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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The behavior of children is greatly influenced by their notions about themselves. Each event in the educational experience has potential for self concept change or reinforcement whether that event is one of success or failure. Although the elementary school experience is an important factor in the process of becoming a self-actualized person, it may become a frightening, frustrating, and anxiety producing experience for a young child.

As children grow and develop, they learn and interact in the arena of the world and within the arena of self. Each of these learning arenas is of great importance to the individual. The arena of the world deals in cognitive growth, which in turn may lead to social and economic recognition or status. The arena of self is intensely personal and private and is of vital importance to both personal happiness and public behavior (Edeburn, 1974). The elementary school should seek to enhance human potential and be concerned about facilitating continual growth in both arenas, the world and self.

Through the years, social and economic conditions have influenced the amount of emphasis given to certain goals. During particular periods, some goals have received precedence over others. In the early part of the century, for example, academic goals were a primary concern. In the 1930s, concern shifted to social and personal goals until the 1960s after Sputnik, when it
returned to an academic focus. Following the Sputnik era, there was a reemphasis on the personal and social. For two decades, personal and social goals have been emphasized, but some fear it is threatened by the current interest in "the back-to-basics" and the "competency testing" movements. Others feel that the public still wants educational institutions to be concerned with the personal and social development of their children. A survey of teachers and administrators revealed that the development of a positive self concept on the part of students is still a very important goal (Silvernail, 1981). A similar survey of teachers and parents asked these groups to rate the importance of four broad goals and to indicate which ones should be emphasized most in our schools. All four were viewed as important with personal goals ranking second only to intellectual ones in terms of needed emphasis (Goodlad, 1979; Gordon, 1968). Thus, it is apparent that our concern for helping youth develop intellectually must not overshadow an equally important concern for their personal development. Educators must identify strategies for developing and enhancing the self concepts of students.

Since school is often the first place the child has daily contacts with cultures other than his own, it is a vital force in influencing a child's acceptance of his family's way of life. The teacher has a responsibility to provide a climate whereby the child can express his true feelings. The teacher does this by solving the problem of his own relationship to authority, his own
feelings of achievement, his own concepts of his role and the role of subject matter in the development of the child (Gordon, 1972).

The organizational climate of a school is a matter of impression and is somewhat difficult to define with precision. It is viewed on the one hand as the enduring characteristics which describe a particular school, distinguishing it from other schools, and it influences the behavior of teachers and students. On the other hand, organizational climate is viewed as the "feel" which teachers and students have for a given school. Litwin and Stringer (1968), for example, defined climate as the perceived subjective effects of the formal system, the informal 'style' of managers and other important environmental factors on the attitudes, beliefs, values, and motivation of people who work in a particular organization. According to this view, organizational climate represents a composite of mediating variables which intervene between the structures of an organization and the style and other characteristics of leaders and teacher performance and satisfaction.

According to Litwin, Humphrey, and Wilson (1978), organizational climate has an effect on the people who live and work in the organization. Organizational climate describes a set of conditions that arouse or inhibit various motivational states. By changing the climate, the manager is able to effect change in employee motivation and, in turn, to influence performance.
In the elementary school, it is assumed that the teacher and principal intend their behaviors to have a positive effect on pupils and that any negative effect is inadvertent. The source of intended positive effect and inadvertent negative effect lies in the teacher's perception of himself, of the teaching role, of his pupils or individuals and of their roles as pupils. The source of intended positive effect and inadvertent negative effect also lies in the principal's ability to create a school climate conducive to learning.

In summary, the behavior of children is affected by their perceptions of themselves, their self concept. The development of self concept is a product of the interactions of the child and his environment, particularly with the significant adults in his life and is subject to change. In the school, the teacher is one of the most significant adults in the child's life. The organizational climate of a school is described as the interpersonal relationships or the social interactions which occur between the teachers and the principal of a school and among the teachers themselves as perceived by the teachers. This organizational climate affects the behavior of the teacher and the behavior of students.

Statement of the Problem

The problem central to this investigation was to determine the effects which open and closed school climate types have upon student self concept. Answers to the following specific questions were sought: (1) Does a relationship exist between the
organizational climate of a school and student self concept?
(2) Is there a significant difference between the self concepts of children in elementary schools, characterized as open, and elementary schools characterized as closed?

Theoretical Background

The theory and resulting research concerning self concept and organizational climate as they relate to the educational setting were examined. The theoretical bases of this investigation were drawn from the work of social behaviorists, psychologists, social psychologists, and educational psychologists. The hypothesized relationships tested in this study have been generated from this theory base and the resulting investigations.

Self Concept

Much of the theoretical basis of this study is rooted in the discussion of social theory of self advanced by Mead (1934). Mead emphasized the social origin of the self. He theorized that the "self" is a social product formed through the processes of internalizing and organizing psychological experiences. These psychological experiences are the result of the individual's exploration of his physical environment and the reflections of "self" he has received from those persons he considers "significant others." Mead described two general stages in the full development of the self. The individual's self is first constituted by an organization of the particular attitudes of other individuals toward himself and toward one another in the specific social acts
in which he participates with them. At the second stage, the individual's self is constituted by an organization of particular attitudes and an organization of the social attitudes of the generalized other or the social group as a whole to which he belongs. According to Mead, "The self arises in the process of social experience and activity, that is, develops in the given individual as a result of his relations to that process as a whole and to other individuals within that process" (p. 135). Applying Mead's theory to the learning situation, the pupil may be viewed as the "developing self," gradually forming a concept of self through interaction with "significant others" (teachers and principals) and the environment (the school). Within this interaction are psychological experiences in which the school climate reflects to the pupil an image of his "self." If the pupil values this image, the pupil will internalize the psychological experience to influence the development of his self concept.

Sullivan (1947) theorized that self awareness is a product of social interaction. Through repeated interaction with others, a residual self awareness develops. The individual remembers certain perspectives toward the self and comes to adopt these as his own. The development of self concept begins in childhood when the individual is exposed to different social perspectives for the first time. Without prior perspectives to provide an anchor, the child remembers and accepts as valid the views of others, especially the views of "significant others."
According to Jersild (1952), the concept of the self provides a key to the understanding of mental health. The healthy individual is true to himself. He is developing the potential resources of his "real self" and using them in a manner that is harmonious with a total way of life. Each person's self is something individual, yet it has a social origin. The theory of self concept development has important meaning for education because many of the strongest social influences are brought to bear upon the child by way of his experiences at school.

Organizational Climate

The school is viewed as a social institution whose members are in continual interaction. The social interaction taking place among teachers and between the principal and the teachers constitutes the organizational climate of the school.

Researchers at the University of Illinois were probably among the first to investigate the nature of organizational climate in the public schools specifically (Cornell, 1955). The study was primarily concerned with the teachers' role in decision-making and teaching morale and how these variables were interactive with organizational climate and teacher attitudes and needs. The study yielded two measures which had the greatest effect as measures of organizational climate. These measures included (1) satisfactions of teachers with their relationships to the organization and (2) the extent to which teachers expect the sharing of administration and policy making (Cornell, 1955).
Several years later, Argyris (1958) used the term organizational climate to discuss research relative to interpersonal role behavior of participants in a bank. He conceptualized organizational climate as a method of ordering the complex, reciprocal network of variables that comprise organizations. The variables identified were (1) the formal policies, procedures, and positions of the organization; (2) personality factors including individual needs, values, and abilities; and (3) the complicated pattern of variables associated with the individual's efforts to accommodate his own needs with those of the organization. These variables were seen as a pattern in which each supported each other in the maintenance of itself and the total pattern. This interaction was the organizational climate as seen by Argyris.

Halpin and Croft (1962) have been closely associated with the construct of organizational climate. The organizational climate in an educational setting 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, 1963, p. 1). Halpin and Croft (1963) designed the "Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire" and used it in a study of 71 elementary schools throughout the United States to measure the organizational climate as perceived by the classroom teachers and principals in these schools. It was hypothesized that the behavior of principals and teachers as perceived by themselves from schools that scored high on Openness would differ
significantly from the behavior of those from schools which scored low on Openness. They identified six organizational climates and found that they could be arranged along a continuum defined at one end by an Open Climate, and at the other by a Closed Climate.

Steinhoff and Owens (1967) conducted a study to assess the organizational climate of schools. They used the Organizational Climate Index developed by Murray and Stern and found that there are significant systematic differences in perceived climate. Owens (1970) asserted that evidence we have that the atmosphere of one school differs from another comes from observations of the behavior of people in the schools. In one school, faculty members seem to be relaxed, competent, and generate within others a sense of confidence in them. In another school, the faculty members seem tense in their manner of speech and the manner in which they supervise students. Some schools appear unusually noisy where teachers shout considerably. In some schools the principal appears to emphasize his authority and status, while in others the principal appears too busy to give staff members personal attention. Yet, in some schools the principal seems to accommodate an approximate informality without losing his important role. Owens states, "The subtle differences which characterize the psychological environment are the domain of organizational climate" (p. 167).

Interaction of Self Concept and Organizational Climate

The theoretical basis of the effects of school organizational climate on student self concept was rooted in the social system
theory of Brookover and his associates (1977). Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1977) theorized that the school social system or school organizational climate affects school learning outcomes. Members of a school social system become socialized to behave differently in a given school. These patterns of behavior are acquired in interaction with other members of the social system, the school.

Researchers such as Jersild (1952) and Combs (1963) have found that the attitudes of teachers toward human beings, themselves, and others are just as important as instructional skills. Jersild concluded that the personal problems of teachers often interfere with their effectiveness in teaching and an understanding of these and other attitudes and emotions is vital in working with students. Combs maintained that when teachers have essentially favorable attitudes toward themselves, they are in a much better position to build positive and realistic self concepts in their students. A teacher's attitude about himself and the children, therefore, can affect self concept development.

Hypotheses generated from the social theory of self and social systems organizational theory predicted relationships concerning student self concept and the organizational climate of schools. The interpersonal relationship among teachers and between teachers and principals tended to have an effect on the development of the child's self concept. It is assumed that teacher behaviors have an effect upon the self concepts of pupils and self concepts are
acquired in social interaction and are subject to change. Specifically, the self concept of students in schools with open organizational climates will differ from the self concept of students in schools with closed organizational climates.

**Definition of Terms**

In this study, the independent variable, school climate, and the dependent variable, self concept, are constructs which required specific definition.

**Self concept.** An array of constructs has proliferated around the term self concept. Most approaches to this area of the self assume that the self concept has both a content and a structure. That is, our self concept is most basically what we think we are and thus has content. However, these images of ourselves are integrated with each other in some way, thus implying structure. The latter point is subtle, but it is one that researchers in self concept often emphasize. For example, one commonly used measure, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1964), has separate subscales for the physical self, moral self, ethical self, personal self, family related self, and social self. All these aspects of one's self concept are logically distinguishable from each other. Yet, it would be hard to imagine each of them existing in isolation from the others. People's images of their social selves often have important connections with their images of what they are like physically (Vallacher, 1980, p. 230).
The psychological construct of self concept refers to the organization of all that seems to the individual to be "I" or "me." Both Cooley (1902) in his concept of the "looking-glass self" and Mead (1934) in his concept of the two selves, the "I" and the "me" pointed out that the child first develops an awareness of himself as an entity separate and distinct from his environment because other people respond to him as a separate, autonomous object. If there were no other people, we would have no self concept. As an individual develops a concept of self, he becomes aware of himself as an object of his own perception or distinct from himself as the perceiver. The individual's evaluation of himself arises as a reflection of others' evaluation of him. Cooley and Mead contend that the individual's self concept arises in the first instance and develops through time by the process of social interaction with other people. Combs and Snygg (1959) defined self concept as "what the individual believes about himself; the total way of seeing himself" (p. 127). This definition was accepted for purposes of this investigation.

Organizational climate. The term organizational climate, for purposes of this study, might be viewed as the enduring characteristics which describe a particular school, distinguish it from other schools, and influence the behavior of teachers and students. On the other hand, it might be viewed as the "feel" which teachers and students have for a school. Litwin and Stringer (1968) defined organizational climate as the perceived
subjective effects of the formal system, the informal style of managers and other important environmental factors on the attitudes, beliefs, values, and motivation of people who work in the organization (p. 70). According to this definition, climate represents a composite of mediating variables which intervene between the structure of an organization and the style and other characteristics of leaders and teacher performance and satisfaction. Organizational climate, for this study, refers to a global assessment of the social interactions within the school providing satisfaction to group members with respect to task accomplishment and social satisfaction (Halpin, 1968). This assessment is perceived by the teachers and the principal in that school. The behavior of principals and of teachers as perceived by both creates the perceived reality of this organizational climate.

Elementary school. Elementary school refers to a school which accommodates pupils in grades kindergarten through five. It is so designated by the Virginia Department of Education.

Hypotheses

The hypothesized relationship investigated in this study was generated from the social process theory proposed by Mead (1934) and resulting empirical investigations. The theory led to the prediction of a relationship between school organizational climate and student self-concept. This relationship is stated in Hypotheses 1 and 2.
Hypothesis 1. A relationship exists between the mean student self concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Self Concept Rating Scale (CSCS) and the organizational climate of selected schools as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ).

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant difference between the mean student self concept scores of the five schools with the most open organizational climates and the five schools with the most closed organizational climates.

In Chapter 2 is found a review of research relevant to the stated problem and to the hypotheses. The research setting and methodology, to include a description of the sample population, the instruments, and the research design are described in Chapter 3. An analysis of data concerning the relationship of organizational climate to student self concept is presented in Chapter 4. The findings, conclusions, and implications for administrative practice and research are presented in Chapter 5.
Chapter 2

RELEVANT RESEARCH

There has been extensive research dealing with self concept and its relationship to the performance of students in schools (Brookover, et al., 1962, 1965 and 1967). This research has demonstrated that the individual student's self evaluation of his academic ability is related to his perception of others' evaluation of him. This research has also shown that the individual self concept is correlated with student achievement.

A review of past studies which have implications for this investigation and which support the hypotheses of this study is presented in Chapter 2. This relevant research is organized under the following sections: (a) Development of Self Concept, (b) Organizational Climate, and (c) Summary.

Development of Self Concept

One consequence of being human is that a person becomes an object to himself. Because of his possession of language and a superior intelligence, man has a unique capacity for thinking about his body, his behavior, and his appearance to other persons. Each of us has a set of thoughts and feelings toward ourselves. The terms most commonly applied to this set of elements are self or self concept (Secord and Backman, 1964).

Self concept can be defined as the way we perceive ourselves and our actions, and our own opinions regarding how others perceive us. As such, our self concept is multifaceted. For instance, we
perceive ourselves in different roles (child, student, parent) with different abilities (physical, mental) and different limitations. All these are subparts of our self and combine to form our general self concept (Silvernail, 1981). Kash (1978) identified the key dimensions of the general self concept as the sense of (1) body self, (2) cognitive self, (3) social self, and (4) self esteem. The sense of body self can be described as the dominant sense of self that emerges first in an individual's life. It should be viewed as the primary or central core of the conceptualized self. The senses of self are generally acquired in a developmental sequence. Self esteem is the evaluative dimension of our self concept. While our self concept describes our perceptions, our self esteem evaluates these perceptions. In essence, self concept is the value we place upon the various dimensions of our general self.

Sarbin (1954) described the self as what the person is. He further described self concept as a composite of numerous self percepts. Self concept is a hypothetical construct encompassing all the values, attitudes, and beliefs toward one's self in relation to the environment. The self concept influences and determines perception and behavior.

According to Sarbin (1954), understanding of self is probably the most crucial of all understandings. Each person strives to become the image of an ideal established by his own value system. Yet, the ideal a person establishes as the self he wants to become
is usually not the same as the self he perceives himself to be.

People often have invested time wondering who they are and why they behave in the ways that they do. There are almost as many theories about how self concept develops as there are psychologists, sociologists, and educators who have studied about it. Although theories of self concept development vary, there is general agreement that the self concept does not exist at birth. Felkner (1979) asserted that while one may be born with characteristics which will influence the type of self concept he develops, the actual development of self concept is a learned process. The development of a self concept begins in childhood when the individual is exposed to social perspectives for the first time. Without prior perspectives to provide an anchor, the child remem­bers and accepts as valid the views of others, especially the views of "significant others," such as parents, older siblings, and teachers (Scheier and Carver, 1980). Scheier and Carver (1980) stated:

An almost incredible array of constructs has prolifer­ated around the term self concept. That is, our self concept is most basically, what we think we are, in various respects, and thus has content. But these component images of ourselves are integrated with each other in some way, thus implying structure. (p. 230)

Cooley (1902) compared our perceptions of how others see us to the reflections of a looking glass. Referring to this "looking­glass self," Cooley noted:
As we see our face, figure, and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be; so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and are variously affected by it.

A self-ideal of this sort seems to have three principal elements; the imagination of your appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification. The comparison with a looking-glass hardly suggests the second element, the imagined judgment, which is quite essential. The thing that moves us to pride or shame is not the mere mechanical reflection of ourselves, but an imputed sentiment, the imagined effect of this reflection upon another's mind. (p. 152)

Another basic insight into the special nature of interpersonal perception was reflected in the work of the sociologist, George Herbert Mead. Mead (1934) theorized that the child first develops an awareness of himself as an entity separate and distinct from his environment because other people respond to him as a separate, autonomous object. As an individual develops a concept of "self," he becomes aware of himself as an object of his own
perception (me), as distinct from himself as the perceiver (I). An individual's own evaluation of himself arises as a reflection of others' evaluation of him. Both Mead and Cooley argued that the individual's self concept arises in the first instance and develops through time by the process of social interaction with other people. It was during the 1940s that "humanism" or the "personal frame of reference" with self concept development as its base, evolved with the thinking of people such as Maslow, Rogers, Combs, and Snygg. Their viewpoints are based on the following concepts:

1. All people are unique because each person's past experiences, present perceptions and future expectation are different.
2. Self concept is not fixed. New experiences create a growing and changing person.
3. Our behavior depends upon our interactions with our environment.
4. Each of us sees the world differently.
5. People behave according to how things seem to them.
6. People's behavior makes sense to them as they perceive their world.
7. We are constantly searching for personal fulfillment and satisfying relationships with others.
8. Personal fulfillment is a never ending quest.
9. We have individual responsibility for our own personal decisions.

10. Only people who understand and appreciate growth and attempt to do so themselves can help to grow (Combs and Snygg, 1959; Maslow, 1954; and Rogers, 1951).

Other noted "developmental" psychologists, Piaget and Erickson, hold concepts compatible with those mentioned above. Combs (1963) asserted that:

People discover their self concepts from the kinds of experiences they have had with life; not from telling, but from experience. People develop feelings that they are liked, wanted, acceptable and able from having been liked, wanted, accepted from having been successful. (p. 43)

Thus, to develop a healthy self concept, the influence of quality relations with individuals is more important. The development of self concept first begins with family, then with peers in unstructured situations and then with plans in more structured situations. Kelly (1962) asserted that if "people around the individual form the climate and the soil in which the self grows and if the soil is fertile and the climate is wholesome, there is vigorous and healthy growth" (p. 93).

Brookover, Thomas, and Paterson (1962) also theorized that self concept is developed through interaction with significant others which in turn influences behavior. When applied to the
specific school learning situation, a relevant aspect of self concept is the person's perception of his own ability to learn the accepted types of academic behavior; performance in terms of school achievement is the relevant behavior influenced.

According to Scheier and Carver (1980), our self concept derives from a variety of sources. One prerequisite is the human capacity for self consciousness. Each person is aware of being an individual self and can reflect and react to himself or herself as an object. A second factor which enables one to achieve a self concept is a sense of continuity over time. Each person, from the moment of birth, passes through a unique sequence of life events and each person can recognize that these events have happened to no one else. A third factor which determines one's self concept is the varied social roles we play in our daily interactions.

Mueller (1974) identified three major determinants of the self concept: genetic inheritance, family, and the external environment. According to Mueller (1974), while one's genetic inheritance is largely fixed, its effects can be altered in specific cases. For example, nutritional factors can sometimes significantly alter the growth patterns of individuals. Medical or therapeutic treatment can sometimes offset the effects of certain kinds of physical handicaps and the self concept can be eroded by a crisis involving physical development. The child's closest family members are the first and usually the greatest influence on his self concept. The ways in which parents and
others in the immediate family who are very close to him regard the child will be a very significant influence on his attitudes toward himself. As the child grows and interacts in the environment outside his home, significant others such as teachers, friends, and neighbors become contributors to the development of his self concept. Later, in his adolescence, the child will come into contact with individuals and social groups even further removed from his immediate personal circle. These influences will also contribute to his personality development through the setting of competitive standards and the inculcation of social values and attitudes.

Research shows that while the self concept is resistant to change, it appears that modification can be made. Spaulding (1964) conducted an extensive survey of teacher-student transactions in elementary schools, using classroom observations to categorize teacher-student transactional patterns in 21 fourth and sixth grade classes. These patterns were correlated with measures of achievement, creativity and self concept. With respect to self concept correlations, significant relationships were found for "socially integrative" and "learner and supportive" teacher behaviors specific characteristics of "democratic" leader behavior and other teacher behaviors.

Jersild (1955) and Combs (1953) have found that the attitudes of the teacher toward human beings, one's self and others are just as important as instructional skills. Jersild
concluded that the personal problems of teachers often interfere with their effectiveness in teaching, and an understanding of their and other attitudes and emotions is vital in working with students. Similarly, Combs concluded that when teachers have essentially favorable attitudes toward themselves, they are in a much better position to build positive and realistic self concepts in their students. Combs further concluded that a teacher's attitude about herself and the children can affect self concept development. Communication which the young child understands and accepts is very important. Praise which implies standards too high for the child to maintain can undermine self confidence. Criticism which the child cannot fully grasp can contribute to feelings of anxiety and hostility. Strong personal resources are important for positive self concept. The child needs to be able to have pride in self and achievement. Self expression, independence, and curiosity experimentation are qualities in children which the teacher might choose to nurture and support.

Brooks (1963) wrote that the child appears upon the human scene without self; the self is a social product conceived and born in the process of social interaction. Merrill (1965) further noted that the most important group of social interaction is the family, for it is here the child acquires first impressions of human conditions. Even though the causes for many human problems rest in history, and attitudes and values about self, others and environment were set sometime early in life, we cannot
assume that what was true at one time cannot be changed. It should be recognized, therefore, that the school can play a major role in the development of self concept. Self concept may be the key to unlocking the mysteries of learning and achievement in our educational system. The development of a positive self concept would result in the development of an academically successful student. The self concept is learned from individual experiences in dealing with people. The impact of social relationships on the self has been emphasized by Sullivan (1947). The concept of "interpersonal relationships" was the central theme in Sullivan's theory of personality. This concept of interpersonal relationships in a school would help to promote healthy self development or to improve negative tendencies in a personality.

According to Sullivan (1947), the earliest experiences which influenced the development of the self were experiences with other persons. The origin of self was in part determined by significant people. Sullivan (1947) called this "learning about self from the mirror of other people" (p. 147). The most important aspect of developing self concept in a person is the quality of the relationship that one establishes with that person. Strengthening self concept in ourselves depends upon our ability to give and receive feedback so that we can get to know ourselves and our strengths and weaknesses better in order to grow. Sullivan maintained that the attitudes and feelings of significant people could be communicated to the child by empathy. Parents, family, friends, teachers, and
administrators were significant people to different individuals.

McDonald (1965) asserted that among the list of significant people, the teacher was one of the more important. The teacher was one who described and evaluated a child's behavior to him. The teacher was an important source to the child in his effort to understand himself. As a child understands himself, he may be able to achieve his goals and the goals of the group to which he belongs.

McDonald (1965) further asserted that the influence of the teacher in the development of self was important because this process continued as long as the child lived. A harsh and unsympathetic teacher may have done harm to the self. In a school climate where teachers are harsh and unsympathetic, the child cannot be himself or free to inquire and develop.

Steins (1965) tested some concepts concerning the teacher's relation to the students' self concepts. His data significantly supported the hypothesis that it is possible to distinguish reliability between good and poor teachers in normal classrooms on the basis of the frequency and kinds of comments they make with reference to the learner's self. There are marked differences between teachers in the frequency of their positive or negative comments on the child's performance status and self confidence. The experiment also supported the hypothesis that the teacher can make specific changes in the learner's self picture while aiming at the subject matter objectives of teaching.
Statistically significant changes were found in two dimensions of the self-certainty and differentiation. Both changes were interpreted as indicating greater psychological security.

Kulp (1976) in his study of the effects of an inservice teacher seminar on self concept theory and enhancement of self esteem on selected teacher and pupil variables found a relationship between student self concept and success in school. Findings led to the conclusion that the inservice seminar which incorporated theory, process education, and reading of the text was associated with higher mean scores on student self concept.

Walden and Below (1966) investigated the enhancement of the self concept of students in elementary and secondary schools. The study was conducted in Orange County in Orlando, Florida. It employed measures of inferred self concept and the Parker Projective Test with the students. The consensus from all the sources was that negative self perceptions develop most frequently in circumstances which fail to meet the (1) physical, (2) safety, and (3) emotional needs of the individual. Conversely, a positive self concept is associated most frequently with situations which meet these same needs. During the pilot study teachers were involved in an inservice training program designed to sensitize the teachers to classroom procedures which seemed to facilitate positive changes in children's self perceptions and to identify for the teachers the type of climate which would cause positive
changes in their own self perceptions and increase their propensity for positive change. A nine step program helped teachers become proficient in use of the Flanders Observation Scales, the Carkhuff Scales, and the Success Promotion Scale. Teacher reliability reached and at times exceeded .75 correlation with experienced observers.

Fox (1978) examined the hypothesis that teacher personality characteristics affect student achievement. Fifty-three sixth grade Austin teachers in four schools, along with their classes, participated in the study. Two types of teacher measurements were obtained: observation of behavior and self reports. All the pupil measurements used in the study were self report measures, with the exception of the achievement test. The effects of the teacher characteristics on the pupils were analyzed using a linear models approach which treated all the measurements as continuous variables and which took into account quadratic predictor effects and pretest by predictor interactions.

Teachers who described themselves as relatively introverted produced the best gain in pupil achievement and in their pupils' evaluation of them. Conversely, perhaps, teachers who rated themselves high on their own charm, wit, and sophistication had negative effects in pupil achievement and coping skill, and they tended to be rated low as stimulating, inventive teachers by experienced observers. The results indicate a modest but meaningful degree of lawful relatedness between teacher personality and
observed teaching behavior even when personality is self assessed.

Peck (1977) investigated teacher effects on student achievement and self esteem. Fifty-three sixth grade teachers and their students participated in the study. One aspect of the study focused on the relationships between teacher classroom behavior and student self esteem. Students completed a self concept questionnaire in which teachers, based upon classroom observations, were rated on three factors. The three factors were kindly-understanding, systematic-organized, and stimulating-inventive.

Student self esteem was reported to be affected by all three factors. More importantly, the effects differed for students with different self esteem levels. Findings seem to indicate that children with average or high self esteem, working with friendly, understanding, and sympathetic teachers, in all likelihood will develop even higher self esteem; while children exhibiting low self esteem, working with these same teachers will develop lower self esteem.

Because teachers interact differently with male and female students, one could expect to find a difference in male and female student self concept. Elaugh and Harlow (1973) found that males generally receive more attention than females receive from male teachers. When the teacher is female this can result in lower self concepts for females. Samuels (1977) on the other hand, wrote that females more than males generally perceive teachers' feelings toward them as being positive. It is uncertain
if a difference in male and female self concept exists. Recent studies (Beemer, 1971; Edeburn, 1973; Bills, 1978) have reported higher self concept for females than males. Macon (1976), however, reported higher self concepts for males rather than females. Thus, it is unclear if student sex is related to self concept.

A similar lack of clarity exists in the case of student socio-economic status (SES) and self concept. High SES tends to be positively correlated with high self esteem. Burchinal (1958) noted that fifth grade students from higher social classes showed fewer indications of maladjustment. Another study by Sewell (1965), involving a larger sample of elementary school students, reported that students with higher SES showed better adjustment than those with lower SES. Some researchers indicate that by some criteria, low SES students may have more positive self concepts than middle SES students (Trowbridge, 1970, 1972; Zirkel and Moses, 1971).

The research findings with respect to the relationship between ethnicity and student self concept are inconclusive. For example, Coleman (1966) reported that the self concept of American Indian students was lower than that of Anglos. Studies by (Deutsch, 1971; Kelly, 1963; Long, 1968) noted differences in the self concept levels of Blacks and Anglos in favor of Anglos, while a study by Zirkel and Greene (1971) reported no significant differences. A similar mixture of results can be found in studies of the effects of segregated and desegregated school settings on black student self concept. Some favor a segregated setting
(Harootunian, 1968 and Hodgkins, 1969) and others a desegregated one (Griffin, 1969; Kirkel and Greene, 1971; Zirkel and Moses, 1971).

Several studies have examined the impact of certain school practices on student self concept. Jewell (1971) and Samuels (1969) found that heterogeneous grouping was related to improvements in self concept. Livingston-White (1976) reported that self esteem levels were related to achievement tracking.

The practice of nonpromotion of academically deficient students has a long history of debate in education. Several studies report that both single and multiple nonpromotions have a negative effect on the self concept of students (Johnson, 1968 and White and Howard, 1973). However, the data on self concept levels were not collected prior to nonpromotion. Chansky (1964) and Finlayson (1977) collected pretest information and conducted similar studies. They found that nonpromotion did not adversely affect self concept development.

The relationship between the "open classroom" and student self concept has received some attention in recent years. Some investigators report more positive self concepts for students enrolled in open classroom or open space settings (Beals, 1972; Brophy, 1970 and Kaskoff, 1973). Others, however, report lower self concepts (Lovin, 1973 and Sackett, 1971).

Terence (1972) tested a hypothesis derived from the proposition that open education promotes self concept. The Sear's Self Concept
Inventory, yielding scores in six self concept areas, was administered to 316 students, ages 9 to 12, from six suburban schools. The Walberg-Thomas Scales rated each school as to degree of openness. No significant difference in any of the six "areas" of self concept was found between students in the open and those in the traditional groups. Significant differences in total self concept were found between males in open and traditional schools, between males and females in open schools, and between open schools. No correlations were found between a school's openness and students' self concept.

Lewis (1973) conducted an investigation into the relationship between low-achieving, black students' perceptions of significant others (teacher and parents) academic evaluations of them and their own self concepts of academic ability. Eighth grade students entering a special school in the fall of 1973 were tested. Testing was done at three points in time over a five month period. The statistical method used was path analysis. The population studied consisted of low-achieving black students. Significant others were found to affect student self concept of ability and achievement where attitudes toward school were positive. Where attitudes were negative, attitudes appeared to protect self concept, which was found to be disproportionate to and unaffecting of achievement. The findings imply the responsibility both parents and teachers have in promoting healthy self-image in students. The results of the study suggest that the attitude toward school is an important
variable in affecting the self concept achievement model. Lewis (1973) asserted that since attitudes change when they are no longer necessary to the individual, the implication is an encouraging one. Given a sympathetic and encouraging school environment, attitudes toward school can be enabled to change.

Frey (1973) conducted a study to ascertain if the adolescent's grade point average, grade level in school, age, sex, and social class are significantly related to his self concept as he perceives it in relation to his ability to achieve Havighurst's Developmental Tasks for Youth which are as follows:

1. Achieving New and More Mature Relationships with Age Mates of Both Sexes
2. Achieving a Masculine or Feminine Social Role
3. Accepting One's Physique and Using Body Effectively
4. Achieving Emotional Independence of Parents and Other Adults
5. Preparing for Marriage and Family Life
6. Preparing for an Economic Career
7. Acquiring a Set of Values and an Ethical System as a Guide to Behavior
8. Desiring and Achieving Socially Responsible Behavior

Subjects were 282 adolescents ranging in age from 13 and 18. The individual subjects were administered a self concept scale for adolescents based on Havighurst's developmental tasks. Data were gathered on each of the independent variables included in
the study: sex, age, grade level, grade point average, and social class as indicated by father's occupation.

In this study, social class is significantly related to the adolescent's perception of his ability to achieve. Grade point average was a significant variable when a comparison was made between high and low achievers in the areas of preparing for an economic career and acquiring a set of values and an ethical system as a guide to behavior. None of the other independent variables were significant in any of the individual tasks.

Morse (1964) reported on a research project which dealt with the self concept in pupils. Data were collected on a metropolitan school system with children in alternate grades from three through eleven from all strata of society. The two methods of studying self concept included the Osgood Semantic Differential and the Self-Esteem Inventory developed by Coopersmith of the University of California. In both tests and on all parts, the third grade responded in a significantly different manner from the other grades and in the direction of higher self regard at the lower grade level. In the sample, the sharp decreases were in grades three to five, with some recovery by the eleventh grade in overall self regard. The findings indicate that the students' self esteem appears gradually to grow less positive with time.

Vanderpool (1975) analyzed the role of self concept and organizational concept, and the effects of their relative congruence on organizational participation and work performance.
Subjects were 20 first-line supervisors in a midwestern manufacturing company. They were interviewed and tested for self concept, organizational concept, organizational participation, and work performance, using an ex post facto field study methodology. The subjects were then classified into three groups according to conceptual states: (1) positive, (2) neutral/positive, and (3) negative. Means, standard deviations, and correlations of variables were computed. A one-way analysis of variance, tested for discriminate analysis of significance between groups and tests, was used for discriminate analysis of variables between groups. The results showed a partial relationship between self concept and organizational concept and a statistically significant relationship between organizational participation, work performance, and the conceptual states.

Organizational Climate

According to Owens (1970), schools differ markedly, not merely in their architecture, socio-economic status, and ethnic population, but also in atmosphere, tone, climate, and "feel." The feeling which lets us know that one school is different from another is relatively intangible. In one school faculty members seem to be relaxed, competent, and generate within others a sense of confidence in them. In another school, the faculty members seem tense in their manner of speech and the manner in which they supervise students. Some schools appear noisy and teachers shout. In some schools the principal appears to emphasize his authority
and status, while in others the principal appears too busy to give staff members personal attention. Yet, in some schools the principal seems to accommodate an appropriate informality without losing his important role. The subtle differences which characterize the psychological environment are the domain of organizational climate (Owens, 1970).

Organizations have existed for two basis purposes. These purposes, as originally stated by Barnard (1938), included:

1. Effectiveness - the accomplishment of the recognized objective of cooperative action.

2. Efficiency - the organization's capacity to maintain itself by the individual satisfaction it affords.

Research on organizational purposes shifted the focus from the single concern for production to a concern for production and the needs of the members of the organization (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939). Consequently, the need to examine the interaction between individual and organization became evident.

Getzels and Guba (1957) proposed a social process model in which they characterized the two purposes as follows:

We conceive of the social system as involving two major classes of phenomena, which are at once conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive. They are, first, the institutions with certain roles and expectations that will fulfill the goals of the system. Secondly, inhabiting the system there are
the individuals with certain personalities and need-dispositions, whose interactions comprise what we generally call "social behavior." Social behavior may be apprehended as a function of the following major element: institution, role and expectation, which together constitute the nomothetic or normative dimension of activity in social system; and individual, personality and need disposition which together constitute the ideographic or personal dimension of activity of the social system. (p. 424)

Cornell (1955) described organizational climate as:
A delicate blending of interpretations of perceptions, as social psychologists would call it, 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. (P. 222)

Cornell (1955) was among the first to investigate the nature of organizational climate in the public schools specifically. This study was primarily concerned with the teachers' role in decision-making and teaching morale and how these variables were interactive with organizational climate and teacher attitude and needs. Cornell listed five variables which had effect as measures of organizational climate of schools:
1. A teacher morale measure, more specifically a measure of satisfaction of teachers with their relationships to the organization.

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

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

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

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

Argyris (1958) used the term organizational climate in discussing research relative to role behavior of participants in a bank. He conceptualized organizational climate as a method of ordering the complex, reciprocal network of variables that comprise organizations. He was concerned with interpersonal variables in the determination of the climate. These variables were identified as: (1) formal policies, procedures, and positions of the organization; (2) personality factors including individual needs, values, and abilities; and (3) the complicated
pattern of variables associated with the individual's efforts to accommodate his own needs with those of the organization.

Halpin and Croft (1962), by factor analysis, identified three general factors by which they described six organizational climates. The three factors were: (a) Social Needs, (b) Esprit, and (c) Social Control. Social Needs and Social Control were respectively the needs-satisfaction and task achievement in the organization, while Esprit was a third factor that was dependent upon the extent to which each of the other two was integrated.

Halpin and Croft applied the concept of organizational climate to educational administration. They conceived of organizational climate as the "organizational personality" of a school. The primary purpose of their study was to construct an instrument for measuring the organizational climate of elementary schools.

In developing the instrument, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Halpin and Croft found three parameters which were deemed successful predictors: (1) authenticity, openness of behavior of the leader and group constituents; (2) satisfaction in respect to task achievement and social needs; and (3) leadership initiation. By factor analytic methods, Halpin and Croft identified six organizational climates arranging on a continuum as follows: Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal, and Closed. Halpin and Croft employed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire in a study of 71 elementary schools throughout the United States.
Since the research on the organizational climate of schools conducted by Halpin and Croft, interest in this topic has grown. The significance of the research is evidenced by the long list of studies utilizing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire as an assessment instrument. Research studies relevant to the present study follow.

Hoy and Appleberry (1969) studied the relationship between school organizational climate and pupil control by exploring the contrasting domains of "humanism" and "custodianism" in school organizations. Humanistic orientation depicts the school in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience; self-discipline is substituted for strict teacher control. Custodial orientation depicts a rigid and highly controlled setting, concerned with maintenance and order. This type of school is highly autocratic and students must accept the teacher decisions without question. Data revealed that a humanistic pupil control orientation has significantly more open organizational climate than those with a custodial orientation. \( F = 18.77, p < .01 \). An additional finding was that principals were more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than teachers.

Seidman (1973) investigated the relationship between physical openness and climate openness and also organizational climate and operational life of open space elementary schools. A subsidiary purpose was to determine the principal and teacher behaviors contributing most to climate openness and closeness. Seidman
administered the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire** to randomly selected open space elementary schools throughout the United States. Chi square analyses revealed data which rejected the hypothesis that open climate would occur in open space elementary schools more frequently than would closed climates. Additionally, no significant climate differences were found in any stages of operational life of open space schools.

The relation of organizational climate to school academic achievement is related to self concept. Davidson and Lang (1960) found that the student's perceptions of the teacher's feelings toward him correlated positively with his self perception. Further, the more positive the children's perceptions of their teachers' feelings, the better their academic achievement and the more desirable their classroom behavior as rated by the teacher. Clarke (1960) reported a positive relationship between a student's academic performance and his perception of the academic expectations of him by others. Feldvebel (1954) found no significant relationship between organizational climate and pupil achievement levels. There was also no relationship between the organizational climate and the socio-economic status of the school population. Subjects included thirty schools in the Northwestern Illinois Metropolitan area.

The findings of the above study were contradicted by a number of the researchers. Miller (1965) found that open climate was related to high achievement. Rice (1968) also determined that
open climate was related to high achievement in elementary schools.

Smith (1966) conducted an investigation to study the relationship between selected variables and openness of climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Data revealed a significant positive correlation between the perception of the group on the effectiveness of the group and thrust. This seemed to imply that there was a relationship between the principal who was perceived to put forth evident effort and the groups' perception of itself.

Becker (1967) conducted a very interesting study which focused on the administrator-staff relationship (school climate) and its effect on the self concept development of children. The data related to the question of an existing relationship between positive change in school climate and a higher self concept was partially supported but not statistically significant. Of special significance was that after ten months the school ranking highest in positive climate also ranked highest in self concept change.

Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1977) conducted a study to determine the extent to which some characteristics of the school social structure and social psychological climate explain the between school differences in mean student outcomes. Brookover, et al., hypothesized that social structure and social climate explained much of the variance in student outcomes: cognitive school achievement, student self concept, and student self reliance. The measure of self
concept used in this study was limited to student role and specifically to the student's perception of his academic ability in comparison to others in the school social system. The sample included fourth and fifth grade pupils in 68 randomly sampled schools in the Michigan public elementary schools. Data were collected through principal and teacher questionnaires designed to identify school climate and student questionnaires were used to identify student self concept of ability.

The most significant finding is that individual self concept of academic ability is highly correlated, generally in range of .50 to .70 with individual measures of academic achievement. Contrary to much popular assumption, the academic self concepts of black students are not lower than those of white students. Data revealed the school mean self concept in black schools is significantly higher than the mean in the white schools. The pattern of relationship between racial composition and self concept does not hold in the case of socio-economic status composition of the schools. The higher SES schools have slightly higher mean school self concept than do the lower SES schools and mean self concept has a low positive association with mean socio-economic status in each of the white and black school samples.

The higher mean self concept in black schools is reflected in a low positive association between school size and mean self concept of academic ability. Size is significantly related to mean self concept in both the white and black schools, but not
at a high level. Another significant finding is that the differences in mean self concept between schools can be largely explained by the differences in the social climate of the school, primarily by the students' perceptions of others' expectations and evaluations of them. The variance in individual self concepts within a school has been shown to be positively related to individual students' achievement within a school.

In a study that focused on organizational climate and self concepts of children in selected open and closed construction middle schools, Phillips (1978) tested two major hypotheses. He used 427 seventh and eighth grade pupils and 329 teachers to determine if:

1. There is a significant difference in the organizational climate between open construction and closed construction middle schools.

2. There is a significant difference in the self concepts of children attending open construction schools when compared with the self concepts of children attending closed construction schools.

The researcher employed the Self-Concept as a Learner Scale to measure the self concept of students and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to measure the organizational climate. After analyzing the data, the researcher concluded that there was a significant difference between the open and closed
construction middle schools in terms of organizational climate. This conclusion was in conflict with Seidman (1973) who determined that there was no significant difference between the organizational climates of open and closed construction schools. It was determined that the self concepts of children attending open construction schools differed significantly from those individuals attending closed construction buildings. Hinojosa (1974) investigated the relationships between the organizational climate and pupil control ideology as perceived by teachers and the self esteem and power dimensions of the students' self concept as perceived by the students. The population of the study consisted of the teaching staff and students of six selected elementary schools of the Corpus Christi Independent School District. The sample of the study included all the fourth and sixth grade students and teachers of their schools. A total of 29 teachers and 779 students comprised the sample of this study.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed to examine the relationship between organizational climate and students' self esteem scores. The results indicated a correlation of 0.145 which is not statistically significant. An Analysis of Variance was used to look for a significant difference between the self esteem scores of students belonging to the top ten and lower ten teachers in the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire continuum. The resulting F-ratio of 6.653,
indicated a statistical significance at the .01 level. The contrasting results of the OCDQ and self esteem relationship may be due to the two different techniques. The apparent absence, in the Pearson, of statistical significance in correlation might have been caused by the nine teachers in the middle of the OCDQ continuum. The results of this analysis indicated a significant relationship between school climate and student self esteem.

Vanderpool (1975) conducted a study designed to analyze the role of self concept and organizational climate and the effects of their relative congruence on organizational participation and work performance. Subjects were 20 first line supervisors in a midwestern manufacturing company. They were interviewed and tested for self concept, organizational concept, organizational participation, and work performance, using an ex post facto field study methodology. The subjects were classified into three groups according to conceptual states: (1) positive, (2) neutral/positive, and (3) negative. Means, standard deviations, and correlations of variables were computed. A one-way analysis of variance tested for discriminate analysis of variables between groups. The results showed a partial relationship between self concept and organizational climate and a statistically significant relationship between organizational participation, work performance, and conceptual states.

Brimm and Bush (1978) suggested that administrative behavior is a key factor in helping youngsters achieve a sense of direction and accomplishment. They conducted a study to identify areas
within the school environment with which students feel greatest satisfaction and dissatisfaction and to determine if there were a difference in the way students who were classified as activists felt about their experiences from those classified as non-activists.

The Student Satisfaction Inventory was utilized. Students from five secondary schools in Tennessee were included in the study. Absolute frequencies, means, and standard deviations were computed for each statement, while the Chi square technique was used to compare the responses of activist and non-activist students.

Students expressed satisfaction with class size and teacher's knowledge of the course. Greatest dissatisfaction was expressed with liveliness and interest of their classes, class explanations by teachers, amount of time allotted to discussion in class, and the classroom methods of teachers. The category of interpersonal relationships revealed that students are sensitive about teacher attitudes.

Beane and Lipka (1976) commented on self concept and affective growth within transescence as they relate to and may be influenced by institutional features of the middle school. Beane and Lipka reported:

Schools which stress heterogeneous physical strength competition, rigid rules and regulations, corporal punishment, over-structured curriculum plans, passive student rules and neuter teacher roles present a
potential danger to the self concepts of learners. Those which work toward student participation in classroom planning, homebase counseling, cooperative rule-making, flexible and problem-centered curriculum plans, elastic time frames, small group instruction and trusting adult models provided the kinds of support and encouragement which promote positive self concepts and affective group. (p. 17)

Holst (1978) stated, "The educational climate, that invisible but critical tone which pervades a school, depends upon many factors, but clearly the administrator plays a key role. Humaness is a key factor in the learning environment" (p. 168).

Powley (1978) studied the organizational climate and self concepts of elementary school students. The study was designed to appraise the extent to which the organizational climate in the elementary school has an effect on student self concept. Questions to be answered were (1) to what extent do the age and the years of experience of the principal affect the organizational climate, (2) to what extent does the size of the school affect the organizational climate, and (3) to what extent do students in open climates have more positive self concepts than students in closed climates?

Subjects in this study were principals, teachers, and fourth grade students from Region XII Education Service Center area of Texas. The data revealed that the age of the principal does affect the organizational climate. Younger principals tend to
have schools with a more open climate. Older principals are more likely to have a more closed climate school. The years of experience of the principal do affect the organizational climate of the school. More open climate schools usually have the principals with the fewer years of experience while the more closed climate schools have the principals with the larger number of years of experience. Smaller schools are more likely to have a more open climate than the larger schools and are more likely to have students with higher self concepts than the more closed climate schools.

Hinson (1965) conducted a study identifying the organizational climate of elementary schools and investigating the extent and sources of congruence and divergence between the perceptions of teachers and principals regarding the organizational climate of schools. His most significant finding was that principals differ significantly from teachers in perceptions regarding the organizational climate of schools. Differences were greater among Negro schools than among white schools, and differences occurred more among closed climates than among open climates.

Keadle (1976) investigated the relationships between organizational climate in schools and selected student variables. The assumption was made that schools whose organizational climates are characterized as "open" will tend to result in higher student achievement, higher student self-perceptions, more favorable classroom behavior, and higher student perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them, than in schools whose organizational
climates are characterized as "closed." Data revealed no significant relationships. While it appears from the findings of this study that organizational climate is not a predictor of certain educational variables, a considerable amount of evidence has been accumulated to support the belief that organizational climate is an important dimension and does play some positive role in the overall teaching-learning situation.

Bender (1971) conducted a study to compare student and teacher perceptions of the educational environment and to examine those comparisons in light of selected features of the organizational climate. The results of the analysis confirmed the hypothesis that there are significant differences between student and teacher perceptions of the educational environment in elementary schools.

Summary of Related Research

The review of related research was presented under the following sections: (a) Development of self concept and (b) Organizational climate. The major findings pertinent to this study are summarized here.

Self concept is a system of attitudes, feelings, and perceptions a person has about himself. These perceptions may vary widely in their importance to an individual. Self concept theorists believe that human behavior cannot be understood without knowledge of one's conscious perceptions of his environment and of his self in relation to the environment. A person discovers his self concept from the kinds of experiences he has had in life.
Thus, the development of self concept is a never-ending social process. It develops gradually as one learns about himself through social interaction and is subject to change.

Several studies have examined the impact of certain school practices and variables on student self concept. There is considerable evidence that indicates a direct relationship between achievement and self concept; that is, higher achievement is accompanied by higher self concept and low achievement by low self concept (Brookover, et al., 1962, 1965, and 1967). Teachers' self image, their interactions with students and their teaching styles all relate to student self concept (Combs, 1953; Fox, 1978; Jersild, 1955; Kulp, 1978; Peck, 1977; Spaulding, 1964; Steins, 1965; Walden, Royce, and Below, 1966). Furthermore, these teacher characteristics may have a different impact on self concept depending upon the ethnicity of the student (Coleman, 1966; Deutsch, 1971; Kelley, 1963; Long, 1968; Zirkel and Greene, 1971). It is unclear if, and in some cases, how, the student's sex (Beemer, 1971; Bills, 1978; Edeburn, 1973; Mason, 1976) socio-economic status (Burchinal, 1958; Sewell, 1965; Trowbridge, 1970, 1972; Zirkel and Moses, 1971) or ethnic background influences his self concept.

With respect to specific school practices, it remains unclear how grouping patterns (Jewell, 1971; Samuels, 1969) and open classroom settings (Beals, 1972; Brophy, 1970; Terence, 1972) are related to self concept. The impact of nonpromotion practices is
also unclear. Recent studies report adverse effects (Johnson, 1968; White and Howard, 1973) and some report positive effects (Chansky, 1964; Finlayson, 1977).

Morse (1964) found a sharp decrease in student self concept in grades three to five, with some recovery by grade eleven. The findings indicate that the student's self concept appears gradually to grow less positive with time.

Organizational climate is an accepted term that describes the social interaction with a given school, the administrator-staff relationship. Although organizational climate might appear to be an intangible quality, it has a real effect on people who live and work in the school. Research has demonstrated that organizational climate affects the performance and growth of a school as well as the people who live and work there.

Cornell (1955) was among the first to investigate the nature of organizational climate in the public schools. He found certain variables which had effect as measures of organizational climate of school. They include teacher morale; teachers feeling that they have responsibility for participation in policy making; teachers feeling that their contribution to policy making is taken into account in final decisions; teachers' perception of the degree of deconcentration of administrative power and the extent to which teachers interact directly with administrative personnel with respect to general school problems.
Halpin and Croft (1962) found that each school has an atmosphere or "personality" of its own. They called this personality the organizational climate. They developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to measure the organizational climate of schools. Since the development of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, many investigations have been accomplished concerning the relationship of organizational climate to diverse factors.

Feldvebel (1964) found no significant relationship between organizational climate and pupil achievement. Other studies showed a relationship between climate and pupil achievement (Miller, 1965; Rice, 1968; Smith, 1966).

Phillips (1978) concluded that there was a significant difference between the open and closed construction middle schools in terms of organizational climate. This conclusion was in conflict with Seidman (1973) who determined that there was no significant difference between the organizational climates of open and closed construction schools.

While few studies investigated the relationship of organizational climate to student self concept, the findings are inconsistent. Becker (1967) found no statistically significant relationship between positive change in school climate and student self concept. Brookover, et al. (1977) reported that self concept is correlated to academic achievement and social climate. Data also revealed that the school mean self concept
in black schools was significantly higher than the mean in the white schools. School size is significantly related to mean self concept, but not at a high level.

Powley (1978) found a relationship between school climate and student self concept. Smaller schools are more likely to have a more open climate than larger schools and are more likely to have students with higher self concepts than the more closed climates. Keadle (1976) found no significant relationships between organizational climate and selected student variables.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects which open and closed climates of elementary schools have upon the self concept of students. Chapter 3 contains an explanation and description of the methodology used to accomplish this research goal. The following sections are included: (a) Research Site and Population, (b) Sample Selection, (c) Description of the Measures, and (d) Statistical Procedures.

Research Site and Population

The research site for this investigation was a city in Virginia. This school system has 29 elementary schools. The elementary school student population was approximately 15,974, and regular classroom teacher population in the elementary schools numbered approximately 574 teachers. Eighty-nine fifth grade teachers, 25 principals, and 500 fifth grade students in 25 of the elementary schools constituted the original sample population.

Sample Selection

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Halpin and Croft, 1963) (OCDQ) was completed by 69 teachers and 24 principals from a total population of 89 fifth grade teachers and 25 principals respectively in the 25 elementary schools which constituted the original sample population. One school did not participate. Schools were arbitrarily assigned an identification number.
To test the first hypothesis, all schools were included in the sample. From a computer analysis, the five schools with the "most closed" organizational climates and the five schools with the "most open" organizational climates were selected to test the second hypothesis and the 14 schools which ranked in the middle of this open-closed continuum were eliminated from the sample population. Data upon which these decisions were based are presented in Appendix A.

The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (Piers, 1969) (CSCS) was completed by 480 students from a total population of 500 fifth grade students in the 25 elementary schools which constituted the original sample population. The mean score for each group of students in the schools was computed as an index of group self concept. The data are reported in Table 3.1.

Description of the Measures

The measurement of the two variables was accomplished by the OCDQ to measure organizational climate and the CSCS to measure self concept of children.

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

The organizational climates of the 24 elementary schools in the population were measured by the OCDQ. Each fifth grade classroom teacher in each school and each principal were sent a copy of the OCDQ complete with instructions and an attached self addressed envelope. A letter containing directions and a response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA Composite Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>50.74</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>54.45</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>71.05</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>56.07</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>41.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>SRA Composite Score</td>
<td>Intelligence Behavior</td>
<td>Physical Status and School Appearance</td>
<td>Happiness and Attributes Anxiety</td>
<td>Popularity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>47.53</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>52.78</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>71.95</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>56.39</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>40.72</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>67.07</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>62.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
form were also sent to the principal. A copy of the directions is found in Appendix B. A copy of the response form is found in Appendix C. The school system mail service was used to distribute and collect the questionnaires. Of the 114 instruments distributed, 69 were completed by teachers and 24 were completed by principals and returned. A return rate of 82 percent was realized.

On the OCDQ, teachers and principals indicated their perception of the organizational climate in their respective schools by responding to the 64 type items on a 4-point, forced-choice scale of "rarely occurs," "sometimes occurs," "often occurs," and "very frequently occurs." The teachers and principals responded by indicating how well each item described their school. The items of the questionnaire described what is called "typical" behaviors of teachers and administrators and the instrument actually measures reported frequency of perception.

The 64 items of the questionnaire were randomly ordered but can be brought together in eight subtests. The names of the eight subtests are:

1. **Disengagement** - This dimension indicates that the teachers do not work well together. They pull in different directions with respect to the task; they gripe and bicker among themselves.

2. **Hindrance** - This dimension refers to the teachers' feelings that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which
the teachers construe as unnecessary busy work.

3. **Esprit** - This dimension refers to morale. The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.

4. **Intimacy** - This dimension refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other.

5. **Aloofness** - This dimension refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal with the teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation.

6. **Production Emphasis** - This dimension refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive and task-oriented.

7. **Thrust** - This dimension refers to behavior marked not by close supervision of the teacher, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets. He does not ask the teachers to give of themselves anything more than he willingly gives of himself; his behavior, though starkly task-oriented, is nonetheless viewed favorably by the teachers.

8. **Consideration** - This dimension refers to behavior by the
principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat teachers humanly, to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms (Halpin and Croft, 1963, p. 2).

Subtests one through four describe the behavior of teachers while subtests five through eight describe behavior of the principal.

From the scores on the eight subtests a profile is constructed for each school and by comparing the profiles of different schools the distinguishing features of their respective organizational climates are identified. From the eight subtests, six organizational climates are identified and arranged along a continuum ranging from an Open Climate at one end to a Closed Climate at the other. The categories of the climate continuum are:

1. Open
2. Autonomous
3. Controlled
4. Familiar
5. Paternal
6. Closed

Two methods were considered in order to classify the schools with respect to the degree of openness of the organizational climate. The first method was to inspect the similarity scores. These scores are indicators of the type of climate which best characterizes a particular school or which type of climate least
characterizes a particular school. Each similarity score was obtained by computing the absolute difference between each sub-test score in a school's profile and the corresponding score in the first prototypic profile, then in the second one, and so on. The score profile for each of the 24 schools in the current population was compared to each of the six prototypic profiles. The sum of the absolute differences between the profile scores was computed. A low sum indicates that the two profiles are highly similar; a large sum indicates that the profiles are dissimilar. Each of the 24 schools was assigned to the set defined by the prototypic profile for which its profile - similarity score was lowest (Halpin and Croft, 1963).

The second method was to examine the openness score. This score is based upon three of the eight dimensions of the total climate. Halpin and Croft (1963) described the Openness score as a reliable indicator of the openness of the climate of a school. Both the Climate Similarity Scores and the Openness Score were considered for purposes of classification as the present task was to determine the relative openness or relative closedness of the climates of this population of schools.

An illustration of the use of these scores to classify schools as more open or more closed with respect to climate may be seen by noting the data from Schools 18 and 24. The Climate Similarity Score for School 18 was 73 for the Open Climate while the score for the Closed Climate for that same school was 76.
On the second method, the Openness Score for School 18 was 73, the highest for all the 24 schools. These results of a high similarity to the Open Climate profile, lesser similarity to the Closed profile, and a high Openness Score indicate that School 18 has a relatively Open Climate. By contrast, School 24 has a Closed score of 24, and Open score of 118, and an Openness score of 24 indicating that the climate of that particular school was relatively closed.

Using a combination of the "climate similarity scores" and the openess scores, the five most open schools were labeled open schools and the five most closed schools were labeled closed schools. Among the schools designated as open, it should be noted that there are schools classified along the continuum of open, autonomous, controlled, and familiar climates. Schools designated as closed schools had a Climate Similarity Score and Openness Score which indicated that they could be characterized as having Paternal and Closed Climates. Schools fell into all six climate categories. Schools 2, 3, 6, 7, and 18 had open climates. Schools 15 and 21 had autonomous climates; Schools 1, 4, 11, and 13 had controlled climates; Schools 5, 14, 20, and 22 familiar climates; Schools 12 and 16 had paternal climates; and Schools 8, 10, 17, 19, 23, 24, and 25 had closed climates. This instrument is presented in Appendix D.

In developing the OCDQ, Halpin and Croft (1963) analyzed
the climate of 71 elementary schools located in six regions of the United States. Behaviors within these schools were described by 1,151 respondents. Factor analysis was used to assign the 64 items of the OCDQ to eight subtests. A profile for the organizational climate of each school was constructed from these eight subtest scores.

The six organizational climates have been described according to the behavior assessed by the items of the eight subtests. The following are brief descriptions of the six climates:

The Open Climate is characterized as an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals and which provides satisfaction for the 39 group members' social needs. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately from both the group and the leader. The members are preoccupied disproportionately with neither achievement nor social needs satisfaction. Satisfaction on both counts seems to be obtained easily and almost effortlessly. The main characteristic of this climate is the "authenticity" of the behavior that occurs among all the members.

The Autonomous Climate is characterized by leadership acts emerging primarily from the group. Social needs are satisfied to a greater extent than is task achievement; however, tasks are achieved. The principal exerts little control over his teachers and is satisfied to allow teachers to work at their own speed. School routine is facilitated by procedures and routines. Morale is slightly lower than in an Open Climate.
The Controlled Climate is characterized best as impersonal and highly task-oriented. Teacher behavior is depicted primarily toward task accomplishment, while relatively little attention is given to behavior oriented to social needs satisfaction. Esprit is fairly high, but it reflects achievement at some expense to social needs satisfaction. This climate lacks openness, or "authenticity" of behavior, because the group is disproportionately preoccupied with task achievement. The principal is dominating and directive and assumes leadership almost exclusively.

The Familiar Climate is characterized by a satisfaction of social needs and little attention to task achievement. It is highly personal, but under control. Esprit is extremely high. Teachers are required to perform few administrative tasks. The principal behaves as one of the group and a happy family environment exists. Few guidelines are present to suggest how routine tasks should be accomplished. Production is not emphasized, and teachers do not exert their greatest efforts.

The Paternal Climate is characterized by inadequate satisfaction from both task accomplishment and social needs. Teachers tend to work poorly together. The principal seems unable to control the activities of his faculty. The principal completes administrative reports and makes most of the decisions. Any consideration he shows teachers is usually a manipulative technique which tends to satisfy only his social needs.
The Closed Climate is characterized also by little satisfaction from either task achievement or social needs. Teachers do not work well together and the organization is not moving toward common goals. The principal is aloof emphasizing production and dictating arbitrary rules. The principal does not set a good example by his own behavior. Leadership is not exerted by the principal and he gives no latitude for leadership to merge from the group. Esprit is low. A more detailed description of the six climates of the OCDQ is presented in Appendix E.

According to Halpin (1966) there is a limitation of the OCDQ. The OCDQ cannot be used for normative purposes. The sample of 71 schools upon which the findings are based was not randomly selected from a clearly defined population. However, one can compare the profile of any one school with the profile of any other or with the profiles of all other schools if all schools are within the same sample.

"The dimensions by which the OCDQ have been defined are descriptive, taxonomic, and phenotypic and do not necessarily correspond to the dimensions of behavior along which change can be induced in a school's Organizational Climate" (Halpin, 1966, p. 202). It is possible that a Closed Climate would become more closed if the principal were given abrupt knowledge of his closed organizational climate scores.

With respect to the validity of the OCDS, Smith (1966)
concluded that the organizational climates identified by the OCDQ are sound and viable. His findings supported the use of the OCDQ in identifying organizational climates.

Brown (1965) replicated the original work of Halpin and Croft and found that the OCDQ was a well constructed, reliable instrument. Brown did conclude, however, that the dividing of the climate continuum into discrete climate may cause researchers to become overly dependent on these classifications.

Andrews (1965) administered the OCDQ to 165 Alberta schools. The method utilized in this study was the construct validity approach. Andrews concluded that the subtests of the OCDQ provided reasonably valid measures of important aspects of the school principal’s leadership, in the perspective of interaction with his staff.

Halpin and Croft (1963) provided data on the split-half coefficient of reliability, the correlation between odd and even numbered respondents and communality estimates from the three-factor rotational solution of the eight subtests. The latter was advanced as the most pertinent measurement of reliability and its results were evaluated as sufficient for the instrument. The reported communalities for the eight subtests were disengagement .66, hindrance 144, esprit 173, intimacy .53, aloofness 172, production emphasis .53, thrust .68, and consideration .64. Halpin (1966) stated:
the high communalities found for each of the individual subtests provided estimates of the reliability of the eight subtests. (p. 160)

Probably the most recent validation study was conducted by Hayes (1973). Hayes analyzed the original Halpin and Croft (1963) data to provide an estimate of the reliability of the dimensions of climate for the climate profile. The reliability estimates for the dimensions of climate were disengagement .55, hindrance .64, esprit .66, intimacy .61, aloofness .77, production emphasis .73, thrust .74, and consideration .56. A canonical correlation of .89, statistically significant at less than the .0001 level of confidence, yielded an estimate of the reliability of the climate profile. The correlation indicated that the profile is a dependable indicator of the climate characteristics of a school. Haynes research also identified dimension of Logistical Support and Object Socialization which were not a part of the original study. He did recommend a revision of the OCDQ with a deletion of items no longer pertinent to the measure of a subtest. Kenney and Rentz (1970) conducted a factor-analytic study of OCDQ data from a large sample of respondents from urban schools and they could identify only four dimensions of organizational climate. Intimacy was not one of the dimensions identified.

The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale

The self concepts of the 500 fifth grade students in the population were measured by the CSCS. Twenty students assigned
randomly in each school were sent a copy of the CSCS complete with directions. These instruments and a letter containing directions were placed in an envelope and sent to the principal of each school. A copy of the directions is found in Appendix F. The school system mail service was used to distribute and collect the scales. An information copy of the CSCS was sent to each principal. Of the 400 scales distributed 356 were completed by students and returned. Eighty-nine percent of the students responded.

On the CSCS, student respondents indicated their feelings about themselves by responding "yes" or "no" to the 80 first-person declarative statements of the type "I am a happy person." The results of scoring provide six sub scores derived from cluster analysis. The sub scores are in the areas of behavior, happiness, satisfaction, intellectual and school status, physical appearance, anxiety, and popularity. This instrument is presented in Appendix G.

In developing the CSCS, Piers used items from Jersild's collection of children's statements about what they liked and disliked about themselves. The scale was standardized on 1,183 children in grades 4-12 of one Pennsylvania school district. There appear to be no consistent sex or grade differences in means. The internal consistency of the scale ranges from .78 to .93 and retest reliability from .71 to .77. Correlates with similar instruments are in the mid-sixties, and the scale possesses
teacher and peer validity coefficients on the order of .40. Care was taken that the scale not correlate unduly with social desirability, and reasonable success was achieved; however, quite high correlations, -.54 to -.69, exist with a measure of anxiety. The authors believe this correlation represents a true trait correlation rather than one of response style. Thus, the scale possesses sufficient reliability and validity to be used in research (Buros, 1972).

Statistical Procedures

Two approaches were used to examine the hypotheses stated earlier. Analysis of the data was accomplished by an analysis of variance and analysis of covariance.

Analysis of Variance

In this study, the eight subtest scores on the OCDQ were the independent variables. The dependent variables were the mean student self concept sub scores.

Hypothesis 1 was tested to ascertain the relationship between the mean student self concept scores and the organizational climate of the elementary schools. Analysis of variance was used to examine the relationship and was also used to determine if any of the six organizational climates types differed significantly from one another and whether the self concept scores in the more open climate were higher than those in the more closed climate. The .05 level of significance was utilized for testing the hypothesis.
Analysis of Covariance

An analysis of covariance technique examined the scores of the five most open schools and the five most closed schools. Hypothesis 2 was tested by determining if a statistically significant difference existed between mean student self concept scores of the five schools scoring highest with open organizational climates and the five schools scoring lowest with closed organizational climates. Co-variates were SRA composite scores and school size. An $F$ ratio was established to determine if a statistically significant greater variability existed between the two groups. The .05 level of significance was utilized for testing the hypotheses.
Chapter 4
RESULTS

The statistical results of the investigation to determine the effects of open and closed organizational climate upon the development of student self concept is reported in Chapter 4. Theory and previous empirical investigation had predicted relationships between self concept and climate. The results of the statistical analysis collected to test the predictions are reported under separate sections for each of the two research hypotheses. Analysis of variance and analysis of covariance were used. Analysis of variance is a statistical method for testing the statistical significance of the difference among the means of several samples. The $F$ ratio provides an indication as to whether the variability among sample means is due to chance or to sampling error. Analysis of covariance is a statistical method for testing the significance of the differences between the means of final experimental data by taking into account the correlation between the dependent variables and covariates, thus adjusting initial mean differences in the experimental groups. The measure used for the control is called the covariate. The $F$ ratio provides an indication as to whether the variability among sample means is due to chance or sampling error.

The mean climate profile of subtest scores for each school is presented in Table 4.1. The degree of similarity between the climate profile of a school and the prototypic profile determined
Table 4.1
Mean Climate Profile of Subtest Scores by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Disengagement</th>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Esprit</th>
<th>Intimacy</th>
<th>Aloofness</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Thrust</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>Espirit</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Aloneness</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by Halpin and Croft identified the organizational climate of the school.

Scoring of the OCDQ yielded climate similarity scores. The similarity scores revealed the congruence between the observed climate profile scores and the prototypical organizational climate. The similarity scores were presented as scores relating the climate of the school to each of the climates identified by the OCDQ. The lower the score the greater the relationship between the climate of the school and the prototypic climate. The climate similarity scores by school are presented in Table 4.2.

In this study, there were five schools classified as open, two as autonomous, four as controlled, four as familiar, two as paternal, and seven as closed.

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 stated that a relationship exists between the organizational climate of a school and student self concept. A finding of no significant difference between the mean student self concept scores of schools with varying organizational climate types would not provide support for this hypothesis.

An attempt was made to determine if any of the six organizational climate types differed significantly from one another on self concept scores. There are six dependent variables corresponding to the six self concept factors. What is of interest is whether there is a difference between the six organizational climate types for any of the six self concept factors. Wilks'
Table 4.2
Climate Similarity Scores by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Similarity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 (continued)

Climate Similarity Scores by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Similarity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Climate**

**Familiar Climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Similarity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paternal Climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Similarity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closed Climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Similarity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 (continued)

Climate Similarity Scores by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Similarity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed Climate (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
criterion was the index used to test for this multivariate
difference. An approximate $F$ ratio of $1.00$, $p < .5$ indicated
that there was no significant difference between the six
organizational climate types for the self concept factors. How­
ever, one of the univariate tests was moderately significant.
Factor 1 (Behavior) was significant ($F_{5,17} = 2.52$, $p < .05$).
Table 4.3 presents the results of the analysis of variance
between schools for Behavior.

Table 4.3

Analysis of Variance - Student Self Concept

Factor 1 (Behavior)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>5.5392</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1078</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7.4552</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. $R^2 = .58$.

The results of analysis of variance procedures for the other five
self concept factors registered no significant difference in each
of the six climate groups. Tables 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8
present the findings.
Table 4.4
Analysis of Variance - Student Self Concept
Factor 2 (Intelligence and School Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>2.3775</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4755</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13.1279</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.

Table 4.5
Analysis of Variance - Student Self Concept
Factor 3 (Physical Appearance and Attributes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.9925</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1985</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6.5385</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.
### Table 4.6
Analysis of Variance - Student Self Concept

#### Factor 4 (Anxiety)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.8214</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1643</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5.6691</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.

### Table 4.7
Analysis of Variance - Student Self Concept

#### Factor 5 (Popularity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>1.0797</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2159</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6.1351</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.
Table 4.8
Analysis of Variance - Student Self Concept
Factor 6 (Happiness and Satisfaction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.2264</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2.7050</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.

Hypothesis 1 was not supported because no statistical significance was found to indicate a significant relationship between organizational climate scores and student self concept scores. The means of student self concept factor scores in each of the climate groups are presented in Table 4.9.

The correlations between the factors are shown in Table 4.10. Factor 1 was uncorrelated with some of the other factors. Since there was no mean difference on all but one of the factors, their ordering from open to closed climate is immaterial for all but Factor 1: Behavior.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 states that there is a significant difference between the mean student self concept scores of the five schools scoring highest with open organizational climates and the five schools scoring lowest with closed organizational climates,
Table 4.9
Means of Student Self Concept Factors in
Each of the Climate Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Factor 1: Behavior</th>
<th>and School Status</th>
<th>and Factors 2: Physical Intelligence and Appearance</th>
<th>and Factor 4: Factor 5: and Factor 6: Happiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10
Correlations Between Self Concept Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1: Behavior</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>4: Anxiety</th>
<th>5: Popularity</th>
<th>6: Happiness and Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Behavior</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance and Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Anxiety</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Popularity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Happiness and Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05
covarying out school size and pupil achievement. The ANCOVA results relevant to Hypothesis 2 are shown in Tables 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, 4.15, and 4.16. The data in Table 4.17 show the mean student self concept scores for these two groups of schools.

Wilks' criterion was the statistic used to test for this multivariate difference, controlling for school size and pupil achievement. The ANCOVA resulted in a \( F \) ratio of 2.55, \( p < .04 \), which was not statistically significant. This indicated that the schools with more open organizational climate score did not necessarily have higher student self concept scores.

As a result, Hypothesis 2 was not supported because no significant difference was found between the mean student self concept scores in either of the two organizational climate groups.
Table 4.11
Analysis of Covariance - Student Self Concept

Factor 1 (Behavior)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.0468</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0468</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1.7324</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.

Table 4.12
Analysis of Covariance - Student Self Concept

Factor 2 (Intelligence and Schools Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>0.6709</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6709</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.2201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2201</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4.0430</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.
Table 4.13
Analysis of Covariance - Student Self Concept
Factor 3 (Physical Appearance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.5742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5742</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.0842</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0842</td>
<td>0.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2.2822</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.

Table 4.14
Analysis of Covariance - Student Self Concept
Factor 4 (Anxiety)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>1.0020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0020</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>9.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.1035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1035</td>
<td>0.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3.0542</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.
### Table 4.15

**Analysis of Covariance - Student Self Concept**

**Factor 5 (Popularity)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.3897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3897</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>0.1262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1262</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.3663</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3663</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2.4089</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.

### Table 4.16

**Analysis of Covariance - Student Self Concept**

**Factor 6 (Happiness and Satisfaction)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>0.0845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0845</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.3010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3010</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>0.7978</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant.
Table 4.17
Summary Data of Mean Student Self Concept Factors on the Five Most
Open and Five Most Closed Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5
Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, the relationship of organizational climate to the development of student self concept was investigated. The effect of organizational climate on student self concept was predicted in two hypotheses. In Chapter 5, the findings of the investigation are discussed and conclusions are drawn concerning these findings. Finally, implications of the investigation are discussed. The discussion and conclusions are presented under the following headings: (a) Organizational Climate and Student Self Concept and (b) Implications for Research.

Organizational Climate and Student Self Concept

The central purpose of this study was to investigate the effects which open and closed organizational climate types have upon student self concept. Over 400 students, 69 teachers, and 24 principals in 24 schools responded to the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (CSCS) and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The CSCS is an 80-item survey which assesses the self concept of a student on six factors: Behavior, Happiness Satisfaction, Intellectual and School Status, Physical Appearance, Anxiety, and Popularity. Analysis of variance procedures were used to examine student responses between schools to determine if students differ significantly in their feelings about themselves regardless of the type of organizational climate in the school. The OCDQ is a 64-item questionnaire designed to measure four

Two hypotheses were stated in Chapter 1. The two hypotheses were:

1. A relationship exists between the mean student self concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Self Concept Rating Scale and the organizational climate of selected schools as measured by the Organizational Climate Questionnaire.

2. There is no significant difference between the mean student self concept scores of the five schools with the most open organizational climate and the five schools with the most closed organizational climate.

To determine whether there was a statistical difference between the mean student self concept scores in the open climate and the closed climate schools, multivariate analysis of variance procedures were used. An F ratio of 1.00, p < .5 was calculated. Therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected. However, from a univariate perspective, only one of the student self concept subtests was statistically significant. This subtest was Behavior and it did not correlate with the other factors.

To determine whether there was a statistical difference between the mean student self concept scores in the five most open schools and the five most closed schools, multivariate
analysis of covariance procedures were used. Wilks' criterion was
the index used to test for this multivariate difference controlling
for school size and pupil achievement. The multivariate analysis
indicated that there was no significant difference between the
children's self concept scores in open versus closed climate
elementary schools. The second hypothesis was also rejected.

From the findings of the study it is difficult to draw many
generalizations from the data. The study showed that while there
were differences between elementary schools in terms of organiza­
tional climate and student self concept, these differences were
not significant. The findings do not support the notion that the
self concepts of children attending open climate schools differ
significantly from those attending closed climate schools. While
the findings of the study do not agree with Brookover and Powley,
who determined that there is a relationship between organizational
climates of schools and self concept of students, they do support
the results of other empirical investigations by Becker and Keadle
which have shown no significant relationships between organizational
climate of schools and self concept of students.

Implications for Research

Although much evidence has been accumulated to support the
thesis that organizational climate is an important construct to be
considered within the organizational structure, it appears from
the findings of this study that organizational climate is not a
predictor of student self concept development. The inability of
the writer to find relationships existing between the climate of the school and the self concept of students could be the result of using the school as a unit of analysis rather than the classroom. The other possibility is that measurement error was responsible for lack of support for the hypotheses. Further research into this area should be accomplished.

Any implications from the results of this study must be drawn with various limitations clearly in mind. Conclusions may be made concerning this sample population of elementary school students, staff, and administrators and like groups only. The OCDQ used to measure organizational climate is currently under examination for possible revision in light of the social changes of today, the results of further empirical investigations, and advanced computer techniques.

It is hoped that the present study will stimulate further investigation into the relationship of student self concept and organizational climate. Recommendations for future studies include:

1. A study to determine whether there is a difference in the educational program of open and closed climate schools.

2. A study comparing the effects of open and closed climate schools on the self concept of students in the middle schools.

3. A study comparing the effects of open and closed climate
4. A study to determine whether there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions and students' perceptions of student self concept.

5. A study to determine whether there is a relationship between student self concept and other selected variables.

6. A study to determine whether there is a relationship between organizational school climate and other selected variables.

As educators understand the school climate and its effect on human behavior, they may be able to create learning opportunities and organizational climates appropriate to student needs.
### Appendix A

**CLIMATE SIMILARITY SCORES AND OPENNESS SCORES FOR THE SAMPLE POPULATION OF SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Directions to Principal for the OCDQ and the CSCS

To:  
From: Beverly W. Braxton  
Subject: Participation in Doctoral Study  
Date: June 3, 1981  

Dr. Neil Pedersen has granted me permission to include your school in a research study concerning the relationship between student self concept and the organizational climate of selected elementary schools in Richmond. All information collected will be kept in strictest confidence and will be reported without reference to the individual school, principal, teachers or students.

Please cooperate in this research study in the following manner:

1. Designate a person, perhaps the guidance counselor or curriculum specialist, to administer the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Rating Scale to the 20 fifth grade students listed on the attached. The completed scales should be placed in the brown envelope provided. This rating scale takes approximately 20 minutes to administer.

2. Ask each of your fifth grade teachers to complete the enclosed Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and return it sealed in the attached white envelope to the person you have designated in your school. Have this person return directly to me in the enclosed envelope the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Rating Scale completed by students and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire completed by the fifth grade teachers.

3. Complete the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the enclosed form giving the name of the person(s) designated to administer the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Rating Scale to the fifth grade pupils and the name of the person designated to collect from the fifth grade teachers the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaires.

4. When all the sealed envelopes have been returned in your school, please place them in the large envelope and return them to me.

Thank you very much for your consideration and cooperation.

Enclosures
Appendix C

RESPONSE FORM

To: Beverly W. Braxton
From: ______________, Principal
       ______________ Elementary School
Subject: Participation in Doctoral Study
Date: June ____, 1981

The following named person has been selected to administer the Piers-Harris
Children's Self Concept Rating Scale to the twenty fifth grade students:

   Name:_____________________
   Position__________________

The following named person has been selected to collect the Organizational
Climate Description Questionnaire from the fifth grade teachers:

   Name:_____________________
   Position__________________

   Number of fifth grade teachers in school:____
   School Enrollment:______
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions:

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

The purpose of this questionnaire is to secure a description of the different ways in which teachers have and of the various conditions under which they work. The questionnaire will be examined to identify the behaviors or conditions that have been described as typical by the majority of the teachers in your school. For this examination, a portrait of the Organizational Climate of your school will be constructed.

The information which you are being requested to provide will be treated on a confidential basis. You may be sure that this information is for research purposes alone, and that neither you, your school, by name, or identification implied by any other means.

Thank you for taking time to complete this questionnaire.

---

Reprinted with permission of the Macmillan Company from Theory and Research in Administration by Andrew W. Halpin. Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1966.
1. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school................................. R S O V

2. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying............................................. R S O V

3. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.................. R S O V

4. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.......................................... R S O V

5. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.......................................... R S O V

6. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority............................. R S O V

7. Extra books are available for classroom use................................................................. R S O V

8. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports............................................ R S O V

9. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members...................................... R S O V

10. Teachers exert group pressure on nonconforming faculty members................................. R S O V

11. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done"............................... R S O V

12. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school............................................... R S O V

13. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.................................. R S O V

14. Teachers seek special favors from the principal......................................................... R S O V

15. School supplies are readily available for use in classroom.......................................... R S O V

16. Student progress reports require too much work.......................................................... R S O V

17. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.......................................... R S O V

18. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.................... R S O V

19. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.................................... R S O V
20. Teachers have too many committee requirements

21. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally

22. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings

23. Custodian service is available when needed

24. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching

25. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves

26. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings

27. Teachers at this school show much school spirit

28. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers

29. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems

30. Teachers at this school stay by themselves

31. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure

32. The principal sets an example by working hard himself

33. The principal does personal favors for teachers

34. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms

35. The morale of the teachers is high

36. The principal uses constructive criticism

37. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work

38. Teachers socialize together in small select groups

39. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions

40. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day

41. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions

42. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences
43. The principal schedules the work for the teachers...... R S O V
44. Teachers leave the ground during the school day........ R S O V
45. Teachers help select which courses will be taught...... R S O V
46. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes............... R S O V
47. The principal talks a great deal....................... R S O V
48. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.......................... R S O V
49. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.................................. R S O V
50. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously...... R S O V
51. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.... R S O V
52. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.............................................. R S O V
53. School secretarial service is available for teacher's use.............................................. R S O V
54. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference.......................... R S O V
55. The principal is in the building before the teachers arrive.............................................. R S O V
56. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.............................................. R S O V
57. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.............................................. R S O V
58. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.............................................. R S O V
59. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.............................................. R S O V
60. Teachers talk about leaving the school system........ R S O V
61. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.............................................. R S O V
62. The principal is easy to understand.......................... R S O V
63. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.............................................. R S O V
64. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.............................................. R S O V
Halpin and Croft administered the OCDQ in 71 elementary schools in various parts of the country. Predictably, the schools varied in their climate profiles. In some schools the teachers thought morale was high, whereas in other schools the teachers thought morale was somewhat lower. In some schools the principal was rated high in consideration, whereas in other schools the teachers thought their principal evidenced less consideration. Teachers in some schools thought their colleagues were fairly well "disengaged," whereas other school faculties thought their members were quite involved.

In their nationwide sample of schools, Halpin and Croft were able to identify "school profiles" which tended to cluster. They arbitrarily identified six such school climate profiles which they called:

1. Open climate
2. Autonomous climate
3. Controlled climate
4. Familiar climate
5. Paternal climate
6. Closed climate

The characteristics of each of these climate types may be described as follows:

1. Open climate
   a. Characteristics of climate
      High esprit
      Low disengagement
      Low hindrance
      Average intimacy
      Average aloofness
      High consideration
      Average thrust
      Low production emphasis
   b. Behavioral description. The behavior of the principal represents an appropriate integration between his own personality and the role he is required to play as a principal. In this respect, his behavior can be viewed as genuine. He sets an example by working hard and makes special efforts to help his teachers. He possesses a personal ability to be "genuine" whether he is required to direct the activities of others or to show compassion in satisfying the social needs of individual teachers. He is not found to be aloof, nor does he permit the rules and procedures he sets up to be inflexible or impersonal. The principal does not need to emphasize production or monitor teachers' activities closely. In summary, such a principal is in full control of the situation and provides clear leadership for the staff. Under his leadership teachers obtain considerable job satisfaction and are sufficiently motivated to overcome difficulties and frustration. The teachers are proud to be associated with the school and do not feel burdened by busy-work or routine reports.
2. Autonomous climate

a. Characteristics of climate
   - High esprit
   - High intimacy
   - Low disengagement
   - Low hindrance
   - High aloofness
   - Low production emphasis
   - Average consideration
   - Average consideration
   - Average thrust

b. Behavioral description. The principal gives the teachers complete freedom to provide their own structures for interaction, as well as to find ways within the group for satisfying their social needs. The teachers in this climate are able to achieve goals quickly and easily. Such teachers are not hindered by administrative paperwork and do not complain about reports they must submit. Teacher morale is high, but not as high as in an open climate. High aloofness is evident, for such a principal runs the school in an impersonal, businesslike manner. He is satisfied to let the teachers work at their own speed and he monitors their activities very little. On the whole, the principal is considerate and attempts to satisfy the social needs of the teachers. He provides incentive for the school by setting an example of hard work.

3. Controlled climate

a. Characteristics of climate
   - High esprit
   - Low disengagement
   - High production emphasis
   - Low consideration
   - High thrust
   - Average aloofness
   - Low intimacy

b. Behavioral description. The principal presses for achievement at the expense of social needs satisfaction. Everyone works hard and there is little time for friendly relations with others. However, morale is high and this climate is classified as more open than closed. The teachers are completely engaged in the task and do not bicker, complain, or differ with the principal's directives. They know they are in the school to do a job and expect to be told individually just how to do it. There is an excessive amount of paperwork, routine reports, and other obstacles which hinder the teachers' task accomplishment. Teachers have little time to establish very friendly social relations with each other. Teachers ordinarily work alone and are impersonal with each other. The principal dominates and directs. He cares little for the feelings of teachers,
but does what is necessary to get the job done his way. He delegates few responsibilities and initiates leadership acts rather than allow them to come from the group.

4. Familiar climate

a. Characteristics of climate
High disengagement
Low hindrance
High intimacy
Average esprit
High consideration
Low aloofness
Low production emphasis
Average thrust

b. Behavioral description. The principal and teachers are conspicuously friendly. Social needs satisfaction is very high and little is done to direct or control a group's activities toward goal achievement. The principal exerts little control in directing teachers' acts, resulting in disengagement and few task-oriented accomplishments. Socially, the teachers are part of a big, happy family. The principal is afraid to make changes lest he disrupts his "big, happy family." Under the principal's guidance no one works to capacity, and no one is ever wrong. In short, little is done by either direct or indirect means to evaluate or direct the activities of teachers. However, teachers attribute thrust to the principal—he is a "good guy."

5. Paternal climate

a. Characteristics of climate
High production emphasis
High disengagement
Low hindrance
Low intimacy
Low esprit
Average thrust
Low aloofness
High consideration

b. Behavioral description. The principal is so non-aloof that he becomes intrusive. He must know everything that occurs. He continually emphasizes what should be done, but nothing seems to get done. The school and his duties within it are the principal's main interest in life. However, he fails to motivate the teachers primarily because he does not provide an example or an ideal which they can emulate. The principal is ineffective in controlling teachers and in satisfying their social needs. The teachers in this school do not work well together, but split into fractions. The principal insists on doing most of the busy-work himself. The teachers do not enjoy
friendly relations with each other nor obtain adequate satisfaction with regard to tasks accomplished or social needs.

6. Closed climate

a. Characteristics of climate
   High disengagement
   High hindrance
   Average intimacy
   Low esprit
   Low thrust
   High aloofness
   High production emphasis
   Low consideration

b. Behavioral description. Group members obtain little satisfaction with respect to task achievement or social needs. The principal is ineffective in directing the activities of the teachers and is not inclined to look out for teachers' personal welfare. Teachers are disengaged and do not work well together. There is also a very high turnover rate among teachers. The principal is highly aloof and impersonal in controlling and directing teacher activities. He sets up rules which are usually arbitrary. He does not get too involved personally with his teachers and their problems. He frequently feels that external forces are directing the course of events in his school and therefore puts little personal drive into his own work, demonstrating little thrust to his teachers. The principal keeps perfect records and turns out all necessary paperwork. He usually urges people to work harder.
Appendix F

Instructions for Person Administering the CSCS

To:

From: Beverly W. Braxton

Subject: Participation in Doctoral Study

Date: June 3, 1981

Your principal has selected you to assist me with the collection of data for my doctoral study concerning the relationship between student self concept and the organizational climate of selected elementary schools in Richmond. The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale is designed to measure the self concept of students. Completion of the instrument should take no more than 15 - 20 minutes of the student's time. All information collected will be kept in the strictest confidence and will be reported without reference to the individual school or students.

Please cooperate in the following manner:

1. Distribute the scale to the twenty identified fifth grade students at an appropriate time.

2. Following the instructions, administer the scale to the students. Read aloud each question with the students.

3. Collect the booklets when completed.

4. Seal the booklets in the envelope provided.

5. Return the envelope to your principal

Thank you very much for your time, your cooperation and your assistance.
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

THE PIERS-HARRIS CHILDREN'S SELF CONCEPT SCALE
(PAGES 115-120)
May 8, 1981

Ms. Beverly W. Braxton  
G.W. Carver Elementary School  
1110 West Leigh Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23220

Dear Ms. Braxton:

You have our permission to use, in the English language only, the "Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire" from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew W. Halpin, subject to the following limitations:

Permission is granted for usage of the material in the manner and for the purpose as specified in your letter. Note: If your doctoral dissertation is published, other than by University Microfilms, it is necessary to reapply for permission;

Permission is granted for a fee of $55.00. This fee is payable upon signing;

Full credit must be given on every copy reproduced as follows:

Reprinted with permission of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.  
from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew W. Halpin. © Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1963.

If you are in agreement, please sign both copies of this letter in the space provided below and return one copy and your remittance to this department.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Agnes Fisher  
Contracts Supervisor

AGREED TO AND ACCEPTED:

BEVERLY W. BRAXTON
Appendix I

G W. Carver Elementary School
1110 West Leigh Street
Richmond, Virginia 23220

May 18, 1981

Dr. Neil Pedersen
Director of Planning and Development
Richmond Public Schools
301 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dear Dr. Pedersen:

I am pursuing a doctoral degree in Educational Administration at William and Mary College. Part of my doctoral work is studying the relationship between student self concept and the organizational climate of 25 elementary schools in an urban school district. This study is under the direction of Dr. William Bullock, Professor of Education at William and Mary.

In order to complete this research study, I am requesting that your office initiate approval proceedings for the collection of data from 25 elementary schools in the Richmond School System. Twenty fifth grade students selected randomly from each school will be administered the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Rating Scale. The fifth grade teachers and the building principals will be requested to complete the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Completion of both instruments should take approximately 30 minutes. I shall assume full responsibility for securing voluntary participation of principals, teachers and students to complete the questionnaire and scale without requiring staff in schools to perform the task. Most principals have already indicated their willingness to participate in the study.

Approval of my proposal has been granted by my dissertation committee. If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me. Please find enclosed a copy of my dissertation proposal, a research request form and the twenty-five schools selected for the study.

Your prompt action would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Beverly W. Braxton

BWB:rl
Enclosure
REFERENCES


Austin, G. R. Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness. Educational Leadership, 1979, 37, 10-14.


Bradfield, L. E. *Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1964.


Briner, C. *Organizational Structure Teacher Personality Characteristics and Their Relationship to Organizational Climate.* California: Claremont Graduate School, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 040 510)


Drews, E. M. *The Effectiveness of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Ability Grouping in Ninth Grade English Classes with Slow, Average and Superior Students*. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, 1962.


Edmonds, R. Effective Schools for the Urban Poor. Educational Leadership, 1979, 37, 15-23.


Farls, R. J. High and Low Achievement of Intellectually Average Intermediate Grade Students Related to the Self-Concept and Social Approval (Doctoral dissertation). Dissertation


Feldvebel, A. M. Organizational Climate, Social Class and Educational Output. *Administrator's Notebook,* 1964, XII, 86.


Flanders, R. E. The Relationship of Selected Variables to the Organizational Climate of the Elementary School (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1967). *Dissertation Abstracts International.* (University Microfilms No. 66-13598)
Flizak, C. W. Organizational Structure and Teacher Role-Orientation. 


Fox, R. S. School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973


Good, T., & Brophy, J. Behavioral Expression of Teacher Attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1972, **63**, 617-624.


Jersild, A. T. *In Search of Self*. New York: Bureau of Publica-
tions, Teachers College, 1952.

Jersild, A. T. *When Teachers Face Themselves*. New York: Teachers

Jewell, J. S. An Analysis of the Effects of Multigrading on a
Number of Noncognitive Variables (Doctoral dissertation,
71-16, 961)

Johnson, A. A. A Study of the Relationship Between Nonpromotion
and the Male Student's Self-Concept of Academic Ability and
His Perceived Parental, Friends' and Teachers' Evaluation of
His Academic Ability (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State
University, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*,
1968, *29*, 409-A. (University Microfilms No. 76.68-11, 059)

Kash, M. M., Borich, G. D., & Fenton, K. L. *Teacher Behavior and
Pupil Self Concept*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing
Co., 1978.

Keadle, M. E. A Study of the Relationships Between the Perceptions
of Teachers of the Organizational Climate and Selected Cognitive
and Non-Cognitive Variables Associated with Elementary Students
(Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1976).

(University Microfilms No. 76-27, 400)


Koplyay, J. B., & Mathis, C. The Relationship Between Teacher Morale and Organizational Climate. Northwestern University, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 266)


McKay, A. B. Principals, Teachers and Elementary Youth: A Study of the Relationships Between Selected Variables of Teacher-Principal Social Interaction and Six Features of the Educational

McQuire, W. J., Fujioka, T., & McQuire, C. V. The Place of School in the Child's Self Concept. Impact on Instructional Improvement, 1979, 15, 3-10.


Piers, E. V., & Harris, D. B. *Age and Other Correlates of Self Concept in Children*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1964, 55, 91-95.


Ranyard, R. W.  *The Organizational Climate and Organizational Structure of Elementary Schools.* Tampa, Fla.: South Florida University, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 043 138)


Stansbury, R. D. A Validation Study of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Iowa Elementary Schools (Doctoral


Vita

Beverly Whitaker-Braxton

Birthdate: June 24, 1943
Birthplace: Richmond, Virginia

Education:

1977 - 1982 The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Williamsburg, Virginia
Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study in Education
Doctor of Education

1964 - 1967 Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Master of Education

1960 - 1963 Virginia Union University
Richmond, Virginia
Bachelor of Arts

Professional Experience:

1963 - 1967 Teacher of English at Armstrong High School
Richmond, Virginia

1967 - 1970 Consultant/Teacher of Reading

1970 - 1973 Consultant/Teacher of Reading for Title I
Reading Program

1973 - 1974 Curriculum Specialist at George H. Reid
Elementary School, Richmond, Virginia

1974 - 1976 Supervisor of Reading, Area I
Richmond Public Schools

1976 - 1977 Assistant Principal at Binford Middle School
Richmond, Virginia

1977 - 1979 Principal at Baker Elementary School
Richmond, Virginia

1978 - Present Principal at George W. Carver Elementary
School, Richmond, Virginia
Abstract

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND STUDENT SELF CONCEPT

Beverly Whitaker-Braxton, Ed.D.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia, June 1982

Chairman: Professor William Bullock, Jr.

This study explored the effects of school organizational climate on student self concept development. Its purpose was to investigate the relationship between organizational climate and student self concept in selected elementary schools in an urban school district in Virginia.

The population of this study included 500 fifth grade students, 89 fifth grade teachers, and 25 principals in 25 elementary schools. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) was used to assess teacher and principal perception of the organizational climate. The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (CSCS) was used to assess student self concept.

It was hypothesized that 1) a relationship exists between the mean student self concept and the organizational climate of schools and 2) that there is a significant difference between the mean student self concept scores of the five schools with the most open organizational climates and the five schools with the most closed organizational climates.

Analysis of variance was employed to determine significant differences between student self concept in the schools with more open climate and more closed climate. The results of the analysis did not support the first hypothesis. Analysis of covariance was employed to examine significant differences between student self concept scores of the five most open schools and the five most closed schools. Covariates were SRA composite scores and school size. The second hypothesis was not supported by this analysis.

It was concluded that while there were differences between elementary schools in terms of organizational climate and student self concept, these differences were not significant. The findings do not support the notion that the self concepts of children attending open climate schools differ significantly from those attending closed climate schools.

Further study is needed to evaluate the relationship between student self concept and organizational climate.