DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 407   CG 006 550

AUTHOR   Appleberry, James B.
TITLE   Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Climate:
              An Empirical Assessment. A Paper Presented to the
              National Association of Elementary School
              Principals, April, 1971.
INSTITUTION   Oklahoma State Univ., Stillwater.
PUB DATE   Apr 71
NOTE   15p.; Paper presented at the National Association of
              Elementary School Principals Convention, Cleveland,
              April 17-22, 1971

EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Educational Environment, *Elementary Schools,
              Organization, *Organizational Climate, Principals,
              School Administration, School Attitudes, School
              Conditions, *School Environment, *School
              Organization, Schools, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher
              Behavior, Teachers

ABSTRACT
              The school is viewed as a social system, composed of
human beings interlocked in a network of social relationships and
possessing a system of shared orientations which serve as standards
for human behavior. Two related concepts are discussed: (1) pupil
control ideology, conceptualized along a continuum ranging from
"custodialism" to "humanism;" and (2) organizational climate, also
arrayed along a continuum from open to closed. It is hypothesized
that schools with open climates, and teachers and principals serving
in relatively open schools, will be significantly more humanistic in
pupil control ideology than schools with closed climates, or teachers
and principals serving in closed climates. Two measurement
instruments, the Pupil Control Ideology form (PCI) and the
Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) are briefly
described. These were used to collect data on 45 elementary schools
in 30 school districts. Results indicate that public elementary
schools with open climates are significantly more humanistic in pupil
control ideology than those with closed climates. Also, teachers, but
not principals, serving in open schools, were found to be more
humanistic in pupil control ideology than those in closed schools.
(TL)

PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE:

AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT

A Paper Presented to the
National Association of Elementary School Principals
April, 1971

James B. Appleberry, Ed.D.
Oklahoma State University

The emphasis on pupil control in the organizational life of schools

is not new nor surprising to teachers and administrators. Indeed, there

is no lack of opinion or prescription on pupil control in public schools,

but unfortunately there is little systematic study on the subject, much

less, study which begins from the perspective of the school as a social

system. Studies which have focused on the schools as a social system

have described antagonistic student subcultures and attended control

problems.[1] For example, Wallers[2] classic analysis of the social organiza-

tion of the school underscored the importance and centrality of pupil

control in both the structural and normative aspects of the school culture.

Control is a problem faced by all organizations, but it is especially

important in certain types of organizations such as schools. Schools are

service organizations which have no choice in the selection of clients

(students) and the clients must (in the legal sense) participate in the

organization. These organizations seem likely to be confronted with some

clients who have little or no desire for the services of the organization,

a factor which accentuates the problem of client control in such organiza-

tions.[3]

For the purposes of this study, it was fruitful to view the school

as a social institution. As such, it is composed of human beings inter-

locked in a network of social relationships and possessing a system of

shared orientations which serve as standards for human behavior. Social interactions within the school give rise to what has been termed the climate or "personality" of the school. In a preliminary study of the culture of one school, Willower and Jones[4] found that although many factors influence the "personality" of the school, pupil control was a dominate motif. Subsequent research has underscored the saliency of pupil control orientation in the organizational life of schools.[5] These studies support Wallers description of the organization of the school as one which emphasizes dominance of teachers and the subordination of students.[6] Halpin and Croft[7] have constructed an organizational climate description questionnaire (OCDQ) which portrays the organizational climates of schools by assessing various aspects of teacher-teacher and teacher-principal interactions. However, the pupil control orientations of professional staff are not included as an aspect of the climate of educational organizations. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the pupil control orientation of professional personnel and the organizational climate of schools.

Pupil Control Ideology

Pupil control ideology has been conceptualized along a continuum ranging from "custodialism" at one extreme to "humanism" at the other. These terms refer to contrasting types of individual ideology and the types of school organizations that they seek to rationalize. They are "ideal types" or analytic abstractions which may never be fully realized in experience.

A custodial pupil control ideology is characterized by a school which provides a rigid and highly controlled setting concerned primarily with

the maintenance of order. Students are stereotyped in terms of their appearance, behavior and parent social status. Teachers who hold a custodial orientation conceive of the school as an autocratic organization with a rigid pupil-teacher status hierarchy; the flow of power and communication is unilateral downward. Students must accept the decision of teachers without question. Student misbehavior is viewed as a personal affront; students are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive, external sanctions. Impersonality, pessimism and "watchful mistrust" imbue the custodial orientation.

The model for the humanistic orientation, on the other hand, is the school who conceived as an educational community in which students learned through cooperative interaction and experience. For teachers who hold a humanistic orientation, learning and behavior are viewed in psychological and sociological terms rather moralistic ones. Self-discipline is substituted for strict teacher control. The humanistic orientation leads teachers to desire a democratic atmosphere with its attendant flexibility in status and rules, sensitivity to others, open communication, and increased student self-determination. Both teachers and pupils are willing to act on their own volition and accept responsibility for their actions.

Organizational Climate

The organizational climates of educational organizations have been arrayed along the continuum defined at one end by an open climate, and at the other by a closed climate.[8] The open climate is portrayed as an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals while simultaneously providing satisfaction for group members' social needs. Leadership acts emerge from both the group and the leader. Group members

do not overemphasize either task achievement or social need satisfaction, but in both instances satisfaction seems to be obtained easily and almost effortlessly. The basic characteristic of the open climate is the "authenticity" of the behavior that occurs among all members of the group.

The closed climate is characterized by a high degree of apathy among all organizational members. The school seems to be stagnate; morale is low because satisfaction is obtained from neither task achievement nor fulfillment of social needs. The main characteristic of the closed climate is the "inauthenticity" of the behavior of all organizational members.

Rationale and Hypotheses

Public schools are social units specifically vested with a service function, in this case the moral and technical socialization of the young.[9] Recall that they are a type of service organization in which clients have no choice concerning their participation in the organization and the organization has no control in the selection of clients.[10] Therefore, educational services must sometimes be provided to reluctant clients, students who have little desire to take advantage of the service. Further, recall that pupil control has been found to be an especially important feature of the organizational life in public schools; in fact, it has been described as an "integrative theme" of the social system of a school.[11] Since the school is a service organization in which clients are unselected and participation is mandatory, it seems reasonable to assume that pupil control orientation is an important factor in intra-faculty relations that will bear a relationship to the climate of the school.

Halpin has concluded that the chief consequence of his study of the organizational climate of schools was the pivotal importance of authenticity

in organizational behavior.[12] Authenticity refers to behavior which is
"for real," that is, genuine or without pretense.

The distinguishing feature of the open climate is the authenticity in
relations among teachers and between the principal and teachers. Individual
behavior is not submerged by organizational role demands. To the contrary,
within the open climate there is enough flexibility in the specification of
roles to permit role incumbents to be themselves; that is, to adjust the
role to their personal need dispositions. Within the closed climate however,
"...the role itself and the individual status as a teacher or a principal
appear to constitute his essential sense of identity. Furthermore, in these
instances the individual used his role ritualistically, so that it became
a device which kept others at a distance and precluded the establishment
of authentic relationships."[13]

The concept of authenticity in organizational behavior seems highly
compatible with a humanistic pupil control orientation of professional
public school personnel. The humanistic orientation calls for cooperative
interaction and experiences between the teacher and the pupil, two way
communication between teachers and pupils, and increased student self-
determination as well as the importance of individuality.

In the open climate, if interactions among teachers and between
teachers and principals are authentic, then it seems reasonable to assume
that authenticity would also tend to pervade teacher-pupil interactions.[14]
Further, a humanistic pupil control orientation would appear to facilitate
and be facilitated by authentic interactions between teachers and pupils.

Given the inauthenticity of the closed climate, it seems likely that
teachers will be somewhat fearful of criticism, especially criticism con-
cerning "lack of control;" hence, they will attempt to keep others at a

distance and strive to maintain custodial control over students. However, the open climate should provide an atmosphere where teachers are more at ease and less fearful of criticism, a situation which should foster more authentic pupil-teacher relationships and a humanistic pupil control orientation.

The following related hypotheses are derived from the preceding rationale.

H.1.   Schools with relative open climates will be significantly
       more humanistic in pupil control ideology than schools
       with relatively closed climates.

H.2.   Principals serving in relatively open schools will be
       significantly more humanistic in pupil control ideology
       than principals serving in relatively closed schools.

H.3.   Teachers serving in relatively open schools will be
       significantly more humanistic in their pupil control
       ideology than teachers in relatively closed schools.

Methodology

Operational Measures

The pupil control ideology form (PCI) is a twenty item instrument used to measure the pupil control ideology of educators along a custodial-humanistic continuum. Responses to each item are made on a five-point Likert-type scale and are scored from five (strongly agree) to one (strongly disagree); the lower the overall score, the more humanistic the respondent.[15]

The organizational climate description questionnaire (OCDQ) is composed of sixty four Likert-type items which can be divided into eight subtests. Each subtest measures one of the eight dimensions of the organizational climate. Aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration refer to major characteristics of the principal as a leader, and disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy pertain to basic aspects of

the teachers as a group. The pattern formed by the eight subtest scores, the school's profile, can be used to determine the climate of the school.[16] Six discrete climate classifications were identified by Halpin and Croft (open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed).

An alternate method of ranking schools on a climate continuum has been recommended by Croft and used in studies of climates of schools.[17] This method involves ranking schools in terms of their "openness" scores. An "openness" score for each school is found by summing the school's scores on the esprit and thrust subtests, then subtracting the school's score on the disengagement subtest. While not identifying discrete climates, this method does allow a ranking of the school along a climate continuum from open to closed.

In this investigation schools were ranked according to their "openness" scores; the higher the score, the more open the climate. Schools with scores in the upper one-third of the distribution were termed relatively open schools (N = 15, range = 48-79) and those with scores in the lower one-third of the distribution were designated as relatively closed schools (N = 15, range = 24-38).

Sample

Forty five elementary schools in thirty school districts comprised the sample of this study. Several criteria were used in the selection of the elementary schools for the study. In order to allow for sufficient oppor-tunity for the development of interaction patterns between the principal and teachers, only schools with principals who were near the completion of at least their second year as full-time principals and who served in only one building were included in the sample. Further, elementary schools were selected from various types of communities; rural, town or small city,

suburban, and urban.

Originally, fifty schools appeared to meet the selection criteria and were asked to participate in the study. Four schools declined the invitation to participate and further information excluded another school from the sample. The forty five elementary schools that agreed to participate were personally visited by a researcher and both the PCI form and the OCDQ were administered to professional personnel during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Virtually all of the faculty in each school responded to each instrument.

Results

As hypothesized, public elementary schools with relatively open climates were found to be significantly more humanistic in pupil control ideology than the elementary schools with relatively closed climates. This basic hypothesis led to the formulation of a more general prediction concerning the relationship between the degree of "openness" of the climates and the PCI in all forty-five of the schools in the present sample. We predicted that the more "open" climates of the schools, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology of the schools. To test this relationship, a coefficient of correlation was computed using data from all forty-five schools in the sample. The openness scores of the schools did correlate significantly with school PCI scores; the more open the school, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology. $(r = -.61, p < .01)$.

In order to test the two other related hypotheses of this investigation, it was necessary to compare separately the mean PCI scores of principals in open and closed schools and the mean PCI scores of teachers in each type of school climate. The hypothesis that principals serving in relatively

open schools would be significantly more humanistic in pupil control
ideology than principals serving in relatively closed schools was <u>not</u>
supported by the statistical analysis of the present data. Although a
comparison of the means between the two groups indicated a difference in
the expected direction, the F value was not significant. Similarly the
prediction was not confirmed that the more "open" the climate of the
schools, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology of the principals.
$(r = -.26, p > .05)$.

However, as hypothesized, teachers serving in relatively open schools
were significantly more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than
teachers serving in relatively closed schools. Furthermore, the relation-
ship between the degree of "openness" of the climate of all forty-five of
the schools and the PCI of teachers was also significant; the more open
the climates of the schools, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology
of the teachers. $(r = -.59, p < .01)$.

Discussion

The rationale for the major hypotheses of this study stress the
authenticity of interactions among professional staff in schools with open
climates and the inauthenticity of the interactions among professional
staff in schools with closed climates. It was assumed that if the inter-
actions among teachers and between teachers and principals were authentic,
then authenticity would also tend to pervade teacher-pupil interactions.
We also theorized that a humanistic pupil control ideology would facilitate
and be facilitated by authentic interactions between teachers and pupils.

The confirmation of the hypothesis that schools with relatively open
climates would be significantly more humanistic in pupil control ideology

than schools with relatively closed climates, and of the hypothesis that teachers serving in schools with relatively open climates would be significantly more humanistic than teachers serving in schools with relatively closed climates provided support for the theoretical rationale.

Failure to confirm the hypothesis that principals serving in relatively open schools would be significantly more humanistic in pupil control ideology than principals serving in relatively closed schools and the subsequent failure to find a significant correlation between the open scores of the schools and the PCI scores of the principals raises an interesting point. Role factors, as they are related to pupil control ideology, seem important in explaining these findings. Recall that the school has been defined as a type of service organization in which participation is mandatory and clients are unselected. In this connection, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy have stated:

> The status problem of teachers are grounded in the nature of
> the school as an organization and in the requirements for the
> teacher role. They arise, in part at least, because the public
> school is an organization with unselected clients and because
> teachers are directly responsible for the control of these
> unselected clients.[18]

They further theorized that those directly responsible for the control of unselected clients would be less humanistic than those directly responsible for client control. This proposition led to the prediction that teachers would be less humanistic in their pupil control ideology than principals. The prediction was confirmed in their study and reconfirmed in the present study. Furthermore, the relationship held regardless of organizational climate; that is, principals were found to be significantly more humanistic than teachers in both a relatively open and relatively closed schools. In brief, the role of the teacher seems more vulnerable to threat from unselected clients than the role of the principal; therefore,

it seems reasonable that the difference in pupil control orientation of principals in open and closed schools was less pronounced than that of the teachers in open and closed schools; however, the difference in mean PCI scores for principals in open and closed schools was in the expected direction--more humanistic in open climates.

The strength of the correlation found to exist between the openness of the school and the pupil control orientation of the school may have substantial theoretical import. The OCDQ measures the climate of the school by tapping the teacher-teacher and principal-teacher interactions. The PCI form measures the ideological orientations of educators toward control of students. It seems appropriate to raise the question of the extent to which the concept of "custodialism" and "humanism" are useful in identifying different types of school organizations. If student control is a salient feature of the organizational life of public schools, and if statements concerning ideology correspondence relatively well with behavior, then the pupil control orientation of the school may be another important correlate of the climate of public schools. Public schools are collectivities of which students are an important segment.

Strategies have been suggested for changing the climate of a school. Based on the present findings, an additional strategy to "open" the climates of elementary schools might involve the selection and assignment of humanistic personnel to schools. Such a strategy, however, seems to have severe limitations. It is one thing to infuse personnel with humanistic pupil control orientations into schools which are not closed in order to maintain or increase the degree of openness; however, it seems quite a different matter to assign educators with humanistic pupil control orientations to elementary schools with extremely closed climates. In the first instance

the strategy may be appropriate; in the second instance the strategy may
be disastrous for the individual as he is confronted with the strong
custodial pupil control norms, and the disengagement, the hindrance, the
lack of consideration, the low esprit, and the low thrust which imbue the
closed climate. The shock may be overwhelming. Indeed, the conflicts and
adaptations of humanistic teachers teaching in schools with closed climates
and of custodial teachers working in open climates would seem to be inter-
esting and fruitful avenues for further empirical investigation of the social
organization and climate of public schools.

Supplementary Analysis of Data

Simply for heuristic purposes, the data collected in the present study
was subjected to a different statistical procedure. From the original
group of forty-five schools, fifteen relatively "custodial" and fifteen
relatively "humanistic" schools were identified. The schools were classi-
fied as humanistic or custodial on the basis of the mean school scores on
the PCI form. The organizational climate profiles of the humanistic and
custodial schools were then examined. While complete results of this treat-
ment are available elsewhere,[19] a brief description of the profiles may be
fruitful.

Humanistic schools were found to be different from custodial schools
in several important ways. In addition to the basic contrast in orienta-
tions toward student control as measured by PCI scores, humanistic schools
are more likely than custodial schools to have: 1. Teachers who work well
together, that is, pull together with respect to the teaching-learning task
(disengagement); 2. High morale and satisified teachers, satisfaction
growing out of a sense of task accomplishment and fulfillment of social

needs (esprit); 3. Principals who deal with teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation rather than "go by the book" (aloofness); 4. Principals who do not supervise closely but instead attempt to motivate through personal example (thrust); and 5. An atmosphere marked by openness, acceptance, and authenticity in teacher-principal interactions.

The importance of the concept of openness and the organizational climate of schools has been discussed in detail by Halpin and Croft; they posed the interesting query that perhaps "...climate profiles may actually constitute a better criteria of the schools effectiveness than many measures that already have entered the field of educational administration and now masquerade as criteria."[20] If the openness of the school climate provides one valid criterion of school effectiveness, then elementary schools with a humanistic pupil control ideology would appear to be significantly more effective, at least in terms of expressive or social emotional development, than those with a custodial orientation.

Moreover, to the extent that an elementary school attempts to communicate values as well as to communicate knowledge and develop skills, a humanistic pupil control ideology seems highly functional. A positive and strong commitment of students to the school seems required to effectively communicate values.[21] It also appears unlikely that such commitment can be effectively obtained in the custodial school; in fact, the custodial atmosphere in the school is more likely to produce alienation of students rather than commitment.

FOOTNOTES

1. Coleman, James S., The Adolescent Society, Free Press, New York, 1961; Gordon, C. Wayne, The Social System of the High School, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1957; Waller, Willard, The Sociology of Teaching, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1967.

2. Waller, Willard, The Sociology of Teaching, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1967.

3. Carlson, Richard O., "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," in Griffiths, Daniel E. (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1964, pp. 262-276.

4. Willower, Donald J., and Ronald G. Jones, "Control in an Educational Organization," in Raths, J. D., et al. (ed.), Studying Teaching, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967.

5. Willower, Donald J., Terry L. Eidell, and Wayne K. Hoy, The School and Pupil Control Ideology, Penn State Studies Monograph No. 24, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1967. See also Wayne K. Hoy, "The Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," The School Review, LXXVI (September, 1968), pp. 312-323; Wayne K. Hoy, "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology," Journal of Educational Research, LXI (December, 1967), pp. 153-155.

6. Waller, op. cit.

7. Halpin, Andrew W., and Don B. Croft, Organizational Climate of Schools, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1963.

8. The descriptions for the prototypes of the open and closed climates have been liberally adapted from Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," Administrator's Notebook, XI, No. 7 (March, 1963).

9. For an excellent discussion concerning the basic characteristics of public schools as formal organizations, see Charles E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in March, James (ed.), Handbook of Organizations, Rand-McNally and Co., Chicago, Illinois, 1965, pp. 972-1022.

10. Carlson, op. cit.

11. Willower and Jones, op. cit.

12. Halpin, Andrew W., *Theory and Research in Administration*, The McMillan Co., New York, 1966, p. 207.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 205.

14. It should be indicated, however, that authenticity and pupil-teacher interaction will probably never be as "pure" as it might become in teacher-teacher or teacher-principal interactions. Since the political organization of the schools requires the subordination of pupils, a certain amount of social distance between pupil and teacher seems inevitable.

15. For a more complete discussion of the operational measure for the pupil control ideology, see Willower, Ediell, and Hoy, *op. cit.*

16. Halpin and Croft, *op. cit.*

17. Telephone conversation with Croft, May 14, 1968. See also, Eldon J. Null, *Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools*, Research Monograph No. 3, Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1967; Harry E. Randles, "The Effects of Organizational Climate on Elementary Teachers," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Ohio State University, Columbus, 1964.