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A COMPARISON OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF SCHOOLS ADMINISTERED BY FEMALE AND MALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Abstract of the Dissertation

The purpose of this study was to compare the organizational climate of schools administered by female elementary school principals with those administered by male elementary school principals as perceived by teachers. A comparison was made to determine differences in the perception of teachers of (1) organizational climate, (2) specific behaviors of each group of principals, and (3) specific behaviors of the staffs working with each group of principals.

The population for this study was comprised of teachers in public schools which serve pupils in kindergarten through grade eight or any portion thereof. A random selection of fifteen staffs working with female principals and fifteen staffs working with male principals comprised the sample. The total number of participants in this study was 527 which represented 91% of the teachers of the selected staffs. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, developed by Halpin and Croft, was used to assess the organizational climate, the specific behaviors of the principals and the analyses of crosstabulation and the multivariate analyses of variance.

As a result of the study the following conclusions were drawn:

1) There was no significant difference in organizational climate between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals as perceived by teachers.
2) There was no significant difference between female principals and male principals with regard to the leader behavior, Consideration, (friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth) as perceived by teachers.
3) There were significant differences between female principals and male principals with regard to the leader behaviors of Thrust, Production Emphasis, and Aloofness as perceived by teachers; that is, female principals exhibited greater concern with moving the organization toward its goals, with closer monitoring of teachers, and with being guided by rules and policies.
4) There were no significant differences in the perceptions of the staffs of female principals and the staffs of male principals with regard to the staff behaviors of Hindrance (the degree to which teachers feel their work is hindered by routine duties and busy work); Esprit (morale); and Intimacy (the enjoyment of friendly social relations).
5) There was a significant difference in the perceptions of the staffs of female principals and the staffs of male principals with regard to the staff behavior of Disengagement; that is, the staffs of male principals perceived themselves as "going through the motions" of problem solving more than did the staffs of female principals.
6) Generally there were no significant interaction effects between sex of principal and sex and/or age of teacher. There appeared to be greater interaction effect between sex of principal and numbers of years of experience of teachers than the other two relationships investigated.

It was concluded that females are perceived by teachers as being as competent in leadership roles in elementary schools as males.

The following recommendations for future studies were made:

1) A study of current trends in recruitment practices in the selection of administrative personnel.
2) A study of perceptions of superintendents and board members regarding females in leadership roles.
3) A study of financial remuneration and assignment of titles of females as compared to males with comparable responsibilities.
4) A study of role conflict due to cultural expectations among females in leadership positions.
5) A study of promotion practices in schools at all levels as well as in business fields.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade the potential role of women in the work force of the United States was enhanced by legislative action at the federal level. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act which was approved on July 2, 1964 prohibits discrimination based on sex in addition to the usual grounds of race, color, religion and national origin. It is now unlawful for an employer to discriminate on the basis of sex in (1) hiring or firing, (2) wages, terms, conditions or privileges of employment, (3) classifying, assigning or promoting employees, and (4) training, retraining or providing apprenticeships.\(^1\) The Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women considers Title VII a congressional mandate for full economic opportunity for women.\(^2\) The federal government, in essence, is committed to the view that "women are people and people are equal in a democracy."\(^3\) However, regardless of legislative action by the federal

\(^1\) Women's Bureau, Laws on Sex Discrimination in Employment, Federal Civil Rights Act, Title VIII, State Fair Employment Practices Laws, Executive Orders (Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, 1970), ED 052 513, p. 4


government and fair employment practices acts by the states, the profile of the nation's work force "continues to reveal a heavy concentration of women in lower grade levels and clerical positions although the total number of women continue to increase"; and concurrently, within the jurisdiction of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, discrimination because of sex was cited in 24 percent or 2,003 of the cases in 1967.

Judging by these figures, it is difficult to agree completely with the latter part of Cohen's statement that "old myths about a woman's intelligence and performance still persist, although some progress has been made in beating them down." It is apparent that progress, in this sense, has not been made in the public elementary school setting of the United States; for what was once, and still is, predominantly a woman's arena, the women's role in administration of the schools has diminished.

Statement of the Problem

Historically, women have had difficulty in occupational choices


5 California University Los Angeles Extension Service, op. cit., p. iv.


and opportunities; Heist and Wallin reported that women face difficulties in career choices; after concluding their studies, Leland and Siegal and Curtis also confirmed that women have difficulty in the selection of careers due to assumptions regarding the role of women in our culture. Furthermore, studies of Astin, Ginder, Freeman, Noland and Bakke, and Pietrofess and Schlossberg report that there is discrimination against women in employment opportunities. Whereas

8California University Los Angeles Extension Service, op. cit.
the role of women in the labor force has expanded, the role women have
played in the professional and semi-professional fields has not. In
1940, 45 percent of all the professional and technical positions were
held by men, and 55 percent were held by women. In 1969, however,
women held only 37 percent of such jobs. 18

In the public schools in the United States, the professional
staff is composed predominantly of women. In 1970-71, 1,366,830 or
67.2 percent of the full time teachers were women. Women comprised
67.4 percent of the auxiliary staff (librarians, counselors, nurses,
psychologists, etc.) as well; however, in the area of administration,
the percentage of women is low: 15.3 percent principals, 15.0 percent
assistant principals, 25.9 percent central office administrators. 19

The proportion of female elementary school principals has decreased from
55.0 percent in 1928, 41.0 percent in 1948, 38.0 percent in 1958, 22.0
percent in 1964 20 to 21.0 percent in 1971. 21

The decline of women in elementary school principalships, as
indicated by both the DESP 22 and NEA 23 studies, raises a question

---

18 Women's Bureau, Underutilization of Women Workers (Washington,
20 Department of Elementary School Principals, The Elementary
School Principalship in 1968 (Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary
22 Department of Elementary School Principals, op. cit.
regarding the proper utilization of women in this segment of our labor force.

The problem of this study is related to the lack of females in administrative positions in elementary schools. Are men perceived to demonstrate more leader behavior than women in actual practice? Is the organizational climate of schools administered by females different than those administered by males? In order for public school administrators to better utilize females in leadership positions, they must know if female administrators are perceived to be as effective in fostering an organizational climate similar to their male counterparts; this information is vital in recruitment, training and placement.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to compare the organizational climate of schools administered by females with those administered by males. Organizational climate of a school can be affected by many variables, for example the physical plant and the interaction and/or support of the community for the school; however, the elements investigated in this study were limited to the interaction between principal and staff and the interaction among the staff. The specific leader behaviors of the principals investigated were Consideration, Production Emphasis, Aloofness, and Thrust; and characteristics of the staff investigated were Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit and

---

Intimacy. Staff members of female and male elementary school principals were surveyed.

Procedure of the Study

The writer, a public school administrator, was concerned with the lack of women in line positions in the public school system and with the explicit and implicit attitudes regarding suitability of women for leadership positions. A review of dissertation abstracts and ERIC documents revealed very few studies of women's performance and the effect of their performance related to the organizational climate of elementary schools as compared to their male counterparts. The statement of the problem of this study thus took form from the concerns of the writer and from the lack of research in the area. The literature with assistance from a computer search of ERIC documents by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, was thoroughly researched.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, a questionnaire widely known in the field of administration, was selected as the tool to collect data; those surveyed for the data were teachers working with female principals and those working with male principals in a county. The instrument was administered at the school site in group situations. Brief biographical information was collected from the respondents.

The data were collected and analyzed to determine if female and male elementary school principals are perceived to maintain different
organizational climates. Further analyses were made to determine if respondents differed in their perception according to sex, age, and years of experience in public school work. Recommendations for future studies and for general implementation in the public schools were also included in the study.

**Hypotheses of the Study**

The study was based on the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1.** There is a significant difference in organizational climate between those schools administered by female principals in comparison to those administered by males, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 2.** There is a significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Consideration, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 3.** There is a significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Thrust, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 4.** There is a significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Production Emphasis, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 5.** There is a significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Aloofness, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 6.** There is a significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in
regard to Hindrance, as perceived by teachers.

Hypothesis 7. There is a significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Disengagement, as perceived by teachers.

Hypothesis 8. There is a significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Esprit, as perceived by teachers.

Hypothesis 9. There is a significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Intimacy, as perceived by teachers.

In addition to these hypotheses, the study determined if there is a difference in perception of the principal's behavior between female and male respondents. Furthermore, the study determined if there are differences in perception among respondents according to age and according to numbers of years of experience in public school work.

Significance of the Study

The study is significant for the following reasons:

1. The results may increase the understanding of the competencies and/or suitability of females for administrative work and for maintaining suitable organizational climate. Women are assumed to be unsuited for administrative positions. Ginder reported that the results of a 1960 study conducted by the National Office Management Association indicated that men were favored over women as supervisors. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents preferred men, whereas only 11
percent favored female supervisors. Ginder concluded, "whether or not women make effective supervisors, employers and workers alike frequently seem to believe that women supervisors are not as effective as men. To the extent that this belief guides hiring and promotion policies, supervisory and executive jobs will tend to be reserved for men." 

Furthermore, men are considered to command more respect than women, therefore, are better suited for management positions.

In the teaching profession, Saunders studied the attitudes of select superintendents and school board members and found that the opportunities for women to pursue administrative careers are limited inasmuch as in a choice between two candidates equally qualified, one male and one female, the male would be chosen. Secondly, women are likely to be appointed to staff positions as opposed to superintendencies or principalships. In addition, Schriber concluded that men tend to select men more often than women for administrative positions, and since there are more men than women in public school administrative work the men, in essence, are perpetuating their own kind in these

25 Ginder, op. cit.

26 Noland and Bakke, op. cit.


29 Department of Elementary School Principals, op. cit.
positions.

2. **The results of the study may acknowledge the achievements of women and provide data to support bringing personnel practices in closer accord with merit by eliminating some of the myths and fallacies which have in the past all but denied women entry into certain occupations, especially administrative positions.** Elizabeth Kuck, a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, stated that even after the enactment of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, "Women applicants for professional jobs are still asked about their typing and shorthand skills no matter what their educational achievements."\(^{30}\) Furthermore, opportunities for women in administrative positions are still limited. Koontz states that "barriers are still high against employing women in professions other than those traditionally associated with women, and many of the myths regarding women's ability to hold administrative and managerial positions still prevail."\(^{31}\)

3. **The results of the study may encourage women to seek employment opportunities in management and administration.** Women have many motivating factors which lead them to work: they want to make constructive and creative use of their time; they want to improve the family's standard of living; they want to help send the children to college; they want to help buy a new house, etc.\(^{32}\) However, the

---

\(^{30}\)California University Los Angeles Extension Service, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

\(^{31}\)Women's Bureau, *op. cit.*

unemployment among women, and "the underutilization of American women continues to be the most tragic and most senseless waste of this country."\textsuperscript{33}

4. The results of the study may help to identify an area in which greater efforts must be made to insure equal opportunities for women. The report from the President's Commission on the Status of Women appointed by John F. Kennedy included a statement that "greater development of women's potential and fuller use of their abilities can greatly enhance the quality of American life."\textsuperscript{34} Furthermore, the Commission stated that failure to utilize the talents and abilities of all our citizens diminishes our total effort and deprives the economy of workers needed for domestic programs.\textsuperscript{35} For the professionally ambitious woman, the results of the study may be particularly significant because this group "is doubly handicapped in the attainment of her goals, handicapped by the prejudice and competition of men and by the lesser professional ambitions of most women and the employment policies which take account of that lesser ambition."\textsuperscript{36}

Definitions

For the purpose of this study the following definitions were

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p. 3.

used:

**Principal.** Full time chief building administrator of a public school having grades K-8 or any portion thereof. Schools excepted are those designated as (a) schools maintained solely for educationally handicapped, mentally handicapped and/or physically handicapped (deaf, hard of hearing, blind or orthopedically handicapped) or a combination thereof, and (b) juvenile halls.

**Teachers.** All full time certificated staff members assigned on a full time basis to the school of the principals selected.

**Consideration.** Behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the staff. 37

**Thrust.** Behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization," the principal's effort to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets. 38

**Production Emphasis.** Behavior by the principal demonstrating close supervision of the staff and demonstrating the role of a "straw boss," behavior in which communication is one way and which does not demonstrate sensitivity to feedback from the staff. 39

**Aloofness.** Behavior by the principal which is characterized

---


38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.
as formal and impersonal; behavior which demonstrates that the principal prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal with teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation.\textsuperscript{40}

\textbf{Hindrance.} The teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary busy work. The teachers perceive that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work.\textsuperscript{41}

\textbf{Disengagement.} This dimension describes the degree to which a group is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand.\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{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 jobs.\textsuperscript{43}

\textbf{Intimacy.} This dimension refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other.\textsuperscript{44}

\textbf{Organizational climate.} Personality of the school; the psychological dynamics of the members of the group.\textsuperscript{45} The global assessment

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{41} Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, \textit{The Organizational Climate of Schools} (Report Developed by HEW, 1962), p. 40.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., pp. 1-5.
of the interaction between the task-achievement dimension and the needs satisfaction dimension within the organization.  

Limitations

The study has the following limitations:

1. The facets of organizational climate investigated in this study are limited to those interactions between the staff and the principal and among the staff.

2. No attempt is made to determine the reason(s) for the perception of those surveyed.

3. The study is limited to principals working in public elementary schools.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. A description of the contents of each of the chapters follows:

Chapter I includes the introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, and the purpose of the study. It also includes the procedure followed to plan and implement the study. The significance of the study, the definitions of select terms used in the study and the

---


limitations are included. Chapter I also contains a description of the study.

Chapter II is devoted to a review of the literature and research related to the role of women as leaders in education and to organizational climate. The chapter is divided into four main sections. The first section includes a review of the literature and research on the role of women in the labor force. The second section includes a review of the literature and research on the role of women in public school work. The third part includes a review of the literature and research regarding leadership and includes a sub-section on the approaches to study leadership. Another sub-section of this section focuses on the role of women in administration and management. The fourth section includes a review of literature and research on organizational climate.

The methodology and procedures of the study are described in Chapter III. The chapter includes a description of the study, of the population and sample selection procedures and the methodology to collect data. The instrument used is described in Chapter III and the hypotheses are stated in null form.

The data collected are presented in Chapter IV. The analyses of the data and the findings of the study are reported.

Chapter V includes the conclusions of the study. Recommendations for future studies are included.
Summary

The first chapter of this study indicated that the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act has the potential of ending discrimination based on sex for full equal employment opportunities for women; however, women are far from reaching that goal. Also included in the chapter were the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study. The chapter included the procedure which was followed in the study, the hypotheses which were tested, the significance of the study and a list of definitions of significant terms. The chapter also included the limitations of the study and a description of the study.

The following chapter includes a review of the literature related to the role of women in the general labor force. A review of the literature regarding the role of women in the public schools of the United States and the role of women in leadership roles in schools is also included.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

The literature and research related to the role of women as leaders in education and to organizational climate are reviewed in this chapter. The role of women in the general labor force and the role of women in the public schools of the United States are described in the first section. The second section includes a review of the literature and research regarding leadership, and methods used to study leadership. The third section includes a review of literature and research on organizational climate.

The Role of Women in the Labor Force

The role of women in the United States has changed during the past century. There have been a number of forces in our society which have contributed to this change; among those forces are the advancement in technology and the shift of population from a rural to an urban setting.¹

During most of the nineteenth century this country was predominantly agricultural. The pioneer family typically worked the soil together mainly to feed and clothe themselves. The pioneer woman

typically raised farm animals and grew vegetables and fruits to insure the family food supply. She made clothes for the family out of wool and/or flax. The goods she produced were often used as a trade for other commodities which were not available on her farm: butter, eggs, jelly, pickles, bread and other goods were sold and traded. Thus, the work of women was concerned with insuring the abundance of the food supply and other necessities on a day-to-day basis, as well as providing produce which could be used to secure other needed goods. The pioneer woman, therefore, was a farm hand, housewife, seamstress, producer, processor and seller of foods, as well as nurse, cleaning woman, companion and mother. Her life was a hard one and she toiled daily from before sunrise to late at night without benefit of electricity or gas power, running water and other modern conveniences.  

In the cities women contributed to the meager income of the family by sewing buttons on trousers, by being a laundress, by providing domestic service as housekeepers, chambermaids, cooks, and servants. In the major cities many women earned money by working in factories as early as the first part of the nineteenth century. Women spun and wove fabrics in the textile mills in the New England states. By 1890 there were approximately a million women working in factor-

---


ies. A large group of women was employed as teachers and nurses; however, other professions were exclusively for men. Smuts concluded that around 1890 teaching, domestic services and manufacturing employed the largest number of women and that they outnumbered male workers. Furthermore, he states that by 1890 a growing number of women were working in retail sales and in office jobs.

As the population in this country shifted from rural agricultural to urban and as the technology on the farm increased, women's work changed. The new farm machinery decreased the need for women's work on the farm; technology decreased the need for her labor in textile mills, in food processing and home sewing. Her role in the family changed as families became smaller, as the physical needs of the family became more accessible, as children began to spend more time in school. Although the nature of her occupation changed, women have continued to provide an extensive amount of energy in the labor force of the United States. In 1969, thirty-one million women from the ages of 16 to 70 were in the labor force; they represented every color and creed; they represented the farms, suburbs and cities. New job opportunities, educational advancement, increased leisure time, the

5 Smuts, op. cit., p. 20.
6 Ibid., p. 24.
8 Ibid.
desire for financial independence and the desire to improve the family's standard of living\(^9\) have all encouraged women to stay in the labor force. As indicated in Table I the percentage of women in the labor force has been slowly increasing during the past ten years.\(^{10}\)

### Table 1

The Number and Proportion of Females in the Total Labor Force During 1960-1970 Categorized by Age\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Labor Force (in millions)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 16-19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 20-24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25-34</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35-44</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 45-64</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65 and over</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of the abundance of women in the labor force, equal opportunity for women continues to be a problem. In our own federal government, for example, one hundred ten years elapsed from the time the federal government hired its first female, a postmistress, to the

\(^9\)Cohen, \textit{op. cit.}


\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. xvi.
time the Treasury Department hired women clerks. In 1883 the Civil Service Act encouraged women to compete in civil service examinations on the same basis as men; however, equal pay for equal work between the sexes did not become a reality until 1923. 12

Kreps found that one-fourth of all employed women work in one of five occupations. They are secretary-stenographer, household worker, bookkeeper, elementary school teacher or waitress. 13 She further states that although 42 percent of all bachelor's degrees are earned by women, women account for less than ten percent of the engineers, seven percent of the physicians, fifteen percent of the salaried managers and officials and twenty-one percent of the professional workers outside the traditional female fields of health and education. 14 From their study, the U.S. Women's Bureau concluded that the educational background of many women is not being fully utilized in their jobs 15 and "failure to utilize fully the talents and abilities of women diminishes our total productive effort, deprives the economy of workers needed for vital domestic programs and has a depressing effect on the whole job structure." 16

14 Ibid., pp. 47-48.
15 Women's Bureau, Underutilization of Women Workers, op. cit., p. 18.
16 Ibid., p. ii.
Since the enactment of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act on July 2, 1964, it is now illegal for an employer to discriminate on the basis of sex in providing employment opportunities. However, the Civil Rights Commission continues to report large numbers of grievances filed regarding discrimination cases based on sex.

The Role of Women in Public School Work

The role women have played in the education of children of this country began before the birth of this nation. Dexter states that "by 1670 or 1680 the common schools were frequently taught by women," and that "it is apparent that pre-Revolutionary women played an important part as elementary teacher, as school dames in the town school, as mistress of the boarding school and as governess." Smuts notes that it was common for young girls in the rural south and the midwest to supplement the family's cash resources by teaching school. He further states that "a quarter million school teachers made up the only other large group (other than factory workers) of women employed outside their homes" and it seems that during the early part of the nineteenth century, teaching was virtually the only job of a professional

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{17}}\text{Dexter, op. cit., p. 79.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{18}}\text{Ibid., p. 97.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{19}}\text{Smuts, op. cit., pp. 8-9.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{20}}\text{Ibid., p. 19.}\]
nature which was available to women with some education. Because of the limitations of job opportunities, young women were often willing to teach at one-half or one-third of what men received for the same task. In 1857, the average salary for men teachers in Pennsylvania was $24.00 a month compared to $16.60 for women; in Wisconsin, $24.60 compared to $15.16; in Indiana, $24.00 compared to $17.00, and in Massachusetts, $46.63 compared to $19.70 for women.

Women teachers were not allowed membership in the National Teachers Association when the organization was established in 1857. It was not until 1866 that the restriction of women was dropped.

During and after the Civil War the percentage of women teachers increased, and by 1870 women teachers outnumbered men teachers by 123,000 to 78,000. The percentage of male teachers in public elementary schools has fluctuated somewhat during the past 100 years, but at the present the percentage is somewhat the same as it was 100 years ago. See Table 2.

The range of the number of years of public school experience of men teachers and women teachers is comparable. In 1970, 25.1 percent of the men teachers had one to three years of experience as

---

21 Ibid.
23 Ibid., p. 323.
24 Ibid., p. 324.
Table 2
Number of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers from 1869-70 to 1967-68 Categorized by Sex26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male Teachers</th>
<th>Female Teachers</th>
<th>Percent of Teachers Who are Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869-70</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-80</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-90</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1900</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>296,000</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-10</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>413,000</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-30</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>703,000</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>681,000</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>719,000</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>402,000</td>
<td>985,000</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>568,000</td>
<td>1,218,000</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>616,000</td>
<td>1,341,000</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

compared to 23.4 percent for the women; 18.3 percent of the men had four to six years of experience as compared to 18.1 percent of the women teachers; 13.6 percent had seven to nine years of experience compared to 9.9 percent of the women; 18.1 percent of the men had 10-14 years of experience as compared to 14.6 percent of the women teachers; 10.5 percent of the men had 15-19 years of experience compared to 10.0 percent of the women, and 16.7 percent of the men compared to 14.5 percent of the women had 20 plus years of public school experience.27

26 Ibid., pp. 54-55.
Although the range of years of public school experience is somewhat similar, an NEA survey of 1971-72 salaries shows that the mean salary of men teachers' contracts is $9,854 as compared to $8,953 for women.  

The number of women in leadership roles in the major national professional organization has not been representative of the members of the profession. Although women outnumbered men two to one in 1870, there were objections to women holding office in the organization; however, in spite of these objections a few women were elected. During the years from 1871-1907 there were 34 presidents of the elementary department; 11 of these were women. Of the total of 102 officers during the same time, 40 were women. 

In 1910 a woman was elected to the presidency of NEA for the first time. She was Ella Flagg Young, who was superintendent of the Chicago schools. Between 1917 and 1945, a woman was elected to the presidency every odd-numbered year, and since 1945 the situation has been reversed, with a woman elected on even-numbered years and men elected on odd-numbered years. 

At the elementary school level, the percentage of women as

---

28 Elizabeth Koontz, The Best Kept Secret of the Past 5,000 Years: Women are Ready for Leadership in Education (Bloomington, Indiana: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1972), p. 44.
29 Wesley, op. cit., p. 325.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid., p. 327.
public elementary school principals has diminished from 55.0 percent in 1928\textsuperscript{33} to 21.0 percent in 1971.\textsuperscript{34} In a survey conducted by DESP in 1968, the median age of the 1,463 male principals in the sample was 43. The median age of the women principals was 56.\textsuperscript{35} The DESP report showed that in 1968 women entered the principalship later in their careers than did men: approximately 24 percent of the men had zero or one years of classroom experience prior to becoming a principal, whereas only 1.7 percent of the women fell into this category; 59.2 percent of the men and 23.4 percent of the women had two to nine years of classroom experience; 14.6 percent of the men and 40.7 percent of the women had 10-19 years of experience; 2.3 percent of the men as compared to 29.0 percent of the women had 20-29 years of classroom teaching experience, and .2 percent of the men and 5.3 percent of the women had 30 or more years of classroom experience before becoming a principal.\textsuperscript{36} Approximately 60 percent of the men and 61.2 percent of the women had served in only one school; 25.6 percent of the men and 20.3 percent of the women had served in two schools, and 15.3 percent of the men and 18.5 percent of the women had served in three or more schools.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{33}Department of Elementary School Principals, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{34}"Professional Women," NEA, p. 67.

\textsuperscript{35}Department of Elementary School Principals, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 20.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., p. 23.
Although 63.9 percent of all the full time professional staff of all public schools were women, during the 1970-71 school year only 13,186 or 19.6 percent of the administrative and supervisory positions such as principals, superintendents, assistant superintendents, in the public schools were filled by women.\textsuperscript{38} Further specifics regarding such positions are shown in Table 3.

It is apparent that historically and in the contemporary scene women have dominated the teaching profession numerically; however, women have had a limited role in leadership positions. Kreps states, "Perhaps no other profession is now the focus of as much criticism for its alleged discrimination against women" than the public school system.\textsuperscript{39}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>2,034,581</td>
<td>667,751</td>
<td>1,366,830</td>
<td>32.8 67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>47,714</td>
<td>37,673</td>
<td>10,041</td>
<td>79.0 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>8,782</td>
<td>8,472</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>96.5 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Principal</td>
<td>5,119</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>66.2 33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>6,777</td>
<td>6,022</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>88.9 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>14,379</td>
<td>14,289</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99.4 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Supt.</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92.5 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Supt.</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>97.1 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All</td>
<td>2,302,212</td>
<td>850,862</td>
<td>1,471,350</td>
<td>36.1 63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{38}"Professional Women," NEA, p. 67.

\textsuperscript{39}Kreps, op. cit., p. 48.

\textsuperscript{40}"Professional Women," NEA, p. 68.
Leadership

This section of the chapter is concerned with leadership. The section begins with a review of the literature and research on the historical perspective of leadership and the study of leadership. The final pages are devoted to an investigation of women in leadership positions.

Historical Perspective of Leadership

One of the early pioneers in the study of administration was Frederick Taylor. Taylor emphasized increased output through greater efficiency through "scientific management." Thus, the effective leader was one who was proficient as an "efficiency expert." Henri Fayol was another early pioneer in studying administration. He described the tasks of administration as follows:

1. To plan, to study the future and arrange the plan of operation.
2. To organize, to build up the material and human organization of the business, organizing both men and materials.
3. To command, to make the staff do their work.
4. To coordinate, to unite and correlate all activities.
5. To control, to see that everything is done in accordance with the rules which have been laid down and the instructions which have been given.

---

42 Ibid., p. 38.
Fayol viewed administration as a responsibility of many in an organization. He felt that everyone should participate to some extent in administration, although some would have more participation and responsibility than others.  

The era of scientific management reached its maximum popularity from 1910-1925; the theories of Taylor and Fayol and those of Gulick and Urwick are most often cited. Gulick and Urwick enlarged Fayol's list of elements to describe the functions of administration; thus, POSDCORB, an acronym for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting became the starting point for many writers in the various areas of administration. The leader was viewed as an efficiency expert or as an "organizational engineer." The important tasks of the leader were those concerned with (1) authority, (2) delineation of responsibility and its relationship to authority, (3) authority delegated in consideration of a unity of command, and (4) the relationship of line and staff.  

The human relations movement influenced management during the late 1930's and during the 1940's. Follett, Mayo and Roethlisberger

---

44 Ibid.


47 Owens, op. cit., p. 10.
were among the leaders in developing the human relations concept in administration; the concepts included those related to morale, group dynamics, democratic supervision and personnel relations.\textsuperscript{48}

In recent times Getzels and Guba are among the most influential advocates in advancing the concept of administration as a social process. In their article, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," they theorize that the process of administration deals primarily with the conduct of social behavior in a hierarchical setting.\textsuperscript{49} They state that:

Structurally, we may conceive of administration as a series of superordinate-subordinate relationships within a social system. Functionally, this hierarchy of relationships is the locus for allocating and integrating roles, personnel, and facilities to achieve the goals of the system.\textsuperscript{50}

In their theoretical model Getzels-Guba maintain that the social system is comprised of two major classes of phenomena. One is the institution (nomothetic dimension) which has certain roles and expectations which will fulfill the goals of the system, and there are individuals (idiographic dimension) in the system; these individuals have certain personalities and needs. Thus, Getzels and Guba state that the task of the leaders in an organization is to consider and "integrate the demands of the institutions and the demands of the staff members in a way that it

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., p. 424.
is at once organizationally productive and individually fulfilling."

Thus we find that the concepts about leaders have changed through the years from that of an efficiency expert concerned primarily with production output to that of emphasizing the human element to that of recognizing the need for balance between the goals of the organization and the needs of the individuals. The historical progression of the concept of leadership behavior is somewhat analogous to the leadership-followership styles identified by Getzels-Guba: the nomothetic which emphasizes the requirements of the institution and the transactional style which recognizes the need for an awareness of the needs and the limits of both the individual and the institution.

Study of Leadership

There have been many approaches to the study of leadership. Historically, leadership studies were character-trait studies. These studies focused on the individual characteristics of effective leaders as predictors of administrative performance. Owens identified the following as common traits of leaders: intelligence, imagination, perseverance, and emotional stability. Barnard listed the five qualities characteristic of leaders as vitality and endurance, decisiveness, persuasiveness, responsibility, and intellectual capacity.

---

51 Ibid., p. 430.
52 Owens, op. cit., p. 119.
Pierce and Merrill found the following to be characteristic of leaders: intelligence; knowledge; insight; originality and adaptability; initiative, persistance and ambition; judgment, responsibility, integrity, conviction and self-confidence; dominance, and popularity and prestige. Other characteristics were: disposition (humor, constancy of mood and emotional stability); cooperation; social activity and mobility; and fluency of speech. 54

Stogdill identified the following as traits possessed by leaders: intelligence, scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibilities, and socio-economic status. However, Stogdill concluded that a combination of traits alone does not make a leader; it was Stogdill's contention that a person becomes a leader through the interaction with the group with which he is working. 55

Another approach to the study of leadership which became popular in the 1940's was the "Times Makes the Man" approach. Morphet, Johns and Reller credit this approach for possibly giving "emphasis to the need for studying the leader in relation to his social environment." 56


Another approach was the situational approach. This approach studies the leader in relation to a particular situation. School administrators typically work with at least four different groups of people who influence the manner in which he performs the administrative functions of a school: the community, the Board of Education, the school district organization and the organized profession.57

During the past two decades, the study of leadership has centered on a behavioral-oriented approach. This approach is concerned with educational leadership defined as "that action or behavior among individuals or groups which causes both the individual and group to move toward educational goals that are increasingly mutually acceptable to them."58

Barnard was among the first to relate the importance of the followers to the leader. In discussing the function of the executive, Barnard stated that the control from the view of the effectiveness of the whole organization is never unimportant and is sometimes of critical importance; but it is in connection with efficiency (cooperation and individual satisfaction), which in the last analysis embraces effectiveness, that the viewpoint of the whole is necessarily dominant.59


In discussing leadership, contemporary theorists describe, define and study leadership in context with followers/groups.

The impact of groups on leaders was studied extensively by Hemphill. As a result of his study, he identified fifteen dimensions of groups:

1. Size, the number of persons in a group.
2. Viscidity, the feeling of togetherness or cohesion of the group.
3. Homogeneity, the similarity of group members to each other.
4. Flexibility, the degree to which the group adheres to fixed modes of behavior.
5. Permeability, the degree to which the group maintains an exclusive membership.
6. Polarization, the degree to which the group's goals are clear and definite.
7. Stability, the degree of turnover in group membership.
8. Intimacy, the degree of mutual acquaintance.
9. Autonomy, the degree of independence from other groups.
10. Control, the amount of control the group exercises over its members.
11. Position, the status of each member within the group.
12. Potency, the extent to which vital individual needs are satisfied by group membership.
13. Hedonic tone, the degree of satisfaction group members obtain from group membership.
14. Participation, the spread of participation among group members.

---

60 John K. Hemphill, Situational Factors in Leadership (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1949).
15. Dependence, the degree to which group members depend upon the group leader. Halpin maintains that the leaders are always confronted with the task of the organization and with two duties: (1) as a problem solver/decision-maker, and (2) as a group leader. As a group leader, the leader is committed not only to how well the group accomplishes the group task, but also to how well the group remains intact as a group; their morale and cooperation among the group members are as important as the group task. Shartle identified the leader as an individual who exercises positive influence acts upon others, an individual who exercises more important positive influence acts than any other member of the group or organization he is in, an individual who exercises most influence in goal-setting or goal achievement of the group or organization, an individual elected by a group as a leader and/or an individual in a given office or position of apparently high influence potential.

Morphet, et al. defined leadership as "the influencing of the actions, behaviors, beliefs, and feelings of one actor in a social system by another actor with the willing cooperation of the actor.

---

61 Ibid., pp. 31-33.
They describe leadership acts as those of (1) helping a group to define tasks, goals and purposes, (2) helping a group to achieve its tasks, goals and purposes, (3) helping to maintain the group by assisting in providing for group and individual needs. Wiles describes leadership as a matter of helping a group release its full ability, much as a catalytic agent promotes reaction.

Myers investigated studies related to leadership and the relationship of leaders to a group, and made the following generalizations about leadership:

1. Leadership is the product of interaction, not status or position.

2. Leadership cannot be structured in advance. The uniqueness of each combination of persons, of varying interactional patterns and of varying goals and means, and of varying forces within and without impinging upon the group will bring forth different leaders.

3. A leader in one situation will not automatically be a leader in another situation.

4. Leadership does not result from a status position, but rather how a person behaves in the organization.

5. Whether a person is a leader in a group depends upon the group's perception of him.

6. The way a leader perceives his role determines his actions.

7. Most groups have more than one person occupying the

---

64 Morphet, Johns and Reiler, op. cit., p. 124.

65 Ibid., p. 127.

leadership role.

8. Leadership fosters positive sentiments toward the group activity and persons in the group.

9. Leadership may be democratic or autocratic but never laissez faire.

10. Leadership protects the critical group norms.

11. Leadership is authority rendered to some who are perceived by others as the proper persons to carry out the particular leadership role of the group.

12. Program development that involves only persons of a single position (such as principals, supervisors or teachers) is not as comprehensive or lasting as that which involves people of various positions in the organization.67

Some writers have studied leadership by trying to determine various styles of leadership.

As a result of studying how 232 elementary school principals perform administrative tasks, Hemphill identified and described eight administrative styles:

1. High communication style. Principal characterized by this style of work stressed communicating with others about the problems they encountered in their work.

2. High discussion style. Principals characterized by this style placed unusually high emphasis upon the use of face-to-face discussion in administration.

3. High compliance style. This style characterizes principals who generally followed suggestions made by others.

4. High analysis style. Principals who were high with respect to this style spent relatively more effort than others in analyzing the situation surrounding each administrative problem.

---

5. High relationships style. This style refers to a high concern with maintaining organizational relationships, especially relationships with superiors.

6. High work-organization style. This refers to the principal's emphasis upon scheduling and organizing his own work.

7. High outside-orientation style. Principals high on this style of administrative performance displayed greater readiness than others to responding to pressures from outside the school.

8. High work-direction style. Principals who followed this style tended to stress giving directions to others as an important part of their work.68

Owens combined the investigations of White and Lippitt with those of Bonner and Knickerbocker and identified five main leadership styles: Authoritarian, Democratic, Laissez Faire, Bureaucratic and Charismatic.69

As a result of their studies, Tannenbaum, et al. described their findings in terms of a continuum of leadership behavior. See Figure 1. The description of the various points on the continuum follows:

The Manager Makes the Decision and Announces It:

In this case, the boss identifies a problem, considers alternative solutions, chooses one of them, and then reports this decision to his subordinates for implementation. He may or may not give consideration to


Manager makes decision and announces it.

Manager "sells" his decision. He "sells" ideas and invites questions. In any case, he provides no opportunity for them to participate directly in the decision-making process. Coercion may or may not be used or implied.

The Manager "Sells" His Decision:

Here the manager, as before, takes responsibility for identifying the problem and arriving at a decision. However, rather than simply announcing it, he takes the additional step of persuading his subordinates to accept it. In doing so, he recognizes the possibility of some resistance among those who will be faced with the decision, and he seeks to reduce this resistance by indicating, for example, what the employees have to gain from his decision.

The Manager Presents His Ideas, Invites Questions:

Here the boss who has arrived at a decision and who seeks acceptance of his ideas provides an opportunity for his subordinates to get a fuller explanation of his thinking and his intentions. After presenting the ideas, he invites questions so that his associates can better understand what he is trying to accomplish. This give and take also enables the manager and the subordinates to explore more fully the implications of the decisions.

The Manager Presents a Tentative Decision Subject to Change:

This kind of behavior permits the subordinates to exert some influence on the decision. The initiative for identifying and diagnosing the problem remains with the boss. Before meeting with his staff, he has thought the problem through and arrived at a decision--but only a tentative one. Before finalizing it, he presents his proposed solution for the reaction of those who will be affected by it. He says in effect, "I'd like to hear what you have to say about this plan that I have developed. I'll appreciate your frank reactions, but will reserve for myself the final decision."

The Manager Presents the Problem, Gets Suggestions, and Then Makes His Decision:

Up to this point the boss has come before the group with a solution of his own. Not so in this case. The subordinates now get the first chance to suggest solutions. The manager's initial role involves identifying the problem. He might, for example, say something of this sort: "We are faced with a number of complaints from newspapers and the general public on our service policy. What is wrong here? What ideas do you have for coming to grips with this problem?"

The function of the group becomes one of increasing the manager's repertoire of possible solutions to the problem. The purpose is to capitalize on the knowledge and experience of those who are on the "firing line." From the expanded list of alternatives developed by the manager and his subordinates, the manager then selects the solution that he regards as most promising.

The Manager Defines the Limits and Requests the Group to Make a Decision:

This represents an extreme degree of group freedom only occasionally encountered in formal organizations, as for
instance, in many research groups. Here the team of managers or engineers undertakes the identification and diagnosis of the problem, develops alternative procedures for solving it, and decides on one or more of these alternative solutions. The only limits directly imposed on the group by the organization are those specified by the superior of the team's boss. If the boss participates in the decision-making process, he attempts to do so with no more authority than any other member of the group. He commits himself in advance to assist in implementing whatever decision the group makes.70

Getzels-Guba identified three leadership-followership styles:

1. The nomothetic:

The nomothetic style emphasizes the nomothetic dimension of behavior and accordingly places emphasis on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectation rather than on the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the need-disposition—-the obligation of the follower is to do things "by the book." The standard of administrative excellence is institutional adjustment and effectiveness rather than individual integration and efficiency.

2. The idiographic:

The idiographic style of leadership-followership emphasizes the idiographic dimension of behavior and accordingly places emphasis on the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the need-disposition rather than on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectation... the most expeditious route to the goal is seen as residing in the people involved rather than in the nature of the institutional structure. The basic assumption is that the greatest accomplishment will occur, not from enforcing adherence to rigorously defined roles, but from making it possible for each person to contribute what is most relevant and meaningful to him... The standard of administrative excellence is individual integration and efficiency.

rather than institutional adjustment and effectiveness.

3. The transactional:

The transactional style of leadership-followership is intermediate between the other two . . . since the goals of the social system must be carried out, it is obviously necessary to make explicit the roles and expectations required to achieve these goals. And, since the roles and expectations will be implemented by flesh and blood people with needs to be met, the personalities and dispositions of these people must be taken into account. . . . The aim throughout is to acquire a thorough awareness of the limits and resources of both individual and institution within which administrative action may occur. . . . Institutional roles are developed independently of the role incumbents, but they are adapted to the personalities of the individual incumbents . . . the standard of administrative excellence is individual integration and efficiency, satisfaction, and institutional adjustment and effectiveness.71

Role of Women in Administration and Management

It is apparent from the literature that although women participated extensively in the labor force of the United States72 and particularly in the public school systems,73 women who aspire to be in leadership positions still face discrimination and disadvantages in being appointed to such positions. This situation exists despite legislation which requires equal employment opportunities.74 Astin,

73 "Professional Women," NEA, pp. 67-68.
74 California University Los Angeles Extension Service, op. cit.
who studied women doctorates, reported:

The proportions of the total sample of respondents citing experience with each of the different types of discrimination were as follows: prejudice against hiring a woman, 25 percent; differential salaries for men and women with the same training and experience, 40 percent; differential sex policies regarding tenure, seniority and promotion, 33 percent; unwillingness on the part of the employer to delegate administrative responsibilities and authority to professional employees, 33 percent, and other forms of sex discrimination, 12 percent.75

Studies of Ginder76 and Noland and Bakke77 substantiated the perception that there is unwillingness on the part of the employer to delegate administrative responsibilities and authority to professional employees. Oppenheimer stated that "whether or not women make effective supervisors, employers and workers frequently seem to believe that women supervisors are not as effective as men. To the extent this belief exists, it guides hiring and promotion policies."78 Saunders' investigation of attitudes of superintendents and school boards in Connecticut revealed that opportunities for women to pursue administrative careers are limited. She concluded from her study that (1) in a choice between two candidates (one male and one female) of equal qualifications, a man would be chosen, and (2) women are likely to be

75 Astin, op. cit., p. 106.
76 Ginder, op. cit., p. 13.
77 Noland and Bakke, op. cit., pp. 33-37.
appointed to central office supervisory and coordination positions as opposed to a superintendency or to a principalship. The results of Shreiber's study showed the following:

1. When candidates for an elementary school principalship are equally qualified, male candidates will be selected more often than female candidates.

2. When the female candidate is very much more well qualified than the female candidate will be selected more often.

3. Men tend to select men more often than women in both 1 and 2 above.

In a study involving all supervising principals in cities of 50,000 or more during 1960-61, Gross and Herriott surveyed 476 principals and 128 superordinates and 10 teachers for each principal. They found that the mean score on the dependent variable, the Executive Professional Leader Survey (EPL) for men and women principals were identical. They concluded that sex has no apparent relationship to the EPL score. Similarly, Barter surveyed a group of teachers who rated female and male principals. She found that teachers rated both groups equally in ability and personal behaviors.

Other studies revealed that there is a difference between

---

79 Saunders, op. cit.
80 Shreiber, op. cit.
female and male leaders. Newell found that female elementary school principals showed more evidence of being "aware of the cognitive factor of the learning process than did male administrators."\(^{83}\) Grobman and Hines reported that females rank significantly higher than men as democratic leaders.\(^{84}\) Also, superordinates rated women higher on "knowledge of teaching methods and techniques" than men. They further concluded that women tend to be more concerned with teaching, pupil participation and evaluation of learning.\(^{85}\) Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen reported that after surveying 137 male and 95 female principals they found that the aspects of administrative performance most characteristic of women were those reflected in Factors A, E and G.\(^{86}\)

Factor A is described as the act of exchanging information. The abilities and knowledges associated with this factor include high verbal knowledge and facility, knowledge of elementary education, school administration and facts about the general culture. The personality factors associated with Factor A include those of being sociable, sensitive, trusting, confident and relaxed. A high score on Factor A

---


\(^{85}\) Ibid.

is indicative of a person concerned with teacher and pupil personnel problems, especially with the reaction of pupils to the educational program.

Factor E is described as the act of maintaining relationships. Among the attributes of a person high on Factor E are those which follow: sociable, lively, sensitive, confident, dependent, concerned with instruction, curriculum, personnel and public relations.

Factor G refers to the relating with outsiders. The characteristics of one ranking high on this factor include those which follow: submissive, subdued, shy, stable, relaxed, concerned with objectives, planning, evaluation and effects of teacher performance.

Male principals were characterized by Factors C and D. Factor C related to complying with suggestions. Those ranking high on Factor C are suggested to have the ability to reason and see relationships, to know general cultural facts, science and mathematics and to learn new material rapidly. They are aloof, shy, practical, skeptical, independent, insecure, unstable and tense, unconcerned with objectives, evaluation, planning and continuity, curriculum or child growth and development.

Factor D related to analyzing the situation. The general abilities are similar to those of Factor C; the personality traits are somewhat the same. A person rated high on Factor D is generally not concerned with classroom climate or routines.

87 Ibid., pp. 328-329.
88 Ibid.
The investigators further reported that "when performances were evaluated by supervisors and teachers, it was found that both groups were somewhat negative toward male principals and generally positive toward female principals. Furthermore, they concluded the following:

The work of women principals was characterized to a greater degree than that of men by asking subordinates for information. Men made more concluding discussions, followed pre-established structures more often and took a greater number of terminal actions. In general, the difference between men and women is that women tended to involve teachers, superiors and outsiders in their work while the men tended to make final decisions and take action without involving others.89

Van Meir investigated the suitability of men and women for leadership positions, particularly the elementary school principalship.90 He used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as his tool to collect data from the staffs of 10 female and 15 male principals. A total of 175 teachers were surveyed, an average of seven from each staff. Van Meir reported that the "teachers rated female elementary school principals more highly than the male principals on composite behavior and on all twelve leader behavior dimensions under investigation. The differences between means were significant at the .05 level for composite leader behavior and for the dimensions of persuasiveness, demand recognition, role assumption

---

89 Ibid., p. 333.
and predictive accuracy."\textsuperscript{91}

Persuasiveness is defined as the "perceived degree to which an individual uses persuasion and argument effectively and exhibits strong conviction"\textsuperscript{92} demand recognition as "the perceived degree to which an individual reconciles conflicting demands and reduces order in the system";\textsuperscript{93} role assumption as "the perceived degree to which an individual actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrenders leadership to others";\textsuperscript{94} and predictive accuracy as "the perceived degree to which an individual exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately."\textsuperscript{95}

In public secondary schools the percentage of women principals dropped from 18 percent in 1950-51 to 3.8 percent in 1961-62.\textsuperscript{96} Morsink reported that most frequently given reasons for such a decline are that "most women lack the appropriate graduate education to qualify for the principalship; few women desire to leave teaching for administration; women must compete with men to obtain such positions; women

\textsuperscript{91}Ibid., p. 198.
\textsuperscript{92}Ralph M. Stogdill, Manual for the Leader Behavior Questionnaire Form X, An Experimental Revision (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1963), mimeographed report, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{93}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{94}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95}Ibid.
often lack the career tenure to qualify; they lack the financial incentive to seek the principalship; and they are considered to be inferior to men.\textsuperscript{97}

Morsink conducted an investigation similar to that of Van Meir's with the exception that her population consisted of secondary principals instead of elementary principals. She conducted a study in Michigan to determine if men and women behaved differently as leaders as perceived by faculty members. Morsink used the LBDQ with a sampling of faculty members of 15 female and 15 male principals. No significant difference was found in the following behaviors: (1) the ability to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety and upset, (2) the degree to which an individual actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others, and (3) the degree to which the leader regards the comfort, well-being, status and contribution of followers. There were significant differences with the women scoring higher in the following behaviors: (1) the degree to which an individual speaks and acts as the representative of the group, (2) the degree to which an individual reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorders in the system, (3) the degree to which an individual uses persuasion and argument effectively and exhibits strong conviction, (4) the degree to which the leader applies pressure for productive output, (5) the degree to which the leader clearly defines his own role and lets followers know what is expected of them, (6) the degree

to which an individual allows followers scope for initiation, discussion and action, (7) the degree to which an individual exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately, (8) the degree to which an individual maintains a closely knit organization and resolves intermember conflict, and (9) the degree to which the leader maintains cordial relations with superiors, influences them and strives for higher status. 98 Morsink concluded that "if the appropriate secondary principal is defined as one who more often speaks and acts as a representative of the group; is persuasive in argument; emphasizes production; maintains cordial relations with superiors, influences them and strives for higher status; the findings favor women as secondary school principals." 99

Hoyle conducted a study to compare the manner in which male and female principals make decisions or solve problems. 100 He administered the Problem Attack Behavior Inventory (PABI) to 30 Texas school faculties of which 21 worked with male administrators and nine worked with female administrators. The five variables studied were:

1. Problem-recognition behavior: the extent to which an administrator appears to perceive situations that are seen as problems by his staff.

2. Problem Analysis behavior: the extent to which an administrator appears to discover and examine responses to problem situations.

98 Ibid., pp. 86-87.
99 Ibid., p. 87.
100 John Hoyle, "Who Shall be Principal, a Man or a Woman?" National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLVIII, No. 3 (January, 1969), pp. 23-24.
3. Group Participation behavior: the extent to which an administrator encourages those with whom he works to use initiative to criticize and to involve themselves in solving school problems.

4. Administrator Action behavior: the extent to which an administrator acts on problem situations, including the quality of his actions.

5. Administrator Evaluation behavior: the extent to which an administrator reviews the results of his actions.

Hoyle concluded that "teachers described female administrators as noticing potential problem situations (variable 1) and as reviewing results in action (variable 5) significantly more often than did male administrators. On other variables, differences were not significant."\(^{101}\)

**Organizational Climate**

The personality or climate of a school is generally represented by an intangible observation of behavior of the staff. Lonsdale defines organizational climate as "the global assessment of the interaction between the task-achievement dimension and the needs satisfaction dimension within the organization, or in other words, of the extent of the task-needs integration."\(^{102}\) The importance of the integration of the task-achievement dimension (nomothetic) with the needs satisfaction dimension (ideographic) in the administrative process was also

---

\(^{101}\) Ibid., p. 24.

\(^{102}\) Lonsdale, op. cit.
stressed by Getzels and Guba.\textsuperscript{103} Owens views organizational climate as a "function of a dynamic interrelationship between the needs of the individual person and the needs of the organization as they are expressed by demands on the individual."\textsuperscript{104}

The principal has an important role in the organizational climate of a school. Lonsdale maintains that the task of the leader (principal) is to sustain the organization in dynamic equilibrium which occurs through an integration of the task-achievement and need satisfaction.\textsuperscript{105} Halpin describes the leader as having a dual role: (1) As a decision-maker he is confronted with the tasks of the organization, and (2) as a group leader he is concerned with the extent to which the goals are achieved and with the extent the group works together.\textsuperscript{106}

Barnard analyzed the functions of the executive as dependent on two conditions: (1) effectiveness which relates to the accomplishment of the purposes, and (2) efficiency which relates to the satisfaction of individuals.\textsuperscript{107} Johnson maintains that the school principal, as a single individual, has a major effect on the school climate, and that the principal is a chief agent in determining whether a school has an

\textsuperscript{103} Getzels and Guba, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{104} Owens, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 169.
\textsuperscript{105} Lonsdale, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{106} Halpin, "A Paradigm for Research . . .," \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 166-169.
\textsuperscript{107} Barnard, \textit{The Functions of the Executive}, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 60-61.
open climate or a closed one. Tirpak states that the personality traits of a school principal have significant influence on the creation and maintenance of the organizational climate of the school. After studying the operational behavior of principals, Hines and Grobman found that the manner in which the principal carries out his duties affects the feelings as well as the actions of the teachers in his school. Shartle, Morphet, et al., and Wiles also describe the leader as one involved in both the attainment of the organizational goals and that of satisfying the needs of the individual within the system. It is evident that the principal, the leader of a school, is the most influential person in the school setting. Trump states:

Although teacher militancy and student activism are effecting some changes in school programs, the leadership style, the educational know-how, and the supervisory organizations that principals and their assistants develop continue to be the most potent factors in determining school excellence. We define that excellence as the degree to which learning is more individualized, with each pupil developing his own potential to the maximum; teaching is more professionalized, with the use of sounder methodology;

Marcum Johnson, Organizational Climate and the Adoption of Educational Innovations, Utah State University, February, 1969, ED 028 517, p. 6.
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who knew how to get what they wanted for the school. The investigators also found that in these schools the teachers shared the enthusiasm and the high morale which was generated by the principal. The teachers were excited about teaching. 117

Thus it is evident from the literature that the leader or the principal in the case of schools is an important factor in the overall organizational climate of a school. The leadership behavior does have an effect on the productivity of an organization and the morale of its workers.

Summary

The literature and research related to the role of women in education and to leadership and organizational climate were reviewed and reported in this chapter. It was reported that women have always contributed to the labor force of this country and that in the field of education, there have been more women teaching than men; however, women have had less representation in leadership positions. Furthermore, it was reported that women have been subject to discrimination when applying for leadership positions; however, once in such positions they exhibit as much, and in some cases more, leadership behavior than do men.

The last section of the chapter was devoted to an exploration of organizational climate and the role of the leader or building

principal in the determination of the overall climate of a school.

The methods and procedures used in this research study are reported in the next chapter. The analyses of the data are reported in Chapter IV, as well, and the recommendations and conclusions are reported in Chapter V.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

A description of the study, the procedures used to collect the data, the instrument used, and the hypotheses tested are presented in this chapter. The procedures described include a description of the population and the sampling process. The methods of analyzing the data collected in the study are also presented.

Description of the Study

The study investigated the organizational climate of those schools administered by female elementary school principals as compared with those administered by male elementary school principals. Those facets of the organization which were studied include the interaction between the staff and the principal and those among the staff members. The data collected reflect the perceptions of classroom teachers working with each group of principals.

Procedures

Population

The population for this study are the public elementary schools in a county as identified by the county school directory, and the teachers working in those schools. All schools within the system
containing grades from kindergarten to eighth, inclusive, comprised the population. Those schools excepted from the population were those designated as (1) schools maintained solely for educationally handicapped, mentally handicapped and physically handicapped (deaf, hard-of-hearing, blind, or orthopedically handicapped) or a combination thereof, and (2) juvenile halls. Included in the population were all certificated employees working in these schools on a full-time basis.

Among the elementary school districts, the average daily attendance in five districts is less than 901; the A.D.A. in six of the districts is between 1,000 and 4,999. The remaining 11 districts have over 5,000 A.D.A. At the end of the 1971-72 school year the total A.D.A. for the elementary school districts was 136,188, and the elementary grade A.D.A. of the unified school districts was 67,445 for a grand total A.D.A. for the elementary grades of 203,633.1 The lowest pupil enrollment among the elementary school districts is 10, with 23,529 the largest; the range of pupil enrollment in the six unified school districts is from 5,103 to 37,445.2

In the fall of 1971 the ethnic composition of the pupils in the elementary school districts was .2 percent American Indian, 2.6 percent Negro, 2.5 percent Oriental, 17.6 percent Spanish surname, 18 percent other nonwhite, and 76 percent other white.3

1Santa Clara County, Office of Education, Dept. of Attendance and Juvenile Service, Data Regarding Schools of Santa Clara County (San Jose, California: Santa Clara County Office of Education, 1972), pp. 2-23.

2Ibid.

The total number of certificated personnel in the 37 school districts during the school year 1972-73 was 113,792. The breakdown for this number was as follows: elementary (non-unified), 5,850, and elementary (unified), 2,910.4

The range of the number of certificated personnel in the elementary school districts is from one to 863 and the range of the number of certificated personnel in the unified school districts is from 225 to 1,925. The range on an elementary school-by-school basis is from one to 54 in non-unified school districts and from three to 101 in unified school districts.5

During the 1970-71 school year the median salary for elementary school teachers in this county was $10,865. The state median salary that year was $10,303.6

In the fall of 1971, the ethnic composition of the total professional staff in this county was .2 percent American Indian, 1.7 percent Negro, 3.1 percent Oriental and 3.5 percent Spanish surname. There were .3 percent other nonwhite and 91.3 percent white.7

4 Santa Clara County Office of Education, Data Regarding Schools, op. cit., pp. 2-17.


7 Santa Clara County Office of Education, Racial and Ethnic Data, op. cit., p. 46.
Selection of Sample

The number of schools in the study was 30 (15 administered by females and 15 administered by males). Using the county school directory, all schools administered by females were numbered consecutively as one group and all schools administered by males were numbered consecutively as another group. Through the use of a table of random numbers, 8 15 schools from each group were selected.

Methodology

An introductory letter was sent to the superintendent of the 30 selected schools requesting permission to contact the principal of the specific schools. (See Appendix A.) A letter of endorsement from the Association of California School Administrators was sought, and granted. A return form letter was included to facilitate the response from the superintendent. (See Appendix B.) After receiving permission to contact the school principal, the principal was then contacted by phone and told that the study was to investigate organizational climates of schools and that the study would investigate, among other facets, the differences perceived among respondents by sex, age, and years of experience. The principal was requested to permit the investigator's representative to administer the questionnaire at a staff gathering at an appointed time and date. A confirming letter was sent. (See

Appendix C.) After the administration of the questionnaire, a letter of appreciation was sent to the principal. (See Appendix D.)

**Instrument Used**

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) (see Appendix E), developed by Halpin and Croft, was the instrument used to assess the staff's perception of the school climate. The OCDQ is a standardized instrument which has been used extensively across the country. It consists of 64 items with eight subtests, each measuring a dimension of organizational climate. The personality or organizational climate is assessed by questions related to the characteristics of the leader and to the characteristics of the staff. In essence, the questionnaire delves into the various aspects of social interaction in the schools. The behavior of the principal is measured by the subtests on Consideration, Thrust, Production Emphasis and Aloofness. The behaviors of, or interaction among, the teachers are measured on the Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit and Intimacy subtests.⁹

In 1959 Halpin received a grant from the United States Office of Education to conduct a research project to determine the feasibility of mapping "the domain of organizational climate, to identify and describe its dimensions and to measure them in a dependable way."¹⁰

---


¹⁰Ibid., p. 132.
Halpin and Croft first conducted their studies with 71 selected schools from six geographic regions of the United States. From these 71 schools they had a total of 1,151 respondents. They started with a bank of 1,000 sentences; each sentence describing an interpersonal event or experience related to the teaching situation. They obtained their list of 1,000 sentences from graduate students, from in-depth interviews with teachers who described critical incidents in social interactions, from a search through the literature as well as from other instruments such as the LBDQ. The 1,000 items were then screened for clarity and for redundancy. The 600 items which survived the screening served as the basis for the identification of the major dimensions of the OCDQ. Further screening was conducted, and by the time the second form was developed, the number of items had been reduced to 160 and the items were grouped according to the source of interaction: the leader, the group, the individual and procedures. Through a series of cluster analyses and factor analyses, the dimensions were grouped in a matrix. See Table 4.

Halpin and Croft describe Social Need as:

the behavior of individuals directed toward the satisfaction of their own individual needs, or toward the establishment of positive social relations with others.11

Thus, Consideration and Intimacy describe social needs-oriented behavior; in the case of Consideration, satisfaction is derived from the

---

11 Halpin and Croft, op. cit., p. 20.
Table 4

The Eight Dimensions of the OCDQ¹²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions Associated Primarily with Social-Needs Satisfaction.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aloofness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leader; in the case of Intimacy, the satisfaction is derived from the group.

According to Halpin and Croft, Social Control represents "the principal's behavior in directing and controlling the activities of the group in order to accomplish the organization's goals."¹³ The dimensions of Disengagement (reflecting the group) and Aloofness (reflecting the characteristic of the Leader) are primarily task-oriented behaviors. Production Emphasis also represents a form of the principal's social control, the principal's orientation toward directing and controlling the behavior of the teachers.

The procedural aspect of an organization was originally

¹² Ibid., p. 35.
¹³ Ibid., p. 20.
measured as a subtest within itself; however, during the cluster analyses and factor analyses, Halpin and Croft found that all of the procedural items were found to recluster into a single subtest: Hindrance. Therefore, whereas none of the subtests are categorized as Procedure, those behaviors related to procedures in the organization are identified in the subtest on Hindrance.

The dimension, Esprit, is not synonymous only with morale. Esprit reflects the genuineness of the interaction between the principal and the group. Esprit provides an index to the "authenticity" of the group's behavior; Thrust provides an index to the "authenticity" of the principal's behavior.

Thrust is similar to "reality centered leadership" as described by Argyris:

Effective leadership depends upon a multitude of conditions. There is no one predetermined, correct way to behave as a leader. The choice of leadership pattern should be based upon an accurate diagnosis of the reality of the situation in which the leader is imbedded. If one must have a title for effective leadership, it might be called reality-centered leadership. Reality-centered leadership is not a predetermined set of "best ways to influence people." The only predisposition that is prescribed is that the leader ought to first diagnose what is reality and then to use the appropriate leadership pattern. In making his diagnosis, he must keep in mind that all individuals see reality through their own set of colored glasses. The reality he sees may not be the reality seen by others in their own private world. Reality diagnosis, therefore, requires self-awareness and awareness of others. This leads us back again to the properties of personality. A reality-oriented leader must also keep in mind the worth of the organization. No one can make a realistic appraisal if for some reason he weighs one factor in the situation as always being of minimal
importance.  

This dimension, Thrust, measures a combination of the two factors Initiating Structure and Consideration which were tapped by the LBDQ.

In discussing Thrust, Halpin and Croft state:

The principal who scores high on Thrust is not enslaved by a narrow definition of his role nor does he seem to be preoccupied with his status. He is more intent on task accomplishment, on getting the job done, and on moving the organization toward its goals. In a sense, he is willing to "unfreeze" the organization from one stage of its development—even if that stage be highly satisfying to the group members in terms, for example, of Esprit or Consideration—and to take the risk of change, confident that such change will result in a higher order of organizational development which, in turn, will permit a greater congruence between the social-needs satisfaction of individual group members and the specification of their roles. To take this risk and to gamble on the outcome of "unfreezing" the organization, the principal "must stand for something." He also must be open in letting his teachers and the school's patrons know what, indeed, he does stand for. In short, he must be "authentic."

Contrast his behavior with that of the principal in the Closed Climate. This principal's low Thrust, combined with moderately high Aloofness and Production Emphasis, suggests that he uses his role to keep people at a distance, to limit his "part" to a two-dimensional one, and to re-enforce the present level of the organization's development (i.e., he insists that nobody rock the boat). We would guess that he is afraid to let go because letting go will expose his lack of the professional skills necessary for embracing change. Lacking professional competence, he must cling all the more tenaciously to his status. So he is compelled to "keep other people in their place," and to emphasize reiteratively that, "We must move slowly. Changes must be made very gradually."

Because change represents so terrifying a threat to him, he clutters the organizational system with Hindrance. The result is high Disengagement and low Esprit. 15

After obtaining scores on each of the eight subtests for each school, Halpin and Croft constructed profiles for each school, and as a result, identified six organizational climates on a continuum from open to closed. A description of the six prototypes follows:

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

2. The Autonomous Climate is described best as one in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group. The leader exerts little control over the group members; high Esprit results primarily from social-needs satisfaction. Satisfaction from task-achievement is also present, but to a lesser degree.

3. The Controlled Climate is characterized best as impersonal and highly task-oriented. The group's behavior is directed 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.

4. The Familiar Climate is highly personal, but undercontrolled. The members of this organization satisfy their social needs, but pay relatively little attention to

---

social control in respect to task accomplishment. Accordingly, Esprit is not extremely high simply because the group members secure little satisfaction from task achievement. Hence, much of the behavior within this climate can be construed as "inauthentic."

5. The Paternal Climate is characterized as one in which the principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group and attempts to initiate most of these acts himself. The leadership skills within the group are not used to supplement the principal's own ability to initiate leadership acts. Accordingly, some leadership acts are not even attempted. In short, little satisfaction is obtained in respect to either achievement or social needs; hence, Esprit among the members is low.

6. The Closed Climate is characterized by a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization. The organization is not "moving," Esprit is low because the group members secure neither social-needs satisfaction nor the satisfaction that comes from task achievement. The members' behavior can be construed as "inauthentic"; indeed, the organization seems to be stagnant.

The reliability and validity of the OCDQ by Halpin and Croft has been verified by their own follow-up investigations, as well as those of others. Halpin and Croft investigated the reliability of the OCDQ by using three different methods. The results of these investigations are summarized on the following page. See Table 5.

Andrews conducted several studies to determine the construct validity of the OCDQ. Sax states that "Construct validity is used to gain supportive evidence for a theory or construct which a test is designed to measure." As a result of one study, Andrews concluded that

16 The above descriptions of the six climates were abstracted from Halpin and Croft, op. cit., pp. 80-89.

Table 5
Estimates of Internal Consistency and of Equivalence for the Eight OCDQ Subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Split Half Coefficient of Reliability, Corrected by the Spearman-Brown Formula</th>
<th>Correlations between Scores of the Odd Numbered and Even Numbered Respondents in Each School</th>
<th>Commuinity Estimates for Three Factor Rotational Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimation of internal consistency
Estimate of equivalence
These are lower bound, conservative estimates of equivalence.

The OCDQ, in its relationships with the characteristics of school staffs, demonstrated a large number of relationships which were consistent with theory, some of which were equivocal, and none of which were inescapably inconsistent.19

A sub-study by Schmidt compared the OCDQ subtest scores with the LBDQ subtest scores, and the results indicated a "number of meaningful

---

18 Halpin and Croft, op. cit., p. 66.

relationships between the two."\(^{20}\) Paxton conducted a study to investigate the relationship of the personality of the principal measured by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator and the OCDQ and found "many relationships between personality types and OCDQ subtest scores."\(^{21}\) Andrews reported that in Paxton's study all OCDQ subtest scores except one showed significant F ratios across the 11 personality types.\(^{22}\)

As a result of a study investigating the relationship between teacher satisfaction and organizational climate, Andrews reported significant relationships in six of the eight subtest scores.\(^{23}\) In another study, Andrews reported that seven of the subtest scores were significantly related to principal effectiveness. Andrews concluded that "the subtests of the OCDQ provided reasonably valid measures of important aspects of the school principal leadership, in the perspective of interaction with his staff."\(^{24}\)

Watkins critiqued the OCDQ as a research tool and concluded that "the OCDQ is a most promising research tool and has opened new

\(^{20}\) Ibid., p. 328.
\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 329.
\(^{22}\) Ibid.
\(^{23}\) Ibid.
\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 333.
directions in the study of school organizations."  

Pritchard conducted a study in 1966 to determine the concurrent validity of the OCDQ. He concluded that "the eight subtest dimensions of the OCDQ are viable concepts which can be used to assess the favorability of work atmosphere surrounding an elementary school."  

Hypotheses of the Study

The study was based on the following null hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1.** There is no significant difference in organizational climate between those schools administered by female principals and those schools administered by males, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 2.** There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Consideration, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 3.** There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Thrust, as perceived by teachers.

**Hypothesis 4.** There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Production Emphasis, as perceived by teachers.


26 James Leon Pritchard, Validation of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire Against Perceptions of Non-Faculty School Personnel (Stanford, CA: Stanford University, June, 1966), p. 108.
Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Aloofness, as perceived by teachers.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Hindrance, as perceived by teachers.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Disengagement, as perceived by teachers.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Esprit, as perceived by teachers.

Hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Intimacy, as perceived by teachers.

In addition to these hypotheses the study attempted to determine whether there is any difference (1) in the perception of the principal's behavior between female and male respondents, and (2) in perception among respondents based on age groupings and based on number of years of experience in public school work.

Analyses of the Data

The respondents recorded their responses on IBM forms and all data collected in this study were then keypunched and run at the Stanford Computational Center, Stanford, California. The program used to
score the OCDQ was developed by William A. Gilmore in 1971 and was based on the directions provided by Halpin and Croft. The program is written in FORTRAN language.

In analyzing the data for Hypothesis 1, regarding the overall Organizational Climate as perceived by the teachers working with female principals as compared with those working with male principals, a score for each subtest of the OCDQ was determined for each teacher; the scores were then converted to standard scores in accordance with the Halpin and Croft model. The standard score for each subtest was then compared with the Open Climate score for that subtest. The absolute difference between the teacher's standard score and Halpin and Croft's Open Climate score were totaled to indicate to what degree each of the teachers was congruent with the prototypic profile of the Open Climate. The teachers' numerical differences were placed on a continuum, then dichotomized: those more similar to Open Climate and those less similar to Open Climate. An Analysis of Cross Tabulation was used to determine if there was a difference between teachers working with female principals when compared with teachers working with male principals.

For Hypotheses 2 through 9, the comparison of specific leader behaviors and staff behaviors, the statistical treatment involved the use of the t test. The subtest scores obtained from the schools administered by females were compared with the subtest scores from the schools administered by males. The analyses included determining the relationship of the subtest to teachers' sex, age and years of exper-

---

ience. The Multivariate Analysis of Variance was used to determine these relationships.

Summary

The description of the study and the procedures were presented in this chapter. The study focused on the comparison of organizational climates of schools administered by females with those administered by male elementary school principals. The sample was selected through the use of a table of random numbers; thirty schools (15 administered by females and 15 administered by males) were selected as the sample. The OCDQ was administered to each of the 30 staffs as the source of data. The hypotheses of the study were stated in null form in this chapter. The statistical treatment of the data involved the use of the multivariate analysis of variance; the data was run at the Stanford Computational Center in Stanford, California. The presentation and analyses of the data will appear in Chapter IV; the findings will be interpreted and stated. The conclusions and recommendations will be presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to compare the organizational climate of schools administered by female principals with the organizational climate of schools administered by male principals. For the purpose of this study, organizational climate was defined as "the personality of the school; the psychological dynamics of the members of the group"¹ and as "the global assessment of the interaction between the task achievement and the needs satisfaction within the organization."² The study of organizational climate included the study of specific leader behaviors of the principal (Consideration, Thrust, Production Emphasis, and Aloofness) and specific staff behaviors (Hindrance, Disengagement, Esprit, Intimacy). The analyses of the data collected for this study are included in this chapter.

Data regarding the comparison of organizational climate between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals are included in the first section. The results of ancillary investigations of the relationship of sex, age, and years of experience of the teachers to organizational climate are also reported.

¹Halpin and Croft, op. cit., pp. 1-5.
²Lonsdale, op. cit.
in the first section.

Data regarding the comparison of specific leader behaviors demonstrated by female principals and male principals are reported in the second section. The results of ancillary investigations of the relationship of sex, age and years of experience of the teachers to their perception of leader behaviors (Consideration, Thrust, Production Emphasis, and Aloofness) are also reported in the second section.

Data regarding the comparison of specific staff behaviors demonstrated by the staffs of female principals and by the staffs of male principals are reported in the third section. The results of ancillary investigations of the relationship of sex, age and years of experience of the teachers to the behaviors of Hindrance, Disengagement, Esprit, and Intimacy are reported in the third section.

Analyses of the Sample

All of the public elementary schools in a county administered by female full time principals were numbered consecutively; all of the public elementary schools in the county administered by male full time principals were numbered consecutively. A sample of fifteen schools administered by each sex was selected by the use of a table of random numbers. Five hundred twenty-seven teachers were surveyed; this number represents 91 percent of the teachers on these 30 staffs. Among the participants, 433 were identified as females and 84 were identified as males. The age distribution of the teachers who participated in this survey was as follows:
Under 25: 45
Between 26-34: 205
Between 35-44: 131
Between 45-54: 104
Over 55: 31

The distribution in terms of the numbers of years of experience in public school work was as follows:
0-4 years: 133
5-9 years: 166
10-14 years: 100
15-19 years: 52
Over 20 years: 52

Some teachers did not provide complete biographical data; consequently, the total numbers vary slightly.

SECTION ONE: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Hypothesis 1 stated that there was no significant difference in organizational climate in schools administered by female principals as compared to those administered by male principals as perceived by the teachers. For each individual teacher, a profile of subtest scores was developed. A comparison was made between the individual teacher's profile with the prototypic profiles for Open and Closed Climates as developed by Halpin.\(^3\) The total absolute numerical difference between

\(^3\)Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, op. cit., p. 136.
organizational climate. Data supporting these conclusions are provided in Appendix F.

It was further concluded that there was no significant difference among teachers of various ages in their perception of organizational climate. Data supporting this conclusion are provided in Appendix G.

It was concluded that there was no significant difference among teachers with various years of experience in their perception of organizational climate. Data supporting this conclusion are provided in Appendix H.

The findings as a result of comparing the organizational climate of schools administered by female principals with those administered by male principals were reported in this section. In summary, it was concluded that there was no significant difference between the organizational climate of schools administered by female principals as compared with those administered by male principals in the perception of teachers.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of sex, age and years of experience of teachers to organizational climate. It was concluded that there is no significant relationship between organizational climate and sex of teacher, between organizational climate and age of teacher and between organizational climate and teachers' years of experience.
SECTION TWO: LEADER BEHAVIORS

Leader Behavior: Consideration

Hypothesis 2 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Consideration, as perceived by teachers. For the purpose of this study, Consideration was defined as "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the staff." The mean score for male principals was 72.99 with a standard deviation of 6.07. The mean score for female principals was 73.39, with a standard deviation of 6.95. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t value of 0.71, which is less than the required critical value to be significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Consideration, as perceived by teachers, was accepted. The mean score, standard deviation and t value obtained in comparing the female principals with male principals in the four leader behaviors are reported in Table 7.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of sex of teacher, teacher's age and years of experience and teachers' perception of Consideration. Whereas the teachers did not perceive any significant difference between female and male principals in regard to Consideration, there was a significant difference between

---

4 Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, op. cit., p. 151.
female teachers and male teachers in their perception of Consideration. These data are presented in Table 8. There was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher on the variable, Consideration.

### TABLE 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Value of Mean Difference in Leader Behavior Scores Reported by Sex of Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consideration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>73.39</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>72.99</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thrust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>81.23</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>-4.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>78.80</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production Emphasis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>72.51</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>71.49</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allofness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>71.17</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>70.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8

Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Sex of Teacher on OGD Subtest, Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>127.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127.68</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A significant difference among teachers of various ages in their perception of the leader behavior, Consideration, was found. It was concluded that there was a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teacher on this variable. Teachers under 25 perceive male principals to demonstrate more Consideration than female principals whereas teachers over 55 perceive female principals to demonstrate more Consideration than male principals. These data are reported in Table 9. The means of the various age groups are reported in Table 10 and are reported by sex of principal. The same information is pictorialized on Profile Graph 2.

**TABLE 9**

Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Teacher</td>
<td>347.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>398.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99.72</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 10**

Means on Subtest, Consideration, Reported by Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Principal</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>26-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>72.47</td>
<td>73.41</td>
<td>74.96</td>
<td>78.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.79</td>
<td>72.57</td>
<td>72.92</td>
<td>73.36</td>
<td>72.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was concluded that there were significant differences among teachers of various years of experience in their perception of Consideration. It was further concluded that there was a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience on this variable. These data are summarized in Table 11. The means of the teachers with various years of experience are shown in Table 12 and are pictorialized on Profile Graph 3. In both the table and graph the information is reported by sex of principal.
TABLE 11
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers on OCDQ Subtest, Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.41 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>541.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135.33</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.01 &lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>604.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>151.04</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.00 &lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 12
Means on Subtest, Consideration, Reported by Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>72.11</td>
<td>75.91</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>74.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72.98</td>
<td>72.90</td>
<td>72.58</td>
<td>71.75</td>
<td>75.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFILE GRAPH 3
Means on Subtest, Consideration, Reported by Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers
In summary, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the leader behavior, Consideration, between female and male principals as perceived by the teachers was accepted. Ancillary investigations indicated that there was a significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of Consideration; there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher. Also, it was concluded that there were significant differences among the teachers when grouped by age in their perception of Consideration. The results indicated a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teacher. Furthermore, it was concluded that there was a significant difference among teachers when grouped by years of experience and a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience.

**Leader Behavior: Thrust**

Hypothesis 3 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Thrust, as perceived by teachers. For the purpose of this study, Thrust was defined as "behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to 'move the organization,' the principal's effort to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets." The mean score for female principals on this variable was 81.23 with a standard deviation of 6.17. The mean

\(^5\)Ibid.
score for male principals was 78.80 with a standard deviation of 6.73. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t value of -4.29 which is greater than the required critical value to be significant at the .01 level. These data are presented in Table 7. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Thrust, as perceived by teachers, was rejected.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of the sex of teacher, teachers' age and years of experience and Thrust. Whereas there was a significant difference between female and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Thrust, there was not a significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of this behavior. Furthermore, there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher on Thrust. These data are presented in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>771.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>771.22</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>&lt;.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&lt;.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Sex of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, Thrust.
The results of an Analysis of Variance showed that there were significant differences among teachers when grouped by age in their perception of Thrust. However, it was concluded that there was no significant interaction between sex of principal and age of teacher on this variable. These data are presented in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>794.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>794.45</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Age of Teacher</td>
<td>579.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144.86</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of an Analysis of Variance showed that there were significant differences among teachers when grouped by years of experience in their perception of Thrust. Furthermore, it was concluded that there was a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience on this variable. These data are presented in Table 15. The mean scores of teachers with different numbers of years of experience are shown in Table 16 and are pictorialized on Profile Graph 4. In both the table and graph the data are reported by sex of principal.
TABLE 15
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers on OCDQ Subtest, Thrust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>748.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>748.84</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>475.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118.77</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>353.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88.37</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 16
Means on Subtest, Thrust, Reported by Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>Over 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80.22</td>
<td>77.46</td>
<td>83.25</td>
<td>83.42</td>
<td>81.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.46</td>
<td>78.47</td>
<td>78.24</td>
<td>79.39</td>
<td>81.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFILE GRAPH 4
Means of Teachers on Subtest, Thrust, Reported by Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers

Female principals
Male principals
In summary, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between female and male principals in regard to Thrust as perceived by the teachers was rejected. Ancillary investigations indicated that there was no significant difference between sex of teachers with regard to Thrust and there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher. Furthermore, it was concluded that although there were significant differences among teachers when grouped by age, there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teachers. It was also concluded that there were significant differences among teachers with various years of experience and that there was a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience.

**Leader Behavior: Production Emphasis**

Hypothesis 4 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Production Emphasis, as perceived by teachers. For the purpose of this study, Production Emphasis was defined as "behavior by the principal demonstrating close supervision of the staff and demonstrating the role of a 'straw boss,' behavior in which communication is one way and which does not demonstrate sensitivity to feedback from the staff." The mean score for female principals on this variable was 72.51 with a standard deviation of 5.29. The mean score for male principals

---
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was 71.49 with a standard deviation of 4.88. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t value of 2.26, which is significant at the .02 level. These data are reported in Table 7. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, **Production Emphasis**, as perceived by teachers, was rejected.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of sex of teacher, teacher's age and years of experience and **Production Emphasis**. It was concluded that there was a significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of the leader behavior, **Production Emphasis**; however, there was not a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher on this variable. These data are reported in Table 17. Furthermore, there were no significant differences among teachers when grouped according to age or years of experience, and no interaction effect between sex of principal and teacher's age or sex of principal and years of experience. These data are reported in Tables 18 and 19.

**TABLE 17**

Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Sex of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest: 
**Production Emphasis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal</td>
<td>127.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127.39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>201.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.28</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- **NS** indicates not significant.
- **<.05** and **<.01** indicate statistical significance at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.
TABLE 18
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, Production Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>137.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137.67</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Age of Teacher</td>
<td>143.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>67.41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 19
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers on OCDQ Subtest, Production Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>143.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143.94</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>199.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49.84</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>129.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between female and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Production Emphasis, as perceived by the teachers, was rejected. Ancillary investigations indicated that there was a significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of this variable. Furthermore, it was concluded that there were no significant differences among teachers when grouped by age or by years of experience.
Leader Behavior: Aloofness

Hypothesis 5 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Aloofness, as perceived by teachers. For the purpose of this study, Aloofness is defined as "behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal; behavior which demonstrates that the principal prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal with teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation." The mean score for female principals on this variable was 71.17 with a standard deviation of 3.87. The mean score for male principals was 70.07 with a standard deviation of 0.00. A statistical test for differences of means resulted in a t value of -4.41, which is more than the required critical value to be significant at the .01 level. These data are reported in Table 7. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Aloofness, as perceived by teachers, is rejected.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of sex of teacher, teacher's age and years of experience and their perception of Aloofness. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between female teachers and male teachers in their perception of the leader behavior, Aloofness; furthermore, there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher. These data are presented in Table 20.
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### TABLE 20
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Sex of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, *Aloofness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>146.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>146.60</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference regarding *Aloofness* was found to exist among the teachers when grouped by age; there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' age. These data are reported in Table 21.

### TABLE 21
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, *Aloofness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>137.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137.79</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Age of Teacher</td>
<td>102.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>48.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was further concluded that there were no significant differences among teachers when grouped according to the number of years of experience in public school work. It was also concluded that there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers'
years of experience in regard to **Aloofness**. These data are reported in Table 22.

**TABLE 22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>135.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135.58</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>41.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>69.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the null hypothesis regarding no difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, **Aloofness**, as perceived by teachers, was rejected. It was also concluded that there was no difference between female and male teachers in their perception of this variable and no interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher. It was also concluded that there were significant differences among teachers regarding **Aloofness** when they were grouped by age, but no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teacher. There were no significant differences found among teachers when grouped according to the number of years of public school experience; there was no interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience.
SECTION THREE: STAFF BEHAVIORS

Staff Behavior: Hindrance

Hypothesis 6 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to Hindrance as perceived by the teachers. For the purpose of this study, Hindrance was defined as "the teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary busy work. The teachers perceive that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work."\(^8\) The mean score for schools with female principals was 72.84 with a standard deviation of 6.27. The mean score for schools with male principals was 73.31 with a standard deviation of 6.05. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t value of 0.86, which is less than the required critical value to be significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between schools with female principals and schools with male principals in regard to Hindrance as perceived by teachers was accepted. The mean score, standard deviation and t value obtained in comparing the four behaviors of staff working with female principals with the behaviors of staff working with male principals are reported in Table 23.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the rela-

\(^8\)Halpin and Croft, op. cit., p. 40.
TABLE 23
Means, Standard Deviation and t Value of Mean Difference in Staff Behavior Reported by Sex of Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HINDRANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>72.64</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>73.31</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISENGAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>68.29</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIRIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>80.05</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>79.93</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>75.05</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was concluded that there was no significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of Hindrance. It was further concluded that there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher on this variable. These data are presented in Table 24.

TABLE 24
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Sex of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, Hindrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ret. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>37.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.96</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ret. Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, it was concluded that there were no significant differences among teachers when grouped by age or when grouped by years of experience. It was also concluded that there were no significant interaction effects between sex of principal and teachers' age and between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience on Hindrance, as perceived by the teachers. These data are reported in Tables 25 and 26.

<p>| TABLE 25 |
| Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, Hindrance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.36 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Age of Teacher</td>
<td>263.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.14 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>94.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.65 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TABLE 26 |
| Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers on OCDQ Subtest, Hindrance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.41 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.94 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>206.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.71</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.25 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the hypothesis of no significant difference in the staff behavior of Hindrance between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals was accepted. Furthermore, there was no significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of Hindrance, nor were there significant differences among teachers when grouped by age or years of experience. There was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teacher or between sex of principal and years of experience of teachers.

Staff Behavior: Disengagement

Hypothesis 7 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to Disengagement, as perceived by the teachers. For the purpose of this study, Disengagement was defined as "the dimension describing the degree to which a group is 'going through the motions,' a group that is 'not in gear' with respect to the task at hand." The mean score for schools with female principals was 68.29 with a standard deviation of 4.70. The mean score for schools with male principals was 69.05 with a standard deviation of 5.23. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t value of 1.73, which is more than the required critical value to be significant at the .10 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference

9 Ibid.
between schools with female principals and schools with male principals in regard to Disengagement, as perceived by teachers, was rejected. These data are reported in Table 23.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of sex of teacher, teachers' age and years of experience and Disengagement. It was concluded that there was a significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of Disengagement; however, there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher on this variable. These data are reported in Table 27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>80.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.98</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>404.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>404.95</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of an Analysis of Variance showed that there was a significant difference among teachers when grouped by age in their perception of Disengagement. However, it was concluded that there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' age on Disengagement. These data are reported in Table 28.
TABLE 28
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Age of Teachers on OCDQ Subtest, Disengagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>93.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.46</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Age of Teacher</td>
<td>289.45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72.36</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>61.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was concluded that there were no significant differences among teachers when grouped according to years of experience. There was no interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience on this variable. These data are reported in Table 29.

TABLE 29
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Years of Experience of Teachers on OCDQ Subtest, Disengagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>77.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.24</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>152.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.09</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>163.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the staff behavior of Disengagement between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals as perceived by teachers was rejected. Furthermore, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between female teachers and male
teachers in their perception of this variable. It was also concluded that there were significant differences among teachers when grouped by age but not when grouped by years of experience. There were no significant interaction effects between sex of principal and sex of teacher, or between sex of principal and age of teachers or between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience.

**Staff Behavior: Esprit**

Hypothesis 8 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to the staff behavior, Esprit, as perceived by teachers. For the purpose of this study, Esprit was defined as "the dimension referring to 'morale'; the teachers' feeling that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their jobs."\(^{10}\) The mean score for schools administered by females was 80.05 with a standard deviation of 5.01. The mean score for schools administered by male principals was 79.93 with a standard deviation of 4.97. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t value of 0.27, which is less than the required critical value to be significant at the .05 level. These data are reported in Table 23. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to Esprit.

\(^{10}\) Ibid.
as perceived by teachers was accepted.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of sex of teacher, teachers' age and years of experience and Esprit. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of Esprit; however, there was a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher. These data are reported in Table 30. The means of the schools are reported by sex of principal and sex of teacher in Table 31 and pictorialized on Profile Graph 5.

TABLE 30
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Sex of Teacher on OCDQ, Subtest, Esprit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.66 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.68 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>109.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.99</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 31
Means on Subtest, Esprit, Reported by Sex of Principal and Sex of Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Principal</td>
<td>80.36</td>
<td>78.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principal</td>
<td>79.76</td>
<td>80.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was further concluded that there were differences among teachers when grouped by age in their perception of *Esprit* and there was significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teachers. These data are reported in Table 32. The means of the schools are reported by sex of principal and age of teachers in Table 33 and are pictorialized on Profile Graph 6.
### TABLE 32
Analysis of Variance Results on Relationship between Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher on OCDQ Subtest, *Esprit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Age of Teacher</td>
<td>535.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133.98</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>183.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.92</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 33
Means on Subtest, *Esprit*, Reported by Sex of Principal and Age of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>26-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Principal</td>
<td>77.62</td>
<td>78.79</td>
<td>80.72</td>
<td>81.94</td>
<td>83.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principal</td>
<td>79.48</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>81.04</td>
<td>81.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFILE GRAPH 6
Means on Subtest, *Esprit*, Reported by Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher
Furthermore, it was concluded that there were differences among teachers in their perception of Esprit when they were grouped by years of experience. A significant interaction effect between sex of principal and years of experience was found. These data are reported in Table 34. The means of the teachers grouped by years of experience are reported in Table 35 and are pictorialized on Profile Graph 7.

### Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>502.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125.66</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>287.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71.76</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>Over 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.24</td>
<td>79.27</td>
<td>81.32</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>81.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79.60</td>
<td>79.84</td>
<td>78.73</td>
<td>80.75</td>
<td>82.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to *Esprit* as perceived by teachers was accepted. There was no significant difference between female and male teachers in their perception of *Esprit*; there was a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and sex of teacher on this variable. There were differences among teachers in their perception of *Esprit* when they were grouped by age and there was significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teacher. Furthermore, there were significant differences among teachers when grouped according to years of experience and a significant interaction effect between sex
of principal and years of experience.

Staff Behavior: Intimacy

Hypothesis 9 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals on the staff behavior, Intimacy, as perceived by teachers. For the purpose of this study, Intimacy was defined as "the dimension which refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other." The mean score for schools with female principals was 74.36 with a standard deviation of 4.83; the mean score for schools with male principals was 75.05 with a standard deviation of 4.90. A statistical test for difference of means resulted in a t value of 1.51, which is less than the required critical value to be significant at the .10 level. These data are reported in Table 23. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to Intimacy as perceived by teachers was accepted.

Ancillary investigations were conducted to determine the relationship of sex of teacher, teachers' age and teachers' years of experience and Intimacy. It was concluded that there was no difference between female and male teachers in their perception of Intimacy and that there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal

---

11Ibid.
and sex of teacher. These data are reported in Table 36.

### Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>52.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.53</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.14 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.17 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Sex of Teacher</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.22 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of an Analysis of Variance showed that there were no significant differences among teachers grouped by age in their perception of Intimacy; however, there was a significant interaction effect between sex of principal and age of teacher. These data are reported in Table 37; the means of the teachers grouped by age are shown in Table 38 and are pictorialized on Profile Graph 8.

### Table 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.17 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Age of Teacher</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.92 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Age of Teacher</td>
<td>225.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56.37</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 38
Means on OCDQ Subtest, *Intimacy*, Reported by Sex of Principal and Age of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>26-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73.56</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>74.03</td>
<td>75.38</td>
<td>76.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75.21</td>
<td>75.57</td>
<td>74.85</td>
<td>74.60</td>
<td>73.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFILE GRAPH 8
Means on Subtest, *Intimacy*, Reported by Sex of Principal and Age of Teacher
It was further concluded that there were no differences among teachers when grouped by years of experience in their perception of Intimacy. It was also concluded that there was no significant interaction effect between sex of principal and teachers' years of experience. These data are reported in Table 39.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Sex of Principal</td>
<td>51.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.95</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.14 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet. Years of Exper.</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.51 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Principal X Years of Exper.</td>
<td>103.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.36 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the null hypothesis of no difference between schools administered by females and by males in regard to Intimacy as perceived by teachers was accepted. There were no differences among teachers when grouped by sex, age or years of experience. There were no significant interaction effects between sex of principal and sex of teacher or between sex of principal and years of experience; however, a significant interaction effect was found to exist between sex of principal and teachers' age.

Summary

The results of the analyses of the data were reported in this chapter. The results indicated that there were no significant
differences in organizational climate between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals as perceived by teachers. Therefore, hypothesis 1 of no difference was accepted.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Consideration, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 3 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Thrust, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Production Emphasis, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

Hypothesis 5 stated that there was no significant difference between female principals and male principals in regard to the leader behavior, Aloofness, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

Hypothesis 6 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to the staff behavior, Hindrance, as perceived by the teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was accepted.
Hypothesis 7 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to the staff behavior, Disengagement. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

Hypothesis 8 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to the staff behavior, Esprit, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was accepted.

Hypothesis 9 stated that there was no significant difference between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals in regard to the staff behavior, Intimacy, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was accepted.

Findings from ancillary investigations regarding the relationship of sex, age and years of experience of teachers to organizational climate, to the four leader behaviors and to the four staff behaviors were also reported.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Problem

The decline in the percentage of female elementary school principals from 55 percent in 1928 to 21 percent in 1970\(^1\) raises an issue regarding the equal employment opportunities for all and the proper utilization of our human resources. Studies have been conducted to determine the competence of females as public school administrators. Van Meir investigated the perceptions of teachers regarding female and male elementary school principals and reported that female principals were rated significantly higher on composite leadership behavior than males were.\(^2\) Grobman and Hines reported in their study that female principals ranked significantly higher than male principals as democratic leaders as perceived by their subordinates.\(^3\) Gross and Herriott found that the mean score on the Executive Professional Leader Survey for female principals and male principals was not significantly different.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Oppenheimer, op. cit.
\(^2\) Van Meir, op. cit., p. 198.
\(^3\) Grobman and Hines, op. cit.
\(^4\) Gross and Herriott, op. cit.
Barter surveyed a group of teachers regarding their perception of female and male principals; she reported that teachers rated both groups equal in ability and personal behaviors.\(^5\) Regardless of findings such as these, opportunities for women to pursue careers in administrative work have been limited for numbers of reasons including that of biases on the part of superintendents and school boards.\(^6\)

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

Hypotheses

The first hypothesis was based on a comparison of the organizational climate of schools administered by females as opposed to schools administered by males, as perceived by teachers. Hypotheses 2 through 5 were based on the comparison of specific behaviors (Consideration, Thrust, Production Emphasis and Aloofness) of the two groups of principals, as perceived by the teachers. Hypotheses 6 through 9 were based on a comparison of specific behaviors (Hindrance, Disengagement, Esprit and Intimacy) among the staff members working with the two groups of principals. Ancillary investigations were

\(^{5}\) Barter, op. cit.

\(^{6}\) Saunders, op. cit.
conducted to determine whether differences of sex, age, and/or numbers of years of public school experience of the respondents resulted in differences in the perception of the respective faculties.

Conclusions

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in organizational climate between those schools administered by female principals as compared to those administered by males, as perceived by teachers. The acceptance of the null hypothesis indicates that the personalities of the schools administered by female principals and male principals were found not to be significantly different. The results indicate that the degree to which there is an integration of task achievement dimension and needs satisfaction dimension in schools administered by females and males is not significantly different. Thus it is concluded that schools with female principals and male principals are perceived by teachers not to be significantly different in organizational climate.

The vital role that the principal has in the organizational climate of a school was reviewed in Chapter II. Essentially, the role of the leader as perceived by Lonsdale involves sustaining the organization through the integration of task achievement and needs satisfaction; Halpin described a group leader as one concerned with the goals to be achieved and the extent the group works together. Johnson

7 Lonsdale, op. cit.
maintains that the principal of a school has a major effect on the school climate. This position is supported by other leaders in educational administration such as Shartle, Morphet, Johns and Reller, and Wiles. Thus, the importance of the principal in the efficiency and effectiveness of a school cannot be minimized.

Investigations such as those of Grobman and Hines, Van Meir, Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen, and Newell have been conducted to compare female and male principals and have reported findings which support the premise that females are as competent as males as school principals. These studies have focused on the behavior of the leader instead of studying both leader behavior and staff behavior. Studies have not been made which directly support or refute the findings of this study regarding each of the specific behaviors studied.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Consideration, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of

9 Johnson, op. cit.
10 Shartle, op. cit.
11 Morphet, Johns and Reller, op. cit.
12 Wiles, op. cit.
13 Grobman and Hines, op. cit.
14 Van Meir, op. cit.
15 Hemphill, Griffith, and Frederiksen, op. cit.
16 Newell, op. cit.
no significant difference was accepted. Female principals were perceived to demonstrate as much concern regarding the human relationships between staff and leader as were male principals. This conclusion is consistent with those of Morsink and Van Meir. In investigating leader behaviors of secondary school principals, Morsink found no significant difference between female and male principals on the leader behavior, Consideration, as perceived by teachers. In a study regarding elementary school principals, Van Meir found similar results. In both studies, as it was found in this study, the difference was not significant.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Thrust, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected; female principals were perceived as demonstrating significantly more Thrust than male principals. The rejection of this hypothesis indicates that female principals are perceived to be more task-oriented than male principals, that female principals are perceived as demonstrating more behavior which motivates teachers by example than male principals. It is thus concluded that female principals are perceived to demonstrate more effort to move the organization toward its goals than do male principals. The results

17 Morsink, op. cit.
of this study are supported by Morsink, who found female principals to demonstrate significantly more "Initiation of Structure," which was described as behavior in which the leader clearly defines his role and lets followers know what is expected of them.\(^{19}\) The results are also supported by the findings of Grobman and Hines, which indicated that females were found to be more concerned with teaching, pupil participation and evaluation of learning\(^{20}\) and also by the study of Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen, who reported that females were found to be characteristically concerned with reaction of pupils to the educational programs, whereas males were characterized as being unconcerned with objectives, evaluation, planning and continuity, curriculum development or child growth and development\(^{21}\).

Thus in the Morsink and Grobman and Hines studies, females were found to be concerned with those activities which may be considered to be integral aspects in moving toward the goals of education, and in the study of Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen, male principals were found to be unconcerned with aspects which might be considered vital to the goals of education.

The importance of **Thrust** as a trait among educational leaders was suggested by Ramseyer and Halpin as well as Morphet, Johns and Reller. Ramseyer defined educational leadership as "that action or

\(^{19}\)Morsink, *op. cit.*  
\(^{20}\)Grobman and Hines, *op. cit.*  
\(^{21}\)Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen, *op. cit.*
behavior among individuals or groups which causes both the individual and group to move toward educational goals that are increasingly mutually acceptable to them."{22} Halpin maintained that leaders are confronted with two tasks; one of these tasks is that of demonstrating a commitment to the accomplishment of group tasks.{23} Morphet, Johns and Reller described leadership acts as those including helping a group to achieve its tasks, goals and purposes.{24}

**Hypothesis 4:** There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Production Emphasis, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected. Female principals were perceived to monitor teachers more closely than male principals; female principals were perceived to be less concerned with two-way communication than were their male counterparts. Thus, it is concluded that teachers in this study perceive female principals to demonstrate more Production Emphasis than male principals.

Female principals have been found to demonstrate more knowledge of the curriculum and the learning process than male principals. For example, Newell found that female elementary school principals showed more evidence of being "aware of the cognitive factor of the learning

---

{22}Ramseyer, op. cit.


{24}Morphet, Johns and Reller, op. cit., p. 124.
process than did male administrators." Grobman and Hines reported that female principals were rated higher on "knowledge of teaching methods and techniques" than were males. They also found that females were more concerned with teaching, pupils and evaluation of learning. Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen reported results which indicated that female principals were characterized by such factors as concern with objectives, planning and evaluation, and the effect of teacher performance.

These findings provide a possible reason why females were perceived to monitor teachers more than males were. The aforementioned studies provide evidence to the effect that females have more knowledge about the educational program; therefore, their concerns and questions regarding the program may be more relevant, and thus they may be perceived as providing closer supervision of the instructional program.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between female and male elementary school principals in the leader behavior of Aloofness, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected. The rejection of this hypothesis indicates that female principals are perceived to be more formal and impersonal than male principals; that female principals are perceived to be guided

---

25 Newell, op. cit.
26 Grobman and Hines, op. cit.
27 Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen, op. cit.
by rules and policies and to prefer to follow the policies instead of dealing with teachers in informal, face-to-face encounters. It is concluded that female principals are perceived to keep themselves more emotionally apart from the staff than are male principals.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is no significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Hindrance, as perceived by teachers. The staffs of both groups of principals perceived themselves not to be significantly different in regard to being burdened by busywork, routine duties and committee work. It is thus concluded that the staffs are not significantly different in the degree to which they perceive the principal is hindering their work.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is no significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Disengagement, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected; schools with female principals scored significantly lower on Disengagement than those with male principals. The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that teachers working with male principals perceive themselves to be simply going through the motions while working on a task more so than teachers working with female principals; teachers working with female principals perceive themselves as achieving their goal more quickly than do their peers who are working with male principals. The teachers working with male principals perceive themselves as having less group maintenance
than those working with females.

It is concluded that teachers working with female principals perceive themselves as being more goal-oriented and that the manner in which they proceed to accomplish their goals is defined more clearly than the process followed by teachers working with male principals. The findings of Newell\textsuperscript{28} and Grobman and Hines,\textsuperscript{29} as well as Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen,\textsuperscript{30} all of which resulted in evidence that females are more knowledgeable and concerned with the goals of instruction and pupil progress, may provide the reason for the difference in the amount of Disengagement perceived in the two groups of schools. Van Meir found female principals to score significantly higher on "role assumption," which was defined as the perceived degree to which an individual actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrenders leadership to others.\textsuperscript{31} Thus, female principals are perceived to exert the leadership to move the organization toward its goals.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between those schools administered by female and male elementary school principals in regard to Esprit, as perceived by teachers. The null hypothesis of no difference was accepted; the findings indicate that there is not a significant difference in Esprit or morale in the schools.

\textsuperscript{28}Newell, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{29}Grobman and Hines, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{30}Hemphill, Griffith and Frederiksen, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{31}Van Meir, op. cit.
selves as enjoying the same degree of social relationships with one another. Halpin does not refer to the social needs satisfaction achieved through this dimension as related to the accomplishment of tasks or group maintenance. 36

As a result of comparing the organizational climate of schools administered by females and males, as perceived by teachers, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The organizational climate of schools administered by females does not differ significantly from the organizational climate of schools administered by males, as perceived by teachers.

2. There was no significant difference regarding the leader behavior, Consideration. Therefore, it was concluded that there is no difference between female and male principals in their concern with group maintenance, in their behavior in demonstrating friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth to their staffs. Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the staffs working with female principals and the staffs working with male principals in the staff behavior, Esprit.

3. Female principals were perceived to be significantly more task-oriented than male principals. Female principals

were perceived to be demonstrating more Thrust (concern with moving the organization toward its goals), Production Emphasis (to monitor the teachers closer), and Aloofness (to be guided more by rules and policies) than the male principals.

4. There was no significant difference between the staffs on the behavior, Hindrance; there was no difference in the degree teachers felt that their work is hindered by routine duties and busy work. However, teachers working with male principals perceived themselves as demonstrating significantly more Disengagement than teachers working with female principals. Teachers working with male principals felt that they go through the motions in problem-solving more than those working with female principals.

5. Generally, there were no significant interaction effects between sex of principal and sex and age of teacher. There appeared to be greater interaction effect between sex of principal and numbers of years of experience of teachers than the other two relationships investigated.

It was concluded that females are perceived by teachers to be as competent in leadership roles in elementary schools as male principals. Specifically, female principals are perceived to demonstrate significantly more effort in motivating teachers toward the goals of the insti-
tution (Thrust) and in establishing procedures by which this can be accomplished more quickly (less Disengagement). The emphasis on goal achievement was not at the expense of the group maintenance or needs satisfaction. The teachers working with female principals do not perceive themselves as having any less Esprit than the staffs working with male principals, and there was no difference between female principals and male principals in the degree to which Consideration is demonstrated.

Based on the findings of this study, it is concluded that there is no evidence to support the position that males are more competent principals of elementary schools and that the selection of elementary school principalships should be based on the qualities and experiences of the individual and the sex of the applicant should have no bearing on his/her candidacy.

**Recommendations**

The results of this study support the position that females are perceived to be as capable, if not more so, than males as elementary school principals. In view of this conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

1. Colleges and universities must adjust their training programs and counseling practices based on the premise that females are suited for administrative and managerial positions as well as other positions other than those traditionally viewed as "female roles." Females themselves
must be encouraged to perceive themselves as capable of alternative career positions.

2. Personnel practices in school districts must encourage and increase females in visible leadership roles at all levels. Females should be accorded titles, authority and financial remuneration commensurate with their responsibilities. School districts should actively support those staff members with leadership potential by involving them in internship training programs concurrent with their regular responsibilities.

3. Professional organizations such as the California Teachers Association, the Association of California School Administrators and the California School Boards' Association must actively address themselves to the problem of disproportionate numbers of females in leadership positions. The findings of this study support the position of providing equal access to administrative positions for all properly qualified applicants, regardless of sex.

4. In view of the findings of this study, it appears that investigations in the following areas would be enlightening:
   a. A study of current trends in recruitment practices in the public schools. It would be of particular interest
to study the practices in the selection of administrative personnel.

b. A replication of Saunders' study in regard to perceptions of superintendents and board members regarding females in leadership roles.

c. A study of financial remuneration and assignment of titles to women as compared to males with comparable responsibilities.

d. A study of role conflict due to cultural expectations of women in leadership positions.

e. A study of promotion practices in universities and colleges, as well as in business fields.
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APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE TO SUPERINTENDENTS REQUESTING PERMISSION TO APPROACH PRINCIPALS FOR STUDY
Dear Dr. Daniels,

I am in the process of conducting a study regarding the organizational climate of elementary schools. In selecting a sample by the use of a table of random numbers, the following schools in your school district were selected:

Gardens School
Glenn School
Grove School
Hause School
Lincoln School

I request your permission to contact the principals of the above schools regarding this project. The certificated staff of participating schools will be asked to meet together for a thirty minute session at their own school. They will be asked to fill out a questionnaire which will be explained and administered by me or my co-workers. The results of the questionnaire will be made available to the principal, at his/her request, at a later date.

Although the information is being collected so that I can complete my doctoral studies at the University of the Pacific, I do hope that the findings from the individual school will assist the principal in assessing the organizational climate of his/her school.

The study is endorsed by our professional organization, Association of California School Administrators.

In order to facilitate your response, I am enclosing a form and an addressed envelope. Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

K. Jessie Kobayashi
APPENDIX B

FORM GRANTING PERMISSION FROM SUPERINTENDENT
March, 1973

K. Jessie Kobayashi
435 Shelford Avenue
San Carlos, California 94070

(Please check one of the following and return the form.)

___ You have my permission to contact the principals of the
    schools listed below to try to secure their cooperation for
    your study.

___ You do not have my permission to contact the principals of the
    schools listed below to try to secure their cooperation for
    your study.

__________________________________________
Signature

__________________________________________
Name of School District
APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE TO PRINCIPALS REGARDING STUDY
First of all, I thank you very much for making it possible for me to collect data from your staff. __________ who has been trained in the administration of the questionnaire will meet with your staff on __________ at __________. Inasmuch as the teachers will be filling out a questionnaire, it would be helpful if they could be seated at tables, however, it is not necessary. The certificated staff members assigned to your building on a full time basis will be asked to complete the questionnaire. As the building principal, you will not be asked to complete the questionnaire, however, I do hope that you will be able to introduce __________ and to be present during the administration of the questionnaire.

If you wish the general results of the questionnaire administered to your staff, please contact me at 967-6921 during the last two weeks of June and I will meet with you to go over the findings from your school.

If you wish an abstract of the results of the entire study, please so indicate to __________.

Again, thank you and please convey my appreciation to your staff for taking time from their busy schedule to assist me.

Yours very truly,

K. Jessie Kobayashi
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO PRINCIPALS
I wish to thank you sincerely for the kind and supportive reception which you and your staff at 435 Shelford Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070 extended to [redacted]. She was most appreciative of all that was done to facilitate the administration of the questionnaire.

Thank you again.

Yours very truly,

K. Jessie Kobayashi
APPENDIX E

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to secure a description of the different ways in which teachers interact and in which teachers interact with the principal. This questionnaire was developed at Ohio State and has been widely used throughout the country.

Please indicate to what extent each of these descriptions characterizes your school. 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 this year.

Mark your response to each of the 64 items on the answer sheet. A typical item and the descriptive scale on which to rate items is explained below:

Example: Teachers call each other by their first names.

A) Rarely occurs
B) Sometimes occurs
C) Often occurs
D) Very frequently occurs

In this example the teacher chose alternative C to show that she felt that this action "often occurs" at her school. So she marked her response sheet as follows:

A B C D E

Use the same four item descriptive scale for all 64 items. Do not use answer space E. Mark only one response per item; be sure to completely erase all unwanted marks.

When you finish, please give the questionnaire and your answer sheet to the examiner. Thank you for your assistance.
A) Rarely occurs  
B) Sometimes occurs  
C) Often occurs  
D) Very frequently occurs  

**QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS**

1. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.  
2. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.  
3. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.  
4. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.  
5. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.  
6. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.  
7. Extra books are available for classroom use.  
8. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.  
9. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.  
10. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.  
11. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."  
12. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.  
13. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.  
14. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.  
15. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.  
16. Student progress reports require too much work.  
17. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.  
18. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.  
19. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.  
20. Teachers have too many committee requirements.
A) Rarely occurs
B) Sometimes occurs
C) Often occurs
D) Very frequently occurs

21. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
22. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
23. Custodial 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.
A) Rarely occurs  
B) Sometimes occurs  
C) Often occurs  
D) Very frequently occurs

44. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.
45. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
46. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.
47. The principal talks a great deal.
48. The principal explains his reason for criticism to teachers.
49. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.
50. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.
51. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
52. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
53. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use.
54. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference.
55. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.
56. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.
57. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.
58. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
59. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.
60. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.
61. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.
62. The principal is easy to understand.
63. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.
64. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.
APPENDIX F

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE REPORTED BY SEX OF TEACHER
Analysis of Crosstabs: Organizational Climate Perceived by Female Teachers and Reported by Sex of Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Principals</th>
<th>Male Principals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² value = 1.99 with 1 degree of freedom  NS

Frequency Distribution by Percentages: Distribution on Organizational Climate Continuum by Female Teachers Reported by Sex of Principal
Analysis of Crosstabs: Organizational Climate Perceived By Male Teachers and Reported by Sex of Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Principals</th>
<th>Male Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi^2 value = 0.07 with 1 degree of freedom. NS

Frequency Distribution by Percentages: Distribution on Organizational Climate Continuum of Male Teachers Reported by Sex of Principal

Female principals ---
Male principals ---
APPENDIX G

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE REPORTED BY AGE OF TEACHER
### Analysis of Cross-tabs: Organizational Climate as Perceived By Teachers Reported According to Age of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>26-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² value = 2.18 with 4 degrees of freedom  NS
APPENDIX H

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE REPORTED BY TEACHERS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
### Analysis of Crosstabs: Organizational Climate as Perceived By Teachers Reported According to Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>Over 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² value = 3.10 with 4 degrees of freedom  NS