newland, and Blazovsky (1977) posited that two common characteristics of professional orientation in schools were demand for autonomy in job performance and a desire to participate in decision and policymaking. They argued that denial of these needs often results in disillusionment, which spills over into other aspects of the organization. They concluded that teachers seem to want rules and regulations to reduce job uncertainty, but that they often resent excessive supervision.

Teacher Values and Personality

Getzels (1958) offered the opinion that people's values condition

perception of organizational roles, institutional events, and interpersonal relations. Halpin, Halpin, and Harris (1982) investigated the personality characteristics and self-concept of teachers-in-training as related to their pupil control orientation. One hundred and ten students participated in the study, which used the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (SPFQ) and the PCI Form. The investigators concluded from their study that:

> The humanistically oriented educators tended to be emotionally stable, expedient, happy-go-lucky, imaginative, venturesome, outgoing, relaxed, self-assured, and have a high self-concept. The authoritarian educators were more affected by feelings, conscientious, sober, practical, shy, reserved, tense, apprehensive, and had a low self-concept (p. 195).

Thus, the expectation is that the individual personality and values people bring to the social organization of the school influence their perceptions and interpretations of the environment.

Socioeconomic Factors

Feldvebel's (1964) investigation of 30 schools in northeastern Illinois showed that neither open nor closed climates tended to be associated with the social class level of the community. However, Gentry and Kenney (1967) came to the conclusion that teachers in low income areas tended to view their schools as more closed. Later, Farber (1968) concluded from his investigation of elementary schools in Detroit, Michigan, that the amount of education of community residents was the characteristic most strongly associated with the organizational climate of schools. He determined that the higher socioeconomic groups tended to be positively related to openness, where the lower socioeconomic communities were positively related to

closedness. Although the evidence is mixed, there is some indication that low socioeconomic status is associated with closed climates.

Building and Classroom Management

The literature provides support for the construct that there is a positive relationship between school climate and planned management systems. For instance, Licata, Willower, and Ellett (1978) found that classrooms with clearly articulated goals and objectives were associated with robust secondary schools. In a more recent investigation dealing specifically with discipline rules and climate, Wynne (1980) found that consistently applied disciplinary rules were a factor in climate improvement as both school coherence and student behavior improved.

The Building Principal

The relationship of the principal's influence on the building's climate has undergone numerous investigations. There is ample supportive research available which indicates that the primary role of the principal should be that of a climate leader; a person who believes that student achievement, staff productivity, and personal satisfaction for all will improve as the climate of the school improves.

Albright (1977) investigated the relationships between organizational climate and the principal's leadership style and effectiveness. A random sample of elementary school principals and teachers was identified in the state of Kansas. Usable information was received from 21 principals and 100 teachers. The unit of analysis for the study was the elementary principal. The instruments used were the

Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), the OCDQ, and a Likert rating of principal effectiveness. Significant correlations were found to exist between the leadership styles of principals rated effective by subordinates in open and medium climate schools.

Ogilvie and Sadler (1979) did a study examining the perceptions of school effectiveness and its relationship to organizational climate. In their research, a School Outcomes Questionnaire was developed and tested in a representative sample of Brisbane state high schools in Australia. It was shown that perceptions of school effectiveness were closely linked with school organizational climate, particularly the staff synergy dimension, which focused upon aspects of the principal's leader behavior. "The teachers generally associated effective schools with principals who facilitated the work of the teachers in their schools by being supportive, considerate, industrious, and communicative" (Ogilvie and Sadler, 1979, p. 147).

An investigation by Smedley and Willower (1981) also indicated that the behavior of the principal of the school made a difference in the degree of openness of a school's climate. The study revealed an association between humanistic pupil-control behavior of principals and high levels of school robustness. In this study, the impact of the principal's behavior on students was explored. Specifically examined was the relationship between the pupil-control behavior of principals and the environmental robustness of school for students. Robust school environments were those perceived by students to be high in dramatic content; perceived to be interesting, meaningful, challenging, and action-packed. This was in contrast to schools perceived to be boring, meaningless, dull, and uneventful.

Pupil-Teacher Relationship

Concern is continuously being voiced about the alienation of students from their schools and the kind of interaction which exists between teachers and students. Some studies which have focused on the teacher-pupil relationship, or at least germane to that topic, are included in this section.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) noted that traditional inputs such as building facilities and class size are not as important to school effectiveness as the classroom atmosphere and pupil-teacher relationship. Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979) found that teacher commitment to improve students' academic performance to be a significant variable in climate. They determined that it gave the students the perception that teachers care. Wynne (1980) emphasized nonacademic events involving both faculty and students as contributing to a school's coherence.

Teacher-Pupil Control Ideology. Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) adapted a typology employed by Gilbert and Levinson (1957) in a study of the control ideology of mental hospital staff members concerning patients. They conceptualized a continuum of control ideology, ranging from custodialism at one extreme to humanism at the other. In adapting Gilbert and Levinson's typology to public schools, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy developed prototypes of custodial and humanistic orientations toward pupil control.

> Custodial Orientation. The rigidly traditional school serves as a model for the custodial orientation. This kind of organization provides a highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order. Students are stereotyped in terms of their appearance,

> behavior, and parents' social status. They are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions. Teachers do not attempt to understand student behavior, but, instead, view it in moralistic terms. Misbehavior is taken as a personal affront. Relationships with students are maintained on as impersonal a basis as possible (p. 5).
>
> Humanistic Orientation. The model of the humanistic orientation is the school conceived of as an educational community in which members learn through interaction and experience. Students' learning and behavior is viewed in psychological and sociological terms rather than moralistic terms. Learning is looked upon as an engagement in worthwhile activity rather than the passive absorption of facts. The withdrawn student is seen as a problem equal to that of the overactive, troublesome one. The humanistic teacher is optimistic that, through close personal relationships with pupils and the positive aspects of friendship and respect, students will be self-disciplining rather than disciplined. A humanistic orientation leads teachers to desire a democratic classroom climate with its attendant flexibility in status and rules, open channels of two-way communication, and increased student self-determination (p. 6).

There is evidence that pupil control ideology is subject to change; for instance, the pupil control ideology of student teachers has been shown to change as a result of teaching experiences. This change has been described in relationship to the student teaching experience (Hoy, 1967; 1969), in-service teaching experience during the teacher's early career (Hoy, 1969), and the amount of time spent in instructional activity during student teaching (Jones and Harty, 1980).

Hoy (1967) examined the effects of the student teaching experience upon student teachers' pupil-control ideology. This study focused on 282 student teachers at a single institution, Oklahoma State University (OSU). There were 130 elementary and 152 secondary student teachers involved in the study. This included virtually all the

student teachers who were completing their student teaching during the 1965-66 school year. The PCI Form was administered by the researcher to the group as a whole several days prior to the beginning of their student teaching experience. Following the eight-week student teaching experience in various school districts in the OSU area, the student teachers returned to the campus, where the PCI Form was administered for the second time. The changes of scores of the 282 students were then evaluated.

The results of the investigation showed the pupil-control ideology of student teachers to be significantly more custodial after student teaching than before. Hoy (1967) concluded that as a result of the student teaching experience, student teachers became significantly more custodial in their pupil-control ideology. Hoy noted that the public schools emphasized a more custodial pupil-control orientation than that acquired by the students during their formal college teacher training programs; the student teacher's pupil-control ideology was therefore significantly influenced by the student teaching experience.

Jones (1982) used repeated measures of the PCI Form to examine the change in student teacher orientation towards pupil-control ideology occurring during the student teaching experience. A total of 62 student teachers completed the PCI Form twice during the same semester of field experience. The pupil-control ideology was found to have increased during their teaching experiences, from 51.71 to 55.66--a statistically significant level ($p < .001$). This increase was toward a more custodial orientation of pupil-control ideology.

Relationship of Teachers' Pupil-Control Ideology and School Climate

A substantive body of research points to the atmosphere of the school and the teachers'/students' sense of involvement and identification with school as crucial factors in students' growth and development. Research indicates that an organizational structure with an orientation stressing an accepting, understanding, trustful, and involved view of teachers/students, seems more likely to provide a healthy school climate. Jones and Blankenship (1970) found that teachers in schools characterized by punishment-centered bureaucratic styles were more custodial than those in schools exhibiting representative bureaucratic styles.

These conclusions were supported by Hoy and Appleberry (1970) from their research comparing teacher-principal relationships in "humanistic" and "custodial" elementary schools. In this investigation, the PCI Form and the OCDQ were personally administered by a researcher to virtually all the professional personnel of 45 elementary schools. From this sample, 15 "humanistic" and 15 "custodial" schools were identified. The researchers found the elementary schools with a humanistic pupil-control orientation to be significantly more open than those with a custodial pupil-control orientation, indicating the pupil-control orientation of a school to be a critical variable affecting a school's climate. They also posited that humanistic teachers desire a more open climate, suggesting that humanistic teachers would see a need for the "ideal" climate to be more open than that perceived by the custodial teacher.

Willower (1975) noted that a number of investigations have examined the relationship of school organizational climate and the pupil-control ideology of faculty, with results indicating that openness in school climate is associated with a humanistic faculty pupil-control ideology. He also concluded from his review of these investigations that teachers who are humanistic in their pupil-control ideology will: (1) exhibit more student-centered verbal behavior, (2) spend more time in praising and encouraging students, and (3) generate more favorable attitudes from students.

Highberger (1976), in a study involving 290 middle school teachers and 279 junior high teachers, sought to compare the pupil control ideology of each group with their perception of school climate. Data were collected from each of the 35 middle and junior high schools through the use of the PCI Form and the OCDQ. It was concluded that middle schools were more humanistic toward student control and were more open in their climate perceptions than were the junior high schools.

In another study, Jalovick (1977) found support for her hypothesis that the more open the classroom practices of the teacher, the less custodial the teacher's pupil-control ideology. This investigation involved a total of 40 "traditional" and 40 "open" teachers from 10 elementary school districts in the state of New Jersey. Results from the study indicated that openness of practices were inversely related to a custodial control ideology. She found that a significant and powerful positive relationship existed between the openness of teachers' classroom practices and their orientation toward student control.

From the evidence presented, it is abundantly clear that a school's climate and the pupil-control ideology of its staff interact together. This, in part, determines the perception of a school's climate as viewed by its participants.

Measuring Pupil-Control Ideology

Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) devised a method to measure a staff's pupil-control ideology by using a 20-item Likert-type scaled instrument called the Pupil Control Ideology Form (Appendix A). The purpose of their developing the instrument was to test several hypotheses concerning the pupil-control ideology of public school professional personnel.

The PCI Form provides a score based on a humanistic-custodial continuum. Briefly, a humanistic pupil-control orientation stresses an accepting, trustful view of students and optimism concerning their ability to be self-disciplining and responsible. A custodial ideology emphasizes the maintenance of order, distrust of students, and a moralistic stance toward deviance.

The first major study using this instrument was conducted in the spring of 1965 by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967). It included a cross-section of 13 school systems and involved 1,306 elementary and secondary teachers, principals, and counselors.

Some findings from this investigation included:

1. There was a relationship between organizational position and pupil-control ideology. Counselors were more humanistic than principals, who were more humanistic than teachers.

2. Elementary teachers were more humanistic than secondary teachers, and elementary principals were more humanistic than secondary principals.

3. Teachers with more than five years of experience were more custodial than teachers with less than five years of experience.

4. Male teachers had a more custodial pupil-control ideology than female teachers.

5. For elementary teachers, there was a positive relationship between age and degree of custodialism. Secondary teachers had a similar, but less pronounced, tendency.

6. Secondary school principals with five years or less experience in administration were significantly more custodial than were more experienced secondary principals.

7. As the amount of education increased for elementary teachers, custodialism in pupil-control ideology decreased.

The PCI Form has been used in numerous studies since its development. Many of these studies have been discussed within this chapter. The validity of the instrument and a more detailed description is included in Chapter III.

Measuring Organizational Climate

Several instruments have been developed to measure organizational climate. One of the most popular and widely used techniques for assessing the organizational climate of schools has been the OCDQ developed by Halpin and Croft (1962).

The questionnaire consists of 64 items to which school personnel respond, reporting their perceptions. The items are answered on a

four-point scale: rarely occurs, sometimes occurs, often occurs, and very frequently occurs. The OCDQ provides eight subtests of dimension scores, four of which describe selected facets of teacher behavior as it is perceived by the teachers. Teacher behaviors are: disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy. Four other dimensions deal with the teacher perception of the principal's behavior. Principal behaviors are: aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration.

These eight subtest scores are utilized to develop a profile of the school's organizational climate and to classify the organizational climate of the school on a continuum from open to closed. The climate continuum, as defined by Halpin and Croft (1962), has six possible classifications (open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed) which move from the desired and hypothesized effective open climate at one end to the less desirable closed climate at the other end.

Hall (1971) made a comparison of Halpin and Croft's (1962) OCDQ and Likert and Likert's (1967) Profile of a School Questionnaire. Both of these instruments were devised to identify types of educational organizations for purposes of classification. Hall's findings indicated that the instruments correlated positively in identifying organizational types. He concluded that, although the instruments were different, they did originate from the same conceptual model.

Thomas and Slater (1973) used the OCDQ to study climates in primary schools in Australia. Their purpose was to contribute to validation efforts for the instrument. Data were analyzed from over 700 respondents and a four-factor solution was produced. Thomas and Slater identified these factors as: supportiveness, operations emphasis,

data in 30 of Murray's (1938) need-press scales. Analysis of these data lead to climate factors established by a factor analysis technique. The five first-order factors together describe a cluster called "developmental-press," which is the capacity of the organizational environment to support, satisfy, or reward self-actualizing behavior. Another second-order factor, "control-press," refers to those characteristics of environmental press which inhibit or restrict personal expressiveness.

A more recent addition to the list of instruments designed to measure organizational climate is the CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile (Appendix A). The instrument was developed by a group of C. R. Kettering Foundation Associates headed by Robert Fox and published in 1973 as part of the book, School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to School Administrators. Through their research, they identified eight factors which comprised school climate. Those factors are:

1. Respect. Teachers and administrators see themselves and others as persons of worth, having ideas which are listened to.

2. Trust. Trust is reflected in one's confidence that others can be counted on to behave in a way that is honest. They will do what they say they will do. There is also an element of believing others will not let you down.

3. High Morale. People with high morale feel good about what is happening.

4. Opportunities for Input. Not all persons can be involved in making the important decisions. Not always can each person be as influential as he might like to be on the many aspects of the school's programs and processes that affect him. But every person cherishes the opportunity to contribute his or her ideas, and know they have been considered. A feeling of a lack of voice is counterproductive to self-esteem and deprives the school of that person's resources.

5. Continuous Academic and Social Growth. Each student needs to develop additional academic, social, and physical skills, knowledge, and attitudes. (Many educators have described the growth process as achieving 'developmental tasks.' Educators, too, desire to improve their skills, knowledge, and attitudes in regard to their particular assignments within the school district and as cooperative members of a team.)

6. Cohesiveness. This quality is measured by the person's feeling toward the school. Members should feel a part of the school. They want to stay with it and have a chance to exert their influence on it in collaboration with others.

7. School Renewal. The school as an institution should develop improvement projects. It should be self-renewing in that it is growing, developing, and changing rather than following routines, repeating previously accepted procedures, and striving for conformity. If there is renewal, difference is seen as interesting, to be cherished. Diversity and pluralism are valued. New conditions are faced with poise. Adjustments are worked out as needed. The 'new' is not seen as threatening, but as something to be examined, weighed, and its value or relevance determined. The school should be able to organize improvement projects rapidly and efficiently, with an absence of stress and conflict.

8. Caring. Every individual in the school should feel that some other person or persons are concerned about him as a human being. Each knows it will make a difference to someone else if he or she is happy or sad, healthy or ill. (Teachers should feel that the principal cares about them even when they make mistakes or disagree. And the principal should know that the teachers--at least most of them--understand the pressures under which he or she is working and will help if they can) (pp. 7-9).

This 40-item instrument asks the respondents to compare what they see as being the actual status of a particular climate factor with what, in their opinion, would be the ideal status of that climate factor. The instrument is designed to serve two purposes. One is to provide a convenient means of assessing the school's climate factors so that initial decisions can be made about priority targets for

improvement projects. The second is to serve as a benchmark against which a school may measure climate change.

Collica (1978), using the CFK, Ltd. Climate Profile, investigated the relationship of idiographic leadership in the elementary and secondary schools that had students who experienced a high gain score on the California Assessment Test Program for the years 1975-76 and 1976-77, or schools reputed by a panel of experts to have high organizational climate, high staff morale, and high student academic achievement.

Seventy-six school sites in 10 school districts throughout San Diego County, California, were involved in the study. Collica (1978) concluded from his investigation that idiographic or highly interpersonal leadership traits of the site administrator contributed to high organizational climate as perceived by the school staff. "There is a cause and effect relationship between the practice of idiographic leadership style and the development of high organizational climate" (Collica, 1978, p. 139). Collica also concluded that site administrators who practiced idiographic leadership style were significantly more accurate in their perceptions concerning how their staffs perceived the organizational climate and the leadership factor in their description of the actual and the ideal climates.

Dennis (1979), in her investigation, sought to assess the validity and reliability of the CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile. Using data collected from the 10 participating Colorado high schools involving 480 administrators, teachers, and students, Dennis found the reliability and validity of the criterion measures to be extremely high using Hoyt estimates of reliability, item analysis, and analysis

of variance. The reliability for the total profile was .95, as were reliability coefficients for each scale and for all population groups.

Summary

Pertinent literature has been reviewed in this chapter which is germane to two research variables: organizational climate and teacher-pupil-control ideology. The review of literature indicated that the importance of climate as a significant contributor to organizational effectiveness became widely recognized only in the last few decades. Evidence was presented supporting the construct that climate not only exists in organizations, but is measurable. In recent years, this has become a widely investigated area, as researchers attempt to analyze and identify the numerous mediating variables which influence climate.

Following a review of the history of the organizational climate concept, an overview of the research and relevant theories was presented regarding the interrelationships of school climate, student achievement, and student behavior. Some variables examined that are commonly thought to have a bearing on these factors include: school size, teacher tenure, teacher job satisfaction, teacher personality and values, student socioeconomic background, building and classroom management, principal/pupil-teacher relationships, and teacher-pupil-control ideology.

Climate was described in terms of a continuum from open to closed, with a climate type on the open side of the continuum identified as being the most effective. Pupil-control ideology was discussed as being on a continuum from humanistic to custodial, with the more humanistic approach proving to be the most favorable in promoting

an effective school climate. The climate types and kinds of pupil-control ideologies were described in detail.

Organizational climate was described as not only influencing, but also as being influenced, by its inhabitants. Evidence was presented establishing the importance of the principal in the development and maintenance of climate.

In conclusion, evidence of the relationship between pupil-control ideology and school climate was analyzed, and validated techniques for measuring school climate and teacher-pupil-control ideology were presented. A more detailed examination of the two instruments used in this study, the PCI Form and the CFK, Ltd. Climate Profile, was also included.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perception of actual and ideal school climate. More specifically, the study examined for possible existing relationships between: (1) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perception of actual school climate factors, (2) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perception of ideal school climate factors, (3) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceived difference between the actual and ideal school climate factors, and (4) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceived difference between the composite actual and composite ideal school climate factors. This investigation was conducted as a means of answering questions concerning the pupil-control ideology and climate perceptions of elementary teachers in one school district. Since the study was designed to examine relationships rather than manipulate them, a heuristic approach was taken.

Population

This investigation included 6 of the 10 K-6 elementary schools within one public school district with approximately 6,600 students.

All schools which had principals with more than one year of experience in that building were selected for the study. Each of the 77 K-6 classroom teachers in those schools who had more than one year of experience was asked to participate. The size of the schools ranged from 175 to 480 students; class sizes averaged approximately 22 students per class, with few extremes.

As shown in Table I, the number of participants at each site ranged from 6 to 21. Seventy-six usable instruments were returned to the researcher and were included in this study.

TABLE I

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS

School Code Number	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
1	12	15.8
2	6	7.9
3	11	14.5
4	14	18.4
5	21	27.6
6	12	15.8
Totals 6	76	100.0

Instrumentation

Data for the study were obtained through the use of two questionnaires: the CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile and the PCI Form. Each participating teacher was asked to respond to both questionnaires. The procedures used in administering these instruments are included in Appendix B.

The CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile asked the participants to respond to eight factors which are considered as climate indexes. Those factors are: respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for input, continuous academic and social growth, cohesiveness, school renewal, and caring. This 40-item instrument asked the respondents to compare what they perceived as being the actual climate conditions with what, in their opinion, would be the ideal climate conditions. The instrument is designed to serve two purposes. One is to provide a convenient means of assessing the school's climate factors so that initial decisions can be made about priority targets for improvement projects. The second is to serve as a benchmark against which a school may measure climate change. Permission to use this instrument was granted from the Collegial Association for the Development and Renewal of Education (CADRE). The instrument is located in Appendix A.

The teachers' pupil-control ideology was assessed by the PCI Form, which is an attitude measure of one's orientation toward pupil control. Permission to use this instrument was granted by Dr. Wayne Hoy. The instrument contains 20 statements about pupils as learners, the nature of the school setting, and interpretation of pupil misbehavior and conduct, with a Likert-type scale to express the

respondent's reactions to the statements. A total PCI score is summed from item responses (range = 20-100) and reflects the teacher's ideological orientation toward pupil control. This score is interpreted on a continuum with extremes of "humanistic" to "custodial" orientation. Low scores (20-40) can be interpreted as a more humanistic orientation and higher scores (60-80) as more custodial.

The custodial orientation can be conceived as having a view of school with a central concern for rigid control of student behavior, stress on maintenance of order, a mistrustful watch of students, and a punitive, moralistic reaction to student misconduct. The humanistic orientation views the school as an educational community fostering learning through interaction and experience, development of two-way communication between pupils and teachers in a democratic atmosphere, replacing strict teacher control with student self-discipline, and interpreting student behavior in psychological and sociological terms (Hoy, 1967).

Studies by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967), using the PCI Form, determined split-half reliability coefficients in two samples of .95 (N = 170) and .91 (N = 55) with the application of the Spearman-Brown formula. Validity of the instrument was supported by principals' judgments of some of their teachers. Further evidence of validity was established by a comparison of PCI scores of personnel from schools known by reputation to be humanistic, with scores of personnel from other schools that were not humanistic at the same grade levels.

Data Collection Procedures

During early August of 1984, the initial research proposal was

discussed with the district superintendent by the researcher. Having obtained permission from the superintendent to conduct the study, contacts were made with each of the six building principals involved to discuss the purpose of the investigation, data-gathering procedures, and to obtain their permission and support for this undertaking.

These initial contacts were followed up in late January, 1985, providing a status report to the superintendent and establishing dates and reviewing data-gathering procedures with each principal. Letters were sent to the K-6 teachers who were to participate in the study. These letters explained the purpose of this investigation and requested that they meet with the researcher briefly at their school to complete the questionnaires. Reminder notices were also sent to each building for placement on bulletin boards.

A time was scheduled with each of the participating building principals during mid-February at 8:30 a.m. (30 minutes prior to the beginning of classes). The same outline was used at each site to provide background and instructions for the participants. Personal contact was made with the five teachers who were not in attendance at the meetings. Instructions were provided for completion of the questionnaires and addressed envelopes were included. Four of the five questionnaires were returned; therefore, 76 of a possible 77 respondents completed and returned their instruments. All data were gathered over a 15-day period. Two individuals did not respond to all items; however, useful data were acquired from the forms.

Samples of the letters and notices sent to each school are located in Appendix B. Also included is the outline used for administering the instruments.

Research Design and Data Analysis

Research Design

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship of two research variables: teacher-pupil-control ideology and teacher perception of school climate--both ideal and actual. The design for the study (the "one-shot" case study) was dictated by the purpose. Campbell and Stanley (1966) were highly critical of this ex post facto design. They cited its lack of variable control and reliance on observation and memory as weaknesses. It was precisely those "weaknesses" cited by Campbell and Stanley, however, which made it appropriate for the present study. The intent of this causal-comparative, descriptive study was to gather data regarding classroom teachers' perceptions of the two research variables (exploring relationships of climate and pupil-control ideology), not to manipulate them.

Data Analysis

Individual instruments were hand scored to obtain the necessary raw data. The CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile is comprised of eight climate factors, with five questions pertaining to each climate factor. A four-point Likert-type scale was used for each of the subscales of "What Is" and "What Should Be," with "Almost Never" receiving one point, "Occasionally" receiving two points, "Frequently" receiving three points, and "Almost Always" receiving four points. Therefore, the scores for each of the climate factors ranged from 5 to 20. The eight climate factors and their corresponding question item numbers are listed below:

1. Respect--items 1 through 5
2. Trust--items 6 through 10
3. High Morale--items 11 through 15
4. Opportunities for Input--items 16 through 20
5. Continuous Academic and Social Growth--items 21 through 25
6. Cohesiveness--items 26 through 30
7. School Renewal--items 31 through 35
8. Caring--items 36 through 40

Each CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile questionnaire had 16 scores to be recorded--eight for each of the two subscales--with potential scores ranging from 5 to 20 points for each of the factors. The composite score was determined by dividing the total score of all factors by eight.

The PCI Form had 20 questions on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with "Strongly Agree" receiving one point (humanistic) and "Strongly Disagree" receiving five points (custodial). Items 5 and 13 were reversely scored. Potential scoring ranged from 20 to 100 points (humanistic to custodial).

Raw scores were placed on Fortran sheets, with schools and teachers each being assigned an identifying number. Neither the schools nor the teachers were identified in the data analysis for purposes of this study. Teachers' PCI scores and general climate factor scores, which were continuous interval level data, were plotted in a manner which allowed scores to be examined to see if there were existing relationships between the following: (1) teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perception of actual school climate factors, (2)

The study was designed to examine for possible existing relationships between the two variables, school climate and teacher-pupil-control ideology, within one particular school district's K-6 classrooms. Hypotheses were developed and relationships analyzed from two major areas: (1) teacher-pupil-control ideology and climate, both actual and ideal; and (2) teacher-pupil-control ideology and the difference between the actual and ideal climate. The data were analyzed using the SPSS System to perform Pearson product-moment correlations (r), the most frequently employed method of ascertaining the relationship between two variables (Van Dalen, 1979).

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study investigated the relationship between elementary teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of actual and ideal school climate. Teachers' pupil-control ideology was measured on a continuum from 20-100 (humanistic to custodial) and teachers' perceptions of actual and ideal climate were measured on a continuum from 5 to 20 (conditions almost never exist to conditions almost always exist).

Four hypotheses were developed to examine for existing relationships between teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of climate in two major areas: (1) pupil-control ideology and eight actual climate factors, pupil control ideology and eight ideal climate factors, and pupil-control ideology and the gap between teachers' perception of actual and ideal climate; and (2) pupil-control ideology and the gap between the composite actual and composite ideal climate. The level of significance for rejecting the null hypotheses was set at .05 for this study.

Descriptive Statistics

Teachers' Pupil-Control Ideology Scores

The 76 teachers' pupil-control ideology scores were scattered

between 29 (on the humanistic side of the continuum) to 75 (on the custodial side of the continuum). The teachers had a mean score of 51.71, with a standard deviation of 8.16 and a range of 46.0. The distribution of scores, mean, standard deviation, and range are presented in Table II.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF PCI SCORES

PCI Scores	Absolute Frequency	PCI Scores	Absolute Frequency
29	2	53	6
38	3	54	6
40	2	55	3
42	1	56	2
43	1	57	2
44	3	58	1
45	5	59	6
46	1	60	2
47	3	61	4
48	3	65	2
49	3	66	1
50	5	68	1
51	4	75	1
52	3	Totals	76

Note: Mean = 51.71; Standard Deviation = 8.16; Range = 46.0.

The standard deviation score, which is an average of how distant the individual scores are from the mean, indicates a wide range of scores, with a low frequency distribution at each score, as portrayed in Table II. There were two extreme humanistic scores of 29 and one extreme custodial score of 75. The range would be reduced to 30 by discounting those three extreme scores.

An examination of PCI scores from previous investigations indicated that a humanistic orientation existed within the schools studied. For instance, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) administered the PCI Form to 25 elementary and secondary teachers who had been identified by their principals as having humanistic orientations. These teachers scored a mean of 51.5. Also, as part of this study, 468 elementary teachers were administered the PCI Form, with a resulting mean score of 55.3 A more recent investigation by Jones (1982) found that after 16 weeks of student teaching, the 22 elementary teacher participants had a mean PCI of 53.15. Therefore, one could conclude that the mean PCI score of 51.71 from the current study reflected a humanistic pupil-control orientation in the elementary schools involved in this investigation.

An investigation by Halpin, Halpin, and Harris (1982) provided information pertinent to the analysis of PCI data and its relationship to climate perceptions. The investigation examined the relationship of the personality characteristics of teachers-in-training and self-concept to their pupil-control orientation. They concluded that certain distinct characteristics emerged which described each of the two pupil-control orientations, custodial and humanistic. Using the SPFQ, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and the PCI Form, the researchers

administered the instrument to 110 university students who were education majors. Sixty-one were graduate students.

Based on definitions supplied with the SPFQ, the teachers-in-training with a humanistic pupil-control orientation could be characterized in the following manner:

1. Emotionally mature and realistic about life
2. Expedient, disliking rules
3. Attentive to people, cheerful, expressive, adaptable, enthusiastic, relaxed, and easy-going
4. Self-assured and confident about their ability to deal with situations
5. Spontaneous, inner-directed, unconventional, less afraid of criticism, and uninhibited

In terms of self-concept, the teachers with humanistic orientations tended to like themselves, were confident in themselves, and acted accordingly. They felt they were valuable individuals.

The investigators determined that the teachers-in-training with custodial orientations had generally opposite personalities and views of themselves. These individuals could be described as being:

1. Low in frustration tolerance, easily upset
2. Exacting in character, dominated by a sense of duty, persevering, responsible, and planful
3. Anxious to do the right thing, careful, conventional, shy, restrained, and rule-bound
4. Reserved, stiff, critical, and cool
5. Precise and rigid in personal standards and actions
6. Tense, frustrated, driven, and overwrought

7. Apprehensive, moody, brooding, scrupulous, fussy

8. Viewing people as not being as moral as they should be

From the standpoint of self-concept, the custodial individuals rated lower than their humanistic counterparts. They tended to see themselves as undesirable and were doubtful about their own worth. They felt depressed, anxious, unhappy, and had little faith or self-confidence.

Halpin, Halpin, and Harris (1982) noted that these descriptions were compatible with those descriptions by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967). Willower, Eidell, and Hoy's descriptions were detailed in Chapter I.

A clear picture of PCI scores and a more precise description of individuals with humanistic and custodial orientations will allow the analysis of the relationships between the two research variables (teacher-pupil-control ideology and teacher perception of school climate) to be more meaningful.

Teachers' Perceptions of School Climate

Teachers' perceptions of the eight climate factors, both actual and ideal, and the resulting gap perceived between each actual and ideal climate factor, are illustrated in forthcoming tables (III through VII). The descriptive data included in these tables illustrate the various perceptions of the climate factors by the participants in this study.

Actual Climate Perceptions. As can be seen in Table III, the composite mean score for the actual climate factors was 16.92 on a

scale of 5 to 20, with a mean range of 3.31. Opportunities for Input, with a mean score of 15.24, was rated the lowest among the actual climate factors. It should be noted that with a range of 14, it had the widest distribution of actual climate factor scores. With a standard deviation of 3.29, it also had the greatest variation from the mean. The distribution of scores indicated this climate factor was not only perceived lowest by the participants, but also had a wider range of opinions. (As illustrated in Table VI, this factor had one of the more unique frequency distributions.) Indicators suggested that this was a climate factor which would be worthy of attention in a district climate improvement plan. An analysis of this factor on the ideal subscale in a later portion of this chapter will assist in determining the degree of emphasis which should be allocated to this factor.

Continuous Academic and Social Growth, with a mean score of 16.14, a range of 9, and a standard deviation of 2.31, had the second lowest mean score. As can be seen in Table III, this actual climate factor's data were not unlike that of several of the other actual climate factors. As noted, the first five factors fell below the composite mean score of 16.92, indicating similar perceptions.

The actual climate factor ranked the highest was Caring, with a mean score of 18.55, a range of 10, and a standard deviation of 1.99. The Caring climate factor had one of the lowest variations from the mean. It is obvious, even with the range of 10, that this factor was perceived as the greatest contributor to an open climate within the elementary schools investigated. This conclusion was supported by the frequency distribution scores (see Table VI), showing a tight cluster of scores on the upper end of the scale. The same kind of

interpretation would apply to Respect, with the second highest actual mean score of 18.07, range of 9, and a standard deviation of 1.98.

TABLE III

DESCRIPTIVE DATA FOR ACTUAL CLIMATE FACTORS

Climate Factor Ranking*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Opportunities for Input	15.24	3.29	14
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	16.14	2.31	9
School Renewal	16.37	2.56	10
High Morale	16.67	3.19	10
Trust	16.83	2.59	8
Cohesiveness	17.04	2.52	10
Respect	18.07	1.98	9
Caring	18.55	1.99	10
Composite	16.92	1.80	--
Range	3.31		

*Climate factors are ranked by mean score, from low to high.

Ideal Climate Perceptions. Table IV includes the descriptive data for the eight ideal climate factors. As can be seen, the composite mean score for this subscale was 18.99 on a scale of 5 to 20, with a mean range of 1.65.

TABLE IV

DESCRIPTIVE DATA FOR IDEAL CLIMATE FACTORS

Climate Factor Ranking*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Opportunities for Input	17.86	2.80	8
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	18.80	2.49	4
School Renewal	18.84	2.45	4
Trust	18.97	2.43	5
Cohesiveness	19.12	2.80	5
High Morale	19.24	3.24	4
Respect	19.33	2.40	4
Caring	19.51	2.36	3
Composite	18.99	2.32	--
Range	1.65		

*Climate factors are ranked by mean score, from low to high.

Opportunities for Input, with a mean score of 17.86, ranked lowest among the ideal climate factors. With a score of eight, it also had the widest range of climate factors--nearly twice that of the nearest range scores of five. A standard deviation of 2.80 shows that this factor had scores showing an average variation from the mean which is equal to or greater than that of all other factors, except one (High Morale) (Table V). The frequency distribution, displayed in Table VI, shows that only 23 participants gave this the maximum score.

TABLE V

COMPOSITE OF DESCRIPTIVE DATA FOR ACTUAL AND IDEAL CLIMATE FACTORS

Ranking of Actual Climate Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation	Ranking of Ideal Climate Factors*	Mean	Standard Deviation
Opportunities for Input	15.24	3.29	Opportunities for Input	17.86	2.80
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	16.14	2.31	Continuous Academic and Social Growth	18.80	2.49
School Renewal	16.37	2.56	School Renewal	18.84	2.45
High Morale	16.67	3.19	Trust	18.97	2.43
Trust	16.83	2.59	Cohesiveness	19.12	2.80
Cohesiveness	17.04	2.52	High Morale	19.24	3.24
Respect	18.07	1.98	Respect	19.33	2.40
Caring	18.55	1.99	Caring	19.51	2.36
Range	3.31		Range	1.65	

*Climate factors are ranked by mean score, from low to high.

TABLE VI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR EIGHT CLIMATE FACTORS ON BOTH ACTUAL AND IDEAL SUBSCALES*

	Respect		Trust		Morale		Input		Growth		Cohesiveness		Renewal		Caring	
Scores	A	I	A	I	A	I	A	I	A	I	A	I	A	I	A	I
6							1									
7							1									
8							1									
9							2									
10					2		1				1		1		1	
11	2				3		6		1		3		4			
12			3				5	1	4		3		2			
13	1		6		2		5	1	5		2		3		1	
14			3		7		5	1	9		2		7		1	
15	5		9	1	3		5	4	14		5	1	9		2	
16	5	2	12		12	1	11	9	8	3	9	4	11	2	7	
17	10	1	14	4	11		13	9	10	7	10	5	9	7	7	2
18	13	2	9	11	9	1	7	12	12	12	16	5	12	9	9	3
19	21	16	14	19	17	12	10	15	7	14	15	11	11	21	10	5
20	19	54	6	40	9	60	3	23	6	39	10	49	7	36	38	65
Total	76	75	76	75	74	74	76	75	76	75	76	75	76	75	76	75

*A = Actual; I = Ideal.

The descriptive data indicated a rather wide variation of opinion regarding this factor, yet it is clear that this factor was not considered one of the more significant contributors to an open school climate, as perceived by the participants in this study. High Morale, with the largest standard deviation of 3.24, indicated that this was a factor which had the greatest amount of disagreement regarding its contribution to an ideal school climate.

The ideal climate factor ranked the highest was Caring, with a mean score of 19.51, a standard deviation of 2.36, and a range of 3. As can be seen, this factor not only had the highest mean score, it had the narrowest range and the least amount of variation from the mean. Table VI shows that 65 of the participants gave Caring a maximum score of 20. It can be concluded that the Caring climate factor was perceived by the participants as the most important factor which contributes to an ideal school climate.

Actual and Ideal Climate Perceptions. Table V shows a comparison and ranking of the mean actual and the mean ideal scores. As shown, the teachers' perceptions of both the actual and ideal climate subscales ranked Opportunity for Input the lowest and Caring the highest. A total of five factors received the same ranking on each of the subscales. As portrayed, the lowest three and the highest two climate factors on both subscales were equated in ranking.

As illustrated in Table V, the two climate factors ranked the lowest have very similar descriptive data. The same is true for the two climate factors ranked the highest. The lowest climate factor, Opportunities for Input, had an actual mean score of 15.24 and a

standard deviation of 3.29. On the ideal subscale, this factor had a mean score of 17.86, with a standard deviation of 2.80. The perceived discrepancy between these two subscales was 2.62, compared to a composite mean of 2.07. The individual questionnaire items, as they appeared on the instrument, along with an interpretation of the Opportunity for Input factor, will be presented prior to the analysis of data.

Opportunity for Input Questionnaire Items.

> (1) I feel that my ideas are listened to and used in this school; (2) When important decisions are made about the programs in this school, I personally have heard about the plan beforehand and have been involved in some of the discussions; (3) Important decisions are made in this school by a governing council with representation from students, faculty, and administration; (4) While I obviously can't have a vote on every decision that is made in this school that affects me, I do feel that I can have some important input into that decision; and (5) When all is said and done, I feel that I count in this school (Fox et al., 1973, p. 54).

Opportunity for Input Climate Factor. Not all students and staff can be involved in making the important decisions and cannot be as influential as they might like to be in many areas. However, individuals relish the opportunity to contribute ideas, knowing their ideas have at least been considered (Fox et al., 1973).

Analysis of Opportunity for Input Data. This climate factor, as previously noted, ranked the lowest on both the actual and the ideal climate scales. Obviously, the participants felt a need for greater input into making important decisions. As noted in Table VII, this factor had the second largest mean gap between the actual and ideal climate scales, yet it was given the lowest priority in terms of

importance as a contributor to an ideal school climate. Therefore, it could be concluded that although the participants cherished the opportunity to contribute their ideas, or at least have them considered, other factors were more important to them. According to the data, Opportunity for Input deserves priority in a climate improvement project. This is congruent with Hoy, Newland, and Blazovsky's (1977) conclusion that teacher participation in decision and policymaking is an important variable influencing a school's organizational climate.

TABLE VII

GENERAL CLIMATE FACTORS: GAP SCORES

Climate Factors	Mean Actual	Mean Ideal	Mean Difference (Gap)
Caring	18.55	19.51	.96
Respect	18.07	19.33	1.26
Cohesiveness	17.04	19.12	2.08
Trust	16.83	18.97	2.14
School Renewal	16.37	18.84	2.47
High Morale	16.67	19.24	2.57
Opportunities for Input	15.24	17.86	2.62
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	16.14	18.80	2.66
Composite	16.92	18.99	2.07
Range	3.31	1.65	1.66

The climate factor ranking second to Opportunity for Input on each of the subscales was Continuous Academic and Social Growth. As portrayed in Table V, this factor had an actual mean score of 16.14 and a standard deviation of 2.31. On the ideal subscale, Academic and Social Growth had a mean score of 18.80 and a standard deviation of 2.49. Table VII shows the perceived discrepancy between these two subscales as 2.66, the widest discrepancy between any of the other actual/ideal factors. It should be noted, however, that this discrepancy was only slightly wider than the one which existed with the Opportunities for Input factor. The individual questionnaire items as they appeared on the instrument, along with an intepretation of the Continuous Academic and Social Growth factor, will be presented prior to the analysis of data.

Continuous Academic and Social Growth Questionnaire Items.

> (1) The teachers are 'alive,' they are interested in life around them; they are doing interesting things outside of school; (2) Teachers in this school are 'out in front,' seeking better ways of teaching and learning; (3) Students feel that the school program is meaningful and relevant to their present and future needs; (4) The principal is growing and learning, too. He or she is seeking new ideas; and (5) The school supports parent growth. Regular opportunities are provided for parents to be involved in learning activities and in examining new ideas (Fox et al., 1973, p. 55).

Continuous Academic and Social Growth Climate Factor. Students and staff need to develop additional knowledge, as well as social and physical skills (Fox et al., 1973).

Analysis of Continuous Academic and Social Growth Data. An interpretation of this data similar to that of the Opportunities for

Input is appropriate; however, Continuous Academic and Social Growth ranked nearly a full point higher on both the actual and the ideal subscales. The relatively low ranking on the ideal scales indicated that this factor was not a prime contributor to an ideal school climate, as perceived by the participants, yet the wide gap between the actual and the ideal subscales reflected a concern for this factor's current status. Therefore, this factor should receive attention as part of a climate improvement project; the degree of its importance as reflected on the ideal scale would help dictate the amount of attention required.

The climate factor which ranked the highest on each of the subscales, as can be seen in Table V, was Caring. It had an actual mean score of 18.55 and a standard deviation of 1.99. On the ideal subscale, Caring had a mean score of 19.51 and a standard deviation of 2.36. Table VII shows the perceived discrepancy between the actual and ideal as being .96, compared to a composite mean difference of 2.07. The individual questionnaire items, as they appeared on the instrument, along with an interpretation of the Caring factor, will be presented prior to the analysis of data.

Caring Questionnaire Items.

> (1) There is someone in this school that I can always count on; (2) The principal really cares about students; (3) I think people in this school care about me as a person, are concerned about more than just how well I perform my role at school; (4) School is a nice place to be because I feel wanted and needed there; and (5) Most people at this school are kind (Fox et al., 1973, pp. 56-57).

Caring Climate Factor. Both students and staff should feel that others are concerned about their general welfare, knowing that it will

make a difference to someone else if they are happy, sad, healthy, ill, or under stress (Fox et al., 1973).

Analysis of Caring Data. The Caring climate factor, as previously noted, had both the highest actual and the highest ideal scores. As shown in Table VII, it had the narrowest gap score between the actual and the ideal climate subscales. According to this, and the frequency distribution data in Table VI, Caring was the most important climate factor to the participants. Also, greater satisfaction existed with this actual factor than with any of the other actual climate factors. Therefore, Caring, though having the highest ideal score, should, because of its perceived contribution to an ideal school climate, remain as a critical variable in any climate improvement project. Obviously, the participants felt that a high degree of concern for the general welfare of all individuals within the building was important as a contributor to an ideal school climate, and that a significant concern for others existed at the time of the investigation.

The climate factor which ranked just below Caring in terms of importance to the participants was Respect. As can be seen in Table V, it received the same ranking on each of the subscales, with an actual mean score of 18.07 and a standard deviation of 1.98. On the ideal subscale it had a mean score of 19.33 and a standard deviation of 2.40. Table VII shows the actual/ideal discrepancy as 1.26, slightly wider than Caring's discrepancy. The individual Respect questionaire items, as they appeared on the instrument, along with an interpretation of the Respect factor, will be presented prior to the analysis of data.

Respect Questionnaire Items.

> (1) In this school even low achieving students are respected; (2) Teachers treast students as persons; (3) Parents are considered by this school as important collaborators; (4) Teachers from one subject area or grade level respect those from other subject areas; and (5) Teachers in this school are proud to be teachers (Fox et al., 1973, p. 53).

Respect Climate Factor. Students and staff should see themselves as persons of worth, having both self-respect and respect for others. They should believe that they have ideas and those ideas are listened to and make a difference (Fox et al., 1973).

Analysis of Respect Data. The Respect climate factor, as previously noted, had the second highest ranking on both the actual and the ideal climate subscales. As can be seen in Table VII, it had the second narrowest gap between the subscales, with a discrepancy of 1.26. The data indicated that a high degree of satisfaction existed with the Respect factor. It also indicated the importance of a continued emphasis to maintain the Respect factor as a highly regarded contributor to an ideal school climate. A standard deviation of 1.98 on the actual subscale and 2.40 on the ideal subscale indicate relatively minor variation of the responses from the mean. The narrow gap of 1.26, compared to a composite mean gap of 2.07, suggests that Respect, although an important climate factor, would not require much attention in terms of an attempt to improve its perceived position as an actual school climate factor.

Inferential Statistics

Data for each of the four hypotheses were analyzed by using the

SPSS subprogram Pearson correlations which computed the Pearson product-moment correlations for the two variables, teachers' pupil-control ideology and school climate perception. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) was used to measure the strength of relationships between the two interval-level variables.

Conclusions From Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis sought to determine if a significant relationship existed between teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of actual school climate. The data for this hypothesis are presented in Table VIII, which shows that no significant relationships ($p > .05$) were found to exist between pupil-control ideology and any of the eight climate factors on the actual scales. Thus, the data failed to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, it would be appropriate to conclude that no discernible relationship existed between the participants' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of the existing climate condition.

According to the data, the participants' view of the actual climate conditions, was not related to where they were on the humanistic-custodial continuum, did not differ significantly. One could conclude that the baseline which was established regarding the actual climate conditions reflected the general opinions of the entire group of teachers in this investigation regardless of the pupil-control orientations. Support for this conclusion could also be found by examining the standard deviation column in Table V, which shows little variation among scores except on two factors, High Morale and Opportunities for input. Also, the frequency distributions, which appear in Table VI,

indicate a general agreement among the participants as to the actual climate status. Therefore, it would be appropriate to use this baseline data in a climate improvement program.

TABLE VIII

RELATIONSHIP OF PCI AND ACTUAL CLIMATE FACTORS

Climate Factors	r	p
Respect	-.0128	.912
Trust	.0039	.973
High Morale	-.0197	.866
Opportunities for Input	.0497	.670
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	.0086	.941
Cohesiveness	-.0558	.632
School Renewal	-.0556	.634
Caring	-.0286	.806
Composite	-.0111	.924

Conclusions From Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis stated that there was no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions

of ideal school climate. The data for this hypothesis are presented in Table IX, which shows significant ($p < .05$) low negative relationships between teachers' pupil-control ideology and each of the eight climate factors on the ideal climate scales. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. One can conclude from the data that those participants with a more humanistic pupil-control orientation perceived a need for the ideal climate to be more open than that perceived by those with a more custodial orientation.

These findings are congruent with conclusions from the data of three previous studies which examined teachers' pupil-control ideology and school climate. Hoy and Appleberry (1970), in their investigation involving 45 elementary schools, concluded that pupil-control orientation of a school was a critical variable influencing a school's climate. They also concluded that humanistic teachers desire a more open classroom. Highberger (1976), from his investigation involving 290 middle school teachers in 35 schools, concluded that schools which were more humanistic in their pupil-control ideology were also more open in their organizational climate. Jalovick (1977) conducted a study involving 40 elementary teachers identified as traditional and 40 elementary teachers identified as open. She concluded that a significant and powerful relationship existed between the openness of teachers' classroom practices and their orientation toward student control.

The results of this study showed a relationship between teachers' pupil-control orientation and their perception of ideal climate conditions. And, just as in the three studies previously mentioned, the more humanistic teachers desired a more ideal (open) climate.

TABLE IX

RELATIONSHIP OF PCI AND IDEAL CLIMATE FACTORS

Climate Factors	r	p
Respect	-.3691	.001*
Trust	-.3859	.001*
High Morale	-.3175	.005*
Opportunities for Input	-.3673	.001*
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	-.3129	.006*
Cohesiveness	-.2960	.009*
School Renewal	-.3998	.000*
Caring	-.3053	.007*
Composite	-.3684	.001*

*$p < .05$

Conclusions From Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three sought to determine if a significant relationship existed between teachers' pupil-control ideology and the gap between actual and ideal climate factors. As shown in Table X, there are eight climate factors represented in this hypothesis. Respect

was the only one of the eight climate factors to have a significant ($p < .05$) low positive relationship to teachers' pupil-control ideology. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected in part. From an examination of the data, it was apparent that the relationship between the participants' PCI score and their view of the discrepancies between the actual and ideal climate conditions were insignificant as a whole when analyzing relationships between the two research variables.

It could be concluded from the data in Table X that the more custodial teachers perceived a greater difference between the actual and the ideal climate on the Respect climate factor than did those teachers of a more humanistic orientation. The concern shown by the more custodial oriented teachers is compatible with the custodial personality characteristics described earlier in this chapter.

Conclusions From Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis stated that there was no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of the difference between the composite actual and composite ideal school climate factors (gap). As shown in Table XI, signifcant negative relationships (p .05) were found to exist between pupil-control ideology and composite ideal score; however, no significant relationships were found to exist between pupil-control ideology and the difference between the composite actual and the composite ideal school climate factors. Thus, the data failed to reject the null hypothesis.

The failure to reject this hypothesis might be credited toward a general overall satisfaction among teachers with the climate as it

TABLE X

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PCI AND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACTUAL AND IDEAL SCHOOL CLIMATE FACTORS

Climate Factors	r	p
Respect	.2607	.023*
Trust	.1949	.092
High Morale	.1117	.337
Opportunities for Input	-.1406	.226
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	.1366	.239
Cohesiveness	.1552	.181
School Renewal	.1087	.350
Caring	.2244	.051

*p < .05

TABLE XI

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PCI AND COMPOSITE ACTUAL, IDEAL, AND GAP

PCI With Composite Mean Scores	r	p
PCI With Actual Climate Factors	-.0111	.924
PCI With Ideal Climate Factors	-.3684	.001*
PCI With Gap Between Actual and Ideal Climate Factors	-.1483	.201

*p < .05

existed. The data clearly indicated that concerns for the difference between the composite actual and composite ideal were not a reflection of pupil-control ideology; neither influenced the other.

Summary

Descriptive Data

PCI scores of the 76 participants were presented, reflecting a mean score of 51.7 and a range of 46. The elementary teachers in this study had a mean score which was on the humanistic end of the continuum (51.7), compared to the 468 elementary teachers (55.3) in a study reported by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967).

The actual climate factor perceived the lowest by teachers was Opportunities for Input, with a mean score of 15.24. It was also the lowest on the ideal scale with a mean score of 17.86 and a mean gap of 2.62, compared to a composite mean gap of 2.07. The climate factor perceived the highest on the actual scale was Caring, with a score of 18.55, and was also perceived the highest on the ideal scale, with a score of 19.51, and a mean gap of .96 compared to a composite mean gap of 2.07. The range and frequency distribution were provided to better clarify the various opinions of the participants.

Inferential Statistics

Four hypotheses were tested to examine for possible existing relationships between the two research variables, teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perception of school climate. Of the four, one was found to be significant at the .05 level. There was a

significant ($p < .05$) low negative relationship between PCI and each of the eight ideal climate factors. The results of data analysis of a second hypothesis showed a significant ($p < .05$) positive relationship between pupil-control ideology and one of the eight climate factor gap scores. No other significant relationships were found to exist between teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of school climate except for a significant ($p < .05$) negative relationship betwee PCI and the composite of the ideal climate factors.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study involved elementary teachers from one school district. It was conducted for the purpose of examining existing relationships between the two research variables, teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of actual and ideal school climate.

A review of the literature revealed that each of the variables has been the topic of numerous research studies in recent years. Although some studies were found which addressed the variables in combination, none addressed teachers' pupil-control ideology in relationship to teachers' perceptions of school climate as measured by the CFK, Ltd. Climate Profile instrument. The review of literature also provided evidence that a relationship existed between pupil-control ideology and school climate perceptions, which was the focus of this investigation.

This investigation involved 76 participants from 6 of the 10 K-6 elementary schools within a public school district of approximately 6,600 students. Data for the study were obtained through the use of two questionnaires, the CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile and the Pupil Control Ideology Form.

The following four null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of actual school climate factors.

2. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of ideal school climate factors.

3. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of the difference between the actual and ideal school climate factors.

4. There is no significant relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and teachers' perceptions of the difference between the composite actual and composite ideal school climate factors.

The hypotheses were designed to provide clarification of the two research variables with specific emphasis given to examination of the relationships between the research variables. Statistical treatment was through the Pearson product-moment correlations and was selected on the basis of power and appropriateness. The second null hypothesis was rejected, applying the .05 level of confidence. The third hypothesis was rejected in part. The remaining two hypotheses (one and four), failed to be rejected. The descriptive data provided information which proved valuable in determining a baseline for the district's elementary climate improvement program.

Conclusions

The review of literature showed pupil control to be a central aspect of school life and the scope of environment within which

instruction takes place. It also revealed studies demonstrating a relationship between teacher-pupil-control ideology and school climate. The purpose of this study was to examine for these relationships. However, a high relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of school climate was not found to exist within the composite of schools studied; yet, this investigation provided some interesting and valuable data, giving the district involved in the study baseline information from which climate improvement projects could be formulated. Also, drawing from previous research and the theory basis which form the foundation of this study, conclusions could be drawn pertaining to appropriate action for the district regarding utilization of the study.

First, as has been noted, the PCI score of 51.7 reflects a humanistic pupil-control orientation by those involved in the investigation. Supportive arguments were presented in Chapter IV for this conclusion. Additional evidence supporting this thesis showed that 59.2% of the participants scored more humanistic than the mean score of the 468 elementary teachers who were involved in the first large scale study using the PCI Form (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967). Therefore, it is appropriate to conclude that the district had a large number of elementary classroom teachers whose self-reported philosophy and characteristics were more in tune with those descriptors included in the review of literature which portrayed teachers with humanistic pupil-control ideology.

Second, the high actual climate factor perceptions indicated that a relatively open climate existed within the schools surveyed. Support for this conclusion can be found in the review of literature,

which indicated a positive relationship between humanistic pupil control ideology and school climate openness. For instance, Appleberry (1969), in his investigation involving 45 elementary schools, found that the 15 schools which were classified by the OCDQ as "relatively open," had a mean PCI score of 52.34. By comparison, the 15 schools which were classified as "relatively closed" had a mean PCI score of 55.87. Willower (1975) noted that a number of investigations have examined the relationship of school organizational climate and the pupil-control ideology of faculty, with results indicating that openness in school climate is associated with a humanistic faculty pupil-control ideology. Therefore, it is appropriate to conclude that the district had climate conditions which were compatible in the degree of openness with the other schools in the literature with humanistic and open climate orientations.

Third, in view of the research data presented in Chapter II supporting the positive relationship between humanistic pupil-control ideology and openness of school climate, three basic assumptions could be made:

1. The general self-reported humanistic orientations of the teachers resulted in the overall high actual climate perceptions

2. The high actual score resulted in a narrow gap between the actual and the ideal scores

3. The narrowness of the gap, general teacher satisfaction, affected the outcome of the hypotheses examining the relationships between pupil-control ideology and climate perceptions

Fourth, two separate, district-wide activities could have influenced the participants' PCI scores and their perceptions of the status

of their school's climate. During the year prior to this investigation, the building administrators were assigned a mandatory job target by the superintendent. This job target dealt with a planned climate improvement emphasis for their school and was monitored by the superintendent. Also, approximately 75% of the participants had been involved in an ongoing district-wide Instructional Skills Program. This program had an emphasis on a humanistic orientation as one of its components.

Fifth, and finally, it could be concluded that the distribution of the descriptive data was valuable for developing a profile of baseline data from which appropriate areas could be targeted for climate improvement projects. The areas for targeting have been described in Chapter IV. Methods, techniques, and considerations used in a climate improvement approach have been included in later portions of this chapter.

The results of this investigation, coupled with those of Hoy and Appleberry (1970), Highberger (1976), Jalovick (1977), and others as mentioned in Chapter II, indicate that teachers' pupil-control orientations of a school may provide an important step in identifying the social climate of a school. To a certain degree, the findings of this study provided further insight into some of the kinds of personal variables which activate the individual teacher's perception of climate.

Implications

During the investigation it was hoped that findings would contribute to the practical utilization of the climate concept in the elementary schools of the district studied. Perhaps as many questions

were raised as were answered. A study of a school's or district's climate should ultimately provide information which would: (1) allow an administrator to choose teachers who would best fit the climate needs of a building, (2) help determine in-service needs of teachers in terms of identified areas of concern, and (3) provide a baseline from which an effective climate improvement plan could be formulated.

In the first instance, the review of literature provided some general characteristics of individuals on each end of the humanistic/custodial continuum which would help in a staff selection process. Also, evidence was presented that pupil-control ideology was subject to change. In several instances, teachers' pupil-control ideology was shown to be influenced by the social system in which the teacher participated. An analysis of the individual building's distribution of descriptive data would provide the administrator with a profile of his/her staff's pupil-control orientation and consequently assist in determining both staffing patterns and in-service needs of the building. Finally, interpretation of data to determine areas of emphasis for climate improvement is an area of critical importance. A procedure for developing a climate improvement plan is discussed in a later portion of this chapter. The prime focus for the remainder of this section will be on one segment of the climate data (Opportunity for Input) as an example of the implications of determining appropriate actions for data gathered.

Opportunity for Input Data

As presented in Chapter IV, the Opportunity for Input climate factor was one which should be addressed in the district's climate

improvement efforts. This factor reflected the greatest variation of responses on each of the subscales, showing a wide range of opinions regarding the degree of existing input as well as degree of input which was desired. Consequently, this factor is being given close scrutiny.

As a means of addressing this factor appropriately, the administrator should make an effort to identify those individuals who desire to participate in the decision-making process, determine their skills to assist with the situation, then, if practical, encourage involvement. Often, the inverse is true if staff members lack interest and/or skills in an areas. Participation in a decision-making process then becomes counterproductive.

Hoy and Miskel's (1982) discussion on shared decision making in schools provides collaborative information supporting the thesis stated above. They posited that different people view opportunities for input in a wide variety of ways, depending on two critical variables: relevance and expertise. The results of the data, combined with the Hoy and Miskel theme, suggested that building principals wishing to narrow both the frequency distribution and the gap between actual and ideal perceptions should formulate a plan for staff involvement in decision making based on two sets of criteria.

Degree of Personal Interest. As part of the input determination process, the building principal should determine those teachers who perceive themselves as having a high personal stake in the various decisions being considered. According to Hoy and Miskel (1982), those individuals with a high personal stake in a particular decision will

usually have high interest in providing input. Inversely, those with a perceived low personal stake will have little interest in being a part of the decision-making process.

Degree of Expertise. The building principal has to make a decision regarding an individual's expertise and in general, his/her capability of making a meaningful contribution. "To involve subordinates in decisions that are outside their scope of experience and sphere of competence is likely to cause them unnecessary frustration" (Hoy and Miskel, 1982, p. 281).

Hoy and Miskel (1982) posited that if subordinates have a personal stake in a particular decision, and if they have the knowledge to make a useful contribution, they should be involved in the decision-making process. They also concluded that, should an issue not be relevant and not within their sphere of competence, involvement is likely to produce resentment because they typically will not want to be involved. These are obviously some broad general statements with numerous intervening variables and consequences. Certainly, there are many marginal situations which cannot be classified as simply as has been stated. The prime consideration is for a building administrator to be aware of appropriate successful alternatives for involving staff members in the various decision-making processes.

Appropriate application of the thesis developed by Hoy and Miskel (1982) would lend itself to the improvement of the Opportunity for Input climate factor. Yet, the implications for its utilization and the resulting consequences depend on the techniques and the precision in which this information is implemented.

Relationship of Teachers' Pupil-Control Ideology and Their Perceptions of School Climate

Within the present investigation, the relationship of teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of school climate factors remains illusive. Although a significant relationship failed to exist between teachers' pupil-control ideology and their perceptions of actual school climate, its influence should not be discounted. The existing relatively high climate factor of the elementary schools studied, combined with an overall humanistic pupil-control orientation, influenced the outcome of the data. Additional study on a broader scale would provide better clarification of this influence.

Recommendations

School District Studied

Based on the data collected and the theoretical basis for each of the two research variables, climate improvement efforts within the participating elementary district as a whole should focus on teachers' pupil-control ideology in combination with the perceived discrimination between each of the actual and ideal climate subscales. Emphasis for climate improvement should be placed on two separate areas: teachers' pupil-control ideology and climate gap scores.

The district investigated should direct its attention toward maintaining the current mean pupil-control ideology at a maximum, with a goal of attaining an even more humanistic level. This could be accomplished through the development of in-service activities and the staff selection process.

There were some obvious differences between six of the actual and ideal climate subscales which are relatively large in comparison to the other two. Those areas where greater discrepancies existed should be examined and given priority for a climate improvement project. Priority should be based on a combination of a particular factor's gap score and the extent of the variaton of this score from the mean. Before finalizing guidelines for a district-wide climate improvement project, those facilitating the project should become familiar with the items which made up the factors and the interpretation of each factor, particularly those which are targeted for emphasis.

Process for Climate Improvement. An effective means for using the data would be for the district to examine the data as a whole, makking some district-wide (K-6) determinations, as previously discussed. To make the most effective use of the data, the district should analyze scores by individual schools, which was not part of the scope and purpose of this study. A climate improvement process could then be developed by following the steps outlined below:

1. Provide each school its individual data, along with the district-wide data. This would allow each school to make a self-examination in comparison with the elementary schools as a whole.

2. A climate awareness in-service would be presented to each school, including an awareness and discussion of the implications of each individual school's data.

3. A task force would be initiated to analyze needs and establish a procedure for climate improvement. The task force would have

humanistic and skilled influential leaders providing the leadership for the group. Based on the data collected, these more humanistic individuals would tend to recognize a greater need for a more open climate. Some key custodial teachers must also be included, using their input and involvement to develop a program from which ownership would be felt by teachers, regardless of their pupil-control orientation.

4. The task force would: (a) identify areas to be targeted for improvement, (b) develop steps and procedures for improvement plan, and (c) at its completion, assess the results of the improvement project and determine additional action necessary.

As noted in item three, those with more humanistic orientations would see a greater need for change. Those with humanistic orientations who are viewed by the teachers as informal leaders should be actively involved in initiating any climate improvement project. Also, teachers on the other end of the humanistic/custodial continuum should be provided opportunities for input, based on the criteria discussed in the Implications sections of this chapter. An awareness of the characteristics and appropriate utilization of teachers with either humanistic or custodial orientations, as noted by Halpin, Halpin, and Harris (1982) and Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967), should be considered in any climate improvement project.

From results of this study it was evident that the influence of pupil-control ideology was a contributor to a rather open perception of the district's elementary school climate. An effort to improve teachers' humanistic pupil-control orientation would be a vital part of any climate improvement endeavor.

Other School Districts

Care and caution should be used in applying interpretations from this study to other districts or in making broad assumptions regarding the relationship of teachers' pupil-control ideology and the organizational climate of schools across a large demographic area. In this study, the humanistic teacher orientation and the perceived open school climate influenced the relationship between pupil-control ideology and climate perception. This kind of relationship may or may not exist in other districts. Consequently, the application of the results of this investigation must be used with caution.

Other districts could benefit from this study. In particular, those districts having an unnecessarily closed climate resulting in participant dissatisfaction could adapt this information for their own use. From the review of literature, the evidence clearly indicated that an open climate, complemented by humanistic pupil-control orientation, signficantly influenced student academic performance and behavior. Using the information secured by this investigation as baseline data, other districts could duplicate the study using the data from this investigation as a point of reference. Again, it is important that the limitations of assumptions regarding the use of this data be kept in mind.

The review of literature demonstrated that many variables influenced climate. A district desiring to improve its climate should seek those variables which are most subject to purposeful change. This study has identified some very specific variables which can be changed. Also, by using the guidelines set forth in an earlier part of this

chapter, additional useful information would be available to other districts desiring to make assessments and improve their school climate.

Additional Research

The research design used in this study could be modified by involving an entire K-12 school district and all staff members. The design should allow the data to be examined as a district unit--by primary, intermediate, junior high, middle high, and high school levels--and by individual school sites. The design should also identify participants according to their role with the school. For example, demographic information such as grade level taught, noncertified staff, special teachers, and administrative personnel would provide information regarding philosophies and perceptions of each of the role groups.

One additional ingredient which would allow more effective usage of the data would be to involve parents and students. This could be accomplished by administering the CFK, Ltd. Climate Profile Questionnaire to a random sample of parents and students.

The data from this investigation, which would provide information from a broader base combined with individual philosophies that influence climate perceptions, would be quite useful in a district-wide climate improvement plan. A school-wide investigation of this magnitude would present a view of the total district, plus a breakdown of data for each instructional site. Individually, each school could develop a plan based on the information gathered regarding baseline

data and the existing relationships between and among school climate, teacher-pupil control ideology, and personal characteristics.

With this information, the building/district administrator would be better equipped to provide a climate which is more conducive to instruction/learning. A climate improvement project could follow the outline suggested previously in this chapter.

Additional studies involving the concepts of pupil-control orientations and school climate should provide further understanding of their relationship. The following questions, which are sources for additional research, might be raised regarding these two variables:

1. How do the pupil-control orientations and school climates of public schools compare with nonpublic schools?

2. How do the pupil-control orientations and school climates compare between and among schools regarded as socioeconomically low, medium, and high?

3. What factors contribute to changing pupil-control ideology toward the humanistic end of the continuum?

4. What would be the effects of a pupil-control ideology experimental treatment on a school's climate?

The preceding suggestions are only a few potential studies which might be pursued. They do indicate the potential for investigation of the two variables, pupil-control ideology and school climate. These studies could provide information leading to the improvement of the school as a social system, one in which the environment is more conducive to the instruction/learning process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, K. B. "A Study of the Relationships Between and Among Leadership Style, Leader Effectiveness, and Organizational Climate in the Elementary Principalship." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1977.)

Anderson, B. "Socioeconomic Status of Students and School Bureaucratization." Educational Administration Quarterly, 7(2), 1971, 12-24.

Anderson, B. D. "A Methodological Note on Contextual Effects Studies in Education." (Paper presented to Canadian Educational Research Association Meeting, Toronto, Canada, May, 1972.)

Anderson, C. "The Search for School Climate: A Review of the Research." Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 1982, 368-420.

Appleberry, J. B. "The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Pupil Control Ideology of Elementary Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1969.)

Appleberry, J. B. and Hoy, W. K. "The Pupil Control Ideology of Professional Personnel in 'Open' and 'Closed' Elementary Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, 5(3), 1969, 74-85.

Argyris, C. "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 1958, 501-521.

Berk, L. and Lewis, N. "Sex Roles and Social Behavior in Four School Environments." Elementary School Journal, 77, 1977, 204-217.

Fox, R. et al. School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator. Phi Delta Kappa, Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 1973.

Brimm, J. L. and Bush, D. "Student Reactions to Environmental Factors in the School." NASSP Bulletin, 62, 1978, 65-73.

Brookover, W. B.; Beady, C.; Flood, P.; Schweitzer, J.; and Wisenbaker, J. School Social System and Student Achievement. New York: Praeger, 1979.

Brookover, W. B. and Schneider, J. "Academic Environments and Elementary School Achievement." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 9(1), 1975, 83-91.

Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. C. Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Carver, F. and Sergiovanni, T. Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Collica, S. "The Relationships of High Organizational Climate to High Teacher Morale and to Student Academic Achievement." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1978.)

Cornell, F. G. "Socially Perceptive Administration." Phi Delta Kappan, 36, 1955, 219-223.

Coughlan, R. J. "Job Satisfaction in Relatively Closed and Open Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, 7(2), 1971, 40-59.

Creaser, M. C. "Parent-Teacher Contacts as Related to School Size, Number of Bussed Pupils, and Organizational Climate." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1966.)

Dennis, P. "An Assessment of the Construct Validity and the Reliability of the CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1979.)

Farber, B. E. "Organizational Climate of Public Elementary Schools as Related to Dogmatism and Selected Biographical Characteristics of Principals and Teachers, and Selected School and School Community Characteristics." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1968.)

Feldvebel, A. M. "The Relationship Between Socioeconomic Status of the School's Patrons, Organizational Climate of the School, and Pupil Achievement." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.)

Flagg, J. T. "The Organizational Climate of Schools: Its Relationship to Pupil Achievement, Size of School and Teacher Turnover." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1964.)

Gentry, H. W. and Kenney, J. B. "The Relationship Between the Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools and School Location, School Size, and the Economic Level of the School Community." Urban Education, 3, 1967, 19-31.

Getzels, J. W. "Administration as a Social Process." In: Administrative Theory in Education, A. W. Halpin, Ed. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958, p. 46.

Gies, F. J.; Leonard, B. C.; Madden, J. B.; and Denton, J. J. "Effects of Organizational Climate and Sex on the Language Arts Achievement of Disadvantaged Sixth Graders." Journal of Educational Research, 67(4), 1973, 177-181.

Gilbert, D. and Levinson, D. J. "Custodialism and Humanism in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology." The Patient and the Mental Hospital, M. Breenblatt, D. Levinson, and R. Williams, Eds. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

Goodlad, J. I. A Place Called School: Projects for the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Hall, J. W. "A Comparison of Halpin and Croft's Organizational Climates and Likert and Likert's Organizational Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 1971, 586-590.

Halpin, A. W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Halpin, A. W. and Croft, D. B. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962.

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

Halpin, G., Halpin, G., and Harris, K. "Personality Characteristics and Self-concept of Preservice Teachers Related to Their Pupil Control Orientation." Journal of Experimental Education, 50, 1982, 195-199.

Hauser, R. M.; Sewell, W.; and Alwin, D. "High School Effects on Achievement." In: Schooling and Academic Achievement in American Society. New York: Academic Press, 1976, pp. 309-341.

Hellriegel, D. and Slocum, J. W. "Organizational Climate: Measures Research, and Contingencies." Academy of Management Journal, 17(2), 1974, 255-280.

Highberger, J. H. "Attitude Toward Student Control and School Climate in Middle Schools and Junior High Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1976.)

Hoy, W. K. "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology." Journal of Educational Research, 61, 1967, 153-155.

Hoy, W. K. "Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Socialization: A Further Examination of the Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher." The School Review, 76, 1969, 312-323.

Hoy, W. K. and Appleberry, J. B. "Teacher-Principal Relationships in 'Humanistic' and 'Custodial' Elementary Schools." Journal of Experimental Education, 39(2), 1970, 27-31.

Hoy, W. K. and Miskel, C. Educational Administration. New York: Random House, 1982.

Hoy, W. K.; Newland, W.; and Blazovsky, R. "Subordinate Loyalty to Superior, Esprit and Aspects of Bureaucratic Structure." Educational Administration Quarterly, 13, 1977, 71-85.

Hyman, B. Symposium of Research in Early Childhood Education, 4th ed. (R. Webb, Ed.) Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Jalovick, J. "Pupil Control Ideology and Openness of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1977.)

Jencks, C. Inequality. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Jones, D. R. "The Influence of Length and Level of Student Teaching on Pupil Control Ideology." High School Journal, 65, 1982, 220-225.

Jones, D. R. and Harty, H. H. "Secondary School Student Teacher Classroom Control Ideologies and Amount of Engaged Instructional Activities." High School Journal, 64, 1980, 13-15.

Jones, P. L. and Blankenship, J. W. "A Correlation of Biology Teachers, Pupil Control Ideology and Their Classroom Teaching Practices." Science Education, 54(3), 1970, 263-265.

Kalis, M. C. "Teaching Experience: Its Effect on School Climate, Teacher Morale." NASSP Bulletin, 64, 1980, 89-102.

Koffka, K. Principles of Gestalt Psychology. New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1935.

Kronick, R. F. "The Impact of Perceived Organizational Climate on Academic Performance." Southern Journal of Educational Research, 6(3), 1972, 169-188.

Leedy, C. K. "Academic Achievement as a Function of Organizational Climate and Teacher Morale." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Kent State University, 1975.)

Lewin, K. Field Theory in Social Science. (D. Cartwright, Ed.) New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Lewis, K.; Lippit, R.; and White, R. "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Crimes.'" Journal of Social Psychology, 10, 1939, 271-299.

Licata, J. W.; Willower, D.; and Ellett, C. D. "The School Environment Robustness: An Initial Inquiry." Journal of Experimental Education, 47, 1978, 28-34.

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

Litwin, G. H. "Climate and Motivation: An Experimental Study." Organizational Psychology, A Book of Readings. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

McDill, E. L. and Rigsby, L. C. Structure and Process in Secondary Schools: The Academic Impact of Educational Climates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1973.

McPartland, J. M.; Epstein, J. L.; Karweit, J. L.; and Slavin, R. E. Productivity of Schools: Conceptual and Methodological Frameworks for Research (Report No. 218). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1976.

Mealor, D.; Perkins, M.; and Reeves, J. "Academic Achievement and Attendance in an Open School." Psychological Reports, 37, 1975, 171-174.

Miller, W. C. "Reaction to Leadership." Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, 1975, 62-73.

Morocco, J. D. "The Relationship Between the Size of Elementary Schools and Pupils' Perceptions of Their Environment." Education, 98, 1978, 451-454.

Multhauf, A. P.; Licata, J.; and Willower, D. "Teacher Pupil-Control Ideology and Behavior and Classroom Environmental Robustness." Elementary School Journal, 79(1), 1978, 40-46.

Murray, H. A.; Barrett, W.; and Homburger, E. Exploration in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Nicholas, L. N.; Virjo, J.; and Wattenberg, W. Effect on Socioeconomic Setting and Organizational Climate on Problems Brought to Elementary School Offices. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965.

Ogilvie, D. and Sadler, D. R. "Perceptions of School Effectiveness and Its Relationships to Organizational Climate." Journal of Educational Administration, 17(2), 1979, 139-147.

O'Reilly, R. Classroom Climate and Achievement in Secondary School Mathematics Classes. Ontario: Ottawa University, 1975.

Owens, R. C. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Panushka, W. J. "Elementary School Climate and Its Relationship to Pupil Achievement." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1970.)

Reilly, J. P. "Organizational Climate and Pupil Achievement in Michigan Elementary Schools." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.)

Rutter, J.; Maughan, B.; Mortimore, P.; Ouston, J.; and Smith, A. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Starratt, R. T. Supervision: Human Perspectives, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Smedley, S. R. and Willower, D. J. "Principals' Pupil Control Behavior and School Robustness." Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(4), 1981, 40-56.

Smith, A. C. "The Relationahip of School Organizational Climate and Student Morale in Selected Schools." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Miami, 1973.)

Stern, G. C. and Steinhoff, C. R. People in Context: Measuring Person-Environment Congruence in Education. New York: John Wiley, 1970.

Tagiuri, R. and Litwin, G. H. Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept. (G. Litwin, Ed.) Boston: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Thomas, A. R. and Slater, R. D. "The OCDQ: A Four-Factor Solution for Australian Schools?" Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 1973, 93-102.

Trickett, E. J. and Moos, R. "The Social Environment of Junior High and High School Classrooms." Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 1973, 93-102.

Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Wayson, W. Creating Nondistruptive Prone Schools. (Report to Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Weeks, J. A. "The Relationship Between Conflict Management Behavior of Principals and the Organizational Climate as Perceived by

Principals and Teachers in Selected Texas Public School Districts." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1978.)

Willower, D. J. "Some Comments on Inquiries on Schools and Pupil Control." Teachers College Record, 77(2), 1975, 219-230.

Willower, D. J.; Eidell, T. I.; and Hoy, W. K. The School and Pupil-Control Ideology. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1967.

Winters, J. A. "An Investigation of the Relationship of Organizational Climate and Certain Personal Status Factors of Elementary School Professional Staff Members." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1968.)

Wynne, E. A. Looking at Schools: Good, Bad, and Indifferent. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath, 1980.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY FORM AND

CFK, LTD. CLIMATE PROFILE

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Years experience in education: 2 - 5 _____

6 - 10 _____

More than 10 _____

Current Grade level: K - 3 _____ 4 - 6 _____

FORM PCI

INFORMATION

On the following pages a number of statements about teaching and school climate perceptions are presented.

You will recognize that statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect answers. I am interested only in your frank opinion of them.

Your responses will remain confidential, and no individual will be identified in this study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

INSTRUCTIONS: Following are twenty statements about schools, teachers, and pupils. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of the statement. Please respond to each item.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. It is desirable to require pupils to sit in assigned seats during assemblies.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Pupils are usually not capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Directing sarcastic remarks toward a defiant pupil is a good disciplinary technique.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Beginning teachers are not likely to maintain strict enough control over their pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Teachers should consider revision of their teaching methods if these are criticized by their pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. The best principals give unquestioning support to teachers in disciplining pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Pupils should not be permitted to contradict the statements of a teacher in class.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. It is justifiable to have pupils learn many facts about a subject even if they have no immediate application.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Too much pupil time is spent on guidance and activities and too little on academic preparation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Being friendly with pupils often leads them to become too familiar.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. It is more important for pupils to learn to obey rules than that they make their own decisions.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Student governments are a good "safety valve" but should not have much influence on school policy.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. If a pupil uses obscene or profane language in school, it must be considered a moral offense.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. If pupils are allowed to use the lavatory without getting permission, this privilege will be abused.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. A pupil who destroys school material or property should be severely punished.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. Pupils cannot perceive the difference between democracy and anarchy in the classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. Pupils often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad.	SA	A	U	D	SD

THE CFK LTD. SCHOOL CLIMATE PROFILE

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to the following statements with respect to What Is and What Should Be. Please give your opinion regarding each item.

	What Is:	What Should Be:
	A Almost Never B Occasionally C Frequently D Almost Always	A Almost Never B Occasionally C Frequently D Almost Always
1. In this school even low achieving students are respected.	A B C D	A B C D
2. Teachers treat students as persons.	A B C D	A B C D
3. Parents are considered by this school as important collaborators.	A B C D	A B C D
4. Teachers from one subject area or grade level respect those from other subject areas.	A B C D	A B C D
5. Teachers in this school are proud to be teachers.	A B C D	A B C D
6. Students feel that teachers are "on their side."	A B C D	A B C D
7. While we don't always agree, we can share our concerns with each other openly.	A B C D	A B C D
8. Our principal is a good spokesperson before the superintendent and the board for our interests and needs.	A B C D	A B C D
9. Students can count on teachers to listen to their side of the story and to be fair.	A B C D	A B C D
10. Teachers trust students to use good judgment.	A B C D	A B C D

	What Is:				What Should Be:			
	A Almost Never	B Occasionally	C Frequently	D Almost Always	A Almost Never	B Occasionally	C Frequently	D Almost Always
11. This school makes students enthusiastic about learning.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
12. Teachers feel pride in this school and in its students.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
13. Attendance is good; students stay away only for urgent and good reasons.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
14. Parents, teachers, and students would rise to the defense of this school's program if it were challenged.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
15. I like working in this school.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
16. I feel that my ideas are listened to and used in this school.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
17. When important decisions are made about the programs in this school, I personally have heard about the plan beforehand and have been involved in some of the discussions.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
18. Important decisions are made in this school by a governing council with representation from students, faculty, and administration.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
19. While I obviously can't have a vote on every decision that is made in this school that affects me, I do feel that I can have some important input into that decision.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
20. When all is said and done, I feel that I count in this school.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
21. The teachers are "alive"; they are interested in life around them; they are doing interesting things outside of school.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D

	What Is:				What Should Be:			
	Almost Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Almost Always	Almost Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Almost Always
	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
22. Teachers in this school are "out in front," seeking better ways of teaching and learning.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
23. Students feel that the school program is meaningful and relevant to their present and future needs.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
24. The principal is growing and learning, too. He or she is seeking new ideas.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
25. The school supports parent growth. Regular opportunities are provided for parents to be involved in learning activities and in examining new ideas.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
26. Students would rather attend this school than transfer to another.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
27. There is a "we" spirit in this school.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
28. Administration and teachers collaborate toward making the school run effectively; there is little administrator-teacher tension.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
29. Differences between individuals and groups (both among faculty and students) are considered to contribute to the richness of the school: not as divisive influences.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
30. New students and faculty members are made to feel welcome and part of the group.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
31. When a problem comes up, this school has procedures for working on it: problems are seen as normal challenges: not as "rocking the boat."	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D

	What Is:				What Should Be:			
	A Almost Never	B Occasionally	C Frequently	D Almost Always	A Almost Never	B Occasionally	C Frequently	D Almost Always
32. Teachers are encouraged to innovate in their classrooms rather than to conform.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
33. When a student comes along who has special problems, this school works out a plan that helps that student.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
34. Students are encouraged to be creative rather than to conform.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
35. Careful effort is made, when new programs are introduced, to adapt them to the particular needs of this community and this school.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
36. There is someone in this school that I can always count on.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
37. The principal really cares about students.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
38. I think people in this school care about me as a person: are concerned about more than just how well I perform my role at school (as student, teacher, parent, etc.).	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
39. School is a nice place to be because I feel wanted and needed there.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
40. Most people at this school are kind.	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D

APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATION OF QUESTIONNAIRES

February 20, 1985

To: K-6 classroom teachers who are in at least their second year of teaching at Oak Park

From: John Ward

Re: Survey of Bartlesville Elementary classroom teachers regarding their perceptions of school climate

I will be in your building on Tuesday, February 26, at 8:30 a.m. to explain and administer a brief anonymous survey (10 to 12 minutes). The purpose of this survey is to examine the relationship between teachers' pupil-control ideas and perceptions of school climate.

Both pupil control and school climate have been priority concerns for many teachers across the country. Hopefully, results from this survey will provide the District with some useful information--assisting with the planning for continued improvement of the Bartlesville Elementary Schools' instructional and learning environment.

I have been in contact with Dr. Mosley regarding this survey.

R E M I N D E R

To: K-6 Classroom teachers who are in at least their second year of teaching at Hoover

Re: Meeting on Tuesday the 19th at 8:30 a.m.

NOTES FOR ADMINISTERING INSTRUMENTS

I. Statement of appreciation to group for willingness to share time and opinions

II. Check roll

  A. K-6 classroom teacher

  B. At least second year of teaching at current school

III. Statement of purpose of study

IV. Distribute and explain instruments

  A. PCI Form

    1. Developed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy

    2. Measures individual's pupil-control ideology

  B. CFK, Ltd. Climate Profile

    1. Developed by Fox and his associates

    2. Measures individual's perception of the actual and ideal school climate

V. Review instructions for instruments

VI. Instrument collection procedure

VITA

John Thomas Ward

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHERS' PUPIL-CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL SCHOOL CLIMATE

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born January 27, 1941, in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, to Felton and Dula Ward. Married to Gay Kennedy on August 2, 1979. Three sons: Shawn, Jared, and Stan.

Education: Graduated from Tahlequah High School, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, in May, 1959; received Bachelor of Science degree in Education from Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, in May, 1964; received Master of Arts degree in Educational Administration from University of New Mexico in August, 1969; completed requirements for elementary principal certification at Tulsa University in December, 1972; completed requirements for Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1985.

Professional Experience: Sixth-grade Classroom Teacher, Albuquerque, New Mexico Public Schools, August, 1964 to June, 1969; Teaching Principal at Lincoln Elementary in Pryor, Oklahoma, August, 1969 to August, 1976; Elementary Principal and Elementary Coordinator, Pryor Public Schools, August, 1976 to August, 1978; K-12 Curriculum Coordinator, Pryor Public Schools, August, 1978 to July, 1979; Principal, Jane Phillips Elementary, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, August, 1979 to present.