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After having discussed the theoretical framework and the related literature, the investigator arrived at the present study. The details of the study in hand including its design are discussed in this chapter.

THE PROBLEM


DEFINITIONS OF IMPORTANT TERMS

a) School Climate

According to Halpin and Croft (1963) school climate can be construed as the organizational personality of a school, figuratively, "personality," is to the individual what climate is to the organization. Owens (1970) maintained that organizational climate can be interpreted as an interrelationship between the needs of individual members and the need of organization. Sharma (1971) defined school organizational climate as the resulting
condition, within the school, of social interaction among the teachers and between the teachers and the principals.

b) Leadership Behaviour

Leadership behaviour has been divided into two dimensions by several theorists. One has been termed structure task or concern for production, referring basically to "getting the job done." The school dimensions concerning relationship with the people involved in doing the work has been classified as consideration, relationship or concern for the people. To these two has been added a third dimension, that is, situation.

c) Moral Development

Moral development may be viewed as the extent to which an individual consistently and coherently follows own code of morals or that of the group within which he identifies himself.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present enquiry has been taken up with the following objectives:
1. To determine the patterns of organizational climate, leadership behaviour and moral development in the elementary and secondary schools.

2. To examine school-to-school differences on various dimensions of organizational climate, leadership behaviour and moral development.

3. To examine the nature of differences between the elementary and secondary schools in respect of the organizational climate of the schools, leadership behaviour and moral development of the heads of these schools.

4. To examine the relative variability of organizational climate, leadership behaviour, and moral development of heads of elementary and secondary schools.

5. To determine the relationship between different dimensions of organizational climate, leadership behaviour and moral development.

6. To enable the heads of the schools and teachers to have their perception of the entire institution.
HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses are formulated:

1. The variables of the principal's behaviour are more dominant than the variables of teachers' behaviour in accounting for the organizational climate of the schools.

2. The elementary schools and secondary schools are alike in organizational climate.

3. The elementary and secondary schools are alike in leadership behaviour of principals.

4. The heads of elementary and secondary schools are alike on moral development.

5. There is positive and significant relationship between the leadership behaviour of principal and dimensions of the school climate in case of both elementary and secondary schools.

6. There is a positive relationship between the moral development of principals and school climate.

7. There is a positive relationship between leadership behaviour and moral development of the principals.
The sampling included the members of the staff and heads of one hundred institutions including fifty elementary schools and fifty secondary schools of district Patiala (Punjab). The teachers were included in the sample keeping in view the total faculty members. On an average five teachers from a high/higher secondary school and four and three respectively from the middle and primary schools besides all the heads were included. It was a purposive sampling based on qualification, areas of specialisation or subject taught and the length of service in the schools. In all 421 teachers and one hundred heads responded to the study.

TOOLS

The following tools have been used in the study:

1. Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire,
2. Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire,

1. **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire**

To assess the organizational climate of the schools, Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire developed by Halpin and Andrew was used. Although it was
felt that the tool to measure organizational climate should have been developed by the investigator yet the decision to use Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was guided by its clarity and relative simplicity. Moreover, the same test has been used by many of my predecessors.

The questionnaire consists of sixty-four items based on eight dimensions, the details of which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hindrance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esprit</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intimacy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aloofness</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thrust</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four dimensions refer primarily to the behaviour of teachers and the second four to the behaviour of the principal. All the teachers were asked to indicate their responses to each of the sixty-four items on a four-point scale as follows:
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

Four categories of responses, rarely occurs, sometimes occurs, often occurs, and very frequently occurs are scored by giving 1, 2, 3, 4 marks respectively. Then we moved from item level to the subtest level. To compute each respondent eight subtest scores, we simply summed his item scores, subtest by subtest and divided each of the eight sums by the number of items in the corresponding subtest. This procedure gave us eight subtest scores for each of the 421 respondents. Mean and standard deviation for each subtest were computed.

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire has been commonly used as stated due to the simplicity and ease to administer. Halpin worked out the reliability of all the dimensions by various methods and found them to be highly reliable.

2. Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire

It was developed by Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University and has been used to
measure the leadership behaviour of the principals. This is the most popular and widely used technique for measuring the leadership behaviour. This technique has been used repeatedly by researchers to assess the leader behaviour of leaders even in the Indian conditions.

This questionnaire consists of thirty short descriptive statements which measure the two dimensions of leadership behaviour, that is, Initiating Structure and Consideration. Each of the keys of the dimensions contains fifteen items. The members of a leader's group, indicate the frequency with which he engages in each form of behaviour by checking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom or never. Each item is scored on a scale from 4 to 0. Consequently the theoretical range of scores on each dimension is from zero to sixty.

In Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire, the estimated reliabilities of the two keys are .93 and .86 respectively.

3. Defining Issue Test of Moral Judgment

James R. Rest (1979) developed Defining Issue Test of Moral Judgment. The test developed by Rest is
aimed at understanding how people think about social problems. Different people often have different opinions about questions of right or wrong. The present investigator has modified this test to suit the local context. In the original test there are six stories and at the end of each story there are twelve questions. In the Locally developed test that has been used in the present study there are six stories, three of which are new and the number of questions at the end of each story varies between 8-12. The new stories and the questions relating to these were developed in consultation with Local experts. In the first draft the number of questions was 12-14 but in the final draft, the questions were between 8-12 and on these the consensus of the five experts was fixed at 80 per cent or above.

Validity

We have used the pace validity index for this test. Because in it, the subject is not merely required to suggest the line of actions that he would be taking but also has to give the reasons behind his choice.

Reliability

The reliability of the test was determined by
the test-retest method on a small sample. The reliability index for the 'P' scores was found to be .76 which is quite high. This index was very much in conformity with the review of several studies by Devison and Robbins (1978) who found the indices of the D1 Test generally between .70 to .80.

The questions at the end of these stories have to be rated and ranked by the respondents. The ratings are in the form of importance of each question which vary from great to no importance, that is, great, much, some, little and no.

After rating each question, ranking of the questions has to be done. Out of the total questions in a story, four have to be ranked in the following way:

i) Most important
ii) Second most important
iii) Third most important
iv) Fourth most important

There are some items which sound like gibberish, subjects are instructed to mark such items as "no importance." There are some other items which are meaningless, nonsense items "M." Subjects are
instructed to rate these items low. There may be some items which a subject fails to understand, he is instructed to rate these items low.

There are six stages:

Stage one  .. Punishment and obedience orientation
Stage two  .. Naive instrumental hedonism
Stage three .. Good boy or good girl morality of maintaining good relationship, approval of others
Stage four  .. Authority maintaining morality
Stage five  .. Morality of contract, of individual rights, and of democratically accepted low
Stage six   .. Morality of individual principles of conscience

Any stage scheme needs to be described in terms of the specific features that judges are to use in scoring a given interview, how each feature of a stage is part of a unified system of ideas and how each stage is conceptually more adequate than the previous stage.

Stage scoring of each questionnaire is to be done as follows:
1. Data sheet was prepared for each subject as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5A</th>
<th>5B</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raw stage score
State percentage

2. Only first four ranking at the bottom of the test page were looked at.

3. For the items marked as most important, the chart below was consulted to find out which stage the item exemplifies.
4. After finding the item's stage, the choices were weighed by giving a weight of 4 to the first rank, 3 to the second rank, 2 to the third rank and one to the fourth rank.

5. For each first, second, third and fourth ranked item in the six stories, the appropriate weight was entered in the stage column on the subject's data sheet.

6. The completed table on the data sheet had four entries for every story and twenty-four entries altogether.

7. On the subject's data sheet each stage column was summed up.

8. To get the raw principled morality score "P" the points together from stages 5A, 5B and 6 were added.
9. The raw stage score were converted to percentage by dividing the raw scores by 6.

EXAMPLE: Suppose that a subject ranked the questionnaire items in the following way:

Stories | Most important | Second most important | Third most important | Fourth most important |
---------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
 i)      | 3              | 5                     | 8                    | 4                    |
 ii)     | 8              | 1                     | 3                    | 6                    |
 iii)    | 2              | 5                     | 7                    | 9                    |
 iv)     | 9              | 2                     | 5                    | 10                   |
 v)      | 4              | 1                     | 5                    | 3                    |
 vi)     | 7              | 4                     | 2                    | 6                    |

Following steps, one to nine above, would produce a date sheet like the following for this particular subject:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5A</th>
<th>5B</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>2+1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>4+2+1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>4+3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2+1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw stage score</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage percentage</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principled morality score ("F") in this case is 36.7 per cent.

**INTERNAL CHECKS ON SUBJECT'S RELIABILITY**

There are two checks on the reliability of each subject's questionnaire. One check is the "M" score. "M" items were written to sound lofty and pretentious, but not to mean anything. These items do not represent any stage of thinking but rather represent a subject's tendency to endorse statements for their pretentiousness rather than their meaning. In these cases the subjects are instructed to rate and rank the items low. If the
subjects consistently rate and rank the M items high, then we cannot be sure that the subject has the proper test taking set, and the questionnaire must be discarded. The questionnaires with M scores 14 per cent or high were discarded. In this way three questionnaires were discarded.

The second check on subject's reliability is the consistency check. This involves a comparison of a subject's ratings, with a subject's rankings. If a subject ranks an item first, then his ratings for that item should have no other items higher except the item ranked first. If there are items not chosen as first or second choices which are rated higher than the ratings of the items chosen as first or second, then there is an inconsistency between the subject's rankings and ratings due to careless responding, random checking, misunderstanding of instructions, changing one's mind about an item etc. In short, inconsistency raises questions about the reliability of the subject's entire questionnaire, although a little inconsistency might be tolerated. Also if a subject shows little discrimination in his ratings, there is the suspicion that he may not be taking the test seriously. In this study four questionnaires were discarded due to this check.
**INTERPRETATION OF DIT STAGE SCORES**

The P score (sum of weighted ranks given to stage 5 and 6 items) has been the most used index from the DIT. This score is interpreted as "the relative importance a subject gives to principled moral consideration in making a decision about moral dilemmas.

Other stage scores are computed in similar fashion to the P score, that is, based on weighted ranks. And so we have a stage 2 score: the relative importance and subjects give to stage 2 considerations in making a moral decision, and so on stage 3 and 4. The subdivisions into 5A and 5B and 6 correspond to the discussions of the "morality of social contract," "the morality of intuitive humanism," and "the morality of principles of ideal social co-operation," respectively. The "A" items are intended to typify an "anti-establishment" orientation, a point of view which condemns tradition and the existing social order for its arbitrariness or its corruption by the rich for the exploitation of the poor. The M score is representative of lofty sounding but meaning less items. Hence this score does not represent any stage of thinking but rather a subject's tendency to endorse statements for their pretentiousness rather than meaning.
ADMINISTRATION OF TOOLS

For the administration of different tools the investigator personally visited all the hundred schools selected for this study. This was considered necessary to select teachers randomly from each school depending upon its total strength.

There were some difficulties in the initial stages but these were overcome through persuasion and developing a sense of professionalism.

The organizational climate and leadership behaviour were determined from the returns of the teachers whereas the moral development was determined by evaluating the responses of the heads of the schools on various social situations.

Analysis of Data

The following statistical techniques were used for testing the hypothesis:

1. Measures of central tendency and standard deviation were worked out.

2. Mean differences in school climate between elementary and secondary schools were calculated.
3. Mean differences in leadership behaviour between heads of elementary and secondary schools were considered.

4. Mean differences in moral development between heads of elementary and secondary schools.

5. Variabilities in school climate of elementary and secondary schools.

6. Variabilities of heads of elementary and secondary schools in leadership behaviour.

7. Variabilities of heads of elementary and secondary schools in moral development.

8. Means and S.D.s of all the elementary and secondary schools on the eight dimensions of school climate, leadership behaviour and moral development, and designated the schools as high, low and average on each dimension.

9. Analysis of variance in respect of elementary and secondary school teacher's perception of each dimension of school climate, leadership behaviour.

10. Correlation between eight dimensions of school
climate of elementary and secondary schools separately.

11. Correlation between two dimensions of leadership behaviour of elementary and secondary schools.

12. Correlation between factors of school climate, leadership behaviour and moral development of heads of elementary and secondary schools.

Having specified the design of the study, the sample and the tests for collection of the data, the investigator proceeds to collect the data and to analyse it with a view to testing the hypothesis and arriving at the results of the study.

The data thus collected are analysed, tabulated and interpreted in the succeeding chapter.