

DIFFERENCES IN ASSESSMENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SCHOOL CLIMATE
BETWEEN TEACHERS AND ADMINSTRATORS

by

Brandy Kinlaw Duff

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Liberty University

April, 2013

DIFFERENCES IN ASSESSMENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SCHOOL CLIMATE
BETWEEN TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

by Brandy Kinlaw Duff

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

April, 2013

APPROVED BY:

Rick Bragg, Ed.D., Committee Chair

Carol McCreight, Ed.D., Committee Member

Candace Norton, Ed.D., Committee Member

Scott Watson, PhD, Associate Dean, Advanced Programs

DIFFERENCES IN ASSESSMENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SCHOOL CLIMATE
BETWEEN TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the organizational school climate perceptions of teachers and principals and to ascertain the extent to which their perceptions differed. This causal comparative study used the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE) as the survey instrument for data collection. The OCDQ-RE was administered to 244 teachers and 11 administrators in four north Georgia elementary schools. The mean scores of the teachers and administrators were compared. The results indicated relationship the organizational school climate perceptions of teachers and administrators in only one of the four schools were alike. Administrators in each of the four schools had a more positive perception about their school's organizational school climate than did the teachers. These findings have implications for schools and their administrators, as well as superintendents. To gain an accurate portrayal of a school's organizational climate, it is not enough to elicit the perceptions of just the administrators; the teachers must also be questioned for their perceptions of the climate.

Descriptors: organizational climate, teacher, administrator, perceptions

DEDICATION

First, all glory and honor goes to Jesus Christ, my Lord and Savior. It is by His hand and divine guidance that I was able to complete this daunting task and persevere through the many challenges, delays, and difficulties that come with writing a dissertation.

I would like to dedicate this to my grandfather, Howard McConneral Kinlaw, whom I will be privileged to meet in heaven. It is his achievements and diligence in the field of education, and many others, that inspire me to fulfill the same. I would also like to dedicate this to my father, Greg Kinlaw, whose continued support and guidance has allowed me to set and achieve my goals.

Finally, I dedicate this to my loving husband, Michael, and my precious son, Mik, whose love and encouragement have made enduring this journey worthwhile. Thank you for your support and prayers in the completion of this process. Also, to my daughter, Valery, who will be born later this year. In addition, I want to thank all of my friends and family for their encouragement, prayers, and support throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	4
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	5
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	8
Background of the Problem	9
Statement of the Problem.....	10
Purpose of the Study	12
Importance of the Study.....	12
Research Question and Null Hypotheses	13
Identification of Variables	14
Assumptions.....	15
Definition of Terms	15
Research Plan.....	19
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	20
Theoretical Framework.....	20
School Climate.....	24
Organizational School Climate.....	34
Principals' Impact on Organizational School Climate	38
Teachers' Impact on Organizational School Climate	44
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	50
Research Design	50

Research Question and Null Hypotheses	51
Setting	52
Participants.....	52
Instrument	53
Data Collection Procedures	56
Data Analysis	59
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	61
Description of the Data	61
Analysis of the Research Questions.....	63
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	77
Summary of the Findings.....	77
Discussion of the Findings in Light of Relevant Literature.....	82
Limitations	88
Implications	89
Recommendations for Future Research.....	90
Conclusion	92
REFERENCES	93
APPENDIX A: The Organizational Climate Description for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE)	102
APPENDIX B: Consent Letter from County.....	105
APPENDIX C: Letter to Principals for Permission.....	106
APPENDIX D: Letter to Participants-Teachers and Administrators.....	107

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1 Demographics of Elementary Schools Participating in Study	53
2 Items on Each Subtest of the Organizational Climate Description for Elementary Schools.....	57
3 Number of Responses by School	61
4 Reliability of Subtests.....	62
5 Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Supportive Principal Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE	64
6 Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Directive Principal Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE.....	65
7 Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Restrictive Principal Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE	66
8 Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Collegial Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE	67
9 Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Intimate Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE.....	68
10 Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Disengaged Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE	69
11 Results of the Analysis of Differences between Administrators and Teachers on the Subtests of the OCDQ-RE	71
12 Climate Type Results from the Organizational Climate Profile on the OCDQ-RE	76

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The atmosphere of a school has a significant impact on the people in that environment. Students, parents, teachers, administrators, and community members experience the feel a school exudes and make judgments accordingly. Some of these perceptions can be conveyed as open, lively, friendly, casual, formal, unwelcoming, rigid, or closed (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004).

Organizational school climate is what constitutes the school's atmosphere based on the interactions and the perceptions of the stakeholders in the school environment (Hoy et al., 1991; Norton, 2008). Organizational school climate influences behavior, learning, productivity, and effectiveness and administrators have a considerable influence over the school climate (Ali & Hale, 2009; Azzara, 2001; Gilmer, 1966; Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1985; Mine, 2009).

After working in four schools and three school districts in two different states, the researcher has firsthand experience of the diverse nature of schools. Each of these schools varied in student demographics and socioeconomic status; however, the greatest variance was in the organizational climate in each of these schools. The schools were dissimilar in the way the teachers interacted with each other and in the interactions with the administration. Organizational school climate is observed and experienced by each member of the school and is depicted through the social and professional interactions that constitute the atmosphere (Norton, 2008). However, each of those members may view the school climate in a different light, according to their own personal interactions, perceptions, and encounters (Halpin & Croft, 1963).

Background of the Problem

Maslow's (1943) research determined a hierarchy of needs that one must possess in order to be successful in an organization. The concept of business climate, organizational climate, and school climate can all said to have originated with Maslow's study (Rafferty, 2008). The fulfillment of all of the needs of the students, teachers, and the administrators guarantees the ability for success and achievement in schools (Schoen & Teddlie (2008). When the fundamental needs of the members of the school are met, those members are enabled to function effectively and efficiently (Heller, 2002; Rooney, 2003). The highest level of Maslow's hierarchy, self-actualization, is met when every member of the school is given the opportunity to reach their full potential as well as their personal goals (Howard, Howell, & Brainard, 1987).

Specific research related to climate in the workplace began to be explored in the late 1950s and crossed into the realm of education in the 1960s (Caldarella, Shatzer, Gray, Young, & Young, 2011; Halpin & Croft, 1963). At first, the concepts of organizational climate and organizational culture were intertwined (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). However, climate was separated out as the perception of one's work environment (Zhang & Liu, 2010) and it involves the atmosphere of that environment and the perception of the behaviors of the people within the environment (Norton, 2008). The majority of the research conducted in the field of organizational climate has been carried out in corporate organizations (Kraska, 2008) and the performance of an organization was found by Luthans, Norman, Anolio, and Avey (2008) to positively correlate with the organizational climate and the performance of the organization.

Statement of the Problem

Organizational school climate greatly affects the success of a school (Cohen, 2006; Dorathi, 2011; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009; Marzano, 2003; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). The crucial interactions that make up organizational school climate are those of teacher to teacher and teacher to principal (Marzano, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005). It is from the perceptions of these interactions that the organizational school climate is determined along an open to closed continuum (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy et al., 1991). A school that exhibits an open climate through both teacher and principal behaviors increases the school's effectiveness through enhanced staff performance, morale, and student achievement levels (Dorathi, 2011). Job satisfaction and commitment have also been positively linked to an open, supportive organizational climate (Douglas, 2010; Luthans et al., 2008; Zhang & Liu, 2010).

The building blocks for research regarding organizational school climate were developed by Maslow (1943) and his study of organizations and the needs the organizations' members must have met in order to be motivated and to succeed (Rafferty, 2008). Maslow identified five needs, ranging from physiological needs to self-actualization needs, critical for the achievement of the organization. These organizational needs have been translated into the educational setting. Students, teachers, and administrators must also have these five needs met in order to reach their optimum performance levels and ultimately create a successful school (Howard et al., 1987; Schoen & Teddlie, 2008).

Improvements in a school's organizational school climate cannot be made until the areas of strengths and weaknesses are known (Center for Comprehensive School

Reform and Improvement, 2009). Assessing the organizational climate of a school provides a constructive guide for improving the school (Dellar & Giddings, 1991). Many aspects of school climate can be assessed to reveal the nature of the school (Marzano, 2003). However, the backbone of a school is the teachers and administrators (Marzano, 2003). These positions lead the school in its interactions with the students, parents, and the community, all of which contribute to the overall school climate. The organizational climate of a school reflects the collegiality and professionalism of the staff members (Marzano et al., 2005). The organizational climate of the school encompasses the interactions and the degree of professionalism of the teachers and administrators while performing their duties (Marzano et al., 2005).

In order to measure each school's organizational school climate, an assessment must be taken of the teachers and administrators. The data are analyzed to determine the school's organizational climate. Schools can use this data to understand how their school's atmosphere is perceived by the stakeholders (Hoy et al., 1991). This is why it is imperative that the organizational school climate be assessed. Once assessed, the data should be analyzed to determine the organizational school climate; then further questioning can lead to improvements (Hoy et al., 1991). Norton (2008) stated that, "The determination of school climate is the forerunner of the determination of the strategies for school improvement generally and improvement of conditions in the workplace specifically" (p. 236). An assessment of the organizational school climate can confirm the school's atmosphere, which significantly contributes to the school's success (Cohen, 2006; Dorathi, 2011; MacNeil et al., 2009; Marzano, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005).

Purpose of the Study

Organizational school climate is often referred to as the personality of a school; however, it is important to determine the atmosphere that the school portrays and if the teachers and the administrators have the same assessment of the school's personality and atmosphere that comprises the climate (Deal & Kennedy, 1983; Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Halpin & Croft, 1963; Howard & Jackson, 1982; Norton, 2008; Pretorius & De Villiers, 2009; Robinson, 2010; Stronge, Richard, & Catano, 2008; Tagiuri, 1968). Therefore, the purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the teachers' and administrators' perceptions of organizational school climate by assessing it using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools. The study also ascertained the extent to which differences existed in the organizational school climate perceptions of the teachers' and the administrators' from the four elementary schools. The survey instrument was administered to 244 teachers and 11 administrators in four north Georgia elementary schools.

Importance of the Study

Fundamentally, organizational school climate is built upon and determined by the perceptions of teachers and administrators in the school (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Le Cornu, 2009; Mine, 2009). An accurate portrayal of the school's organizational climate exists when the perception of the individuals' work environment is cohesive (Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty, 2005; Marzano et al., 2005; Robinson, 2010). Assessing the organizational school climate reveals the strengths and weaknesses of the school. Analyzing survey data from the climate instrument exposes the true perceptions about the administration and

may lead to reflection and necessary improvements (Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2009).

This study sought to determine the organizational school climate profile of four elementary schools in north Georgia and to reveal the difference in assessments between the administrators' perceptions and the teachers' perceptions of organizational school climate. The principals of four elementary schools in one school district were willing to allow the research to be conducted at the schools; therefore, these four elementary schools were selected to represent the school district. The teachers' and administrators' perceptions of organizational school climate were assessed by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (Hoy et al., 1991).

Research Question and Null Hypotheses

The study addressed the following research question and null hypotheses:

Research Question

Are there differences between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments of the six subtests of the organizational school climate profile, as measured on the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools?

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the supportive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

2. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the directive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
3. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the restrictive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
4. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the collegial teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
5. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the intimate teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
6. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the disengaged teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

Identification of Variables

The independent variables in the study were the two groups of educators—administrators and teachers. The dependent variables were the six subtests of the

Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools. Three of the subtests identified the behaviors of the administrators as supportive, directive, and restrictive. The remaining three subtests identified the behaviors of the teachers as collegial, intimate, and disengaged.

Assumptions

It was assumed that all teachers who responded to the Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire were certified in early childhood education in the state of Georgia. A second assumption was that the administrators were certified in leadership according to criteria set by the state of Georgia. It was also assumed that all the participants volunteered to respond to the questionnaire and responded honestly and thoughtfully to the survey questions.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions of the terms apply:

Closed climate. Hoy et al. (1991) defined closed climate:

The antithesis of the open. The principal and teachers simply go through the motions, with the principal stressing routine trivia and unnecessary busywork (high restrictiveness) and teachers responding minimally and exhibiting little commitment to the tasks at hand (high disengagement). The principal's leadership is seen as controlling and rigid (high directiveness) as well as unsympathetic and unresponsive (low supportiveness). These misguided tactics are accompanied not only by frustration and apathy but also by suspicion and a lack of respect of teachers for their colleagues as well as the administration (low intimacy and noncollegiality). (p. 34)

Collegial teacher behavior. Hoy et al. (1991) state “This behavior supports open and professional interactions among teachers. Teachers are proud of their school, enjoy working with their colleagues, and are enthusiastic, accepting, and mutually respectful of their colleagues” (p. 27).

Directive principal behavior. Hoy et al. (1991) defined directive principal behavior as “This behavior is rigid, close supervision. The principal maintains constant monitoring and control over all teacher and school activities, down to the smallest detail” (p. 26).

Disengaged climate. Hoy et al. (1991) reported:

The disengaged climate stands in stark contrast to the engaged climate. The principal’s leadership behavior is strong, supportive, and concerned, The principal listens to and is open to teachers’ views (high supportiveness), gives teachers the freedom to act on the bases of their professional knowledge (low directiveness), and relieves teachers of most of the burdens of paper work and bureaucratic trivia (low restrictiveness). Nevertheless, the faculty reacts badly; teachers are unwilling to accept responsibility. At best, the faculty simply ignores the initiatives of the principal; at worst, the faculty actively works to immobilize and sabotage the principal’s leadership attempts. Teachers do not only dislike the principal they do not especially like each other as friends (low intimacy) or respect each other as colleagues (low collegiality). The faculty is clearly disengaged from their work. (p. 33–34)

Disengaged teacher behavior. Hoy et al. (1991) assert “This behavior signifies a lack of meaning and focus to professional activities. Teachers are simply putting tin time in non-productive group efforts; they have no common goals. In fact, their behavior is often negative and critical of their colleagues and the school” (p. 27).

Engaged climate. Hoy et al. (1991) stated:

The engaged climate is marked, on one hand, by ineffective attempts of the principal to lead, and on the other hand, by high professional performance of the teachers. The principal is rigid and authoritarian (high directiveness) and respects neither the professional expertise nor personal needs of the faculty (low supportiveness). In addition, the principal is seen as burdening faculty with unnecessary busy work (high restrictiveness). Surprisingly, however, the teachers simply ignore the principal’s unsuccessful attempts at control and conduct themselves as productive professionals. They respect and support each other, are proud of their school, and enjoy their work (high collegiality). They not only respect each other’s professional competence but they like each other as friends (high intimacy). The teachers come together as a cooperative unit engaged and committed to the teacher-learning task (high engagement). (p. 33)

Intimate teacher behavior. Hoy et al (1991) reported, “This behavior is cohesive [with] strong social relations among teachers. Teachers know each other well, are close friends, socialize together regularly, and provide strong social support for each other” (p. 27).

Open climate. Hoy et al. (1991) defined open climate:

The distinctive characteristics of the open climate are cooperation, respect, and openness that exist within the faculty and between the faculty and principal. The principal listens and is receptive to teacher ideas, gives genuine and frequent praise, and respects the competence of the faculty (high supportiveness). Principals also give their teachers freedom to perform without close scrutiny (low directiveness) and provide facilitation leadership devoid of bureaucratic trivia (low restrictiveness). Likewise, the faculty supports open and professional behavior (high collegial relations) among teachers. Teachers know each other well and are typically close friends (high intimacy). They cooperate and are committed to teaching and their job (low disengagement). (p. 33)

Restrictive principal behavior. Hoy et al. (1991) reported that, “This behavior hinders rather than facilitates teacher work. The principal burdens teachers with paperwork, committee requirements, routine duties, and other demands that interfere with their teaching responsibilities” (p. 26).

Supportive principal behavior. Hoy et al. (1991) reported that, This behavior reflects a basic concern for teachers. The principal listens and is open to teacher suggestions. Praise is given genuinely and frequently, and criticism is handled constructively. The competence of the faculty is respected, and the principal exhibits both a personal and professional interest in teachers. (p. 26)

Research Plan

This quantitative study used a causal comparative research design to determine the organizational school climate profile of four elementary schools in north Georgia. A survey was used to gather the quantitative data to ascertain the perceptions of organizational school climate from the teachers and the administrators at each school. The difference between the teachers' and the administrators' perceptions were assessed by analyzing the responses of each group. The organizational school climate consists of six dimensions: three administrative behaviors and three teacher behaviors. Each dimension of organizational school climate is separated from the questionnaire as a subtest. The six subtests were analyzed to determine the differences in the teachers' and the administrators' assessments. Quantitative research methods are best used to measure a behavior or phenomena such as organization school climate. This method allows for the provision of objective evidence that can be used in decision making and finding solutions to valid and pending issues (Kraska, 2008).

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this quantitative research, the purpose was to study the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the organizational school climate. How schools are physically structured and the interactions between students and teachers are determinants of the broad concept of school climate (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009). Concerns over school climate have been ongoing for a long period and remains an issue of debate among education stakeholders (Cohen et al., 2009). School climate includes aspects of school life such as safety, relationships, teaching, learning, and the environment (Cohen et al., 2009). With the understanding that the school environment quality has measurable and direct impact on the student behavior, the school climate is emphasized as central to long-term success (Hoy et al., 1991). Organizational school climate is a significant component of school climate and is classified as open or closed, healthy or unhealthy, fragmented or cohesive (Cohen et al., 2009). This literature review addresses the origins of organizational school climate through climate explorations in organizations and then moving into the schools from the viewpoint of teachers and administrators and their impact on organizational school climate.

Theoretical Framework

Climate of a business, organization, or school is a concept that can be traced back to Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs (Rafferty, 2008). Maslow's study was of the motivation factors in organizations and the needs that must be satisfied in order for the members of the organization to be productive. The five needs Maslow identified were (a) physiological needs, (b) safety needs, (c) social needs, (d) esteem needs, and (e) self-actualization needs. Maslow applied the theory to organizations, hypothesizing that it

was the task of the leaders to achieve motivation of the employees by addressing the basic needs of the individuals and allowing them to reach self-actualization, the top of the hierarchy of needs.

These basic needs also have to be fulfilled in students and teachers as well as in the members of the administration of a school (Howard et al., 1987). As Schoen and Teddlie (2008) explained, this fulfillment ensures success in schools. The psychological needs involve the physical school characteristics such as space, light, and heat. The safety needs are addressed by safety from physical harm. The social needs, through friendship and acceptance, are promoted with a positive relationship among all the administrators, faculty, and students. The esteem needs are acknowledged by achieving and recognizing individual success in school. Schoen and Teddlie construed that self-actualization is achieved after individuals within the school are able to maximize their potential while reaching their personal goals. Heller (2002) and Rooney (2003) asserted that both the teachers and the students function effectively and efficiently when their fundamental needs are satisfied. Satisfaction of the fundamental needs results in a caring and satisfying environment where all members care about the welfare of the others; thus fostering an excellent learning and teaching atmosphere.

The field of organizational climate has been comprehensively researched since the late 1950s (Caldarella et al., 2011). Research started in the work environment through the study of climate and culture and in the 1960s began to be applied to educational settings (Caldarella et al., 2011; Halpin & Croft, 1963). Early theorists did not distinguish between organizational climate and culture; the concepts coincided (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Organizational culture and climate are similar constructs

that overlap in their definitions. Organizational climate is grounded in social psychology and industrial psychology, while organizational culture derives from sociology and anthropology (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Contrary to climate, culture develops over time and is not easily changed when there is a change of management unless there is a complete overhaul of the whole system (Jainabee & Jamelaa, 2011). Once developed, the culture is deeply embedded in the system. The members of that system employ it as a reality and natural truth that cannot be changed within that society (Ramdass & Lewis, 2012). Culture is further defined as shared ideologies, philosophies, assumptions, values, attitudes, norms, and expectations that unite members of a community tightly together. The community in reference is the organization, for instance a school, and these intertwined qualities reveal both the explicit and implicit agreement among administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders on the best way of approaching problems and decisions (Ramdass & Lewis, 2012).

As opposed to culture, climate involves the atmosphere, is more interpersonal in tone and substance, is perceived through behaviors, and focuses not on the content of the organizational life, but the process (Norton, 2008). While school climate and culture are two separate concepts, there are connections between the two, such as (a) socialization; (b) interpersonal relations; (c) environmental factors; and (d) influenced behaviors, attitudes, needs, traditions, and sanctions (Norton, 2008). Zhang and Liu (2010) conducted research into the effects organizational climate has on organizational variables. This research included 419 managers and staff members. An organizational climate scale was used to determine the effectiveness of the organizational and was then looked from the realm of both individual and organizational characteristics of organizational climate.

Among the results of this study, organizational climate was found to have a significant effect on the retention, performance, satisfaction, stress, and commitment of the managers and their employees. The organizational climate affected the organization as a whole, as well as the individual workers (Zhang & Liu, 2010).

The perception of one's work environment is the concept of organizational climate (Zhang & Liu, 2010). Within the school context, this can be understood as the internal school environment as experienced by the educators and learners alike and proceeds from their perceptions. Over the last five decades, organizational scholars and researchers such as Cohen et al. (2009) have comprehensively unfolded organizational climate as the work environment and the organizational life. In a study that diagnosed the group dynamics in organizations, Thumin and Thumin (2011) presented organizational climate from the conceptual perspective. Thumin and Thumin defined climate based on formal policies in an organization and employees' personalities, values, and needs.

Krovetz (2004) referred to organizational climate as not only the prevailing learning conditions but also the will and need to survive the environment and continue to cope and adapt. Currently, most of the studies in the organizational theory area have been based on the corporate culture, working to identify strategies as well as best strategies and practices through which productivity can be maximized (Kraska, 2008). A supportive organizational climate is viewed as "the overall amount of perceived support employees receive from their immediate peers, other departments, and their supervisor that they view as helping them to successfully perform their work duties" (Luthans et al., 2008, p. 225). Luthans et al. also found that a positive relationship exists between the

performance of the organization, the effectiveness of the organization, and the organizational climate.

Maslow's study of the motivation factors in organizations and the needs required for the members to be productive laid the foundation for the study of organizational and school climate (Rafferty, 2008). Fulfillment of these basic human needs in every member of the school is essential to the achievement of success in that school (Howard et al., 1987; Schoen & Teddlie, 2008). In addition, students and teachers have superior performance and increased accomplishments when their fundamental needs are met (Heller, 2002; Rooney, 2003).

The study of organizational climate began in the work environment of businesses before transitioning into schools (Caldarella et al., 2011; Halpin & Croft, 1963). At first, distinctions were not made between the concepts of organizational climate and culture; however, theorist soon began to unwrap the differences a separate them into two constructs that involve some overlapping (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Culture is rooted in the organization (Ramdass & Lewis, 2012) and is difficult to alter (Jainabee & Jamelaa, 2011). Organizational climate involves the perception of the atmosphere and behaviors (Norton, 2008). Zhang and Liu (2010), as well as Luthans et al. (2008), found that organizational climate has a significant bearing on the effectiveness of an organization.

School Climate

Academic reformers and researchers have advanced differing definitions of school climate, yet in all of the definitions, the essential components remain the same. Through a review of research, Franco (2010) found four encompassing constructs that

make up the concept of school climate. These domains are (a) physical—this environment is conducive to teaching and learning, safe, and welcoming; (b) social—this environment promotes interaction and communication among students, faculty, staff, and the community; (c) emotional—an affective environment for students, faculty, staff, and community that creates self-esteem and a sense of belonging; and (d) academic—this environment endorses learning and self-fulfillment for students, faculty, and staff (Franco, 2010).

Freiberg and Stein (1999) theorized that school climate is the soul and the heart of a learning institution; the component of a school that motivates the principal, teachers, and the students to the school and that makes them want to stay associated with it. Pretorius and De Villiers (2009) defined school climate as the psychological and institutional aspects that comprise the school's personality. School climate includes the holistic perception of all stakeholders in terms of values and expectations. School climate is the enduring qualities of the school experienced by the members in terms of collective perception and routine behavior. It is imperative to note influences, attitudes, and perceptions of the school community. Krovetz (2004) observed that a positive school climate is manifested in a healthy organizational structure, dynamic guidance that recognizes need to change with time, a dedicated educator team, and learners who are motivated and have goals that are attainable, given sufficient resources.

Franco (2010) reported that, “school climate refers to the intangibles that can affect the feelings and attitudes of the students, teachers, staff, and parents” and it comprises the “physical and physiological aspects of a school that proved the environment necessary for teaching and learning to take place” (p. 786). The individual

can be a student, parent, teacher, administrator, or community member. Each school has a certain feel to it and emits a distinctive aura. Sometimes this is immediately evident through a first impression, or it is a conclusion that one comes to through dealings with the school, the school's environment, and the interactions with the people in the school (Franco, 2010). Most would much rather their school have an open and welcoming climate, than a cold and closed climate. However, the importance of school climate goes beyond having a positive reaction or interaction with a school, it has been linked to many other positive school characteristics (Lehr, 2005).

School climate has been examined as a means of determining a school's effectiveness since the 1970s (Hoy et al., 1991). However, early indications of the significance of a positive school climate were addressed by Perry (1908). Perry referred to the importance of having teachers with positive attitudes as well as outlooks, and the effect that the teachers' wellbeing has on the effectiveness of teaching and the learning of the students. Perry also recognized the responsibility of the principal to encourage and support the teachers. It was equated by Perry that the teacher who is positive presents a profitable force in the school; whereas, the teacher who is negative, passive, and indifferent imparts detriment to the school.

Feldvebel (1981) pointed out that effectiveness of the curriculum is often the focus when looking at student achievement, yet this is not the only cause. Through the study of the structure of schools and the relationships among students, teachers, and administrators, a breakthrough in the understanding of the learning and performance of children has occurred. It is now understood that children also "learn much in the way of

attitudes, values, concepts of justice, etc. from the structures and relationships that they observe and experience in the school” (Feldvebel, 1981, p. 4).

A school’s academic norms, expectations, and beliefs are considered part of the school climate (Brookover et al., 1978). Brookover et al. conducted one of the first thorough studies into the relationship between school climate and student achievement. Questionnaires were given to fourth- and fifth-grade students, fourth- and fifth-grade teachers, and members of the administration at each school. Ninety-one schools in Michigan were used in the research sample: 61 of the schools had a White student population of over 50% and 30 of the schools had a Black student population of over 50%. This study viewed school climate through the lens of the student demographic variables of socioeconomic status and ethnicity as well as the mean achievement of students based on the school level state achievement test annually administered to the public school students in Michigan (Brookover et al., 1978).

Brookover et al. (1978) showed that school climate is related to student achievement. The behavior of teachers and administrators was determined to influence the behavior of students greatly. It was also noted that the socioeconomic and racial composition of the schools played a part in the student achievement variances between schools, but even those parts were influenced by the social-psychological climate that produces the school climate. Brookover et al. concluded that school composition does not have a predominant influence over school climate and that is the creation of a favorable climate that has the most impact for high student achievement.

A study of 10 secondary schools in Lagos, State of Nigeria was conducted by Adeogun and Olisaemeka (2011) to determine the relationship between school climate

and student achievement, as well as teacher productivity for sustainable development. Each school had randomly selected participants from each of the following groups: one principal, seven teachers, and seven students. Adeogun and Olisaemeka concluded that school climate can directly influence academic performance and teacher productivity. They also found that this significant relationship between school climate, performance, and productivity is evidence of the need for ensuring a positive school climate in order to assure sustainable development.

MacNeil et al. (2009) used a sample of 29 schools in southeast Texas to study the effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. The Organizational Health Inventory was used to determine the school climate and student achievement was determined by the rating the Texas Education Agency awards each school based on the student performance on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills. The highest of these ratings is *Exemplary*, followed by *Recognized*, and then *Acceptable*. Each school was used as a unit of analysis to determine the relationship between school climate and student achievement. To ascertain the climate of each school, the Organizational Health Inventory was administered to 1,727 teachers in those 29 schools. In addition, the achievement data were taken from the test results of 24,684 students. MacNeil et al. found those schools that had the highest rating from their students' achievement on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills also ranked as having the healthiest school climates.

This study illustrated that positive climates equal increased student achievement. MacNeil et al. (2009) discovered that schools with the highest achievement rank, *Exemplary*, also produced the healthiest scores on each of the 10 dimensions of the

Organizational Health Inventory. Those schools with a lower student achievement classification, *Acceptable*, demonstrated a lower organizational health score; therefore, not as healthy of a school climate. The schools that encompassed a healthier school climate also earned the highest student achievement rankings (MacNeil et al., 2009).

The National School Climate Center (2008) stated that, “school climate refers to the quality and character of school life” and is “based on patterns of school life experiences and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching, learning and leadership practices, and organizational structures” (p. 5). A summary of school climate research was recently published by the Center for Social and Emotional Education (2010). Four necessary components are contained in school climate: (a) safety, (b) relationships, (c) teaching and learning, and (d) institutional environment. School reform is a fifth dimension to school climate that the summary addressed, although it is interconnected to the other aspects and some information overlaps.

Feeling safe is not only a vital human need, but also an important component of school climate (Center for Social and Emotional Education, 2010). Social, emotional, intellectual, and physical safety needs are all aspects of a safe environment. A school that has a safe atmosphere supports social, emotional, and academic learning as well as the healthy development of students (Devine & Cohen, 2007). Bosworth, Ford, and Hernandaz (2011) conducted a study involving 22 focus groups from 11 secondary schools. The purpose of the study was to determine student and teacher perceptions of school safety. The students reported that physical security features, staff actions, and school climate increased their feelings of safety. Relationships and school climate were also noted as important elements in making the school safe, according to the perceptions

of the faculty. Bosworth et al. concluded that creating and maintaining a positive and protective school climate is critical to ensure perceptions and feelings of school safety.

Taylor and Tashakkori (1994) considered the relationship of teacher decisional participation and school climate to teachers' sense of efficacy and their job satisfaction. Data were synthesized from two previous studies and included survey results from 9,987 teachers and 27,994 students. The school climate factors raised in the questionnaires included principal leadership, faculty collegiality, mentoring, social/cultural environment, and student discipline. Correlations between six main variables were analyzed: (a) the principal leadership component of school climate, (b) the faculty collegiality component of school climate, (c) the student discipline component of school climate, (d) teachers' sense of efficacy, (e) job satisfaction, and (f) teachers' report of participation in decision making (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1994).

Taylor and Tashakkori (1994) found that school climate had a remarkable relationship to job satisfaction, while the relationship between school climate and teachers' sense of efficacy was slight. Teachers' participation in decision making contributed more to the effect on the climate variables than it did on job satisfaction and teachers' sense of efficacy. It was concluded that each of the three elements of school climate had a strong correlation with teachers' feelings of job satisfaction. The deduction was made that the job satisfaction of teachers mediates the relationship between perceptions of school climate and teachers' sense of efficacy. It was also noted that teachers' positive feelings about work are enriched as they experience more proficiency in their performance (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1994).

Howard and Jackson (1982) defined school climate as how a school feels. They observed a series of schools at all levels and in a variety of places. Each school had an immediate feeling to it; this first impression was usually indicative of the school's climate. Schools with a positive climate were characterized as having a high morale, being a place that respects the people, the people respect one another, the people respect learning, and the environment is caring. Howard and Jackson went so far as to say that "We need to shift the emphasis from remediating students over to remediating schools" (p. 34). This was thought to bring positive changes to the schools and concurrently improve the symptoms of alienation in the school. This approach determines and addresses the causes of a poor school climate, not just the symptoms. By addressing the causes, the roots that lie in the nature of the school are brought forth and concentrated on for optimum school improvement.

Collie, Shapka, and Perry (2011) examined the relationships of teacher commitment with school climate and social-emotional learning. The data were taken from questionnaires completed by 664 K-12 public school teachers in British Columbia and Ontario, Canada. School climate was assessed through the use of the Revised School Level Environment Questionnaire and social-emotional learning was measured using the Beliefs in Social-Emotional Learning Teacher Scale and the Social-Emotional Learning Integration Scale. The teacher commitment component was determined by three questions that pertained to one of the following: general professional commitment, future professional commitment, and organizational commitment (Collie et al., 2011).

Collie et al. (2011) found that school climate variables have an impact on the level of teacher commitment. Specifically, student relations pertaining to school climate

had the highest relationship with all three forms of teacher commitment, while collaboration among teachers was second highest. They deduced that student relations correlated at such a high level because as teachers perceive positive student behaviors and motivation for learning, the teachers in turn have a greater sense of efficacy, increased job satisfaction, and less stress. A predictor of organizational commitment was collaboration among teachers. This effect occurs when collaboration raises the level of support that teachers provide for each other and fosters relationships among teachers; therefore, creating a more positive and supportive work environment (Collie et al., 2011).

Wynn, Carboni, and Patall (2006) studied beginning teachers' perceptions of mentoring, climate, and leadership. First and second year teachers comprised the 217 teachers in the study sample. A survey was created to include the each of these three areas: mentoring effectiveness, school climate, and principal leadership. The intent of the study was to determine which, if any, of the three categories were related to the beginning teachers' decisions to remain in the school, the district, or the profession. School climate and principal leadership were both positively correlated with beginning teachers' decisions to remain in the school district and at their current school. Although positive school climate influences teachers' choice to stay, salary was the foremost reason teachers cited for indicating intentions to leave the profession within 5 years. Wynn et al. concluded that a positive school climate is essential for teachers to do their job effectively and is increasingly important as teachers gain years of experience. They also deduced that principal leadership is the force behind a supportive and respectful climate.

School climate also affects student behaviors. Peterson and Skiba (2001) defined school climate as “the feelings that students and staff have about the school environment over a period of time” (p. 1). They looked at creating a positive school climate as a means of reducing school violence and inappropriate behaviors. Ultimately, the school climate is created by students, teachers, staff, administration, and the community. Positive school climate has a positive impact on the entire school, just as negative school climate has a negative impact on the entire school (Peterson & Skiba, 2001). School climate is an important aspect of an effective school (Lezotte, 2001). A safe and orderly environment that promotes the involvement of all stakeholders should be created. The school must possess “an orderly, purposeful, business-like atmosphere, which is free from the threat of physical harm. The school climate is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning” (Lezotte, 2001, p. 6).

Studies have shown the significance and value in determining the climate of schools. The relationships between and amongst teachers and administrators and their relationship with the community constitutes school climate (Arter, 1987). School climate can either enhance the learning environment or become a hindrance. The highest levels of teaching and learning occur when all members of the school community have created a system of support through their interactions (Freiberg, 1998). Teachers and administrators have the greatest impact on the school climate. Positive instructional climates are created when principals are visible and model their beliefs (Krug, 1992). Schools that exhibit a positive, healthy school climate have higher student achievement (Adeogun & Olisaemeka, 2011; Brookover et al., 1978; MacNeil et al., 2009). Feelings of safety are also intertwined with the perceptions of the school’s climate (Bosworth et

al., 2011; Center for Social and Emotional Education, 2010). The job satisfaction of teachers increases as the school climate improves (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1994). School climate has also been found to be strongly associated with beginning teachers' decision to stay at their school and in their district (Wynn et al., 2006) and school climate variables are predictors of teacher commitment (Collie et al., 2011). A school that generates a positive climate is also creating many additional positive characteristics within and about the school and contributes to its overall effectiveness (Hoy et al., 1991; Lehr, 2005).

Organizational School Climate

The study of organizational school climate has increased since the middle of the 20th century. However, the climate study focus was primarily centered on empirical research. Therefore, a large body of material encompasses research methodology and instrumentation, as opposed to defining the conceptual framework. The study of work climate in businesses translated into studies regarding school climate and culture (Halpin & Croft, 1963). Hoy and Miskel (2008) defined organizational school climate as “a relatively enduring quality of the school environment that is experienced by teachers, affects their behavior, and is based on their collective perceptions of behavior in schools” (p. 198). Its properties are likely to be experienced and observed by the organizational members while being reported by them in an applicable questionnaire. Hoy et al. (1991) simplified the definition by stating that “the organizational climate of a school is the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of its members” (p. 8). Organizational climate is a fairly persistent quality of the organization's internal environment that is (a) faced by the organization's members, (b) has an influence on their behavior, and (c) can be described on the basis of the values

of a specific set of attributes or characteristics in that particular organization (Hoy et al., 1991).

Krug (1992) stated that the instructional climate of a school is not as much concerned with the contentment or positive attitude of the students, teachers, and administrators, but is related to their perceptions of norms. The norms consist of instructional performance, expectations for learning, the school's sense of purpose, and overall commitment to this common purpose. When referring to organizational school climate, the environment can encompass a school department, a school building, or a school district. Vos, van der Westhuizen, Mentz, and Ellis (2012) defined organizational school climate as a concept that encompasses the general notion of expressing the enduring organizational life quality. Based on this understanding, the organizational climate framework has increasingly been shaped while establishing an understanding that the organizational climate can be measured and conceptualized (Vos et al., 2012).

Mine (2009) proposed that organizational school climate is the individuals' perception of the environment in which they work. Schools characterized by the virtues of unity, trust, and familiarity among the staff members will have a highly efficient and effective team that is results oriented (Ali & Hale, 2009). In the same sense, the organizational climate is a form of energy. The effects of that energy are dependent on the way this energy is directed and channeled. Some institutions will employ this energy in improving the work place while others will misuse it to the point of causing more problems and difficulties within the same institutions (Dimitri & Mieke, 2012). The two aforementioned generalizations have to be made if the climate is to be perceived as a representation of the capacity of the school to act efficiently and effectively.

Newmann and Wehlage (1995) synthesized 5 years of research data from teachers and administrators in more than 1,500 elementary, middle, and high schools. Newmann and Wehlage concluded that four key factors in school restructuring improve student learning. These four aspects are (a) student learning, (b) authentic pedagogy, (c) school organizational capacity, and (d) external support. In the category of school organizational capacity, components of a school's success are the professional community and positive organizational school climate it possesses. Newmann and Wehlage determined that professional learning communities also improve student learning and increase student achievement.

A positive organizational school climate automatically contributes to staff performance in schools. In addition, this climate promotes increased morale while improving the students' achievement level (Dorathi, 2011). Dorathi used climate and school effectiveness scales in a survey of 240 teachers. These teachers were from both private and public schools. Dorathi's findings link school climate to student achievement and attributes organizational school climate as one of the most significant ingredients contributing to a successful instructional program. A statistically significant, positive correlation between organizational climate and service orientation was found. Without a climate that creates a well-functioning and harmonious school, it becomes difficult to hit a high academic achievement level (Dorathi, 2011).

Two studies conducted in Western Australia specifically denoted the use of an organizational climate instrument as providing a useful framework for school improvement efforts (Dellar & Giddings, 1991). The results from such instruments were also found to provide a school-level approach to transform the organizational climate of

existing schools by prioritizing the areas of need and directly addressing the school improvement efforts to the areas identified in the organizational climate assessment. A favorable organizational school climate must be present in a school in order for improvement and enhanced effectiveness to be achieved and sustained. Everyone throughout the entire institution should experience the climate for improvement (Bear, Clare, Blank, & Fang, 2011).

From an academic viewpoint, organizational school climate is constituted of an interpersonal interaction between the behavior of the teachers and that of the principal (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008). The interaction in groups by teachers can be referred to as synonymous to the topographical contours in a place, while the leadership of the principal can be referred to as the atmospheric conditions. The two combined result in a peculiar social texture unique to each organization and is referred to as its climate (Ali & Hale, 2009).

Teale and Scott (2010) described three standard categories in which the organizational school climate can be conceptualized and measured: (a) perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach, (b) perceptual measurement-organizational attribute approach, and (c) multiple measurement-organizational attribute approach. The concept of organizational climate in modern studies is based on these three categories. However, with the focus being based on the individual nature, the psychological climate has been continuously used in the perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach. To understand the perceptions of the teachers and the principal on the organizational climate, it would be worthwhile to study these behaviors. Literature points to aspects of the principal's behavior and of the teacher's behavior that are contributing factors to

organizational school climate. The varied impact of principals (administration) and teachers on organizational school climate is discussed in the following sections.

Principals' Impact on Organizational School Climate

Principals act as the role model for the demeanor they wish to see in the staff members and the school (Ali & Hale, 2009). The principal also establishes the set standard and offers support to all the members of the staff in the attempt to maintain the set standard (Ali & Hale, 2009). Professional staff and administrators ought to believe genuinely that their students can pass and proceed to work effectively to that end (Krovetz, 2004). It has been shown from studies that when the principal is committed to duty and hardworking members of the staff get both extrinsically and intrinsically motivated, and they tend to enjoy their work (Ali & Hale, 2009). A high trust in a principal positively influences the organizational school climate; all employees direct their energy to the achievement and accomplishment of the organizational goals. Both the students and the teachers enjoy the processes of learning and teaching respectively. On the other hand, when principals are less enthusiastic about their work, the school climate is negatively affected and the performance of both the students and the teachers is debilitated. The effectiveness of an organization and the organizational school climate perceptions of teachers are directly affected by the principal (Ali & Hale, 2009).

Kelley et al. (2005) found through their data collection that the leadership behaviors of a principal affect climate. Five teachers from each of 31 schools ($n = 155$), and the principal from each school were administered a climate survey and a leader behavior survey. Each school was specifically chosen because its student population was between 100 and 650 students, which allotted the school only one principal and no

assistant principal. This was thought to bring accuracy to the results of the study by having the climate and leadership scales in reference to just one leader, not multiple leaders. The purpose of the study was to determine the relationships between the principal's leadership style, the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership style, and the teachers' perceptions of the school climate (Kelley et al., 2005).

Kelley et al. (2005) noted that teachers' perceptions of their principals' effectiveness were positively related to school climate. In contrast, inconsistency in the principal's leadership style results in a negative correlation with school climate. Discrepancies existed between the principals' perceptions of their leadership behaviors and climate and the teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership behaviors and climate. Kelley et al.'s study was significant in showing that principals' opinion of their actions and the insight of the teachers' observations regarding the principals' actions may differ. When a difference in perception exists, the school is clearly not running as effectively as it could. Because the teachers' perceptions are their reality, it is imperative that principals adjust their behaviors to produce a positive, accurate perception that is in congruence with the teachers. In order for principals to improve, they must obtain the viewpoint of their teachers through an assessment and then use that knowledge and their authority to affect the school climate positively (Kelley et al., 2005).

Robinson (2010) examined leadership style and organizational school climate as possible indicators of student achievement. The participants consisted of elementary and high school principals and teachers. Robinson indicated that principals were more in line with the teachers when it came to assessing the leadership style of the principal than with assessing the organizational school climate. Principals only viewed their schools as open

or disengaged, while teacher responses in each of those schools ranged from open, closed, disengaged, and engaged. Principals often perceived their interactions regarding school climate in a more positive light than the teachers did at the same schools. Seven schools had both teacher and principal participation. Teachers and principals in four of the seven schools came to the same conclusion in their assessment of the school climate. However, teachers and the principals came to a different conclusion of the school's climate at three schools. Each of the three schools had the principals who perceived themselves as open, while the teachers at each of those schools rated the principals as closed. This provides valuable information, especially for administrators who wish to attain an open school climate, but realize that the teachers do not perceive the principals' dealings in an open manner. The results enabled the current administrators at those schools to make changes so that the teachers and the principals were on the same page. Everyone worked to strengthen the perceptions of the organizational climate from both point of views to meet the desired result of everyone, teachers and administrators, perceiving the entire school as open (Robinson, 2010).

Some principals have the tendency to isolate themselves from other teachers and to avoid any form of intimate interaction with them. This is what is referred to as aloofness (Ali & Hale, 2009). This group of principals is strict at the observation of regulations and rules and expects all the members of staff and other subordinates to follow these rules to the letter (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008). Consequently, this attitude hinders the existence of a friendly and healthy academic atmosphere within the school because most teachers are opposed to the autocratic leadership of their boss. Aloofness is important in the study of perception of teachers on the organizational climate due to its

direct effect. Halpin (1966) described the impact of principals keeping a social distance from teachers as being perceived as unfriendly and unable to relate to the faculty and staff. The impersonal and formal manner in which the principal behaves results in aloofness (Mohan, & Ashok, 2011). This creates a lack of job satisfaction and cohesion among the teachers (Mohan, & Ashok, 2011).

Principals also affect organizational school climate through their production emphasis, which is a close and commanding supervision (Halpin & Croft, 1963). A controlling and authoritative stress on the results and performance of the teachers is divulged by the administration. Principals who exhibit production emphasis qualities are extremely directive and are not receptive to feedback from their faculty and staff (Halpin & Croft, 1963). Principals who believe in the principle of production base all their actions on the viewpoint that employees work and produce their best when they are exposed to immense tension and pressure (Mine, 2009). These principals believe that they can only avoid conflicts and clashes with the other staff members if all their strength is directed toward the discharge of their duties and roles (Ali & Hale, 2009). This type of behavior influences the way the staff members take their responsibilities and will thus affect the organizational climate of an institution.

Other researchers argue that the lack of emphasis on production may produce a staff that has individuals who are not the least concerned about the achievement of the organizational visions and goals (Brown & Medway, 2007). Without pressure, some teachers and the subordinate staff may fail to take seriously the duties given to them and consider their personal interests as more superior than their official duties (Brown & Medway, 2007). This behavior in turn, directly affects the climate of the school.

Principals who focus only on the rules and policies and are extremely directive in their dealings with the faculty and staff create an environment of low morale and job satisfaction (Mine, 2009). Teachers are without a sense of involvement.

The interaction between the staff and the principal obviously affects the atmosphere of the organization (Jainabee & Jamelaa, 2011). In some institutions, the principal is immensely considerate and responsive to the staff members' needs and takes personal interest in the students, parents, and staff; showing them great sympathy and interest (Mine, 2009). Azzara (2001) ascertained that the principal, in order to demonstrate true leadership, must relate to all of the stakeholders in the school in the way that depicts a concern for them. Azzara also noted that the principal who is most considerate is the most successful because the process of developing a positive interpersonal relationship with the stakeholders of the organization is the epitome of good leadership. These principal behaviors positively influence the organizational school climate (Azzara, 2001).

Due to increasing cultural and social diversity in our schools, educators and administrators must find the right balance that will promote a healthy learning environment while at the same time embracing cultural pluralism (Garcia, 2005). Elementary school teachers and principals will ultimately realize that their duty is not only to provide leadership but also to create socially acceptable value systems in the school population. It is therefore imperative to observe that school leadership is a multidimensional concept that contributes to the organizational climate of schools. Garcia established the viewpoint that equally as important as creating a positive atmosphere is the ability to sustain that climate. Garcia noted that leadership skill sets

should be scrutinized to determine those that are not only promoting an organizational climate, but also maintaining and continuing to improve the organizational patterns within the school.

In a study of 116 K–8 teachers in a Midwestern metropolitan school district, Smylie (1992) investigated relationships between teachers' willingness to participate in school-level decision making using four main factors as determinants: (a) the principal-teacher working relationship, (b) norms influencing working relationships among teachers, (c) teachers' perceived capacity to contribute to decisions, and (d) teachers' sense of responsibility and accountability in work with students. Smylie found that the involvement of teachers in educational decision making is based on the degree of openness that is perceived from the principal. An open principal is collaborative, facilitative, and supportive of the teachers' professional, value-based decisions. Smylie proposed that the "teachers' willingness to participate in school decision making is influenced primarily by their relationships with their principals" (p. 63). The results from this study showed the interdependent aspects of organizational school climate. When there is an open, positive organizational climate, the relationship between the administration and faculty is optimal. In turn, the teachers are more involved in the school and hence vested in its success. When an open climate has not been created and the rapport between administration and teachers has not developed, the teachers are unwilling to participate in the leading and guiding of the school (Smylie, 1992).

Administrators set the stage for the organizational climate of the school and have a great effect on the type of climate that is perceived (Ali & Hale, 2009; Kelley et al., 2005). A positive organizational school climate will prevail if principals show concern

for their faculty and staff (Azzara, 2001; Mine, 2009) and are able to maintain the open climate (Garcia, 2005). Hoyle et al. (1985) recognized the importance and difficulty of creating a positive, open school climate. They stated that school leaders can have a valuable impact on school climate by setting the tone for their teachers and staff, but they are not solely responsible for the school climate. The school leaders must create positive morale and work motivation for teachers, staff, and students. This tone translates into a climate that promotes higher achievement by teachers and students (Hoyle et al., 1985; Robinson, 2010). The administration must also strive to keep the professional working relationships between teachers open and positive so that the organizational climate is open and in turn, teachers are more willing open themselves to be a part of the school and the decision making (Smylie, 1992). All of these pressures could be overwhelming on the school and the leadership, but it is necessary for the school's leaders to sustain the climate (Patterson, 2007).

Teachers' Impact on Organizational School Climate

Teachers' role in creating a positive organizational school climate is as important as their perception of the climate. As a social system, the school allows interpersonal interactions among all the stakeholders of the school; the teachers interact among themselves, with parents, students and the principal. The way the teachers uphold their duties and obligations affects the organizational climate (Ali & Hale, 2009).

Teachers can portray disengagement, which is a lack of commitment that one shows to an organization (Cross & Ji, 2012). In such school climates, teachers indulge in petty and worthless matters such as showing direct dislike of principals and criticizing their every decision, despite the principals' efforts to improve the performance and

quality of work life within the institutions. This negative attitude is mirrored in the way these teachers relate to the stakeholders of the school and even to themselves (Dimitri & Mieke, 2012). Their main aim is to derail the principals and the schools from achieving the goals of the organizations and thus to create an unpleasant climate within the schools. When teachers exhibit high levels of disengagement, their attitude toward their job is poor (Mohan & Ashok, 2011).

The engagement of teachers has a profound effect, either positive or negative, on the organizational climate of schools (Halpin, 1966). In school with low rates of disengagement and high levels of engagement, teachers are committed to their duties and work together as a unit (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008). There exists both mutual respect and professionalism in the way they handle each other and everything at large. A negative demeanor of the principal does not derail the staff from enjoying their work and carrying out their duties (Hoy et al., 1991). An engaged team of teachers is productive irrespective of the poor leadership of the institution.

Douglas (2010) surveyed 67 elementary schools with 1,353 teachers participating in the research. The Organizational Climate Index (OCI) and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire were used to determine the relationship between school climate and teacher commitment. The OCI was chosen because it combines the aspects of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Organizational Health Inventory. Each of the four components of the OCI was examined: (a) collegial leadership, (b) professional teacher behavior, (c) achievement press, and (d) institutional vulnerability. Douglas (2010) found that collegial leadership is a good predictor of teacher commitment, while professional teacher behavior is the best predictor of teacher

commitment. In addition, achievement press was determined to be a predictor of both professional teacher behavior and collegial leadership. Institutional vulnerability was the only element of the OCI that did not show significant relationship with teacher commitment. It was concluded that there is a relationship between organizational school climate, collegial teacher behavior, and teacher commitment (Douglas, 2010).

Le Cornu (2009) contended that teachers' perceptions, expectations, and behaviors help sustain and perhaps expand student performance. Three general expectations that teachers can impart on learners were identified. The first revolves around their perception toward the students' current performance. For example, teachers who believe they are interacting with bright students will most likely influence them to believe so. Yet teachers who believe in the contrary will eventually discourage students. Secondly, a teacher's prediction or guess about a student's future achievement will inform how the teacher exposes the student to learning, hence setting a higher bar in terms of performance for the student. For example, teachers who believe their students are challenged may limit their learning potential in terms of the exposure they get. Thirdly, Le Cornu conjectured that teachers' expectations are a degree to which they over or under estimate students' achievement level. These expectations play a major role in students' performance. This study proved that expectations create either a fulfilling prophecy or a sustaining expectation effect that if positive in nature, creates a positive atmosphere for the students and the school. Le Cornu showed the impact teachers' perceptions of school climate have on the actual success and achievement of the students.

Teachers may relish the impact they have on students, yet view routine duties and committee obligations as hindering their ability to effectively carryout their

responsibilities as a teacher. The term hindrance is used to refer to the attitude that some teachers have toward non-instructional activities and the paperwork involved in teaching (Halpin, 1966). Dimitri and Mieke (2012) found that some teachers are invested mostly in the act of teaching and consider such extraneous requirements to be unnecessary. However, other teachers consider this work just as necessary as teaching; arguing that this is one of the ways the academic goal of student success is achieved. Dimitri and Mieke concluded that the partiality of the teachers' commitment to the act and responsibility of teaching affects the entire school. This lack of embracing the entire role of a teacher is translated to the students, other faculty and staff, and even to the parents. When teachers possess characteristics of hindrance, the school's organizational climate suffers greatly (Dimitri & Mieke, 2012).

In institutions where committee roles and paperwork are emphasized over learning, the climate is also adversely affected (Ali & Hale, 2009). If the principal puts extra weight on the completion of documentation and data, the teachers turn to pleasing the principal to evade confrontation rather than to create positive results. This situation highly destabilizes the organizational climate and thus the perception of the stakeholders in the school (Ali & Hale, 2009). Teachers who feel hindrance are burdened by routine, management, and administrative duties that they view as unnecessary (Mohan & Ashok, 2011). The weight of these extraneous assignments creates a negative attitude in the teachers and eradicates their job satisfaction (Mohan & Ashok, 2011).

Another effect of teachers on organizational school climate is their esprit. Halpin (1966) referred to it as teachers' satisfaction with their social and professional needs. A school that has high rates of accomplishment and esprit has faculty and staff that work

together as a team. They also help and support each other in all the endeavors within and outside the institution (Mine, 2009). Teachers who demonstrate high esprit are innovative, enthusiastic, and are always willing to provide assistance in a mutual way if one of them direly needs help (Jainabee & Jamelaa, 2011). On the contrary, schools with low esprit have an unmotivated staff that are not devoted to duty and draw little satisfaction if any from their careers (Cross & Ji, 2012). In a school where a positive, open organization school climate prevails, the psychological and emotional needs of the teachers are met sufficiently (Ali & Hale, 2009).

Research shows that close degrees of relation (intimacy) may occur in some schools among teachers and the other subordinate staff. Teachers who share the intimate relation tend to know each other more and share more personal information (Elena & Anit, 2010). Intimate behavior also extends outside the school; they relate closely with intense socialization within and outside the school. These teachers strongly support one another in terms of visits, are aware of each other's family details, and are there for each other in all difficult circumstances. Halpin (1966) used the term intimacy to refer to the mutual relationship that exists between one teacher and the other. When intimacy exists among teachers, they work with drive and vitality (Mohan & Ashok, 2011). The morale of the teachers is high and their attitude towards their profession is positive. This intimacy also creates increased job satisfaction (Mohan & Ashok, 2011). Teachers are often motivated by the mutuality and the happiness they derive from intimacy and thus a positive organizational climate exists (Ali & Hale, 2009).

However, if caution is not taken in the application of intimacy, it may result in a negative organizational school climate (Abu-Saad & Vernon, 1995). Schools where

teachers fail to control what they share personally and involve in gossip about issues affecting other members of the staff contribute to confusion, suspicion, and mistrust in the school environment. Some schools also witness low levels of intimacy while others experience no intimacy. This quarrelsome behavior detracts from the overall climate and consequently, the success of the school (Abu-Saad & Vernon, 1995). A lack of intimacy creates a closed organizational climate where teachers have a poor attitude towards their job and are not experiencing satisfaction in their career (Mohan & Ashok, 2011).

Krovetz (2004) observed that it is the duty of the educator to positively affect students and motivate them. The way teachers approach their position and the daily duties of their job affects the overall organizational climate of the school (Ali & Hale, 2009). Teachers who are disengaged or have a lack of intimacy have a negative impact on the school, their attitudes towards their job, and their job satisfaction (Abu-Saad & Vernon, 1995; Cross & Ji, 2012; Dimitri & Mieke, 2012; Mohan & Ashok, 2011). High levels of teacher engagement occur when teachers work together and increase their productivity (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hoy et al., 1991). Organizational climate is a predictor of teacher commitment, and professional teacher behavior is the component that was found to be the greatest predictor (Douglas, 2010). When hindrance is felt and experienced by the teachers, a negative impact results on the organizational school climate and teachers have less job satisfaction and commitment (Ali & Hale, 2009; Dimitri & Mieke, 2012; Halpin, 1966; Mohan & Ashok, 2011). The perceptions that teachers possess of the school climate affect the success of the school and the achievement of the students (Le Cornu, 2009).

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains a description of the approach used to determine the teacher and administrator assessments of organizational school climate, the difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the organizational school climate, and the resulting classification of climate at each school. The research design and a description of the setting and participants are included in this chapter. Also, the instrument used to collect the data is described; in addition, the procedures used for collecting and analyzing the data are presented.

Research Design

This was a quantitative study using a casual comparative research design to examine the organizational school climate of four elementary schools in one north Georgia school district. This study used a survey to collect quantitative data with the purpose of investigating the difference between the administrators' assessments and the teachers' assessments of the organizational school climate perceived at each school. The organizational school climate is separated into six dimensions: three administrative behaviors and three teacher behaviors. Each dimension is separated from the survey as a separate subtest. All six subtests were assessed to determine the differences between the teachers' and the administrators' perceptions of organizational school climate. A quantitative study was chosen because the realm of organizational school climate is assessed through the process of administering a survey. Survey research is a kind of descriptive study under the umbrella of quantitative study. Organizational school climate is behavior or phenomena best measured by using quantitative research methods that

provide objective evidence for decision making and find solutions to problems worth investigating (Kraska, 2008).

Research Question and Null Hypotheses

The study addressed the following research question and null hypotheses:

Research Question

Are there differences between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments of the six subtests of the organizational school climate profile, as measured on the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools?

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the supportive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
2. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the directive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
3. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the restrictive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

4. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the collegial teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
5. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the intimate teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.
6. There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the disengaged teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

Setting

The school district is in a county in Georgia located north of Atlanta with a population of 175,192. The county's school system consists of 35 public schools—19 elementary schools, 9 middle schools, 5 high schools, and 2 alternative schools with an enrollment of 35,953 students. More than 2,500 certified educators comprise part of the full-time personnel of 4,159.

Participants

Teachers at four elementary schools in the school district participated in the study. Each school's participants consisted of the teachers and the administrators employed at that school. The demographics of the four schools are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographics of Elementary Schools Participating in Study

School	Student enrollment	# teachers	# administrators	Met AYP	% of students receiving free & reduced lunch
A	948	65	3	yes	32
B	1,001	65	3	yes	4
C	631	60	2	yes	26
D	1,208	80	3	yes	9

Instrument

Organizational school climate has been determined as a valid means of assessing a school. Freiberg (1998) stated that, “Measuring school climate can help us understand what was and what is, so that we can move forward to what could be” (p. 22). However, assessing the school climate can take on several forms and methodologies.

Organizational school climate can be assessed by the students, teachers, administrators, staff, or community members. Halpin and Croft (1963) observed that schools are noticeably different in their feel, yet the reason for this is unknown. They wanted to discover what caused the different feel of each school and looked beyond just the morale. Because of their observations and questions, Halpin and Croft conceptualized a system for measuring organizational school climate. The measurement tool they developed was the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The responses to the

questionnaire are evaluated along a continuum of open to closed climates. This instrument contains 64 Likert-type items in eight subtests. Four subtests are about the principal as a leader: (a) aloofness, (b) production, (c) thrust, and (d) consideration. The other four subtests are about the characteristics of the group or teacher: (a) disengagement, (b) hindrance, (c) esprit, and (d) intimacy.

An open climate is indicated by a very low emphasis on disengagement, hindrance, aloofness, and production. An open climate also has a high emphasis on intimacy and consideration, and a very high emphasis on esprit and thrust. Conversely, a closed climate has a very high emphasis on disengagement and a high emphasis in hindrance, intimacy, aloofness, and production. A closed climate also has a low emphasis on thrust and consideration and a very low emphasis in esprit (Halpin & Croft, 1963).

Hoy et al. (1991) used Halpin and Croft's original OCDQ as a basis for developing their own organizational climate measurement device. In order to revise the OCDQ, Hoy et al. examined the original items by an assessment of factor loadings, which resulted in 24 of the 64 items being discarded. New items were then generated to increase the scope of the new instrument. A pilot study was conducted with only elementary school teachers and principals to focus the measurement even more. Using the data from the pilot study, a series of exploratory factor analyses was performed that improved the interpretation and refined the measurement tool.

The revised OCDQ from Hoy et al. (1991) contains only six dimensions, three pertain to principal behavior and three pertain to teacher behavior (see Appendix A). Principal behavior dimensions are (a) supportive, (b) directive, and (c) restrictive.

Supportive principal behavior reflects a basic concern for teachers; directive principal behavior is rigid, close supervision; and restrictive principal behavior is behavior that hinders rather than facilitates teacher work. Teacher behavior dimensions are (a) collegial, (b) intimate, and (c) disengaged. Collegial teacher behavior supports open and professional interactions among teachers; intimate teacher behavior is cohesive with strong social relations among teachers; and disengaged teacher behavior signifies a lack of meaning and focus to professional activities.

Another pilot study was then conducted with elementary school teachers and administrators on the revised Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE) to ensure reliability and validity. Hoy et al. (1991) altered the open and closed continuum from Halpin and Croft (1963) to determine the type of climate the elementary schools possess. Four new classifications of climate types were determined:

1. An open climate is indicated by high supportive principal behavior and low directive and restrictive principal behavior, with high collegial and intimate teacher behavior and low disengaged teacher behavior.
2. An engaged climate has low supportive principal behavior and high directive and restrictive principal behavior, with high collegial and intimate teacher behavior and low disengaged teacher behavior.
3. A disengaged climate has high supportive principal behavior and low directive and restrictive principal behavior, with low collegial and intimate teacher behavior and high disengaged teacher behavior.

4. The closed climate has low supportive principal behavior and high directive and restrictive principal behavior, with low collegial and intimate teacher behavior and high disengaged teacher behavior.

Each dimension was measured by a subtest of the OCDQ-RE and the reliability scores for the scales were relatively high. The alpha coefficients were supportive (.94), directive (.88), restrictive (.81), collegial (.87), intimate (.83), and disengaged (.78). By correlating each dimension of openness by the original OCDQ index of openness, the construct validity was supported. The index of teacher openness in the sample used by Hoy et al. (1991) correlated positively with the original general school openness index ($r = .67, p < .01$) as did the index of principal openness ($r = .52, p < .01$). Furthermore, the factor analysis supported the construct validity of organizational climate (Hoy et al., 1991). The items on each subtest of the OCDQ-RE are presented in Table 2.

Data Collection Procedures

All elementary school teachers of Grades K–5 and elementary school principals and assistant principals were provided an opportunity to participate in the study. After approval was obtained from Liberty University's Institutional Review Board and the superintendent of the school district (Appendix B), the principals were emailed to introduce the study and explain the questionnaire (Appendix C). Their cooperation was sought for access to faculty meetings where the questionnaire would be administered to the teachers and principals.

Table 2

Items on Each Subtest of the Organizational Climate Description for Elementary Schools

Subtest	Items
Supportive principal behavior	<p>The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers. The principal uses constructive criticism. The principal explains his/her reasons for criticism to teachers. The principal listens to and accepts teachers' suggestions. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers. The principal treats teachers as equals. The principal compliments teachers. The principal is easy to understand. The principal goes out of his/her way to show appreciation to teachers.</p>
Directive principal behavior	<p>The principal rules with an iron fist. The principal checks the sign-in sheet every morning. The principal schedules the work for the teachers. The principal corrects the teachers' mistakes. The principal closely checks classroom (teacher) activities. The principal supervises teachers closely. The principal checks lesson plans. The principal is autocratic. The principal monitors everything teachers do.</p>
Restrictive principal behavior	<p>Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching. Teachers have too many committee requirements. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school. Clerical support reduces teachers' paperwork. ** Teachers are burdened with busy work.</p>
Collegial teacher behavior	<p>The teachers accomplish their work with vim, vigor, and pleasure. Teachers leave school immediately after school is over. ** Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues. Teachers help and support each other. Teachers are proud of their school. New teachers are readily accepted by colleagues. Teachers socialize together in small, select groups. ** Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.</p>
Intimate teacher behavior	<p>Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school. Teachers invite faculty members to visit them at home. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time. Teachers have parties for each other. Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.</p>
Disengaged teacher behavior	<p>Faculty meetings are useless. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members. Teachers ramble when they talk at faculty meetings.</p>

The population consisted of all of the elementary school teachers and administrators in the school district. Approximately 1,100 faculty members were in the 19 schools. Permission from the principals for their school to participate was voluntary.

The researcher attended faculty meetings at the four elementary schools. The cover letter on the front of the survey (Appendix D) was read before administering the survey during each faculty meeting. The teachers and administrators were asked to complete the questionnaire. A box was provided for the teachers and administrators to place their completed questionnaires upon leaving the meeting. This helped ensure the anonymity of the persons completing the questionnaires. All questionnaires were anonymous, except for an indication on the questionnaire of their school location and if they were a teacher or an administrator. Participation was voluntary.

There was minimal risk to the teachers and principals in participating in the study. Some questions may have been difficult for teachers and administrators to answer honestly about each other; however, confidentiality was assured in person and through the cover letter on the questionnaire. The questions may have triggered some unpleasant feelings, if the participant had had a negative experience with any of the related situations referred to in the questionnaire. To address this, the cover letter stated that participation was voluntary and that questions could be skipped at the participant's discretion.

The research records and results of the analysis will be stored for as long as needed, but not to exceed 6 years in a locked filing cabinet located in the researcher's place of residence. After 6 years, the surveys will be cross-shredded and discarded.

Data Analysis

A quantitative study using causal comparative research was conducted to determine the means of the teachers' and administrators' assessments of organizational school climate. The differences between the assessments of teachers and administrators were calculated according to each of the six subtests that comprised the organizational school climate profile. To achieve this, the completed questionnaires that were collected from each school were entered into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. The administrator and teacher responses to the items on each subtest of the OCDQ-RE were averaged to obtain subtest scores for each respondent. The individual items and the subtests means were used to answer the research question. That data from the Microsoft Excel spreadsheets was then uploaded into the program GraphPad InStat. The results of the mean responses and the calculations in differences from administrators and teachers on each item of the OCDQ-RE subtests are presented in tabular form in Chapter 4.

Research Question

Are there differences between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments of the six subtests of the organizational school climate profile, as measured on the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools?

The Research Question and the subsequent six null hypotheses required the analysis of the differences between the administrators' and the teachers' mean responses on the six OCDQ-RE subtests. The n-value for the administrators was eleven where the n-value for the teachers was 244. The discrepancy in n-values for the two groups is due to the nature of public schools. Schools receive an allotment as to how many

administrators and teachers are allowed to be hired within a building according to the number of students enrolled at that school. Each elementary school consists of only one principal and one or two assistant principals, placing the total number of administrators at two to three; however, the number of allotted teachers is considerably more. In order to assess the differences in the assessments between the administrators and the teachers at the same school, the comparisons had to be made with the using the number of administrators and teachers that were employed at that specific school. This caused a low n-value for the administrators and a higher n-value for the teachers.

Since the two groups were not equivalent in sample size or in variance, the means of the principals and teachers on each subtest of the OCDQ-RE were compared first using an unpaired t-test and then using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test. The Mann-Whitney U test was determined to be the most accurate as it can replace the parametric t-test without showing any significant losses in power (Pophan & Sirotnik, 1992). An alpha level of less than .05 was used to evaluate the significance of each test. The Mann-Whitney U test was used for each of the null hypotheses.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This quantitative study using a causal comparative research design examined the organizational school climate of four elementary schools in a north Georgia school district. This study used a survey to collect quantitative data with the purpose of investigating the difference between the administrator assessments and the teacher assessments of the organizational school climate perceived at each school. This chapter contains the results of the data analysis.

Description of the Data

Questionnaires were received from 255 educators—11 administrators and 244 teachers. Table 3 contains a description of the 255 responses used to analyze the research questions.

Table 3

Number of Responses by School

School	Administrators		Teachers	
	<i>n</i>	<i>% of administrators</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>% of teachers</i>
A	3	.27	58	23.8
B	3	.27	58	23.8
C	2	.18	57	23.4
D	3	.27	71	29.1

Reliability of the subtests were measured using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The six subtests obtained reliability values between .94 and .62. Table 4 contains the number of items in each subtest and the coefficient alpha.

Table 4

Reliability of Subtests

Subtest	# of items	Cronbach's coefficient alpha
Supportive principal behavior	9	.94
Directive principal behavior	9	.68
Restrictive principal behavior	5	.77
Collegial teacher behavior	8	.69
Intimate teacher behavior	7	.81
Disengaged teacher behavior	4	.62

Analysis of the Research Questions

The mean responses of the administrators and teachers at every school are presented in tabular form in Tables 5–10 for each individual item on the six OCDQ-RE subtests. Table 5 consists of the mean responses of the administrators and teachers on the supportive principal behavior subtest. Table 6 records the mean responses of the administrators and teachers on the principal behavior subtest. The restrictive principal behavior subtest has the mean responses of the administrators and teachers in Table 7. The mean responses of the administrators and teachers are in Table 8 for the collegial behavior subtest. Table 9 lists the intimate behavior subtest mean responses of the administrators and teachers. The disengaged behavior subtest has the mean responses of the administrators and teachers in Table 10.

Table 5

Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Supportive Principal Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE

Item	Administrators*	Teachers
The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers.	3.73	3.03
The principal uses constructive criticism.	3.40	2.81
The principal explains his/her reasons for criticism to teachers.	3.40	2.66
The principal listens to and accepts teachers' suggestions.	3.80	2.92
The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.	3.91	3.11
The principal treats teachers as equals.	3.70	2.85
The principal compliments teachers.	3.73	3.08
The principal is easy to understand.	3.45	3.09
The principal goes out of his/her way to show appreciation to teachers.	3.55	3.10

* Mean is based on responses to scale that ranges from 1 (*rarely occurs*), 2 (*sometimes occurs*), 3 (*often occurs*), to 4 (*very frequently occurs*)

Table 6

Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Directive Principal Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE

Item	Administrators*	Teachers
The principal rules with an iron fist.	1.11	1.67
The principal checks the sign-in sheet every morning.	1.18	1.34
The principal schedules the work for the teachers.	2.55	2.06
The principal corrects the teachers' mistakes.	2.64	2.37
The principal closely checks classroom (teacher) activities.	3.00	2.39
The principal supervises teachers closely.	2.64	2.34
The principal checks lesson plans.	1.45	1.60
The principal is autocratic.	1.60	1.89
The principal monitors everything teachers do.	2.09	1.79

* Mean is based on responses to scale that ranges from 1 (*rarely occurs*), 2 (*sometimes occurs*), 3 (*often occurs*), to 4 (*very frequently occurs*)

Table 7

Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Restrictive Principal Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE

Item	Administrators*	Teachers
Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.	1.73	2.21
Teachers have too many committee requirements.	2.09	2.33
Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school.	2.36	2.39
Clerical support reduces teachers' paperwork. **	2.55	2.13
Teachers are burdened with busy work.	1.64	2.32

* Mean is based on responses to scale that ranges from 1 (*rarely occurs*), 2 (*sometimes occurs*), 3 (*often occurs*), to 4 (*very frequently occurs*)

** Item reversed when calculating subtest mean

Table 8

Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Collegial Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE

Item	Administrators*	Teachers
The teachers accomplish their work with vim, vigor, and pleasure.	3.36	3.34
Teachers leave school immediately after school is over. **	1.73	1.67
Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.	2.64	2.70
Teachers help and support each other.	3.82	3.54
Teachers are proud of their school.	3.82	3.71
New teachers are readily accepted by colleagues.	3.45	3.31
Teachers socialize together in small, select groups. **	2.82	2.73
Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.	3.45	3.26

* Mean is based on responses to scale that ranges from 1 (*rarely occurs*), 2 (*sometimes occurs*), 3 (*often occurs*), to 4 (*very frequently occurs*)

** Item reversed when calculating subtest mean

Table 9

Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Intimate Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE

Item	Administrators*	Teachers
Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.	3.18	2.71
Teachers invite faculty members to visit them at home.	3.27	2.28
Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.	3.09	2.53
Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.	3.36	2.71
Teachers have parties for each other.	3.36	2.95
Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis.	3.18	2.76
Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.	3.45	3.01

* Mean is based on responses to scale that ranges from 1 (*rarely occurs*), 2 (*sometimes occurs*), 3 (*often occurs*), to 4 (*very frequently occurs*)

Table 10

Mean Responses of Administrators and Teachers in Each School to Items in Disengaged Behavior Subtest of the OCDQ-RE

Item	Administrators*	Teachers
Faculty meetings are useless.	1.18	1.73
There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.	2.00	1.68
Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.	2.45	1.68
Teachers ramble when they talk at faculty meetings.	1.55	1.69

* Mean is based on responses to scale that ranges from 1 (*rarely occurs*), 2 (*sometimes occurs*), 3 (*often occurs*), to 4 (*very frequently occurs*)

Research Question

Are there differences between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments of the six subtests of the organizational school climate profile, as measured on the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools?

The means of the administrators' and teachers' on each of the six subtests of the OCDQ-RE were calculated using the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test. An alpha level of less than .05 was used to evaluate the significance of each test. Table 11 list the administrators' and teachers' mean responses on each of six subtests of the OCDQ-RE and the results of the analysis of differences between the two groups. Statistical differences were found between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments on two of the subtests of the organizational school climate profile: supportive principal behavior and intimate teacher behavior. There were no statistically significant differences between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments on the other four subtests of the organizational school climate profile: directive principal behavior, restrictive principal behavior, collegial teacher behavior, and disengaged teacher behavior.

Table 11

Results of the Analysis of Differences between Administrators and Teachers on the Subtests of the OCDQ-RE

Dimension	Administrators (<i>n</i> = 11)			Teachers (<i>n</i> = 244)			U	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SEM</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SEM</i>		
Supportive principal behavior	3.85	0.49	0.15	2.97	0.77	0.05	2154.00	0.00
Directive principal behavior	2.07	0.31	0.09	1.97	0.46	0.03	1551.50	0.38
Restrictive principal behavior	2.07	0.51	0.15	2.27	0.57	0.04	1610.00	0.25
Collegial teacher behavior	3.14	0.31	0.09	3.04	0.45	0.03	1676.50	0.16
Intimate teacher behavior	3.28	0.57	0.17	2.71	0.59	0.04	2029.00	0.00
Disengaged teacher behavior	1.80	0.50	0.15	1.70	0.59	0.04	1532.50	0.42

Evaluation of Null Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the supportive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

The supportive principal behavior subtest indicated an extremely significant difference between the administrators' assessments and the teachers' assessments. This significance was demonstrated by a p value of 0.0007 and was caused by the administrators' median score of 3.67 and the teachers' median score of 3.00. Administrators assessed supportive principal behavior occurring more often with a mean score of 3.85 while teachers only ranked supportive principal behavior with a mean score of 2.97. The first null hypothesis was rejected due to the significant difference between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the supportive principal behavior subtest.

Null Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the directive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the directive principal behavior subtest. This was due to the p value of 0.3818 and was caused by the administrators' median score of 2.11 and the teachers' median score of 2.00 being statistically similar. Administrators ($M=2.07$) assessed directive principal behavior occurring close to the same as teachers ($M=1.97$). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the second null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the restrictive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the restrictive principal behavior subtest. This was shown by a p value of 0.2484 and was caused by the administrators' median score of 2.00 and the teachers' median score of 2.20 being statistically similar. Administrators ($M=2.07$) assessed restrictive principal behavior occurring close to the same as teachers ($M=2.27$). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the third null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments of the collegial teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the collegial teacher behavior subtest. This was indicated by a p value of 0.1604 and was caused by the administrators' median score of 3.25 and the teachers' median score of 3.00 being statistically similar. Administrators ($M=3.14$) assessed collegial teacher behavior occurring close to the same as teachers ($M=3.04$). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the fourth null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 5

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the intimate teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

The intimate teacher behavior subtest indicated a very significant difference between the administrators' assessments and the teachers' assessments. This significance was demonstrated by a p value of 0.0041 and was caused by the administrators' median score of 3.29 and the teachers' median score of 2.71. Administrators assessed intimate teacher behavior occurring more frequently with a mean score of 3.28 while teachers only ranked intimate teacher behavior with a mean score of 2.71. The fifth null hypothesis was rejected due to the significant difference between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the intimate teacher behavior subtest.

Null Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the disengaged teacher behavior subtest of the

Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the disengaged teacher behavior subtest. This was indicated by a p value of 0.4229 and was caused by the administrators' median score of 1.50 and the teachers' median score of 1.59 being statistically similar. Administrators ($M=1.80$) assessed disengaged teacher behavior occurring close to the same as teachers ($M=1.70$). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the sixth null hypothesis.

Statistically significant differences were found between administrators' and teachers' assessments of supportive principal behavior and intimate teacher behavior. Therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected for the supportive principal behaviors and intimate teacher behavior. The research resulted in a failure to reject the null hypotheses for directive principal behavior, restrictive principal behavior, collegial teacher behavior, and disengaged teacher behavior.

Climate Type Results at Each School

The climate of each school, as perceived by the administrators and teachers is presented in Table 12. Administrators and teachers differed in their perceptions of the school's organizational climate. The differences became clearer as the subtests were separated out from the descriptive statistics and the comparisons were compiled.

Table 12

Climate Type Results from the Organizational Climate Profile on the OCDQ-RE

	<i>Climate type according to teachers</i>	<i>Climate type according to administrators</i>
School A	Open	Open
School B	Open/Engaged	Open
School C	Engaged	Open
School D	Engaged	Open/Engaged

The classification of climate types for each of the four schools according to the organizational climate profiles indicated that the administrators at School A, B, C, and D perceived their climate more positively than the teachers did. However, only in one of the schools, School A, were the administrators' perceptions in agreement with what the teachers perceived as the school climate. School A had a consensus between the administrators and the teachers; both viewed the organizational school climate as open. In the other three schools, the teachers perceived the climate differently than the administrators. The teachers in School B indicated that the school climate was open/engaged, while the administrators reported the climate as open. Teachers' perceptions at School C revealed that the school had an engaged climate; however, the administrators perceived an open climate. Results at School D indicated the least positive climate among the four schools. Administrators at this school indicated an open/engaged climate, which was the lowest perception among administrators in the four schools. Teachers at this school viewed the climate as engaged.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The success of a school is greatly affected by the school's organizational climate (Cohen, 2006; Dorathi, 2011; MacNeil et al.; Marzano, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005). Organizational school climate is comprised of the crucial interactions between teacher to teacher and teacher to principal (Marzano, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005). It is from the perceptions of these interactions that the organizational school climate is determined along an open to closed continuum (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy et al., 1991). The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the teachers' and administrators' perceptions of organizational school climate as assessed by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools. In addition, the study ascertained the extent to which the teachers' and the administrators' perceptions of the organizational climate differed in each of the four elementary schools in north Georgia.

Summary of the Findings

This study used causal comparative research to determine the organizational school climate of four elementary schools in north Georgia. The data collected created an organizational climate profile for each school and was used to determine if there was a difference between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments on each of the six subtests in the organizational school climate profile.

The results exhibited that the organizational climate perceived by the teachers at each of the schools is along the continuum of open to engaged. School A was the only school where the teachers indicated an open climate. The teachers at School B assessed the climate type as open/engaged. Schools C and D both had the teachers' perceptions of the climate type as engaged. The outcome of the organizational climate as perceived by

the administrators shows that every school's administrators perceived their climate favorably. Schools A, B, and C were viewed by the administrators as having an open climate type. The administrators at School D were the only ones to view their school's climate type as other than open. School D's administrators perceived their climate type as open/engaged.

Research Question

Are there differences between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments of the six subtests of the organizational school climate profile, as measured on the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools?

Statistical differences were found between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments on the two of the subtests of the organizational school climate profile: supportive principal behavior and intimate teacher behavior. There were no statistically significant differences between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments on the other four subtests of the organizational school climate profile: directive principal behavior, restrictive principal behavior, collegial teacher behavior, and disengaged teacher behavior.

Null Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the supportive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

The supportive principal behavior subtest indicated an extremely significant difference between the administrators' assessments and the teachers' assessments. Administrators assessed supportive principal behavior occurring more often with a mean score of 3.85 while teachers only ranked supportive principal behavior with a mean score of 2.97. The first null hypothesis was rejected due to the significant difference between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the supportive principal behavior subtest.

Null Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the directive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the directive principal behavior subtest. Administrators (M=2.07) assessed directive principal behavior occurring close to the same as teachers (M=1.97). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the second null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the restrictive principal behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the restrictive principal behavior subtest. Administrators (M=2.07) assessed restrictive principal behavior occurring close to the same as teachers (M=2.27). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the third null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' assessments and the administrators' assessments of the collegial teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the collegial teacher behavior subtest. Administrators (M=3.14) assessed collegial teacher behavior occurring close to the same frequency as teachers (M=3.04). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the fourth null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 5

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the intimate teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

The intimate teacher behavior subtest indicated a very significant difference between the administrators' assessments and the teachers' assessments. Administrators assessed intimate teacher behavior occurring more often with a mean score of 3.28 while

teachers only ranked intimate teacher behavior with a mean score of 2.71. The fifth null hypothesis was rejected due to the significant difference between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the intimate teacher behavior subtest.

Null Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant difference between the teachers' and the administrators' assessments of the disengaged teacher behavior subtest of the Organizational School Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools.

There were no significant differences found between the administrators' and the teachers' assessments on the disengaged teacher behavior subtest. This was indicated by a *p* value of 0.4229 and was caused by the administrators' median score of 1.50 and the teachers' median score of 1.59 being statistically similar. Administrators ($M=1.80$) assessed disengaged teacher behavior occurring close to the same as teachers ($M=1.70$). Results of this subtest supported failure to reject the sixth null hypothesis.

Statistically significant differences were found between administrators' and teachers' assessments of supportive principal behavior and intimate teacher behavior. Therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected for the supportive principal behaviors and intimate teacher behavior. The research resulted in a failure to reject the null hypotheses for directive principal behavior, restrictive principal behavior, collegial teacher behavior, and disengaged teacher behavior.

Teacher openness was measured by the three subtests: collegial behavior, intimate behavior, and disengaged behavior. The results indicated that the administrators scored the intimate behavior of teachers as occurring significantly more frequently than did the

teachers. Scores were low for both the administrators' report and the teachers' report of the disengaged behavior subtest as those behaviors were ranked as *occurring rarely* or *sometimes*. Collegial teacher behaviors were reported by administrators only slightly more frequently than the teachers reported.

Principal openness was measured by the three subtests: supportive principal behavior, directive principal behavior, and restrictive principal behavior. Supportive principal behaviors were reported as occurring significantly more frequently by administrators than the teachers. Administrators and teachers were similar in their reports of the occurrence of collegial teacher behavior as well as disengaged teacher behavior.

Discussion of the Findings in Light of Relevant Literature

The objective of this study was to determine the organizational climate of four elementary schools in north Georgia and to examine the differences between the teacher's perceptions and the administrators' perceptions of the organizational climate. The perceptions of the teachers and the administrators in the school comprise that school's organizational climate (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Le Cornu, 2009; Mine, 2009). The nature of a school is revealed through the many aspects of school climate and it is evident that the administrators and the teachers are the backbone of the school (Marzano, 2003). The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement (2009) stated that the strengths and weaknesses of a school are exposed when the organizational school climate is assessed and that improvements to the climate cannot be made until the assessment is complete.

Organizational school climate is “the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influence the behavior of its members” (Hoy et al., 1991, p. 8) and the individuals’ perception of the environment in which they work (Mine, 2009). In synthesizing the data from the four schools, the results clearly indicated that the administrators viewed the positive organizational climate dimensions of principal and teacher behaviors as occurring more frequently than the teachers reported. According to administrators, negative organizational climate dimensions of principal and teacher behaviors were perceived as occurring less frequently than the teachers reported. This information indicates that administrators do not have an accurate portrayal of their school’s organizational climate. When the perceptions of the organizational school climate are congruent, the individuals’ work environment is also unified (Kelley et al., 2005; Marzano et al., 2005; Robinson, 2010). School A was the only school that exhibited a strong cohesion between the administrators and the teachers. The disparity in the perceived climate types at Schools B, C, and D indicated a weaker cohesion among the administrators and teachers.

School A

The results of the organizational school climate profile for School A indicate that the strengths of the school according to the administrators and the teachers are supportive principal behavior as well as collegial and intimate teacher behavior. However, the administrators reported that the intimate teacher behavior was a strength occurring more frequently than reported by the teachers. Both the administrators and the teachers viewed the organizational climate type to be open according to the profile. An open climate that is demonstrated through teacher and principal behaviors increases the school’s

effectiveness (Dorathi, 2011). This is in line with the research conducted by Azzara (2001) who determined that in having an open climate, School A possessed such characteristics as cooperation, respect, and openness among the teachers and the administrators. The administrators at this school are perceived to be receptive to teachers' thoughts, show gratitude, avoid micromanagement, and act as facilitators. The teachers at this school demonstrate professional behavior, are friends inside and outside of work, collaborate, and are dedicated to their job. Collegial and professional behaviors are also indicators of teacher commitment according to research conducted by Douglas (2010).

School B

The strengths for School B were the dimensions of supportive principal behavior and collegial behavior for both the administrators and the teachers; however, the administrators ranked both dimensions as occurring more often than the teachers. In addition, the administrators perceived the dimension of intimate teacher behavior as a strength, while the teachers did not. This caused the overall climate perceptions of the administrators to be more open than that of the teachers. An open climate was perceived by the administrators and an open/engaged climate was perceived by the teachers in School B. The administrators and the teachers viewed the school as having a principal who listens to teachers, gives praise, and respects the faculty. Both groups also viewed the teacher behaviors as cooperative, committed, and professional. The difference in viewpoints concerned the intimate teacher behavior dimension. Administrators believed that teachers knew each other well on a personal level, but the teachers reported that they only knew each on a professional basis. Teachers also felt that the administrators

demonstrated more restrictive behaviors than did the administrators. Such restrictive behaviors include routine duties that interfere with the job of the teacher, teachers have too many committee requirements, and that teachers are burdened with busy work (Hoy et al., 1991).

School C

Administrators and teachers agreed on only one dimension at School C. Collegial teacher behavior was ranked as a strength by both groups at this school, which is considered a predictor of teacher commitment, according to Douglas (2010).

Administrators perceived the school as having three strengths: supportive principal behavior, collegial teacher behavior, and intimate teacher behavior. The perceptions held by the administrators were considerably more favorable than were those of the teachers. This result aligns with the findings from Kelley et al. (2005) where it was found that the teacher's perceptions of their principals' effectiveness were positively related to school climate and yet a discrepancy was found between the principals' perceptions and the teachers' perceptions. Kelley et al. (2005) recognized that the teachers' perceptions are their reality and that in order to create a positive, accurate perception among all faculty principals must adjust their behaviors. Teachers indicated that the school's only strength was collegial teacher behavior. According to the organizational school climate profile, the administrators perceived the school as having an open climate; however, the teachers perceived the climate as only engaged. The administrators viewed themselves as listening and being open to teacher suggestions, giving frequent praise, and respecting the personal and professional aspects of teachers. In contrast, the teachers viewed the administrators as having a basic concern for teachers, but their actions hindered teachers

more than facilitated the teachers' work. The teachers also felt that the administrators did not offer assistance, they did not listen or accept suggestions from the teachers, the principal is not easy to understand, and teachers are not treated as equals. Administrators perceived that teachers are close friends, socialize both in and outside of school, and support each other; however, the teachers did not perceive the same to be true. This study is also congruent with that of Robinson (2010) where it was found that principals often perceive their interactions as more positive than teachers perceive them as being.

School D

School D also exhibited a discrepancy between the perceptions of the administrators and the teachers. Like School C, the only dimension that both groups ascertained as a strength was collegial teacher behavior. This dimension was the only one that teachers indicated occurred frequently. Administrators viewed collegial teacher behavior and supportive principal behavior as a strength for the school. The differences in perceptions between the administrators and the teachers showed that administrators saw their school's climate more positively than the teachers. Climate type was perceived as open/engaged by the administrators and as engaged by the teachers. This also supports the research from Kelley et al. (2005) that showed that differences in perceptions exist between teachers and principals and when such discrepancies are present, the school is not operating as effectively as possible.

Jainabee and Jamelaa (2011) concluded that the atmosphere of a school is affected by the interactions between the staff and the principal. The teachers at School D did not view these interactions as positively as the administrators viewed them. Administrators

felt that the principal demonstrates supportive behaviors, which is contrary to the perceptions of the teachers. Teachers actually felt that the principal did not use constructive criticism nor was criticism explained. They also felt that the principal did not look out for them, did not compliment them, did not treat them as equals, and did not accept teacher input. All of the aforementioned categories were perceived as occurring either often or very frequently by the administrators and only occurring sometimes or occasionally by the teachers.

Teachers and administrators were aligned in their viewpoints of teacher behavior. Both groups perceived that teachers help and support each other, respect each other personally and professionally, and that teachers take pride in their work and their school. The area of teacher behavior that showed the greatest disparity was the dimension of intimate teacher behavior. The administrators viewed teachers as having fun and socializing together during the school day, while teachers do not see this as happening often.

The results of this study were concurrent with Robinson's (2010) study regarding organizational school climate. Robinson found that assessments of the school climate were viewed differently by the principals and the teachers. The principals' perceptions of the interactions between and among teachers were regarded more positively than the teachers. It was also found that principals perceived their schools' organizational climate to be more open and positive than the teachers. The principals at some of the schools viewed their own behavior as open while the teachers at the same schools rated the principals' behaviors as closed. Results from the organizational school climate profile enabled the administrators to identify and analyze the discrepancies in perceptions in

Robinson's study. Both the principals and the teachers at each school were able to initiate changes to promote an open climate from the viewpoint of both the administrators and the teachers (Robinson, 2010).

The overall success of a school is significantly affected by the organizational school climate school (Cohen, 2006; Dorathi, 2011; MacNeil et al., 2009; Marzano, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005). Schools that have an open, supportive organizational climate have also been associated with increased job satisfaction and commitment (Douglas, 2010; Luthans et al., 2008; Mercer & Bilson, 1985; Zhang & Liu, 2010). The platform for the perception of organizational school climate is established by the administrators and they have a significant effect on the type of climate perceived (Ali & Hale, 2009; Kelley et al., 2005). The truth is exposed when the perceptions of climate are analyzed. Hopefully, these revelations will lead to reflections among the teachers and the administrators. The results from the study should also act as the catalyst for each school to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. After these areas are recognized, the necessary improvements should occur in the school and the interactions among the teachers and the administrators enhanced (Dellar & Giddings, 1991).

Limitations

Random sampling of the schools and the participants were not plausible for this study; thereby limiting the generality of the research. The principal at each school had to give permission for the research to be conducted at their school, as well as give up time during a faculty meeting for the questionnaire to be distributed to the administrators and teachers; therefore, the schools were self-selected based on this consent. Generalizations beyond this study are also difficult due to the self-selected schools from only part of one

county and only in one state. A self-report survey instrument was given to measure the teachers' and administrators' perceptions of organizational school climate; consequently, outside events and circumstances may have influenced the manner in which the participants responded to the questionnaire.

Implications

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the organizational school climate profile of each of four elementary schools and research the difference between the teachers' perceptions and the administrators' perceptions of the climate on each of the six subtests that comprised the organizational school climate. The findings have implications for schools as they strive to achieve a positive organizational school climate. The most important finding of the study is that administrators at each of the four elementary schools perceived the organizational school climate at their school more positively than the teachers perceived the climate at the same school. Researchers would benefit from looking at both of these participant groups together, administrators and teachers, to gain an accurate portrayal of the school's organizational climate.

The implication for administrators is that they often have a more positive perception of their school's organizational climate than the teachers' possess. These research results indicate the importance of administrators to maintain close communication lines with the teachers in their school to have a precise grasp on the school's organizational climate. Teachers are in the trenches everyday and must be given continuous, anonymous opportunities to make their feelings, perceptions, grievances, and successes known to the administration. This will allow for continuity within the school

and for the teachers and administrators to align in their perceptions of the school's organizational climate.

In addition, the implications for superintendents and county officials are to maintain contact with teachers at each school to gain a more accurate pulse check on the climate at each facility. Maintaining contact with the administrators is not enough to have a precise measurement of the organizational climate at each school. This study proves that administrators view their schools to have a more positive climate than the teachers view their schools to have. It is necessary to look at both the administrators and the teachers to have a complete organizational school climate profile for a school.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study looked specifically at the organizational school climate profile dimensions in four elementary schools in north Georgia. The results were examined to determine differences between perceptions of the administrators and teachers. Future research may expand the sample size to include every elementary school in the county providing a broader look at the entire county's organizational school climate profiles. This would increase the number of schools and participants, providing greater generalizations from the results of the research. This research should also be replicated at the middle schools and the high schools.

Future studies could add perceptions of students to compare with the perceptions of the administrators and teachers. In addition, parents and community stakeholders could participate in the survey. By adding these components, depth would be added to

the current research. Using more groups involved in the school would gain a clearer picture of each school's organizational climate.

Factors such as gender, years of experience, or number of years at the particular school could be collected from the administrators and teachers. The current study did not take these factors into account when determining the organizational school climate profile of each school. Quantitative research methods were used in this study; therefore, future studies could be comprised of qualitative research as well. Focus groups and interviews could be conducted with the teachers and the administrators to determine the reasons behind their ratings on each dimension of the OCDQ-RE. This would enable specific insight into the school's organizational climate and would give the study supplementary information regarding the climate.

The administrators could be divided into groups based on training to provide more specific data regarding the administrators who take the OCDQ-RE. Those administrators who went through leadership training could be separated from those administrators who did not. This would enable a comparison to be made not only across the school, but also across the fields of administrative preparation and training. Another benefit would be to see if those administrators who had official training or more in depth preparation for their positions had more open and supportive climate perceptions from the teachers than those administrators who received less training and preparation.

Furthermore, future studies could narrow the spectrum of groupings within the teacher categories. This could be done by separating the organizational climate profiles according to the grades and subject area taught. By developing these subgroups within the study, the researcher would be able to pinpoint the feelings and perceptions of the

individual subgroups in each school. The school's overall organizational school climate profile would remain the same; however, the results would be identifiable to a grade or a subject and that particular group's perception of the strengths and weaknesses at their school. Caution should be used in this extension of the study to ensure that all of the participants understand that the degree of anonymity has been lessened by the separation of the subgroups.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine the organizational climate profile at each of four elementary schools in north Georgia. These results were analyzed to determine differences in perceptions of the organization school climate dimension between the teachers and the administrators. This study revealed that administrators tend to perceive the organizational school climate dimension in a more positive light than teachers do. Knowing the organizational school climate of a school is critical to determining and contributing to the school's success (Cohen, 2006; Dorathi, 2011; MacNeil et al., 2009; Marzano, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005). Each of these four elementary schools now has a clear, accurate profile of their school's organizational climate and the perceptions of both the teachers and the administrators.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Saad, I., & Vernon, L. H. (1995). Organizational climate and teachers' job satisfaction in a multi-cultural milieu: The case of the Bedouin Arab schools in Israel. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 15, 2, 141–153.
- Adeogun, A. A., & Olisaemeka, B. U. (2011). Influence of school climate on students' achievement and teachers' productivity for sustainable development. *US-China Education Review*, 8(4), 552–557.
- Ali, E., & Hale, E. (2009). Predicting organizational trust level of school managers and teachers at elementary schools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 2180–2190.
- Arter, J. A. (1987). *Assessing school and classroom climate. A consumer's guide*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Azzara, J. R. (2001). The heart of leadership. *Educational Administration*, 58(4), 62–64.
- Bear, G., Clare, G., Blank, J., & Fang, F. C. (2011). Delaware School Climate Survey—Student: Its factor structure, concurrent validity, and reliability. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49(2), 157–174.
- Bosworth, K., Ford, L., & Hernandaz, D. (2011). School climate factors contributing to student and faculty perceptions of safety in select Arizona schools. *Journal of School Health*, 81, 194–201.
- Brookover, W. B., Schweitzer, J. H., Schneider, J. M. Beady, C. H., Flood, P. K., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15(2), 301–318.

- Brown, K. E., & Medway, F. J. (2007). School climate and teacher beliefs in a school effectively serving poor South Carolina (USA) African-American students: A case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(4), 529–540.
- Caldarella, P., Shatzer, R., Gray, K., Young, K., & Young, E. (2011). The effects of school-wide positive behavior support on middle school climate and student outcomes. *Research in Middle Level Education Online, 35*(4), 1–14.
- Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2009). *Developing a positive school climate, 1*(1). Washington, DC: Learning Point Associates.
- Center for Social and Emotional Education. (2010). *School climate brief, 1*(1). New York, NY: Author.
- Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review, 76*(2), 201–237.
- Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 111*(1), 180–213.
- Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2011). Predicting teacher commitment: The impact of school climate and social-emotional learning. *Psychology in the Schools, 48*(10), 1034–1048.
- Cross, D. I., & Ji, Y. H. (2012). An ecological examination of teachers' emotions in the school context. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(1), 10–22.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1983). Culture and school performance. *Educational Leadership, 40*(5), 14–15.

- Dellar, G. B., & Giddings, G. J. (1991, April). *School organizational climate and school improvement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Devine, J., & Cohen, J. (2007). *Making your school safe: Strategies to protect children and promote learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Dimitri, V. M., & Mieke V. H. (2012). The role of teacher and faculty trust in forming teachers' job satisfaction: Do years of experience make a difference? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(6), 879–889.
- Dorathi, M. (2011). Organizational climate and service orientation in select schools. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10(2), 40–54.
- Douglas, S. (2010). Organizational climate and teacher commitment (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3439807)
- Elena, B., & Anit, S. (2010). Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the boundary between in-role behavior and extra-role behavior from the perspective of teachers, principals and parents. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 914–923.
- Feldvebel, A. (1981, August). *Leadership for learning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Seattle, WA.
- Franco, M. S. (2010). School climate. In T. C. Hunt, J. C. Carper, T. J. Lasley, II, & C. D. Raisch (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Reform and Dissent* (Vol. 2, pp. 786–788). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Freiberg, H. J. (1998). Measuring school climate: Let me count the ways. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 22.
- Freiberg, H. J., & Stein, T. A. (1999). *Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments in school climate: measuring, improving and sustaining a healthy learning environment*. London, United Kingdom: Palmer Press.
- Garcia, R. (2005). Sustainability crisis: Time for resolution. *Educational Leadership and Administration*, 17, 33–46.
- Gilmer, B. H. (1966). *Industrial psychology* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Grayson, J. L., & Alvarez, H. K. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(4), 1349–1363.
- Halpin, A. W. (1966). *Theory and research in administration*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Heller, A. D. (2002). The power of gentleness. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 76–79.
- Howard, E., & Jackson, D. (1982). School climate improvement project. In S. Anderson (Ed.), *School effectiveness: Climate, goals, and leadership* (pp. 29–42). Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Lab.
- Howard, E., Howell, B., & Brainard, E. (1987). *Handbook for conducting school climate improvements projects*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hoyle, J., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1985). *Skills for successful school leaders*. Arlington, VA: The American Association of School Administrators.
- Jainabee, M. K., & Jamelaa, B. A. (2011). Promoting learning environment and attitude toward change among secondary school principals in Pahang Malaysia: Teachers' perceptions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 45–49.
- Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, 126 (1), 17.
- Kraska, M. (2008). Quantitative research methods. In N. J. Salkind, & K. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 832–838). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krovetz, M. (2004). Fostering resiliency in principals. *Principal*, 83(4), 43.
- Krug, S. (1992). Instructional leadership: A constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 430–443.
- Le Cornu, R. (2009). Building resilience in pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 717–723.
- Lehr, C. A. (2005). School climate. In S. W. Lee (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of School Psychology* (pp. 471–472). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lezotte, L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2004). *Educational administration: Concepts and practice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

- Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Avey, J. B. (2008). The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate–employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*, 219–238.
- MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 12*(1), 73–84.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396.
- Mercer, A., & Bilson, K. (1985). Factors influencing organizational commitment by physicians. *Academy of Management Proceedings, 72–76*.
- Mine, S. (2009). Leadership behaviors of school principals in relation to teacher job satisfaction in north Cyprus. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1*(1), 2855–2864.
- Mohan, N., & Ashok, J. (2011). Organizational climate and attitude of teachers a co-relational study. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 22*(4), 599–610.
- National School Climate Center. (2008). *The school climate challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy, practice*

- guidelines and teacher education policy*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Newmann, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools-Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Norton, S. M. (2008). *Human resources administration for educational leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patterson, J. L. (2007). Strengthening resilience in tough times. *Principal (Reston, Va.)*, 86(5), 16–22.
- Perry, A. C. (1908). *The management of a city school*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Popham, W. J. & Sirotnik, K. A. (1992). *Understanding statistics in education*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Pretorius, F., & de Villiers, E. (2009). Promoting access to African research health. *South African Journal of Education*, 29(1), 33–52.
- Peterson, R. L., & Skiba, R. (2001). Creating school climates that prevent school violence. *Clearing House*, 74(3), 155.
- Rafferty, T. (2008). School climate and teacher attitudes toward upward communication in secondary schools. *American Secondary Education*, 31(2), 49.
- Ramdass, M., & Lewis, T. (2012). Toward a model for research on the effects of school organizational health factors on primary school performance in Trinidad & Tobago. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(3), 482–492.

- Robinson, T. (2010). Examining the impact of leadership style and school climate on student achievement (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3407042)
- Rooney, J. (2003). Principals who care: A personal reflection. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 76–78.
- Schoen, L., & Teddlie, C. (2008). A new model of school culture: a response to a call for conceptual clarity. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 19(2), 129–153.
- Stronge, J., Richard, B., & Catano, N. (2008). School climate: The heart of the school. *Qualities of Effective Principals* (pp. 16-34). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision-making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analyses*, 14, 53–67.
- Tagiuri, R. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri, & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), *Organizational climate* (pp. 11–32). Boston, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Taylor, D. L., & Tashakkori, A. (1994, January). *Predicting teachers' sense of efficacy and job satisfaction using school climate and participatory decision making*. Paper presented at the Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, TX.
- Teale, W. H., & Scott, J. L. (2010). Making urban schools better places for students, teachers, and families: An interview with Charles Payne. *Reading Teacher*, 63(8), 701–704.

- Thumin, F., & Thumin, L. (2011). The measurement and interpretation of organizational climate. *Journal of Psychology, 145*(2), 93–109.
- Vos, D., van der Westhuizen, P. C., Mentz, P. J., & Ellis, S. M. (2012). Educators and the quality of their work environment: An analysis of the organisational climate in primary schools. *South African Journal of Education, 32*(1), 56–68.
- Wynn, S., Carboni, L., & Patall, E. (2006). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentoring, climate and leadership: Promoting retention through a learning communities perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(3), 209–229.
- Zhang, J., & Liu, Y. (2010). Organizational climate and its effects on organizational variables: An empirical study. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 2*(2), 189–201.

APPENDIX A: The Organizational Climate Description for Elementary Schools

(OCDQ-RE)

DIRECTIONS:

THE FOLLOWING ARE STATEMENTS ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL. PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH STATEMENT CHARACTERIZES YOUR SCHOOL BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

R0=RARELY OCCURS

SO=SOMETIMES OCCURS

O=OFTEN OCCURS

VFO=VERY FREQUENTLY OCCURS

1. The teachers accomplish their work with vim, vigor, and pleasure.....RO SO O VFO
2. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.....RO SO O VFO
3. Faculty meetings are useless..... RO SO O VFO
4. The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers.....RO SO O VFO
5. The principal rules with an iron fist..... RO SO O VFO
6. Teachers leave school immediately after school is over.....RO SO O VFO
7. Teachers invite faculty members to visit them at home..... RO SO O VFO
8. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.....RO SO O VFO
9. The principal uses constructive criticism.....RO SO O VFO
10. The principal checks the sign-in sheet every morning..... RO SO O VFO
11. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching..... RO SO O VFO
12. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues..... RO SO O VFO
13. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.....RO SO O VFO
14. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.....RO SO O VFO
15. The principal explains his/her reasons for criticism to teachers..... RO SO O VFO
16. The principal listens to and accepts teachers' suggestions.....RO SO O VFO

17. The principal schedules the work for the teachers..... RO SO O VFO
18. Teachers have too many committee requirements..... RO SO O VFO
19. Teachers help and support each other..... RO SO O VFO
20. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time..... RO SO O VFO
21. Teachers ramble when they talk at faculty meetings..... RO SO O VFO
22. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers..... RO SO O VFO
23. The principal treats teachers as equals..... RO SO O VFO
24. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes..... RO SO O VFO
25. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school..... RO SO O VFO
26. Teachers are proud of their school..... RO SO O VFO
27. Teachers have parties for each other.....RO SO O VFO
28. The principal compliments teachers.....RO SO O VFO
29. The principal is easy to understand.....RO SO O VFO
30. The principal closely checks classroom (teacher) activities..... RO SO O VFO
31. Clerical support reduces teachers' paperwork.....RO SO O VFO
32. New teachers are readily accepted by colleagues..... RO SO O VFO
33. Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis..... RO SO O VFO
34. The principal supervises teachers closely..... RO SO O VFO
35. The principal checks lesson plans..... RO SO O VFO
36. Teachers are burdened with busy work..... RO SO O VFO
37. Teachers socialize together in small, select groups..... RO SO O VFO
38. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues..... RO SO O VFO
39. The principal is autocratic..... RO SO O VFO

40. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.....RO SO O VFO
41. The principal monitors everything teachers do.....RO SO O VFO
42. The principal goes out of his/her way to show appreciation to teachers..... RO SO O VFO

APPENDIX B: Consent Letter from County



Dr. L.C. (Buster) Evans, Superintendent • 1120 Dahlonega Highway • Cumming, Georgia 30040 • Telephone 770.887.2461

May 18, 2011

Dear Ms. Duff:

RE: Organizational School Climate - Research Study Approval

This letter provides written approval for your quantitative research study analyzing the relationship between administrators' assessments and teachers' assessments of organizational school climate within Forsyth County Schools. As stated in your letter to me, participation should be considered voluntary and will be conducted through survey research. Your study, *Organizational School Climate According to Teachers and Principals in Elementary Schools*, sounds very interesting, and I applaud your efforts of continued education. If I can provide additional information to support this approval, please be *encouraged to contact me at 770-887-2461 or lcevans@forsyth.k12.ga.us*.

Respectfully Submitted,

L. C. (Buster) Evans
Superintendent

APPENDIX C: Letter to Principals for Permission

Dear Principal,

Dr. Evans has approved my dissertation research on Organizational School Climate According to Teachers and Principals in Elementary Schools. Now, I graciously need your cooperation and permission to distribute my survey to your teachers and administrators. Due to the constraints placed on my research by the Institutional Review Board at my University, I must distribute the survey personally, and then collect the surveys immediately upon completion. This should only take 15-20 minutes. I know this is not an opportune time of year to schedule another 15 minutes of your school's time, however, it is imperative I administer the survey to as many elementary schools as possible during the next week. I am willing to come to your school before, during, or after school, or anytime during post planning.

If you have any questions, please call me at 770-888-7511 ext. 122032. Thank you for taking the time to read this e-mail and respond. I have attached the approval letter from Dr. Evans, the actual survey, and the letter for implied consent that will be read and given to all participants. Completion of the survey is strictly voluntary and all data gathered will be kept confidential. Results will be published anonymously, without names of participants and schools.

Sincerely,

Brandy Duff

APPENDIX D: Letter to Participants-Teachers and Administrators

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student at Liberty University and I am conducting the research for my dissertation. The purpose of this study is to ascertain the organizational school climate of Forsyth County, Georgia elementary schools and to investigate the relationship between the administrators' assessments and the teachers' assessments of organizational school climate.

The atmosphere of a school has a significant impact on the people in that environment. Organizational school climate is what constitutes the school's atmosphere based on the interactions and the perceptions of the stakeholders in the school environment. School climate influences organizational behavior, learning, productivity, and effectiveness, yet administrators have a considerable influence over the school climate.

Your participation in this survey will enable the Organizational School Climate to be determined and correlated with the teachers and administrators. Please note that there is a risk of the information being unfavorable, however, the data obtained from the surveys will be confidential, and all references to schools in the dissertation will be by a random number, not the school's name.

Attached is the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Please note that participation in this survey is strictly voluntary and questions may be skipped if you do not feel comfortable answering them honestly. The survey will remain completely anonymous, except for the markings that are already on the survey indicating your school location by a random number and whether you are an administrator or a teacher. Upon leaving the meeting, please remove this cover letter to keep for your records and place the survey, completed or not, into the box at the door. This will ensure that even participation is anonymous and there will be no adverse effects regarding your decision to participate or your answers to the questions.

The completion of this survey implies your consent in allowing me to use the anonymous results of the surveys in my research for my dissertation. I appreciate your time and effort in taking this survey. If you have any further questions or concerns, please contact myself, Brandy Duff, at bduff@forsyth.k12.ga.us or Liberty University at irb@liberty.edu.

Thank you,

Brandy Duff