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2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the course of the last two decades or so, a fairly good volume of research on organizational climate has seen the light of the day. It is neither possible nor necessary to summarise all the reported researches on climate. What can reasonably be done is to present a trend report underscoring the advances being made in the area of climate research. The review in the present chapter would encompass studies done on identification of climate and some related variables as well as factors or influences that operate in weaving the intricate and delicate texture which is imperceivable, but nonetheless sensitive to the 'feel' of the fabric of organizational climate. Researches on the selected major correlates of organizational climate will also be briefly reviewed in terms of emergent major trends and conclusions.

2.2 INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING CLIMATE

Research aimed at identifying the institutional climate dates back to the 1930's when the first studies by Prentice and Kunkel (1930, 1931) appeared. These studies aimed at identifying the college environments that are
effective in stimulating achievement motivation in the students. After these studies, only a few researches were conducted on the institutional environments till the 1960's. Whatever studies have been conducted till the 1960's usually centred round measuring the influence of college or institutional environments on the productivity of the students or the institutional members. Scott (1963) observed that since the 1960's, the interest in this topic has widened because of the strong influence of the system theory model upon the study of organizations.

Environment or climate is such a vast term that it can include anything and everything. A number of scales have been developed so far to measure the climate of colleges, high schools and other organizations. Some of these instruments, named differently, have something in common to measure, whereas some others having something in common in their titles, measure altogether different dimensions of the climate. The different instruments that have appeared so far in the literature of educational research are described below:

(1) **Control Questionnaire**: To measure organizational
atmosphere in terms of distribution of control in the institutions. Tannebaum and Kahn (1957) developed a questionnaire which asks students to indicate the amount of influence exercised by each of the following groups: administration, faculty, students, SDS and Black students Association. Students are asked, "In general, how much influence (they feel) the various groups have in actually determining policies and actions" and how much they feel the various group should have.

(2) **High School Characteristics Index**: The High School Characteristics Index or HSCI consists of 300 questions is another environmental technique developed by Stern (1963) to assess the student's perception of his environment by asking him to respond with either 'true' or 'false' to items about his school. This yields scores on 30 scales representative of different aspects of 'press' in the environment. Through statistical techniques the 30 scales have been grouped or clustered under seven major factors which describe in more general terms various aspects of school life and the overall school climate. These seven conceptual categories (factors) are: Intellectual Climate, Expressiveness, Group Life, Personal Dignity, Achievement Standards, Orderliness and Practical or Pragmatic.
(3) **The Learning Inventory**: The Learning Inventory or LEI developed by Anderson (1970) describes the classroom climate along 14 dimensions or scales. Each scale contains seven items, selected by factor analysis, which are statements descriptive of typical high school classes. The respondents express agreement or disagreement with each item on a four-point scale. The 14 scales of LEI are:

1. Intimacy,
2. Diversity,
3. Formality,
4. Speed,
5. Environment,
6. Friction,
7. Goal direction,
8. Favoritism,
9. Difficulty,
10. Apathy,
11. Democratic,
12. Cliqueness,
13. Satisfaction,

(4) **The Pupil Activity Inventory**: The pupil activity inventory or PAI is another inventory developed by Anderson (1970) which is a 16-itemed instrument to measure the frequency with which pupils engage in a number of science-related activities such as reading about science, visiting museums and programme about science on television.

(5) **The Learning Climate Inventory**

The LOI or the Learning Climate Inventory developed by Hoyle (1972) is a 20-dimension instrument somewhat related to OCDQ and OCI.
The tool consists of 20 items each of which the teachers are required to answer on a 7-point frequency scale with a minimum value of 1 and a maximum value of 7. The twenty raw score can be added to reflect a total learning climate score for the school.

Preston (1972) used the tool to analyse the learning climate and leader behaviour in open-space and traditional elementary schools. Barfield (1972) also applied the LCI in analysing learning climate, organizational climate and pupil achievement in innovative and non-innovative elementary schools.

(6) **The School Survey**: The School Survey is an inventory covering significant elements of the teacher's work environment. It consists of 125 items arranged into 14 categories by Coughlan et al. (1964) after extensive reviews and analysis. The factors that were obtained through this survey include factors related to administrative operations (Board functioning, system administration, work load, materials and equipment, building facilities); factors related to working relationships (principal relations, college, relations, community relations); factors related to school effectiveness (instructional programme, student development); and
factors related to career fulfilment (performance appraisal, financial incentives, professional autonomy).

(7) **The TAPE** : The Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment or Tape evolved by Pervin (1967).

(8) **Description Instruments** : Deshpande et al (1970) reported the Teacher Description Instrument or TDI - the environmental scale based on teacher behaviors. The instrument consists of 147 items +3 items to test criterion variables. A five-point scale to rate the frequency of occurrence of each behaviour is used in this instrument. It has been used on 674 undergraduate students who rated 32 of their regular class-room teachers. When factor-analysed, 14 meaningful dimensions were obtained: motivation, rapport, structure, clarity, content mastery, overload, evaluation, use of teaching aids, instructional skill, teaching styles, encouragement, individual assistance, interaction and text adherence.

(9) **The Organizational Climate Questionnaire** : Rao (1968) constructed OCQ or the Organizational Climate Questionnaire to measure the organizational climate of the small industries. The OCQ was developed with an intention
to study whether organizational climate of industries can be treated as a multi-dimensional variable that could be measured. This questionnaire consists of 23 Likert type questions to measure the organizational climate on 19 dimensions.

(10) **Phenomenal-Self and Phenomenal Environment Scales (1970):**

A notable and recent deviation in the environmental assessment techniques is perhaps viewing the environment as a part of phenomenal-self. Such an environment, existing in the phenomenal-self of the individual has been named by Kubiniec (1970) as phenomenal environment. The techniques described so far can be grouped into those which take into consideration the objective characteristics of the environment and those which measure the subjective perceptions of the Environment. Kubiniec (1970), starting with the assumption that it is not the objective environment which matters, but it is how the individual sees and interprets the environment, has used the term 'phenomenal environment'. Kubiniec's (1970) phenomenal environment scales assess 4 characteristics of the environment (Studying, Reading, Learning, and College degree), each characteristics being rated by 15 semantic concepts (on a semantic differential)
grouped under three dimensions:

1. **Evaluative** consisting of good-bad; useful-useless, important-unimportant; and interesting-boring.

2. **Potency** consisting of strong-weak, serious-humorous; masculine-feminine; severe-lenient, and rugged-delicate; and

3. **Activity** consisting of active-passive, excitable-calm, complex-simple; tense-relaxed and energetic-lethargic.

(11) **The School Climate Opinionnaire**: Scores on the School Climate Opinionnaire developed by William (1973) collects opinions of students about school climate. This instrument elicits problems perceived in the school's climate. The SCO is a forty-item, Likert-type instrument, which refers to seven different aspects of a school's climate. The seven sub-sections of the instrument are activities and club-programs, subject offerings, student-student relationships, daily schedule and yearly calendar, rules and regulations, and general opinions about schools. Thus, the SCO can give a sub-score for each of the aspects of climate shown above and a total score based on all forty items.

Thus, it will be seen that a number of attempts have been made to describe and evaluate school climate. Among these attempts, Halpin and Croft's OCDQ seems to be widely
used particularly in the U.S.A. Western countries like Canada and Australia have also accepted the OCDQ favourably and its use figures in a number of climate studies. This tool has been used in some Asian countries like Korea, Philippines, Thailand and India. The present research also uses the OCDQ but with four additional dimensions and all items rewritten to suit Indian conditions.

2.3 DIMENSIONS OF CLIMATE

Most of the studies on climate reported after Halpin and Croft published their research in 1963 base the identification of the climate on the eight dimensions discovered by them through factor analysing the data on Form III of the OCDQ yielded by U.S. respondents. These eight dimensions were: Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy (all teachers' behaviour indicating dimensions) and Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust and Consideration (all principal's behaviour indicating dimensions). Muliaq used the OCDQ with a sample of nurses. When he factored the items, he found that they held up to the eight dimensions even better than in the original study by Halpin and Croft. However, Motilal Sharma (1973; 196) renamed some of the dimensions of the OCDQ in his study of organizational-
climate of secondary schools of Rajasthan on the following ground: "Because of the varying type of factor structure obtained, the restraint imposed by the sample and the apparent 'unreality' of the factor structure of (his) study, the only choice was to rename and redefine the new factors. The new names given to some dimensions were 'alienation' for 'aloofness', 'psycho-physical hindrance' for 'hindrance', 'controls' for 'hindrance' and 'aloofness' and 'humanized thrust' for 'thrust'. Motilal Sharma (p.211) though used Halpin and Croft's OCDQ, contends that "except in the case of the dimensions 'disengagement', 'esprit', 'intimacy' and 'production emphasis', the factor structure is not the same, as it was in the original study. Pyra's (1965) study on organizational climate based on data drawn from secondary schools of Canada and Mehra (1965) whose sample was drawn from New Delhi secondary schools also yielded dimensions, some of which were different from Halpin and Croft's study. Pyra (1965:122) observes, "the findings indicated that there may be some discrepancies between definitions of the sub-tests and results in empirical utilization." The trend, therefore, is to examine the dimensions or the sub-tests of the OCDQ in contexts of different samples reflecting different cultures. This trend has another off-shoot—the
enrichment of the dimensions by adding some more through empirical explorations.

Several attempts have been made so far to study organizational climate of secondary schools and teachers' colleges of Gujarat. They include studies by Sharma, Roy and Buch (1971), Kumar (1972), Patel (1974), Shelat (1975), Pandya (1975), Darji (1975), Franklin (1975), Choksi (1976) and Tikmani (1976). But unfortunately, no attempt was made in these studies to factor analyse the items and examine their groupings into dimensions. However, these studies underscore the fact that Halpin and Croft's eight dimension centred OCDQ is an appropriate measure to identify organizational climate of Indian educational institutions. The present study, therefore, retains the eight original dimensions of the OCDQ as conceptualised in operation terms by Halpin and Croft, but it adds four more dimensions as a result of the reactions of principals of secondary schools in some parts of Gujarat State.
2.4 VARIABLES INFLUENCING CLIMATE

In analysing the climate of a school there are many variables which influence the nature of the organizational climate. While limiting themselves to the social interactions that occur between the teachers and principal, Halpin and Croft (1963) listed several factors which could be conceived as defining the climate of a school. Included in their list are the following:

The social-economic status of the school's patrons; the biographical and personality characteristics of the principal and the teachers; the 'quality' of the students; the attitudes of the parents toward the school; the schools' physical plant; the teachers' salary schedule; the educational and administrative policies of the school district; and the location of the school.

The factors are represented pictorially in Chart II given on the next page.

Since the domain of 'organizational climate' and its correlates is a vast area, the review of variables has got to be selective.
CHART II

FACTORS AFFECTING CLIMATE OF A SCHOOL

SCHOOL CLIMATE

THE SOCIAL ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE SCHOOL'S PATRONS
THE BIOGRAPHY OF THE PRINCIPAL AND PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP OF THE PRINCIPAL TO ALL TEACHERS
THE QUALITY OF THE TEACHERS
THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENTS
THE ATTITUDE OF THE PARENTS TOWARDS THE SCHOOL
THE SCHOOL'S PHYSICAL PLANT
THE SCHOOL'S PHYSICAL PLANT
THE TEACHER'S SALARY SCHEDULE
THE EDUCATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT
THE LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL
It is assumed that the entire gamut of socio-psychological researches of these sections combined together would have either the significant or insignificant influence on the educational programme and productivity of an organization.

The investigator's assumption is that at the end of the review of selected variables, a better understanding of the psychological and social characteristics of the school and its personnel as well as proper perspective of social interaction within the school would come out which would show how the organizational climate, the personality traits of the school personnel and the pupil control ideology in an organization contribute in running the organization more beneficially to pursue the goals of the organization. Such an understanding would also help State Departments of Education, education officers and the Departments of Extension Services of teachers' colleges to work out the implications of these findings and apply them in determining the best type of organizational climate which should be developed in schools.
Sharma (1973: 101), after scanning a number of OCDQ or organizational climate studies has reached a conclusion that the correlating variables can be classified into two categories, viz., stable variables and unstable variables. Under the stable variables, he puts those characteristics of the school which are relatively stable, and under the second category he includes those variables which are seemingly more easily or rapidly influenced by interaction with the school system. He observes, "though this categorization is somewhat arbitrary and these two classes are at times overlapping, even then it will serve to isolate a highly unmanageable group of interactions among input variables." Sharma's classification is confusing. Therefore in tables that follow findings of major researches on variables like size of the teaching staff, size of the student population, location (urban-rural) of schools, nature of school management, per capita annual expenditure, sex of the school (boys', girls' or co-educational), socio-economic status of the parents of school children and selected biographical characteristics of teachers and school principals are included. No attempt is made to categorise them as stable or unstable variables, though most of them might fall in the category of stable variables.
Table 2.1: Selected Variables of Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year of research</th>
<th>Whether relationship significant with Open/Closed climate types or not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Size of Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Flagg</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cook</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Smaller staff - Open climate; bigger staff - Closed climate; Relationship significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bushlinger</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Smaller staff - Open climate; Relationship not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Creaser</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Flanders</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Smaller schools - Open climate; Relationship significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sargent</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Not significant relationship between staff size and Openness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Marcum</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Smaller-staff - Open climate; bigger staff - Closed climate; Significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Winter</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sharma</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont....
Table 2.1: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year of research</th>
<th>Whether relationship significant with Open/Closed climate types or not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(B) Size of Student Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Faber</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hillman</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Smaller size - Open climate; larger urban schools; Closed Climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farino la</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Not significant; however, larger school districts showed a tendency to be relatively more open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shelat</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Smaller size - Open climate; bigger size - Controlled and Closed Climate types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C) Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gentry and Kenney</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Rural schools significantly more Closed climate type than urban and semi-urban schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Halpin</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Urban schools tended to be more closed than other area's schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shelat</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(D) Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Govt. and private schools; No significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year of research</th>
<th>Whether relationship significant with Open/Closed climate types or not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(E) Per Capita Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marcum</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(F) Sex of the School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Franklin</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Owenby</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Male Female and Coeducational schools - no significant relationship with climate type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(G) Socio-Economic Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nicholas et al</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Combinations of high SES - Open climate; low SES - Closed climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pumphrey</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>No significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Farber</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>High SES - Open climate; Low SES - closed climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guy</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>No significant relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(H) Principal's Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ernst</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>No significant relationship with climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Franklin</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>-do- cont...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1 : (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year of research</th>
<th>Whether relationship significant with Open/Closed climate types or not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Esporite</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shelat</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I) Principal's Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Year of research</th>
<th>Whether relationship significant with Open/Closed climate types or not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ernst</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Franklin</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farber</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(J) Principal's Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Year of research</th>
<th>Whether relationship significant with Open/Closed climate types or not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anderson</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Longer experience - Open climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Watkinis</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Franklin</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. McLeod</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Six or seven years of experience - Open climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farber</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Esporite</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over and above the above cited variables, some other correlating with climate have been studied. Pumphrey (1969) found no significant relationship of students' self concept as a learner or student attendance with school climate, whereas Sommerville (1969) found significant difference between higher personal/social concept, levels of aspirations and attitudes and opinions among students of Open and Closed climate schools. Lutjemeir (1969) found no significant relationship of social classroom structures and climate.

Sharma's (1973) doctoral study revealed that there was no relationship between climate and staff stability. However, school climate was found to be significantly related to teacher satisfaction. It was also found to bear significant correlation with the effectiveness of school principal. School effectiveness was also found to be correlated significantly with climate. This finding was supported by Bhikhu Patel (1974), Ivy Franklin (1975) and Sat Paul Gupta (1976).

A close and significant correlation of climate with leader's behaviour patterns was found by Sharma (1973), Bhikhu Patel (1974), Shelat (1975), Franklin (1975), Pandya (1975), Darji (1975), Choksi (1976), Tikmani (1976) and
Sat Paul Gupta (1976). The same band of researchers also found climate being significantly related with staff morale. Kothai Pillai (1973) also reached the same conclusion.

Kothai Pillai (1973), Bhikhu Patel (1974) and Shelat (1975) and Ivy Franklin (1975) found climate significantly correlated with institutional achieving index. Shelat (1975) investigated relationship between school climate and pupil motivation towards school and found that it was statistically significant.

The foregoing review of researches on relationship between climate and different input type variables shows that not uniform results have accrued. In some researches, relationship between climate and an input variable was found to be significant whereas other researches have gone against such a conclusion. This divergence in research findings can be attributed to either the nature and size of the samples used or it may be due to cultural or other imperceptible influences. However, the research evidences seem to support fully the significant relationship between climate and factors like teacher morale, leadership behaviour patterns and achievement index and quality or standards of education being imparted in the institutions. The present investigator
has not thought it worth while to repeat the earlier research exercises in ascertaining the significant or otherwise relationship existing between climate and the types of input and output variables included in the above presented review. Instead, he would concentrate his efforts on reviewing the researches on the major correlates he has selected for this study, viz., Personality Variables, Pupil Control Ideology and Dogmatism. This will be attempted in the next three sections of this chapter.

2.5 CLIMATE AND PERSONALITY

Most relevant to the present study is the relationship between climate and personality factors of school personnel which may be assumed to be exercising some influence in determining the nature of the organizational climate.

Anderson (1964) made a study of the organizational climate of elementary schools based on a sample of 81 schools, drawn from school districts holding membership in the Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin cities Metropolitan Area. All of the professional staff members in each of the 81 schools completed the OCDQ of Halpin and Croft. Each of the principals completed the 16
Personality Factor Questionnaire of Cattell, the Study of Values of Allport, Vernon and Lindsey, and a biographical inventory. Four major null hypotheses were examined by the investigator. His findings which are reported in Table 4.2, can be of great help to prospective administrators for developing insight of self-diagnosis.

Table 2.2: Significant Relationships Between Climate Dimensions and Personality-Value Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Dimension</th>
<th>Characterization of Principal in High Scoring School</th>
<th>Characterization of Principal in Low Scoring School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Behaviour</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Submissive, dependent, Dominant, assertive, shy, withdrawn, cold, adventurous, genial, practical, conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>Cool, aloof, obstructive, practical, conventional, Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>Mature, calm, stable, Worrying, emotional, Assertive, aggressive, Mild, submissive, Persistent, conscientious, Undependable, friv- tious, Confident, loud, Timid, insecure, Self-secure, Controlled, uncontrolled, lax, exacting, High Social Low Social values. Values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.2: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Dimension</th>
<th>Characterization of Principal in High Scoring School</th>
<th>Characterization of Principal in Low Scoring School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Of less intelligence, Aggressive, Competitive, High Social values.</td>
<td>Brighter, Mild, Dependent, low social values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Behaviour</td>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>Cool, Suspicious, rigid, mild, non-competitive, calculating, Exacting, low social values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>Brighter, Persistent, Consistent, Anxious, Commanding, High economic values, High political values.</td>
<td>Of less intelligence, Relaxed, frivolous, Realistic, self-reliant, Low economic values, Low political values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>Dominant, assertive, Responsible, Persistent, High theoretical values, High aesthetic values.</td>
<td>Submissive, 'milk-toast', Casual, dependable, Low theoretical values, Low aesthetic values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Of lesser intelligence, Enthusiastic, cheerful, controlled, exacting.</td>
<td>Brighter, silent, depressed, uncontrolled, Lax.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plaxton (1965) studied the problem of relationship existing between principal's personality and school organizational climate. The final sample of the study consisted of 165 schools. The research tools used were OODQ of Halpin and Croft and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Responses from the principals were used in the analysis. The researcher formulated five hypotheses to determine relationships between the personalities of principals and the organizational climate of the schools they administered.

The first of these hypotheses was tested to determine whether the six categories of climate (Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal, Closed) were related to the personality types of the principals. It was not found to be significant, indicating that there was no over-all relationship operating between personality types and climate categories.

The second and third hypotheses in this connection were tested in an attempt to determine relationships between the four indices of personality and the eight dimensions of organizational climate.

The only significant correlation coefficient indicated
a relationship between the continuous scores on the JP
Index to personality and the standard scores for the
Production Emphasis sub-test of the OCDQ. The only signifi-
cant difference in mean scores was found between the mean
scores of the Production Emphasis sub-test produced by
of which
schools vthe principals/fell into opposite categories when
the JP Index was dichotomized. The analysis in both the
cases indicated that principals with stronger preferences
for judging were more likely to be associated with higher
scores on the Production Emphasis sub-test of the OCDQ.

The fourth hypothesis was tested in an attempt to
determine relationships between personality and organiza-
tional climate. The median score on each sub-test that was
associated with each of the eleven personality types (types
representing fewer than four principals were eliminated)
was found as under:
Table 2.3: Highest and Lowest Median Scores on OCDQ Sub-Tests Associated with Personality Types of Principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dis-Engagement</th>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Espirit</th>
<th>Intimacy</th>
<th>Aloofness</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Thru-Contr.</th>
<th>Con-Str.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPJ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference to the table indicated rather wide differences in median scores on some sub-tests. Table 2.3 indicates the results of testing these differences statistically. In each case the type written on the left was associated with the larger score on the OCDQ sub-test.
Table 2.4: Pairs of Personality Types Associated With Significantly Different Median Sub-Test Scores on the OCDQ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Subtest</th>
<th>Personality Types</th>
<th>Levels of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>ISTJ - ENFJ*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISTJ - INTJ</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTJ - ENFJ</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTJ - INTJ</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>ISTJ - ENFJ</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENFJ - ENFJ</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>INTJ - INFJ</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTJ - ESTJ</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTJ - ISTJ</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Type with higher score in each pair is underlined.

Significant differences were found in nine cases. These differences were associated with the Hindrance, Aloofness and Thrust sub-tests.

Certain trends were evident in connection with the personality types associated with the significant differences for Hindrance and low scores for Thrust. The ISTJ type was also associated with a high score for Aloofness.
The fifth and final hypothesis was tested to determine significant differences in mean OCDQ sub-test scores associated with particular pairs of personality preferences. Significant differences were found on two OCDQ sub-tests, Aloofness and Hindrance. In each case the Institution-Feeling (NF) pair of preferences was associated with low median scores on these sub-tests.

Murphy (1966) also used the 16 P.F. Questionnaire and reported significant differences between the means of teacher personality factors in different climates and also between those groups of teachers who perceived different climates. Moreover, he found that significant differences existed between teachers' and principals' personalities from schools differing in teacher perceived climates and dropout when the schools are classified by principal perceptions. He also reported that no significant differences were found between the personalities of principals and teachers who perceived the same climate. Collins (1966) using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator found that individual personality tended to have an impact on perception of school climate.
Null's (1967) study was based on stratified random sample of 81 elementary schools located in member districts of the Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc. Three instruments - (1) OCDQ of Halpin and Croft (2) 16 P.F. Questionnaire of Cattell and (3) The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) were used during the data gathering phase of the study. The instruments were answered by teachers during a quasi-formal testing session in each of the eighty-one elementary schools sampled. The tools were answered by 1,691 teachers. The findings of the study were as under:

(1) Certain personality factors, particularly Factor I (Tough Vs. Sensitive), Factor H (Timid Vs. Adventurous) and Factor M (Conventional Vs. Eccentric), were related to the perception of certain dimensions of organizational climate, and in no instance did a high score in a particular personality factor predict one sub-test score in a manner indicative of an open climate and a second sub-test score in a manner indicative of a closed climate.

(2) The mean Factor I score of teachers in schools with an open climate was significantly higher than the mean Factor I score of teachers in schools with a closed
climate, and all three means formed a logical pattern. The same situation was true with Factor L, with the exception that teachers in the most open schools had a significantly lower mean score than the teachers in the most closed schools. The mean Factor N score of teachers in schools with an open climate was significantly lower than the mean Factor N scores of teachers in schools with an intermediate climate and with closed climate respectively, and all three means formed a meaningful pattern.

(3) An examination of the six hypotheses revealed that teachers with certain types of personalities tended to view one or more of the dimensions of organizational climate in a manner indicative of an open climate or of a closed climate. In the Table 2.5, given on next page, based on this observation, equal weight should not be given to each personality factor.

Sargent (1967) investigated the nature of relationship between the secondary school principal and his staff as they affect the personality of a high school or its organizational climate. The investigation was limited to 33 high schools drawn from seven county area surrounding and including St. Paul and Minneapolis. The 33 principals of these
Table 2.5: Personality Factors of Teachers and Their Perception of School Organizational Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Open Climate</th>
<th>Closed Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&quot;Good&quot; attitude towards children Vs. &quot;Poor&quot; attitude towards children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bright Vs. Dull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Submissive Vs. Dominant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Enthusiastic Vs. Glum, Silent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Adventurous Vs. Timid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sensitive Vs. Tough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Trustful Vs. Suspecting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conventional Vs. Eccentric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Simple Vs. Sophisticated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Conservative Vs. Experimenting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Tense Vs. Stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools participated personally by taking the 16 P.F. Questionnaire of Cattell, Allport's Study of Values and the OCDQ of Halpin and Croft. From the faculties of these schools, 1024 teachers participated by taking the OCDQ and responding to four additional brief questions. The major findings of the study were as follows:
(1) Out of 22 characteristics or facets of principal's personality only four related to or correlated highly with certain high school climate dimensions.

(a) A school with a high score on the climate dimension Hindrance is likely to have a principal who is outgoing, warm-hearted, easy going, participating, good-natured, soft-hearted, kindly and ready to cooperate.

(b) A school which scores high on the Intimacy dimension of climate has a faculty whose social needs are being satisfied. Yet, such a school tends to have a principal who is tough-minded, self-reliant, realistic, practical and independent.

(c) The principals who are inclined to be experimenting, critical, liberal, analytical, free-thinking, well informed and tolerant of change and inconvenience are viewed by their teachers as aloof.

(d) Those principals who love to observe and reason, and whose interests are empirical, critical and rational are seen by their teachers to be aloof, mechanistic and uncommunicative.

(2) There is very little relationship between any of the
personality characteristics measured and the degree of climate Openness in high schools. Hence the extent of Openness of a high school cannot be predicted from a knowledge of the principal's personality factors.

3) The study indicated that the principals and teachers perceive the various dimensions of organizational climate in their schools in different light - the principals always see these dimensions in a more favourable light than do their teachers.

4) The various school departments do not differ in their estimate of high school climate dimensions.

5) Open climate schools' faculties were more favourable in their evaluation of their schools' effectiveness than the faculties of closed climate schools. The more open the climate, the greater is the percentage of positive responses from the teachers.

6) The study also revealed that teachers in Open climate schools express greater satisfaction with their work than do their counterparts in Closed climate schools.

7) The inquiry showed that the size of a school has no
relationship to the extent of Openness. Large faculties and small faculties are equally likely to perceive school climate as either Open or Closed.

(8) The location of a school is not related to climate Openness. There was no difference in the proportion of Open or Closed schools in urban or suburban surroundings.

Eberlein's (1968) study of the relationship between school climate and Edward's Manifest Needs of the Elementary Teachers reported that closed climate tended to be correlated with high teacher scores on Achievement, Autonomy and Heterosexuality, and with low scores on Deference, order and Abasement.

Anderson's (1966) study aimed at the comparison of personality attributes of the teachers of elementary schools - Open and Closed. The responses from teachers were collected by administering EPPS (Edward's Personal Preference Schedule) and the OCDQ of Halpin and Croft. The findings of the investigation revealed that the personality attributes of teachers who perceived their schools as having open climate were not significantly different from those who view their schools as possessing closed climates. But the teachers from
schools having Open climate did score significantly (P < .05) higher on the personality variables inter­ception and abasement. The teachers in the open climate schools receive satisfaction from task-achievement and social needs whereas teachers in the closed climate schools receive little satisfaction.

Owenby (1964) reported significant relationships between climate and 10 factors of the 16PF and tendencies for openness to be negatively correlated with politics and Factor D and positively correlated with Factor I, while Berendis (1970) found that there was no significant rela­tionship between 16 PF factors and climate.

Tjarks (1973) made a study of the perceptions of organizational climate in elementary schools and its relationship to selected personality traits of principals based on a sample of 24 schools, drawn randomly from a large metropolitan school district. Every other faculty member from each school completed the OCDQ and each principal completed 16 PF questionnaire. The findings of the study are as follows: (1) No significant differences were found to exist between open and closed climate schools on fifteen of the sixteen personality factor means at the .05 level of
confidence. However, two trends were indicated at the .10 level of confidence. These trends showed principals of closed climate schools to be somewhat more emotionally stable and self-confident than principals of open climate schools.

(2) A significant difference was found to exist at the .05 level of confidence between open and closed climate schools on personality factor self-control. Principals of closed climate schools appeared significantly more self-controlled than the principals in open climate schools. (3) Self score data indicate principals of closed climate schools appear to be emotionally stable, persistent, self-confident, controlled, and relaxed. Principals of open climate schools appear to be out-going, trustful, and relaxed.

Yeazas (1973) reported that there was no significant relationship between the measure of authoritarianism as measured by the California P-Scale and the characteristics of the school as measured by the California P-Scale and the characteristics of the school as measured by CUES developed by pace.

Piccirillo's (1973) study based on the sample of sworn personnel of the New Haven Dept. of Police Service (NHDPS)
revealed that the recruits, patrolmen, and higher ranking personnel were incongruent with respect to current organizational dimensions, and their personality traits.

Reitz (1973) explored the possible relationship between the organizational climate of elementary schools and selected personal orientations of the schools' principals. The sample for the study constituted of principals and teachers of 77 elementary schools, situated in Northwestern Ohio. The study suggested that there were no significant relationships between the elementary principals' personal orientations, as measured by the twelve scales of the POI, and the climate of the schools they served, as measured by the OCDQ.

The above review leads to the need for further research explorations in ascertaining whether a significant relationship exists between personality dimensions or factors and organizational climate of schools.
2.6 **CLIMATE AND PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY**

Pupil control ideology of schools as indicated earlier, has been a vital correlate of organizational climate of schools. Hence in this section an attempt will be made to present and discuss studies dealing with the relationship between the school climate and pupil control ideology.

Appleberry and Hoy (1969) studied the pupil control ideology of professional personnel in open and closed elementary schools with a view to investigate the relationship between the pupil control ideology of educators and the "openness" of the organizational climate of elementary schools. Forty-five elementary schools in 30 school districts comprised the sample of this study. The 45 elementary schools that agreed to participate were personally visited by a researcher and both the PCI-Form and OCDQ were administered to the professional personnel during regularly scheduled faculty meetings.

A one-way classification of analysis of variance was used to determine whether there were significant differences between mean of PCI scores of schools, teachers and principals in relatively open and closed climate schools.
Moreover, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to determine whether significant relationship existed between the pupil control ideology and climate openness.

The findings of the study can be briefly stated as under:

(1) The public elementary schools with relatively open climates were found to be significantly more humanistic in pupil control ideology than elementary schools with relatively closed climates. Professional personnel in relatively open schools had a mean PCI score of 52.34, while those in relatively closed schools had a mean PCI score of 55.87. Analysis of variance yielded an F-ratio of 8.67 (P < .01).

(2) The openness of the schools did correlate significantly with school PCI scores (r = -.61 P < .01); this leads to predict that the more open the climates of the schools, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology of the schools.

(3) The hypothesis that principals serving in relatively open school would be significantly more humanistic in pupil control ideology than principals serving in relatively closed
schools was not significant. Similarly the prediction was not confirmed that the more open the climate of the schools, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology of the principals \((r = -0.26, P > .05)\).

(4) As hypothesized, teachers serving in relatively open schools were significantly more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than teachers serving in relatively closed schools. The mean PCI scores for teachers in open and closed school climates were 52.64 and 56.24 respectively with an \(F\)-ratio of 7.82 \((P < .01)\). Furthermore, the relationship between the degree of "Openness" of the climate of all schools and the PCI of teachers was also significant \((r = -0.59, P < .01)\); the more open the climates of the schools, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology of teachers.

Duggal (1969) reported that student unrest is related to custodial PCI of teachers.

Jones (1969) found that the teachers in schools which were high on the dimension of authority and characterized by punishment centred bureaucratic style were more custodial in PCI than those in low authority and representative style schools.
Keffe (1969) attempted to study the relationship of the pupil control ideology of teachers to key personal and organizational variables. The study was based on the sample of 48 junior high school teachers. The research tools used were OCDQ, PCI-Form and the Dogmatism scale of Rokeach. The study disclosed that the humanistic teachers reported more open climate.

Appleberry and Hoy (1970) explored the teacher-principal relationships in humanistic and custodial elementary schools. The sample of the study consisted of 45 elementary schools drawn from thirty school districts. The Pupil Control Ideology Form and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire were personally administered by a researcher to virtually all the professional personnel of the forty-five elementary schools.

A one-way classification of analysis of variance was used to compare the patterns of social interactions of professional staff in humanistic and custodial schools.

The findings of the study are as under:

(1) Analysis of variance computations yielded significant F-ratios for differences between means of humanistic
and custodial schools on Disengagement ($F = 9.71, P < .01$), Esprit ($F = 5.82, P < .01$), Aloofness ($F = 26.35, P < .01$), and Thrust ($F = 26.02, P < .01$). The degree of Intimacy and production Emphasis was relatively the same in both types of schools. Teachers in humanistic schools experienced slightly less Hindrance and described their principals as more considerate than those in custodial schools. However, the differences between the means were not significant at the .05 level for either of these two dimensions ($F=1.47$ and $F = 3.41$ respectively).

It can be concluded from the above analysis that the comparisons between the patterns of social interactions of professional staff in humanistic and custodial schools revealed statistically significant differences on four of the eight dimensions of the OCDQ.

(2) As hypothesized, elementary schools with a humanistic pupil control orientation were significantly more open than those with a custodial pupil control orientation ($F = 18.77, P < .01$).

Hoy (1971) found that the schools with relatively open climates had significantly more humanistic teachers but
openness of school climate and humanism in principals' PCI were not significantly associated, although the relationship was in the predicted direction.

Waldman (1971) reported that the more open the organizational climate of the secondary school, the less custodial the PCI of the school. Furthermore, the openness of organizational climate was not significantly related to the PCI of the principal but secondary principals were significantly more humanistic in PCI than secondary teachers.

Budzik (1971) revealed that teachers' perceptions of their administrator's control style was not a predictor of teacher PCI.

Bean (1973) made a study of pupil control ideologies of teachers and certain aspects of their classroom behaviour as perceived by pupils. The primary objective of the study was to examine the relation of custodialism in teacher PCI and the instructional climate of the classroom in terms of cognitive activities and affective conditions. The study suggested that teacher sex emerged as a moderating variable. For male secondary teachers, custodialism in PCI was associated significantly with less stress on higher cognitive levels, less discussion, less enthusiasm, less
independence, less tolerance for divergent thinking and
greater focus on lecture. The relationships were not support­
ted for female teachers.

Day (1974) investigated the nature of relationships
between organizational climate, teachers' pupil control
ideology and pupils' attitude toward learning in elementary
schools. The study revealed that the main effects of variables
of organizational climate and the size of schools, considered
separately, were not found to significantly affect the
pupil control ideology of teachers. A significant statistical
difference was found for the interaction between organiza­
tional climate of schools and the size of the schools with
respect to the PCI of teachers.

On the basis of these findings, it was concluded that
main effects variables, considered separately did not
significantly affect pupil control ideology of teachers but
when these variables were considered as an interact­ing
whole, the unique combination of the factors did signifi­
cantly affect pupil control ideology of teachers.

Dafista (1973) reported that two teacher perceived
environmental press factors were related to teacher PCI:
high orderliness press was associated with custodialism, and high supportiveness press was associated with humanism. However, perceptions of environmental press accounted for only 6 per cent of the variance in teacher PCI.

Lunenburg and O'Reilly (1974) studied personal and organizational influence on pupil control ideology. The main purpose of the inquiry was to examine the influence of teacher dogmatism and organizational climate on pupil control ideology. Fifty-three elementary schools in Ontario, Canada, comprised the sample of the study. The three instruments—the OCDQ, the PCI-Form and the Dogmatism Scale by Rokeach—were personally administered by the researcher to the entire professional staff of each school at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. Virtually the entire staff of each school responded the instruments and, in all, nearly 1,000 teachers and principals completed usable forms.

A two-way analysis of variance procedure was used to compare the pupil control ideology of low, middle and high dogmatic teachers in open and closed climate schools.

The statistical analysis of the data indicated that teachers in open schools had mean PCI scores of 45.61, 47.10,
44.48 and 55.15, while those in closed schools had mean PCI scores of 45.47, 50.75, 54.44, and 55.81. Analysis of variance yielded an F-ratio of 5.34 (P < .05). Hence the hypothesis of a relationship between humanism and custodialism in pupil control ideology and the openness or closedness of organizational climate was supported. However, for those teachers who scored at the extreme ends of Dogmatism Scale, school climate had no effect on their pupil control ideology because the middle dogmatic groups had PCI scores of 47.10 and 49.48 in the open schools and 50.75 and 54.44 in the closed schools; whereas, the extreme dogmatic groups and PCI scores of 45.61 and 55.15 in the open schools and 45.47 and 55.81 in the closed schools.

Estadt (1975) has studied the pupil control behaviour of secondary teachers in relation to the rule administration behaviour of the school principal. Three theoretical hypotheses were investigated in the study. The first hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between the representative rule administration behaviour of principals and the humanistic pupil control behaviour of teachers. The second hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between punishment centred principal rule administration behaviour
and custodial pupil control behaviour of teachers. The third hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between the mock rule administration behaviour of principals and teacher pupil control behaviour. The results of the investigation did not support any relationships between principal rule administration behaviour and the pupil control behaviour of teachers. None of the hypotheses was confirmed.

Hinjosa (1974) reported that there was no relationship between organizational climate and the pupil control ideology of teachers.

Holzwarth (1974) reported that the teacher pupil control ideology score distributions were nearly identical in the two different schools environments (one school was of a traditional nature and the second school was more open and flexible).

2.7 PERSONALITY AND PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY

The relationship between various aspects of personality of school personnel and their pupil control ideology has also been studied.
Results of the study by Willower and Landis (1970) supported the hypothesis that there is a direct relationship between professional orientation and humanistic pupil control ideology of secondary teacher in the overall sample, but correlation coefficients were low and the variance accounted for was slight. Hence, results were deemed inconclusive.

and Blankenship Roberts (1970) suggested that student teachers who felt high socialization pressure exhibited greater custodial change in PCI than those who felt low socialization pressure.

Abrams (1971) studied relationships among responses of elementary school principals to school decentralization, their perceptions concerning teacher professionalism and their pupil control ideology. Among several variables examined in this study it was found that a principal's PCI was the single most significant predictor of attitudes toward school decentralization. Principals with a humanistic PCI tended to support decentralization.

Heinman (1971) examined the relationships among high school principals' values of equality and freedom, dogmatism levels and pupil control ideology. He reported that neither value was associated with PCI.
Helsel (1971) conducted a study on the value orientation and pupil control ideology of public school educators. The main purpose of the study was to inquire the relationship between educators' value orientations and their pupil control ideology.

Data for the study were collected by administering the PCI-Form, the DVI and the Biological Information Form to 145 elementary teachers, 129 secondary teachers, 140 counsellors, 131 elementary principals, and 148 secondary principals. The sample was drawn from forty-three counties in Central Illinois.

Partial correlation coefficient was used to see whether there was a positive relationship between traditionalism in educators' value orientations and custodialism in their PCI.

The findings indicated that there was a significant relationship between traditionalism in educators' value orientations and custodialism in their pupil control ideology. This relationship was supported for elementary teachers (Partial r = .351, P < .001), Secondary teachers (Partial r = .466, P < .001), Counsellors (Partial r = .389,
P = .001), Elementary Principals (Partial r = .308, P < .001) and Secondary principals (partial r = .400, P < .001). It can be concluded from the findings of the study that there are no significant differences among the organizational positions in the strength of the relationship between values and pupil control ideology.

In another study Helsel (1971) found that there was a positive association between teacher status obeisance and custodialism in PCI.

McAndrews (1971) reported that teacher self-esteem was not significantly related to PCI or to conformity, defined as the congruence of self-PCI and perceived colleague PCI.

Rafalides and Hoy (1971) made an investigation into the student sense of alienation and pupil control orientation of high schools and found that the student sense of powerlessness, normlessness, and self-isolation were all significantly related to custodialism in the POCI of high schools.

Zelei (1971) in her study, 'Relationship Between Pupil Control Ideology and Sense of Power of Teachers in selected public schools' conducted on 960 Ohio teachers selected by proportional, stratified - cluster sampling techniques
indicated that a custodial PCI was associated with a low sense of power and a humanistic PCI was associated with a high sense of power.

Dobson (1972) suggested that the broad categories of the Flunders Interaction Analysis Scale showed no significant differences between custodial and humanistic elementary teachers, however, humanistic teachers accepted and developed student ideas, lectured less frequently, and had student initiated verbal behaviour significantly more often than custodial teachers.

Hoy and Blankenship (1972) made a comparison of the ideological orientations and personality characteristics of teacher 'acceptors' and 'rejectors' of BSGS Biology and found that high school teachers who held favourable attitudes toward an innovative biology programme and implemented it were more humanistic in PCI than teachers who held unfavourable attitudes toward the programme and did not implement it.

Leppert and Hoy (1972) undertook a study of teacher personality and pupil control ideology. The relationship between pupil control ideology and the broad set of personality characteristics was explored in the study.
Nine hundred thirty-four educators employed in twelve middle schools and twenty-four elementary schools comprised the sample of the study. The elementary schools included in the study were those which acted as "feeders" to the participating middle schools. The AI and the PCI Form were administered by the researchers to the professional staff of each school during regular scheduled faculty meetings.

In order to investigate the relationship between the personality dimensions of the AI and custodialism in pupil control ideology, a step-wise multiple regression analysis was performed with custodialism as the criterion variable. Standard use of step-wise regression was employed.

Responses to the AI and PCI Form indicated that none of the zero order correlations between the personality variables and pupil control ideology was strong. In fact, orderliness was the personality variable with the strongest zero order correlation with pupil control ideology ($r = .21$, $P < .01$). All other zero order correlations between personality needs and pupil control ideology were less than .2 - Self Assertion (.04), Applied Interest (.07), Constraint (.13), Egoism (.18), Closedness (.11), Sensuousness (.07), Friendliness (.02), Audacity (.08), Intellectual Interest
(-.17), Motivation (.09), and Submissiveness (.07). Hence, the most striking finding of the study was the lack of strong relationships found between pupil control ideology and the individual personality dimensions measured by the AI. None of the personality needs was strongly related to PCI.

Rexford et al (1972) in their study on "Teachers' Pupil Control Ideology and Classroom Verbal Behaviour" made an investigation into the relationship between teachers' pupil control ideology and teachers' verbal behaviour as measured by Flander's methods. Three secondary schools in two Pennsylvania school districts comprised the sample of the study. PCI-Form was administered to all the teachers (n=136), of the three schools. On the basis of PCI Form scores of these 131 teachers, twenty-four of them, twelve highly custodial and twelve highly humanistic, were selected for classroom observations.

The major findings of the study were as under:

(1) Custodial secondary school teachers were more direct in their classroom verbal behaviour, as measured by Flanders' methods, than were humanistic secondary teachers.
(2) Differences in the two teacher samples on Flanders' second major category, percentage of teacher talk, failed to reach the .05 significance level.

Williams (1973) in his study "The Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Personnel and its Relationship to Specified Personal and Situational Variables" conducted on 1,241 educators revealed that local-cosmopolitan orientation was associated with custodialism in PCI.

Bean (1973) reported that the pupil control ideologies of men teachers were found to be significantly correlated with their authoritarian behaviour. In contrast, the pupil control ideologies of women teachers were not significantly related to their authoritarian behaviour.

Results of the study by Morrison (1973) did not support the hypothesis that the superintendents who are more favourable toward differentiated staffing are more custodial in pupil control ideology than those superintendents who are less favourable toward differentiated staffing when the effects of the variables (a) the number of years spent by the superintendent in the education profession and (b) the number of teachers under the superintendent's administration are statistically controlled.
Halpin and Goldenberg's (1973) study related to finding out whether any relationships existed between measures of creativity and pupil control ideology. The sample of the study consisted of 99 college students planning to become teachers. For the study three tools, viz., the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, the PCI-Form and the What Kind of Person Are you Test were used. The study revealed that the creative thinking measures of verbal fluency, verbal flexibility and verbal originality and the creative personality measure were significantly correlated with PCI. The more creative potential teachers were more humanistic in PCI.

Hoy (1973) suggested that among a host of characteristics of public secondary schools, custodialism in PCI emerged as an important property of schools significantly related to various dimensions of student alienation.

Jury (1974) in his study "Teacher Self-Actualization and Pupil Control Ideology" examined the relationship between teacher PCI and level of self-actualization as measured by Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory. The hypothesis that the level of self-actualization will be directly related to the degree of humanism in PCI was supported when tested in an overall sample of 272 teachers, and in
separate tests for elementary and secondary teachers in the sample.

Hedberg (1973) reported that student alienation was not significantly related to teachers' pupil control ideology.

Brennman (1975) undertook his study on the relationship among teachers' self-acceptance, acceptance of others and pupil control ideology.

Data for further study were collected by administering Berger's self-Acceptance and Acceptance of Others Form and PCI-Form to a sample of 102 elementary teachers, 81 middle school and 93 high school teachers in ten buildings in a medium size school district in Pennsylvania.

The findings of the study were as under:

Two major hypotheses were proposed: that teacher self-acceptance and teacher acceptance of others would be positively related to humanism in pupil control ideology.

The first hypothesis concerning the relationship between teacher self-acceptance and humanism was rejected. The second hypothesis on teacher acceptance of others and humanistic teacher pupil control orientation was supported at the .01 level.
Further analysis by means of multiple linear regression techniques determined that the three most significant variables relating to the dependent variable, pupil control ideology, acceptance of others, teaching level, and teaching experience. These variables were the best predictors of pupil control ideology.

Rose (1975) revealed relationship between teacher sense of power and pupil control ideology - Pupil control behaviour congruence at the .05 level of significance; a high sense of power was associated with a high behaviour-ideology congruence, and a low sense of power was associated with a low behaviour-ideology congruence.

Pritchett (1974) reported that the custodial teacher pupil control behaviour was found to be positively related to negative student attitudes toward school.

Barfield (1973) in her study, "The Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers in Selected Schools" examined the relationship between pupil control ideology and teacher sense of efficacy, bureaucratic level of school, and socio-economic status (SES) of the school's students. The Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) and the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI-
Form) were administered to teachers (n=275) in nine schools stratified according to socio-economic status of clientele and bureaucratic level. Findings indicated that teachers with low sense of efficacy perceived control of pupils more custodially than teachers with average or high perceptions of efficacy.

Shirley (1975) found that the traditional teachers were significantly more custodial in regard to pupil control ideology; emergent teachers were significantly more humanistic.

2.8 CLIMATE AND DOGMATISM

Next in importance, significant to the present study is the variable 'belief systems of teachers'. This has been studied by quite a few people.

Kirk (1965), Downey (1966) and Huff (1969) investigated that no significant relationship was found between teacher dogmatism and climate. Further more Huff (1969) reported that there was no relationship between dispersion of dogmatism and climate.
Teacher dogmatism was found to have a significant relationship with Intimacy in both Open and Closed climate schools by Legattuta (1966). He also found that there was significant relationship between dogmatism and Disengagement and Production Emphasis in Open schools only. However, he reported that there was no significant difference in dogmatism between extreme open and extreme closed schools.

Hoagland (1968) conducted his research on high schools, controlling the age factor, and found that dogmatism had significantly more influence on job satisfaction in closed than in middle or open schools while there was no difference between the latter two.

Farber (1969) reported that principal's dogmatism was significantly related to Production Emphasis and tends to be positively related to Consideration whereas Huff (1969) found that no significant relationship existed between the level of principal's dogmatism score and the school mean and climate.

Levy (1969) reported that there were significant positive relationships between principals' perception of Production Emphasis and scores on the Dogmatism scale while
significant negative relationship was found to exist between principal's perceptions of Thrust and their scores on the Dogmatism Scale.

Keefe's (1969) study based on the sample of 98 junior high school teachers revealed that groups having Low Dogmatism and High Dogmatism perceive the organizational climate of their schools differently.

Duggal (1969) studied relationship between student unrest, student participation in school management, and Dogmatism and Pupil Control Ideology of Staff in the high school. Seven schools that experienced student unrest in 1968 were matched with seven schools without unrest, comprised the sample of the inquiry. Data were gathered from 340 teachers and 1,100 students in these schools. The hypotheses that student unrest is related to student participation in school management and to teacher dogmatism were not accepted.

Mann's (1973) study related to finding out whether any relationship existed between the organizational climate in emerging school organizations and the structure of the belief system of the staff. The tools used in the study were the OCDQ and the Dogmatism scale of Rokeach. The sample consisted
of the principals and staff of 13 newly opened elementary schools in New York State. The findings and conclusions of the study were as under:

(1) Organizational climate did not change significantly during the first year of the sample school's operations, and there was no significant change in the structure of the belief systems of the individual school staff. However, over the entire sample, teachers were significantly more closed minded in May. The structure of the principals' belief systems did not change during this time.

(2) There was no significant relationship between the structure of the principals' or teachers' belief systems and the organizational climate of their schools. The influence of the principals' Dogmatism Scores on whatever relationship between structure of belief systems and organizational climate exists was very small.

Duffey (1973) conducted his study on relationships between educational innovations, principal's leader behaviour, faculty belief system and organizational climate in Jesuit High Schools in the United States. The sample for the study consisted of principals and faculty members of 48 Jesuit
High Schools of United States. The research tools used were OCDQ and LBDQ of Halpin and Croft and the Dogmatism Scale of Rokeach. The study has yielded some useful findings on the theme. They are as follows: (1) There was no significant difference between dogmatism expressed by faculty members and openness of organizational climate as perceived by faculty members. (2) There were no significant relationships between the criterion variables, innovation and the predictor variables of leader behavior, dogmatism and openness of school climate.

Lunenburg and O'Reilly's (1974) research found that extreme dogmatic teachers were not affected by the climate of the school.

Gauthier (1975) attempted to study the relationship of organizational structure, leader behavior of the principal and personality orientation of the principal to school management climate. The findings of the study indicated that there was a positive but not significant relationship between dogmatism and school management climate. However, most of the elementary principals in the study exhibited low dogmatism scores.
Crates (1975) undertook a study of the relationships between the principals' belief systems and the organizational climate of elementary schools. Principals and teachers of schools of Rockford (Eligan Area) Illinois Catholic Diocesan School System constituted the sample of the study.

The Dogmatism Scale of Rokeach was administered to 28 principals to survey the perceptions in regard to belief system. The OCDQ was used to survey the perception of 306 teachers in regard to organizational climate.

The major findings of the study were as under:

(1) No significant relationship was found between the belief system of the principals and the organizational climate of their schools as perceived by the teachers.

(2) No significant relationship was found between the intolerance of the principals and the organizational climate of their schools as perceived by the teachers.

Further analysis of the data revealed that the perceptions of the principals in regard to their own belief system, intolerance, and authoritarianism had no effect on the organizational climate in the buildings as perceived by the teachers and students.
No significant relationship was found between the perceptions of students and the perceptions of teachers in regard to organizational climate.

Cunningham (1975) surveyed the researches on the OCDQ conducted between August 1963 and October 1969 and analysed the findings of the OCDQ researches. The summary of the significant findings (based on the analysis of the OCDQ researches) indicated that the dogmatism of teachers was found not to be related to climate type. Moreover, the summary revealed that there was no significant relationship between school organizational climate and the dogmatism of the principal.

2.9 **DOGMATISM AND PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY**

In this section an attempt will be made to present and discuss studies dealing with the relationship between the dogmatism of teaching personnel and their pupil control ideology. Unfortunately, the relationship between these two variables has not been much investigated. The few studies done on the relationship between the dogmatism and PCI of teaching personnel include the work of Willower and his associates (1967), Heinman (1971), Longo (1972), Williams (1973) and Lunenberg and O'Reilly (1974).
Willower et al (1967) made a study of the school and pupil control ideology. The purpose of the study was to test a number of hypotheses concerning pupil control ideology of public school professional personnel. The two tools - the PCI-Form and the Dogmatism Scale were utilized for the study.

Data on pupil control ideology were collected in thirteen school systems, twelve in Pennsylvania and one in New York State. The Dogmatism Scale was administered in eleven of these.

In selecting the thirteen school systems, an attempt was made to include systems serving varied communities, including urban, suburban, and rural areas.

A total of 1,306 educators provided usable data. The PCI Form was completed by this number, including 945 teachers, 468 at the elementary level and 477 at the secondary level; 181 principals, 84 at the elementary level and 97 at the secondary level; and 180 counsellors.

The Dogmatism Scale was completed by 973 of these educators, including 805 teachers, 376 at the elementary level and 429 at the secondary level; and 168 principals, 79 at the elementary level and 89 at the secondary level.
The statistical method used in testing the hypothesis was the t-test for the difference between the means of two independent samples.

The findings of the study can be briefly stated as under:

(1) The closed minded teachers were found to be significantly more custodial in pupil control ideology than open minded teachers. The closed minded teachers had a mean PCI score of 63.5, while the open minded teachers had a mean PCI Score of 53.3 (t=12.116, P < .001).

(2) The hypothesis that closed minded principals would be more custodial in pupil control ideology than open minded principals was supported because the t-value was significant (t=6.062, P < .001).

(3) As hypothesized closed minded elementary teachers were significantly more custodial in PCI than open minded elementary teachers. The mean PCI score of closed minded and open minded elementary teachers were 59.2 and 49.6 respectively, with t-value of 6.002 (P < .001).

(4) The statistical analysis of the data indicated that closed minded secondary teachers had a mean PCI score
of 67.6 and open minded secondary teachers had a mean PCI score of 56.6. The t-test for the difference between the means of two independent samples yielded t-value of 10.903 (P < .001). Hence the hypothesis that closed minded secondary teachers would be more custodial in PCI than open minded secondary teachers was supported.

(5) The closed minded elementary principals were found to be significantly more custodial in PCI than open minded teachers (t = 4.345, P < .001).

(6) The hypothesis that closed minded secondary principals would be more custodial in PCI than open minded secondary principals was confirmed because the t-value was significant (t = 4.997, P < .001)

Heinman (1971) reported that principals' dogmatism and custodialism in PCI were significantly related.

Longo (1972) in his study "Pupil Control Attitudes of Public School Cooperating Teachers and Education Instructors" conducted on 100 college instructors and 100 cooperating teachers revealed that the dogmatism and PCI were significantly associated.

Williams (1973) also suggested that the dogmatism and PCI were significantly related.
Lunenberg and O'Reilly (1974) found that the open-minded (low dogmatic) teachers were more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than closed-minded (high dogmatic) teachers.

2.10 CONCLUSION

The review of research focused in this chapter on organizational climate of schools, personality variables, pupil control ideology and dogmatism shows that considerable research work has been done on each one of the variables if taken separately, but precious little seems to have been done on them as correlate of one another. Most of the climate studies done in India are based on Halpin and Croft's OODQ. Though Mehta (1967) and Sharma (1973) have found significant variations in some of the dimensions of the climate as well, as in the order of the six climate types on the climate continuum, no attempt has been so far made to develop a climate delineation and evaluation instrument based on conditions obtaining in Indian secondary schools. Thus, the review highlights this gap in research explorations in school climate in India. Further, it is found that hardly any Indian researcher has attempted to examine the possible relationship between perception of school teachers
about their institutions' climate and their own personality traits, so, this dimension leaves scope for research exercise. Pupil control ideology as a correlate of school climate is new for Indian researchers. This means that possible relationship between custodial ideology and humanistic ideology with climate categories needs to be examined in Indian school conditions. Similarly, dogmatism – the belief and disbelief systems of the open minded individuals (teachers) and closed minded individuals (teachers) as a correlate of school climate does not appear to have been examined by Indian researchers. This shows that the present study on school climate which aims at developing an Indian tool to map the domain of climate, and to correlate the climate types, with the personality traits of school personnel (who perceive the climate), their pupil control ideology and dogmatism, fills out some gaps discovered in Indian climate studies.

The next chapter will describe the major framework of the present study – the objectives, the sample, the research tools, the hypotheses, the methods of analysis and interpretation, etc.