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Present management theory divides teacher evaluation into two categories, summative evaluation and formative evaluation. Summative evaluation is used for administrative decision making. Formative evaluation is used for shaping the performance of teachers. Traditionally, the evaluation process has been more summative than formative. Therefore, teachers have regarded evaluation with some apprehension.

In the 1960s, Halpin and Croft suggested that the climate of a school is analogous to its personality. School climate can be defined as the perception incumbents have of the organization. Degrees of climate can be organized along a continuum ranging from closed to open. A closed climate is characterized by high degrees of disengagement, hinderance, aloofness, and production emphasis, coupled with low degrees of esprit and consideration. An open climate is marked by high degrees of esprit, trust, and consideration, coupled with low degrees of disengagement and hinderance. Generally, the more open a climate is the more positive teacher attitudes are toward evaluation.
This study was conducted using a stratified random sample of fifteen Michigan public schools from three community types: (1) metropolitan; (2) urban/suburban; and (3) rural. The Organization Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991) was administered to the schools’ staff to determine degrees of openness or closedness in each school. Additionally, Piegari’s (1979) Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation Survey was used to determine the positive and negative attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in the schools. Data from 208 respondents were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment correlations.

Comparisons of demographic data demonstrated that the three areas compared were reasonably similar, with differences attributed to population density.

The findings indicate that correlations of the scores for the various subtests on the OCDQ-RE with the scores of the Forty Teacher’s Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation Survey exist in the direction that supports the hypotheses as stated. However, the correlations were not strong enough to support any definitive statement concerning the relationship of school climate and the attitudes of teachers toward evaluation. The data from this research indicate that further study is warranted.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Children and their education represent a significant investment of society's time and resources. In some ways the investment may be a selfish one. Children are the future labor force and the providers of future leadership and services. Their successes have a direct bearing on the quality of life that future older generations will experience in their declining years. For these reasons, at least, the quality of a child's education is of interest to each of us.

In recent years there has been a flurry of activity intended to improve schools in the United States. Much effort has been expended to make schools more effective. There is not complete consensus as to exactly what effective education is, but there is agreement that no part of the educational process is exempt from scrutiny. One area receiving attention is that of teacher evaluation.

Very much in vogue has been the administration of various tests intended to measure the academic growth and skill development of students. The National Education Assessment Program (NEAP), the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP), the California Achievement Test (CAT), and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) are all examples of testing programs in use at this time for the purpose of comparing students' academic growth from one testing period to another.
These testing programs are justified as means of gauging how well an academic program is accomplishing the teaching and learning of students in specified curriculum areas.

Achievement testing programs usually are not treated as a direct part of the teacher evaluation process, but are informally tied to the evaluation process. Achievement test scores are commonly used to make comparisons between schools and between districts.

School Climate

As more of society’s problems creep into today’s classrooms, the conditions in which teachers attempt to carry out their responsibilities are being scrutinized by the public, by elected policymakers, by administrative leaders, and by academicians. These same groups are demanding that changes be made that improve what it is that schools do. Everything that affects how teachers perform is subject to close examination by the aforementioned groups and others interested in bringing about change in schools.

In 1963 Halpin and Croft published their landmark work, *The organizational climate of schools*. Their contention was that there are identifiable differences, such as the kind of relationship that teachers have with other teachers or the relationship of teachers to the building principal (Halpin & Croft, 1963) that are present in all elementary schools. Many of these differences can be combined and analyzed to form a measure identified as “building” or “organization climate”. Earlier work by other social
scientists led to the coining of the term climate for other settings, especially in business organizations.

School climate is the collective personality of the school. It consists of those characteristics, largely intangible, that cause a person entering the building to respond in a way that implies how they find the atmosphere. Its main influence is the relationship within a school between individuals present on a daily basis, primarily the principal and the staff. Students and support personnel contribute to a school’s climate, but they are influenced, or take their cues from the principal and professional staff (Null, 1967).

Organization Climate Description Questionnaire

Halpin and Croft (1963) developed a continuum that described six types of climate. At one extreme was the closed climate and at the other was the open climate. “Three of the six climates reflect different degrees of openness; three expose different degrees of closedness” (Halpin and Croft, 1963, p. 4).

The decision of Halpin and Croft to rank the climates on the open to closed continuum was determined, in part, by Rokeach’s (1961) work, *The open and closed mind*. As one can regard minds as open or closed, we can view organizational climates as opened or closed. The conceptualization of a continuum with openness at one extreme and closedness at the other does not differ very much, in essence, from Lewin’s hypothesis, about the structure of mind. To use Lewin’s (1935) terms, the open climate can be marked as having functional flexibility, the acceptance and support...
of compromise and contrasts, and the closed climate is distinguished by functional
rigidity, an unwillingness to make compromises and intolerance of contrasts.

Halpin and Croft developed the Organization Climate Description
Questionnaire (OCDQ). The instrument contains sixty-four items that permit its users
to portray the “Organizational Climate” of an elementary school (Halpin & Croft,
1963). The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire makes use of
Likert-type items that are descriptive statements intended to measure eight dimensions
of the organization. Four of the dimensions refer to characteristics of the group. The
remaining dimensions refer to characteristics of the principal as the group’s leader. The
dimensions of the group are: disengagement, hinderance, esprit, and intimacy. The
dimensions of the principal as group leader are: aloofness, production emphasis,
thrust, and consideration.

In the years since Halpin and Croft’s 1963 work, there has been a need to
revise the OCDQ. Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) report that a body of literature
from numerous studies exists that charge that the OCDQ was no longer adequate for
eight reasons.

1. The OCDQ was a crude ranking and placing schools in discreet rankings
was inadvisable.

2. The clarity of the “middle climate” was circumspect.

3. The argument could be made that eight climates as opposed to six climates
could be identified.

4. The scores could be manipulated to achieve a higher degree of openness.
5. The OCDQ was not suited to urban or secondary schools.

6. The OCDQ lacks a clear logic:

Paula Silver (1983) argued that the conceptual framework of the OCDQ lacks a clear logic, is cumbersome, and lacks parsimony. For example, although the hinderance subtest is described as a dimension of teacher behavior, it refers to administrative demands rather than interpersonal behavior of teachers. Other conceptual problems plague the instrument. Production emphasis is mislabeled; it measures close and autocratic control by the principal, not an emphasis on high production standards. . . . Halpin and Croft (1962) themselves question the adequacy of the concept of consideration by suggesting that two or more facets of considerate behavior have been confounded within a single measure. (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991, p. 18).

7. The unit of analysis was the individual rather than the school.

8. The OCDQ has become shopworn. Because thirty years have passed since its development, the reliability of some of the subtests could be challenged.

Revising the OCDQ

The task of revising the Organization climate description questionnaire was accomplished by Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp. Reacting to the previously stated concerns about the Organization climate description questionnaire, Hoy and his associates studied the need to revise the instrument. In Open schools/healthy schools, Hoy (1991) and his associates present a revised OCDQ. The purpose of the questionnaire was to provide a means for describing school climate could be reliably.

The revision of the OCDQ was undertaken in a number of steps. The first step was to evaluate each item on the OCDQ. The scope of the instrument was broadened by writing items that focused on students and teacher-student interactions. Items were
only included if they were clear and concise, reflected a property of the school, had content validity, and had discriminatory appeal.

A pilot study using thirty-eight elementary schools was conducted to reduce the number of items and to explore the factor structure of the revised instrument. Analysis of the pilot results enabled the researchers to reduce the number of items on the instrument to forty-two.

Seventy elementary schools in New Jersey participated further in the study using the revised instrument. Further testing of the revised instrument allowed for the demonstration of the stability of the factor structure, to confirm the validity and reliability of the subtests and to explore the instrument’s second-order factor structure.

**OCDQ-RE**

The OCDQ-RE is a new instrument built upon the OCDQ. The instrument consists of forty-two items testing six behaviors of principals and teachers. The authors report that the reliability for the tests have alpha coefficients ranging from 0.95 to 0.75. Table 1 illustrates the reliability for each of the behaviors tested by the instrument.

**Climate and Evaluation**

Other facets of a school’s operation can be more clearly understood by identifying the school’s climate. A relationship between the climate of an organization and various aspects of its operation exists. One aspect is teacher performance.
Table 1

OCDQ-RE Subtest Alpha Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors Alpha Coefficients</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

evaluation. Careful, considered criticism is one method that can lead to change in many areas of a school's operation. Performance evaluation of teachers can bring about a variety of accomplishments.

Evaluation

Teacher performance evaluation has long been a practice in American education. Records from the early English Colonial period refer to regular school inspections (Small, 1914). Accountability was the primary reason for such inspections. The practice continues today. The motivation, however for modern teacher evaluation is primarily the improvement of instruction.
Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation takes two forms, summative and formative. Summative evaluation is conducted as an administrative function. The purpose of summative evaluation is to allow a superordinate to communicate an opinion concerning performance to a subordinate. Summative evaluations offer a summary of the value of the subordinate's performance within the organization. They are conducted for the purpose of hiring, continuing contracts or termination, evaluating for merit, and promotion. These evaluations represent a summation of progress at various points in a teacher's professional life. They are tools to be used in formulating various decisions (McNerney & Medley, 1984) regarding the continuation of a person's activities in a particular work situation.

Formative evaluations are a supervisory activity. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to shape, or form, the performance of teachers. Formative evaluations are intended to reinforce skills and practices that improve instruction (McNerney & Medley, 1984).

In the 1980s much attention was given to the improvement of schools. Improvement of instruction was made a goal for nearly all principals to pursue. The adoption of improvement programs such as Essential Elements of Effective Instruction (E3I), Instructional Theory Into Practice, (ITIP), or following the practices of the Effective Schools movement were intended as ways of improving instruction (Hunter, 1982; Mace-Matluck, 1987). Such approaches brought with them the conspicuous
involvement of principals in classrooms. These philosophies view the act of teaching as a set of components that, when present in a lesson, increased the probability that learning by students had taken place.

Programs such as ITIP focused on teacher behaviors during the activity of teaching. By concentrating on specific elements involved in the act of teaching, such as questioning methods or the use of strategies for actively involving all students in the lesson, instruction would improve (Hunter, 1982). The desired teacher behaviors were defined and modeled for teachers in training sessions and their use was examined by a supervisor while the teacher taught a lesson. After the classroom visitation by the supervisor a follow-up meeting would be held between the teacher and the supervisor for the purpose of criticizing the lesson and offering reinforcement.

Programs, or approaches, such as ITIP placed strong emphasis on the identification of specific teaching behaviors and the active involvement of supervisory personnel. The belief was that by focusing more of the teachers' attention on specific teaching behaviors, and using specified teaching strategies for student involvement, the probability for student learning was increased.

Changes in How Schools Operate

In the 1960s, major changes occurred in how the business of educating the public was conducted. Many states legislated conditions for teacher certification that were more exacting than had previously been the case. In keeping with the social tenor of the time, teachers became more militant and protective of their positions as service
providers. The majority of school districts' teachers became organized for the purpose of collective bargaining. As the relationship between teachers and school boards became formalized, board paternalism in the form of individualized contracts and the preferential treatment of teachers in certain positions, declined. Suddenly there was an emphasis on formalizing teacher/school district relationships: School board paternalism declined and working conditions for teachers were more carefully defined (Stuart & Goldschmidt, 1986).

Because the relationship between teachers and school boards became more formal, concerns were raised regarding the impact of collective bargaining on students and their in-school encounters. A paucity of research into effects of teacher unionization exists. The experience has been that the impact on the relationship between teachers and students has been minimal (Stuart & Goldschmidt, 1986).

Much has happened in Michigan, and the nation, in education in the past decade that justifies reexamining the relationship of teachers' attitudes and the climate of the buildings in which they work. Public interest in educational performance, changes in teacher and administrator certification requirements, and Michigan's Public Act 25 of 1990 are but a few of the factors that have had an impact on how schools are operated. The public has been encouraged in Michigan to become involved in its schools through a minimum of reacting to annual school reports presented by representatives of school staffs and the parents of children attending each school. Funds have been designated for specific kinds of activities intended to improve each school.
Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between school climate and the attitudes of teachers toward evaluation. Halpin and Croft's work in 1963 and later work by others: Hoy and Clover (1986) and Johnston, Yeakey and Piegari (1984), for example, concluded that there was a correlation between Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation and building climate.

This research is of value to those who work in educational settings. School administrators and supervisors should find information developed as a result of this research helpful when considering work relationships. Additionally, this work would be beneficial for preparing educators to assume administrative and leadership roles.

This research has three main purposes:

1. To define the climate of selected schools using the Revised Organization Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RE).

2. To determine the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in their schools using Piegari's 1979 instrument the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation survey.

3. To determine if a relationship exists between school climate and Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation.
Hypotheses to be Tested

Seven major hypotheses will be tested in this study. The hypotheses are:

H-1. The more open an elementary school's climate, the more positive teachers' attitudes will be toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-2. The more supportive a principal's behavior is, the more positive will be the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-3. The more directive a principal's behavior is, the less positive will be the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-4. The more restrictive a principal's behavior is, the less positive will be the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-5. The more collegial teachers' behavior is, the more positive will be the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-6. The more intimate teachers' behavior is, the more positive will be the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-7. The more disengaged teachers' behavior is, the less positive will be the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

Employed will be the Organization Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE) and the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation survey. The original OCDQ instrument, constructed by Halpin and Croft (1963), identified two dimensions of school climate, teacher behavior and principal behavior. Eight subtests describe the two dimensions.
The OCDQ was revised by Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) to be the OCDQ-RE. From their research they concluded that: the climate continuum was ambiguous; the OCDQ lacked logic in its underlying framework, and some of the dimensions tested were vague. As a result of their work, the revision of the questionnaire has a reduced number of questions and only contains six subtests. Three subtests, supportive, directive, and restrictive define principal openness. The remaining three subtests, collegial, intimate, and disengaged define the degree of openness in teacher behavior.

The Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation survey was developed by Piegarì in 1979 because no instrument measuring teachers’ attitudes toward evaluation existed. In developing the instrument Piegarì relied extensively on pilot testing and advice from a panel of seven experts in the field of education administration and supervision.

Definition of Terms

To gain a better understanding of some of the concepts in this study, the following working definitions are presented.

**Academic Press**

The condition in a school setting describing the degree to which emphasis is placed on academic progress.
Attitude

The predisposition or tendency to react specifically towards an object, situation, or value, usually accompanied by feelings and emotions. Some writers differentiate between a verbal attitude (what the reacting person says) and a behavioral attitude (what the reacting person actually does when confronted with the affect producing stimuli). Attitudes cannot be directly observed but must be inferred from overt behavior, both verbal and nonverbal (Carter, 1973).

Closed Climate

The opposite of an open climate. It is one in which there is the perception of high disengagement and hinderance. Organization members have an average sense of intimacy but feel there is a high degree of aloofness and production emphasis. Degrees of thrust, consideration, and esprit are low (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Evaluation

The ascertainment of value or worth. “Evaluation involves the development of a process that judges worth, measures degree to which specified tasks are accomplished, or provides assistance in developing new programs or skills” (Barber, 1986).
Formative Evaluation

A supervisory function. It is intended to form or shape the performance of teachers (McNergney & Medley, 1984). Formative evaluation is an ongoing process that varies as the teacher matures professionally.

Metropolitan Area (MA)

A geographic area consisting of a large population nucleus together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. In general, metropolitan areas are a county based concept which must include a place with a minimum population of 50,000 or a Bureau of the Census defined urbanized area and a total MA population of at least 100,000 (Garwood & Hornor, 1991).

Open Climate

A climate in which there is a high degree of esprit, thrust, and consideration while levels of disengagement and hinderance are low. It is typified by a sense of average intimacy, low aloofness, low production emphasis (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991).
Organizational Climate

Organizational Climate is the perception that members within an organization have of the organization. It encompasses feelings of productivity and satisfaction and how incumbents in the organization react with each other (Kelley, 1980; Hoy, & Miskel, 1987; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990).

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is the value system shared by members of the organization (Heneman, Schwab, Fossum, & Dyer, 1989).

Rural Community

People living in a local area who live on dispersed farmsteads or in a hamlet or village of less than 2,500 population. This community forms the center of their common interests (Carter, 1973).

Staff Supervision

The provision of assistance in an advisory manner and consultative nature to line officers such as superintendents, principals, and department heads, to whom the teachers are directly responsible (Carter, 1973).
Suburban Community

Suburban communities are population centers, usually incorporated townships, surrounding a city (Carter, 1973).

Summative Evaluation

Summative evaluation is an administrative function. Its purpose is to communicate a summary of a subject’s performance. It is a summation of progress at various points in a teacher’s professional life. Summative evaluations are used in formulating administrative decisions (McNergney & Medley, 1984).

Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation is the process by which teachers formally receive criticism of teaching performance. Until fairly recently teacher evaluation tended to be summative in nature. More recently the emphasis has been on the formative nature of evaluation because of interest in improving instruction. Summative evaluation as compared to formative evaluation occurs after the fact and is principally concerned with making decisions rather than focusing on skill development (Tanner & Tanner, 1987).
Urbanized Area Central Place

One or more central places that function as the dominant centers of each urbanized area (UA). UA central places include each place entirely within the UA that is a central city of an MA. If the UA does not contain an MA, central city, or is located outside an MA, the UA central place(s) is (are) determined by population size. (Garwood & Hornor, 1991).

Urban/Rural

Types of area concepts, rather than specific areas outlined on maps. The urban population comprises all persons living in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 or more inhabitants outside urbanized areas. The rural population consists of everyone else. A rural classification need not imply a farm or sparsely settled area, since a small city or town is rural when it is outside an urbanized area and has fewer than 2,500 inhabitants. Urban and rural areas occur inside and outside metropolitan areas (Garwood & Hornor, 1991).

Work Attitude

The overt verbal and behavioral reaction of a subject toward a work situation (Carter, 1973).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will provide the background, based on research literature, that will enable a researcher to conduct a theoretically-based investigation into the significance of organizational or building climate on teacher reactions to performance evaluation. This chapter first presents and discusses recent literature concerning organizational climate. An overview of the literature concerning teacher evaluation follows.

In all human relationships there exists a set of variables that come into play that determine the characteristics of not only the relationship, but also the characteristics of the organization in which the relationship exists. These variables when combined constitute the culture and climate of an organization. Climate is the perceptions of individuals within an organization and a reflection of the organization’s culture (Kelley, 1980; Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990).

Organizational culture and organizational climate are two constructs that are considered when the behavior or performance of organizations is analyzed. Climate is a subset of culture. It is the perception that members within an organization have of the organization’s belief systems and values (Owens, 1987), in other words the culture of the organization.
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Organizational Culture

Organizational culture, simply, is the value system shared by members of the organization (Heneman et al., 1989). Culture is the set of psycho-social characteristics of an organization (Anderson, 1982). It is the set of norms that informs people of what is acceptable behavior within the organization and what are the basic assumptions and beliefs shared by organization members. Culture also includes the philosophy followed by the organization in dealing with members and clients (Owens, 1987). Researchers investigating culture approach the topic by exploring assumptions, values, and norms in a given culture. They use typically ethnographic techniques and tend to use theoretical frameworks from intellectual roots in anthropology and sociology (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). Anthropology and sociology view phenomena from a large group perspective. Studying behaviors within organizations offers a group view of a phenomena as opposed to a more individual view.

Organizational Climate

Kelley (1980) says that climate is composed of the feelings of satisfaction and productivity that exist in an environment. Null (1967) called climate the perceptions of persons in a particular building that are the result of the manner in which actors at each hierarchical level of the organization interact with each other and with incumbents of other hierarchical levels. Hoy and others concur with the idea that climate is a perception (Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990).
Even though organizational climate is influenced by external forces, it is largely the result of the behaviors and attitudes exhibited within the organization. The physical environment of a school is heavily influenced by external factors. The way in which public schools are financed often limits the ability of the members of the organization to make physical changes in the environment. In school settings climate could be exhibited in the physical environment through the display, or lack of display, of students’ work and other amenities under the control of organization members. Building codes, fire regulations, access rules, and political attitudes are some forces that influence the physical school environment. How these factors are dealt with is demonstrated, partially, in a school’s climate and culture.

Owens (1987), in discussing climate, was concerned that a distinction between climate and culture is not often made. He defined culture as the body of solutions to internal and external problems that an organization adopts over a period of time that consistently work for the group. Culture is the shared values, philosophies, beliefs, ideologies, and assumptions that are passed on to new members of the organization by veterans in the organization (Ashforth, 1985; Hoy, Tarter & Bliss, 1990). On the other hand, climate is the perception of individuals of the work environment (Owens, 1987; Hoy & Clover, 1986).

In the recent past, researchers have given attention to organizational climate. While there has not been a clear definition of climate, there is general agreement that the affect of climate on an organization is significant. Like other organizations considered to be work environments, educational organizations have been examined...
by researchers in view of their climates. Organizational climate appears, to some education researchers, to be directly associated with the interrelationship of the school administrator and those affected by the leadership of that individual (Mikkelsen & Joyner, 1982).

Organizational climate has been suggested as a factor in effective organizations. Though it is not the sole determinant in what is considered to be a successful organization, it has played a part in the success of the organization. Halpin and Croft (1963) suspected a connection, explored it, and consequently were able to describe it in their work The organizational climate of schools. Their work has been extended and refined by further research and revision. It has provided a means to quantify the climate of schools through the identification of behaviors of principals and teachers that when assessed and analyzed can be used to depict the organizational climate of a school.

There is some consistency in defining organizational climate. The majority of writers reviewed express a degree of frustration because the concept has been defined in a variety of ways. There is agreement that climate is an enduring quality that distinguishes one organization from another. It affects the behavior of the members of the organization, and is based on their perception of behavior in similar organizations (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp 1991; Kelley, 1980; Owens, 1987; Null, 1967).

Null in, The organizational climate of elementary schools (1967) discussed "climate" in terms of the interactions among the various role participants in an organization, specifically the interactions of teachers and supervisors. Null regarded
organizational climate as a feeling resulting from the interaction of role participants at the various hierarchical levels of the organization housed in a particular building.

Climate has been called by Pennell and others (1990) a delicate blending of interpretations of job roles with the interpretations of others' interpretations within an organization. This definition is sufficiently nonspecific to render it useless except that it supports Owens's (1987) reference to climate as perceptions that individuals have of various aspects of the environment in an organization.

The characteristics of an organization that are analogous to that of the personality of an individual make up climate (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Piegari, 1979; Hoy et al, 1991). In another definition of climate, Norton (1984) calls climate the collective personality of the organization. Social scientists in the 1950's began to examine work-place situations and noticed variations in "personalities" of the sites.

For the purpose of this project, climate is defined as the perception members of an organization hold of an organization. It encompasses feelings of productivity and satisfaction and how incumbents in the organization interact with each other (Kelley, 1980; Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990).

Halpin and Croft have been given much of the credit in the literature for their pioneering work on the climate of elementary schools. Their study report, *The organizational climate of schools* (1963), introduced the notion that organizational climate is the perception of the environment within the organization experienced by people in the organization. Organizational climate is what the participants are experiencing as reality.
When Halpin and Croft published *The organizational climate of schools* (1963), their intent was to describe the organizational climate of an elementary school. To accomplish their task Halpin and Croft developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The sixty-four item instrument was delineated through factor analysis into eight subtests. Four of the subtests pertained to faculty and four of the subtests pertained to the principal as a leader. Using the eight subtests of disengagement, hinderance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration, a profile of each school could be constructed depicting the school’s organizational climate.

A problem with Halpin and Croft’s (1963) study was that climate had not been clearly defined. Halpin and Croft’s work defined climate as the organizational personality of a school. “The organizational climate can be construed as the organizational ‘personality’ of a school; figuratively personality is to the individual what ‘climate’ is to the organization” (Halpin & Croft, 1963, p. 1). Additionally the original study focused its attention on the faculty and principal of the school. The study did not acknowledge the role of students in a school’s climate or other factors influencing school climate.

Researchers studying climate approach the subject through the use of survey techniques. They employ multivariate statistics, and deal with perceptions of behavior. Climate researchers tend to have their intellectual roots in industrial and social psychology. This is due in part to interest in the dynamics of the workplace. They assume a rational systems perspective and examine climate as an independent variable.
The motivation for conducting climate research is often to use the information gained to improve organizations (Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp, 1991).

Evaluation

Evaluation takes place in any activity in which there is a superordinate and a subordinate relationship. Evaluation reveals what is valued by the leaders of the organization. Evaluation should take place so that an organization can identify what presently is and what it intends to become (Staw, 1983).

In “mature” professions, accounting, business administration, and public administration to name a few, there has not been anything resembling what has been practiced as teacher evaluation. Accountability within those professions has been approached largely through rigorous education, punctilious licensing requirements, internships, and on-going practice review (Darling-Hammond, 1986).

Historic precedent for teacher evaluation is addressed by Small (1914) in Early New England schools, Elsbree (1939) in The American teacher, and Tanner and Tanner’s (1987) Supervision in education. The scenario described was to the effect that inspectors were appointed, the classroom was visited, a recitation of students was heard, the room was observed for the appearance of orderliness and cleanliness. Based on the visit, the teacher was given either a satisfactory report or was replaced the following term.

The practice of teacher evaluation had been left to elected or appointed community representatives and, more recently, to administrators. Interest in teacher
evaluation has ebbed and flowed throughout the history of education in America (Doyle, 1983). Interest has ranged from a desire to safeguard the public’s investment to a desire to insure that students were being taught the essential topics necessary to maintain the community’s standards and values (Small, 1914). Essentially public education in the United States has never existed without some form of formal evaluation.

According to Doyle there are four primary reasons for evaluating teaching: (1) improving teaching; (2) program planning; (3) teaching research; and (4) aiding administrative decision making (1983). Iwanicki (1991) states that the purposes for an evaluation program are its foundation. With such a variance in beliefs it is important that a common understanding between teachers and administrators exists as to the purposes of an evaluation program. Doyle states that the act of teaching is not clearly understood by the general public, by lay policymakers, and by many administrators; therefore, evaluation instruments are primitive. Instruments used should be generalizable, reliable, valid, and have utility (Doyle, 1983). Generalizability and reliability are important so that there is confidence that the process is measuring what it claims to be measuring, and that what is measured can be quantified in a way that allows for clear change to be made. Equally important is the need for the evaluation process to reflect the desires and goals of those sanctioning the process. An evaluation process must also be compatible with the manner in which an organization functions. For the process to work properly, it must measure behaviors that are present in the normal activity of the organization. For example, an organization having a closed
climate would not benefit from an evaluation process that emphasized collegiality and participative decision making.

Natriello (1991) identified three reasons for evaluation: (1) improving performance; (2) controlling the movement into and out of positions; (3) and to legitimize the organizational control system. Natriello adds that each of the three reasons for evaluation has levels of effect. The levels of effect are individual, organizational, and environmental. "Levels of effect" is a means of classifying where, or at what level, the impact of evaluation will be felt.

According to Natriello (1991), teachers react positively to frequent evaluations where expectations are clearly enumerated and results are shared. Rothberg’s and Buchanan’s (1981) earlier contentions that the evaluation process needs to be on-going, with frequent interactions between the evaluator and the subject, are supported by what Natriello (1991) found. The opposite is true of evaluations that are conducted irregularly and for which expectations are not clearly stated. Those being evaluated reacted cautiously and with the opinion that evaluations were intended to be punitive and summative.

Evaluation falls into two categories; summative and formative. Summative evaluation, an administrative function, is an appraisal for judging the net worth of a teacher’s performance. Formative evaluation is a system designed to help improve performance. It is a supervisory function. The two types are not compatible (Barber, 1986).
Because of past practice teachers are skeptical regarding evaluation. Present day theory tells us that evaluation should be formative in nature. It should derive its value from being regularly, and objectively conducted according to stated guidelines. Teacher evaluation should be seen by a principal as an opportunity to improve instruction and facilitate professional growth (Isenberg, 1990). Teacher evaluation further needs to be considered from the point of view that it will not affect teaching, but rather, how it affects teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1991).

A scarcity of studies exists concerning the relationship of school climate and Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation. Piegari (1979) encountered the problem of not being able to locate a suitable instrument that would measure the attitudes of teachers toward evaluation. Although Piegari’s development of the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation Survey relieved the situation somewhat, time has not increased significantly the number of studies carried out in this area. The topic of “climate” has frequently been investigated.

Summary

In the preceding pages an overview of the literature concerning school climate, teacher evaluation, and Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation was presented. School climate was defined as the perception that members of a school organization have of the school. It encompasses feelings of productivity and satisfaction, and how incumbents of the school interact with each other.
Evaluation occurs in any activity in which there is a superordinate and subordinate relationship. It is the ascertainment of the worth of the evaluatee's activities within the organization.

Teacher evaluation has been a long standing practice in American education. The reasons for teacher evaluation are: (a) improving performance, (b) program planning, (c) research, (d) aiding administrative decision making, (e) movement into and out of positions, and (f) legitimizing the organizational control system. There are two categories of teacher evaluation. Formative evaluation is a supervisory activity intended to improve performance. Summative evaluation is an administrative function intended to determine the networth of a teacher’s performance.

A number of characteristics of a school and its operation are manifested through its climate. At the present time there is a dearth of research and literature concerning the relationship of a school’s climate and the attitude of teachers in that school toward the evaluation process used in that school.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter the design and methodology used in this project will be discussed. First treated will be the design of the research project.

This project sought to investigate whether or not a relationship exists between the climate of elementary schools and the attitudes that teachers in those schools have concerning the evaluation process used in those schools. Because no treatment was to be introduced, a correlational approach to research was determined to be acceptable (Isaac & Michael, 1981).

Earlier Work

The studies conducted by Piegari (1979) and Johnston, Yeakey, and Piegari (1985) were used as models for this study. The original study conducted by Piegari correlated the (OCDQ) Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation questionnaire.

Using Piegari’s work as a model a decision was made to depart from it and used the OCDQ-RE in place of the OCDQ. The OCDQ-RE was selected because the
utility of the OCDQ was questionable. Criticism found in the literature (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991) indicated that the instrument was not valid or reliable.

Revising the OCDQ

The OCDQ was developed by Halpin and Croft through their work, the Organizational climate of schools in 1963. According to Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991), the OCDQ was

... showing signs of age. Questions about the reliability and validity of both items and subtests persist. Conceptual problems also abound: there is a lack of underlying logic to the framework; the meanings of some of the dimensions are vague; the climate continuum; and the perspective excludes students. Finally the unit of analysis in the development of the original OCDQ was the individual; the analytic unit is the school (p. 29).

Hoy and others (1991) set out to revise the OCDQ. A number of steps were carefully followed in order to accomplish the revision. The first step involved evaluating the items of the OCDQ. Each item was factor analyzed. New items had to be generated and assessed using factor analysis.

The next step required a pilot study to be conducted to examine the conceptual validity of the items, reduce the number of items, and identify the factor structure of the revised OCDQ.

The unit of analysis using the OCDQ had been the individual. This was a problem because the instrument was supposed to describe the climate of the school and not describe traits of the respondents. Conducting the pilot study with the school as the unit of analysis clarified the unit of analysis question.
Hoy (1991) and his associates were able to field test the revised version of the survey instrument. They analyzed its stability factor structure and assessed the instrument’s validity.

In revising the OCDQ, Halpin and Croft’s original sixty-four items were scrutinized. Factor analysis was used, items factoring low were either discarded or revised. Of the original sixty-four items twenty-four were discarded. The scope of the instrument was broadened in order to better describe climate and enhance the instrument’s reliability and validity. New items were selected that focused on students and teacher-student interactions. Items were not included unless they met four criteria: (1) each item was clear and concise; (2) each item reflected a property of the school; (3) each item had content validity; and (4) each item had discriminatory potential.

Of the new items generated, fourteen were developed to measure the academic press of the school. Seventeen of the newly generated items measure pupil control behavior. New items were added to the subtests; intimacy, hindrance, and consideration to strengthen those sections of the instrument.

The OCDQ-RE was pilot tested in thirty-eight elementary schools, each having a staff of not less than 10 teachers. Four teachers from each building were randomly selected to complete the instrument by Hoy (1991) and his associates.

Since the school was the unit of analysis, scores were aggregated at the school level for each item. Exploratory procedures were performed to reduce the number of items.
Three criteria were used to reduce the numbers of the items in the OCDQ-RE. The first was that only items that loaded high on one factor and low on all others were retained. Secondly in addition to the mathematical contribution to the factor, items were evaluated for conceptual clarity and fit with items in the factor. Lastly, items were eliminated if they substantially reduced the internal consistency of the subtest as measured by Cronbach’s coefficient alpha.

After further analysis, forty-two items remained. Two categories of behavior, principal behavior and teacher behavior, emerged. Principal behavior was described by three dimensions and teacher behavior was described by three dimensions. The six dimensions were: (1) supportive principal behavior; (2) directive principal behavior; (3) restrictive principal behavior; (4) collegial teacher behavior; (5) intimate teacher behavior; and (6) disengaged teacher behavior.

Once the OCDQ-RE pilot study was completed, the instrument was tested in seventy elementary schools in New Jersey. Thirty-two schools were added to the thirty-eight that had been included in the pilot study. A random sample of six educators from each building was selected. Data were typically gathered by a researcher in a faculty meeting. In all cases respondents were anonymous. One-thousand-seventy-one educators in seventy buildings responded to the questionnaire. School mean scores were calculated and the item correlation matrix for the seventy schools was subjected to factor analysis.

The results reported by Hoy et al. (1991) in the second portion of the pilot study strongly supported the factor structure disclosed in the earlier portion of the
pilot study. The alpha levels and the reliability scores remained high. Reliability scores for the subareas were as follows: supportive 0.94; directive 0.88; restrictive 0.81; collegial 0.87; intimate 0.83; and disengaged 0.78. Factor loading for both the pilot data and the final data were nearly identical.

Use of the OCDQ-RE

The OCDQ-RE was used for this study because it was the most recent version of the OCDQ. The OCDQ-RE was considered more reliable than the OCDQ. Permission to use the OCDQ-RE was granted through a use statement found on page viii of Open schools/healthy schools (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991).

Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation

Piegari’s (1979) Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation was also used because more recent, or similar, instruments that would measure Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation were unavailable. The Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation questionnaire has an alpha coefficient of 0.73. The instrument had been designed by Piegari (1979) with the assistance of seven experts. The scores for the two instruments for each school surveyed were calculated. Scores of the two instruments were correlated using a Pearson Product Moment as had been done in the earlier projects (Piegari, 1979 and Johnson, Yeakey, & Piegari, 1985).
Written permission to use the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation was obtained from the author (Appendix B).

The Sample

The sample for this project was drawn from Michigan public elementary schools. Stratified random sampling was used in drawing the sample. All public elementary schools listed in the Michigan school directory were given a numeric identification. Schools were categorized as rural, urban/suburban, or metropolitan, based on the population density, as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau, of the school districts where the schools are located.

Using a random number generator, numbers were selected until a pool for each category of school existed. Additionally each school selected had to have a full-time teaching staff of no less than ten teachers. Fifteen elementary schools, 0.76 percent of the total public elementary schools in Michigan, were selected. Schools whose numbers were selected were classified as metropolitan, urban/suburban, or rural according to the classification of the areas in which they were located. Principals of selected schools were contacted until the required sample of five schools for each classification was filled. Fifty-seven schools’ principals were contacted by telephone before the necessary sample size was achieved.

The majority of principals that declined to be studied, stating that they didn’t want to bother their staffs. One principal declined because she was the fourth principal assigned to that particular building in a four year period. She was confident that the
results of any survey would not be helpful and that a fair description of her staff could
not be made at this time. The unwillingness of so many principals to participate many
have impacted to results of the survey. Speculation could be made as to unstated
reasons for principals’ unwillingness to have their staffs surveyed.

Additional demographic information, such as age, sex, degree status, tenure,
total years of service, and years of service in that particular school was collected
through a respondent information sheet.

Collecting the Data

The principals for each of the schools selected were contacted by telephone.
The project was explained to them. Assurances were given concerning anonymity.
Precautions were taken to assure anonymity. Schools and persons participating in the
survey would not be identified. If necessary, follow-up calls were made as well as the
forwarding of materials for examination.

Principals were asked to present the materials in a staff meeting setting. A staff
member was asked to collect the completed materials and forward them to the
researcher in a prepaid mailer. As a courtesy, for their consideration, participants were
given refreshments provided by the researcher. To assure anonymity, each respondent
was provided an unmarked envelope in which to place their completed instruments.
No identifying marks were used on any of the materials mailed. As materials were
returned to the researcher they were coded so as not to mix the materials received
from each school.
The data contained in returned materials were retrieved and encoded for computer analysis using computer facilities and personnel at Northern Michigan University. The program used was SPSS.

Using instructions provided in Open schools/healthy schools (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991) each subarea of the OCDQ-RE was scored. OCDQ-RE results for each school were reported to each principal. Scores of the OCDQ-RE for the sample were then combined, as were the scores for the Teachers' attitudes toward evaluation survey. The means of the scores for each of the behaviors identified on the OCDQ-RE were calculated.

A Pearson Product Moment correlation was calculated for each behavior score mean of the OCDQ-RE and the mean score of the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements toward evaluation survey. The correlations were then analyzed.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the major hypotheses that were tested using the OCDQ-RE and the Teacher’s Attitudes Toward Evaluation survey and some of the demographic data received. The hypotheses tested in this study were:

H-1. The more open an elementary school’s climate, the more positive teachers’ attitudes will be toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-2. The more supportive a principal’s behavior is, the more positive will be the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-3. The more directive a principal’s behavior is, the less positive will be the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-4. The more restrictive a principal’s behavior is, the less positive will be the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-5. The more collegial teachers’ behavior is, the more positive will be the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

H-6. The more intimate teachers’ behavior is, the more positive will be the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.
H-7. The more disengaged teachers' behavior is, the less positive will be the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

The design of the study called for the selection of fifteen elementary schools, 0.76 percent of all Michigan public elementary schools, for study: five from metropolitan areas, five from urban/suburban areas, and five from rural areas. Public elementary schools listed in the 1992 Michigan school directory were assigned an identification number. Using a random number generator, identification numbers of schools were selected for inclusion in the study. The principals of fifty-seven randomly selected schools were approached in February of 1993 before the necessary field of fifteen schools was filled.

Each school selected to participate in the study had to have a professional, full-time staff of not less than ten. Staff size ranged from thirteen to thirty-nine teaching professionals. The mean staff size was 22.5. Of a possible 337 completed surveys, 208 were returned for a return rate of 61 percent. Because the unit of analysis was the school, and 100 percent of the schools selected submitted responses, the return rate of 61 percent was considered adequate.

Survey instruments were distributed at staff meetings. Confidentiality for respondents was assured by the following: no identifying marks were used on the instrument forms; respondents were given envelops in which to seal their completed surveys; a volunteer from each staff was requested to collect the sealed envelops, place them in a prepaid mailing pouch, and place the sealed pouch in the U.S. Mail.
Scores for the OCDQ-RE and Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation were calculated for each school and correlations were calculated using a Pearson Product Moment correlation. Correlations were analyzed for each of the seven major hypotheses of this study.

Results

H-1. The More Open an Elementary School’s Climate, the More Positive Teachers’ Attitudes Will Be Toward the Evaluation Process Used in That School

As predicted, a positive correlation between teacher openness and teachers’ attitudes toward evaluation was indicated. However, the correlation coefficient, though in the predicted direction, is not large enough to support the hypothesis. Table 2 illustrates the correlation.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Openness</td>
<td>1116.664</td>
<td>162.363</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coefficient (r) when converted to a z score would be 0.180. When this statistic is placed on a normal curve, it is significant at the 0.43 level.

Because of the correlation of 0.13 the hypothesis is rejected.
H-2. The More Supportive a Principal's Behavior Is, the More Positive Will Be the Attitudes of Teachers Toward the Evaluation Process Used in That School

Table 3 illustrates the correlation between principal supportive behavior and the attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that school.

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Teachers' Attitudes and the Variable Principal Supportive Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Supportive Behavior</td>
<td>523.774</td>
<td>150.701</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the coefficient (r) is converted to a z score it has a value of 0.91. When this value is placed on a normal curve it is significant at the 0.18 level.

A positive correlation is shown to exist between principal supportive behavior and attitude of teachers toward the evaluation process used in that building. Because the coefficient is not strong enough it is necessary to reject the hypothesis.

H-3. The More Directive a Principal's Behavior Is, the less Positive Will Be the Attitudes of Teachers Toward the Evaluation Process Used in That School

As Table 4 indicates, a positive correlation is shown to exist between the directiveness of principals and the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process used in the schools.
Table 4
Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Teachers’ Attitudes and the Variable Principal Directive Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Directive Behavior</td>
<td>384.713</td>
<td>142.043</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the coefficient (r) is converted to a z score it has a value of 0.23. When this value is placed on a normal curve it is significant at the 0.41 level.

A weak positive correlation is shown, therefore the hypothesis, as stated, is rejected.

**H-4. The More Restrictive Teachers’ Behavior Is, the less Positive Will Be the Attitude of Teachers Toward the Evaluation Process Used in That School**

Table 5 shows the correlation for this hypothesis.

Table 5
Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Teachers’ Attitudes and the Variable Principal Restrictive Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Restrictive Behavior</td>
<td>433.166</td>
<td>185.303</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the coefficient (r) is converted to a z score it has a value of 0.87. When this value is placed on a normal curve it is significant at the 0.19 level.
Because a weak correlation is shown to exist the hypothesis, as stated, is rejected.

H-5. The More Collegial Teachers' Behavior Is, the More Positive Will Be the Attitude of Teachers Toward the Evaluation Process Used in That School

Because a very weak correlation is shown in Table 6 the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 6

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Teachers' Attitudes and the Variable Teacher Collegial Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collegial Behavior</td>
<td>518.96</td>
<td>118.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the coefficient (r) is converted to a z score it has a value of 0.11. Placing this value on a normal curve would make it significant at the 0.18 level. That being the case, the hypothesis is rejected.

H-6. The More Intimate Teachers' Behavior Is, the More Positive Will Be the Attitude of Teachers Toward the Evaluation Process Used in That School

Table 7 shows that no correlation exists between the attitude of teachers toward evaluation and intimate behavior between coworkers.
Table 7
Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Teachers’ Attitudes and the Variable Teacher Intimate Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Intimate Behavior</td>
<td>561.724</td>
<td>200.230</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Converting the coefficient (r) to a z score gives it a value of 0.00. When placing this value on a normal curve it is significant at the 0.50 level.

Because no correlation is shown to exist between teachers’ attitudes toward the evaluation process used in the building in which they work and the intimate behavior between teachers and their co-workers, the hypothesis as stated is rejected.

H-7. The More Disengaged Teachers’ Behavior Is, the less Positive Will Be the Attitude of Teachers Toward the Evaluation Process Used in That School

Table 8
Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Teachers’ Attitudes and the Variable Disengaged Teacher Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Disengaged Behavior</td>
<td>532.626</td>
<td>166.261</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the coefficient (r) is converted to a z score it has a value of 0.18. Placing this statistic on a normal curve would make it significant at the 0.43 level.
Because a weak negative correlation exists as shown in Table 8 the hypothesis as stated is rejected.

**Demographics**

In analyzing and comparing the data from the three groups of schools no significant differences were noted among the three groups. In analyzing other demographic data, only slight differences can be noted. Table 9 is a comparison of the demographic data collected from each group.

The most curious characteristic of these data is the consistency of most of the areas investigated. Areas where differences were most noticeable can probably be explained along the lines of population density and the services that would be expected to accompany a larger population density. For instance, it appears that a higher percentage of the staffs of metropolitan schools are unmarried than in the urban/suburban and rural schools. This pattern is consistent with the population of metropolitan areas.

Another area where there is a noticeable difference between the metropolitan area information and that of the other two categories was degree status. The level of education at the master's degree level and beyond can be attributed to the availability of graduate level course work in a more populated region than in a less densely populated region.

A third noticeable difference was found between the metropolitan schools and the urban/suburban and rural schools. This difference was that of years of service, both
Table 9

Comparison of Various Demographic Data for Metropolitan, Urban/Suburban, and Rural Teachers in Michigan Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (percentages*)</th>
<th>Metro n</th>
<th>Urb/Sub n</th>
<th>Rural n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruments Returned</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>61.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>93.44</td>
<td>93.15</td>
<td>91.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nontenured</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93.10</td>
<td>84.93</td>
<td>94.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 40</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>28.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 45</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>20.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 50</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 55</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>69.49</td>
<td>80.60</td>
<td>86.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Status</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's + 18 Grad. Hrs.</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>42.47</td>
<td>32.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td>38.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's + 20 Grad. Hrs.</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's + 40 Grad. Hrs.</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist Degree</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years Experience</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years at Present Site</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable with Assignment</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These percentages are based on the responses received. Responses were not provided for some items on some of the surveys.
in teaching, and at a particular school. The metropolitan schools' teachers had greater years of service, but, on the average, fewer years of service at a particular building. Change of assignments from one school to another in a large district can be accomplished more readily because the choices are less limited as compared to a smaller school district. Changes may be based on seniority rights, giving some schools a more senior staff than perhaps schools having more difficult or challenging clientele.

The pattern of metropolitan schools differing from urban/suburban and rural schools can also be seen in the percent of possible returned instruments. The urban/suburban and rural school had similar percentages of returned instruments that were nearly sixty-percent greater than that of the metropolitan schools.

The greatest similarity between the three groups of schools was that of any of the age ranges the 40 to 45 year-old group was the largest age group represented. Again the metropolitan schools were shown as having a teaching corps that was more mature than the two other classifications of schools. This is probably a result of metropolitan districts having better benefit packages and teachers' ability to seek and remain at preferred teaching assignments.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research concerned itself with the relationships that exist between the organizational climate found in elementary schools and the attitudes of teachers toward the evaluation process.

Earlier work had been reported by Piegari (1979) and Johnson, Yeakey, and Piegari (1985) that supports the premise that a relationship does exist between teachers' attitudes toward the evaluation process used and the climates existing within the elementary schools. In both of the earlier studies the scores of the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation survey and the OCDQ were correlated. No correlation between the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation survey and the OCDQ-RE have been published due to the relative newness of the OCDQ-RE. The findings of this study gain significance because of the fact no studies to date have been published correlating the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Survey scores and the scores of the OCDQ-RE. The major conclusion reported in each study using the OCDQ and the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation was that teachers felt more positive toward the evaluation process used in the schools when certain conditions were present. Those conditions were that: the staff was engaged in what they were doing and were not merely going through the motions; staff morale
was high; the staff got along well with each other; and the principal operated in a personal and informal manner.

This study differed from the earlier work in that it used the recently revised version of the OCDQ, the OCDQ-RE (Hoy, 1991). The revised instrument provided scores indicating: (a) the degree of principal openness of an elementary school, (b) the degree of teacher openness of an elementary school, and (c) identified six behaviors used for calculating the openness scores.

The mean score for the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation in the earlier studies was 4.19 out of a possible score of 5. The same score for this study’s sample was 2.60.

The Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation survey is a Likert-type instrument providing respondents with a choice of 5 responses. The responses ranged from “very negative” to “very positive.” Each response is to a statement concerning the evaluation process. For analysis purposes “very negative” had been assigned a numerical value of 1, while “very positive” had a value of 5.

The mean of 2.60 skewed the correlations of this study. This score made it necessary to reject the null hypothesis.

In considering the mean score of the Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation survey of this study and the scores of earlier work; Piegari (1979) and Johnston, Yeakey and Piegari (1984), there was concern because of the large difference in the mean scores.
The first point considered was the possible difference in the make up of the sample of each study. The three studies' samples were random, stratified samples. The earlier studies selected samples from teachers in public elementary schools in New Jersey. This study selected teachers in public elementary schools in Michigan.

Selection criteria required that schools represent metropolitan areas, urban/suburban areas, and rural areas. The classification of the New Jersey schools was based on definitions established by the New Jersey Department of Education. The schools selected in this study were from areas receiving their designations based on criteria in the Dictionary of U.S. government statistical terms (Garwood & Hornor, 1991). The sample drawn may have been a truer representation of Michigan public elementary schools had the stratification been a truer representation of the population of the whole state. Population distribution maps of Michigan indicate that a proportion greater than 1/3 of the population resides in metropolitan areas. This score could also have been unduly impacted by the lower rate of return from metropolitan area teachers than from urban/suburban and rural teachers.

Other variables to be considered in the event of restudy might be the timing of the surveys. The sample data for this study were collected in the latter half of the school year. Principals were contacted in January and February and materials were distributed to the schools in March. This was done in an attempt to avoid periods in the calendar where teachers might feel stressed because of too many obligations. Surveying the staffs was accomplished at the discretion of the principals.
It should be noted that though the correlation coefficients were very small, in fact small enough that any strong statement concerning accepting or rejecting any of the hypotheses could not be made, they exist in the directions that support the hypotheses as stated. Therefore, further study is warranted.

The results of this study imply that further study is justified. A case and field study approach would be an acceptable study design because various types of climate have been identified. Case study would further identify those elements that contribute most to the various climate types.

The results of this study also imply that a pattern exists that supports the belief that, in elementary schools, there is a relationship between the climate of the building and the attitudes that teachers in that school have concerning various facets of their work situation. Superordinates would benefit from reflecting on the conditions that exist in their building and considering changes that would suit the attainment of the goals of the school district. In some situations subordinates would directly benefit from reflecting on their work situation. The information gathered may allow them to identify aspects of their work situation that they could monitor and make adjustments for.

The demographic data gathered as a result of this study imply that there are no major differences between school staffs in the three categories of school districts. Worthy of note is the fact that in the rural and urban/suburban school districts 100 percent of those teachers responding indicated that they were comfortable with their
teaching assignment. In the metropolitan school districts, 3.33 percent of the teachers indicated that they were not comfortable with their teaching assignment.
Appendix A

Letter to Participants
Dear Teacher,

I am a middle school teacher with the Marquette Area Public Schools. Presently I am working on a Doctorate at Western Michigan University. I am working on a project that is investigating the relationship between school climate and the attitude of teachers toward teacher evaluation.

You are important to me. Please complete the attached survey instruments and information form. Your individual responses will be kept confidential. The results of the surveys will be recorded by school, as the school is the unit of analysis. Your school will not be named in my report. If your principal has requested to know the school results of the surveys I have agreed to share that information. NO INDIVIDUALS WILL BE IDENTIFIED.

Please place your responses in the unmarked envelopes that I have provided. Place your envelope in the prepaid mailing pouch that I have also provided. One of your colleagues has agreed to see that the pouch is mailed back to me.

Thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to help me out. Your generosity may make a big difference for some fellow teachers.

Gratefully yours,

Tim Lowe
Appendix B

Permission to Use Forty Teacher Attitude Statements
Toward Evaluation Questionnaire
February 10, 1993

Mr. Tim Lowe
801 North Front Street
Marquette, Michigan 49855

Dear Mr. Lowe:

This is in response to our discussion and your letter of January 17th, requesting the use of my survey instrument, "Forty Teacher Attitude Statements Toward Evaluation" for your work at Western Michigan University. I hereby grant permission for your use of this instrument from my doctoral dissertation.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Good luck with your research!

Sincerely,

Patrick Piegari, Ed.D.
Superintendent

/k
Appendix C

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval
Date: February 12, 1993
To: Timothy Lowe
From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number: 93-02-23

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "The relationship between school climate and the attitude of teachers toward teacher evaluation" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: Cowden, EL

Approval Termination: February 12, 1994
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