

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Sharon Martin for the degree of Doctor in Education in
Vocational Education presented on November 29, 1983.

Title: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF AN INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS
THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Abstract approved

Redacted for privacy

Dr. Larry Kenneke

The purpose of this study was to develop a valid and reliable instrument to measure the organizational climate of the community college as perceived by community college administrators, faculty, and classified staff.

There were three phases in this study. The first was to develop a pool of test items based on the review of related literature. This phase consisted of generating, validating, and revising test items for the pilot test. The second phase of the study, the pilot test, consisted of assessing an entire community college staff in Washington State. All levels and areas of the college were represented in the test. The sample consisted of 11 administrators, 40 full-time faculty members, and 40 full-time classified staff members. An interview of a random sample of the group obtained a second view of the questionnaire. The items were subjected to an item analysis for internal consistency, and 42 of the 83 items were selected for the field test instrument.

The field test was the final phase. Three community colleges in Washington State were utilized. The population consisted of 238 respondents from all levels and areas of the colleges. The response rate was 35 per cent. The results were analyzed to determine reliability of the instrument and to reduce the instrument length if possible.

Consistency in responses was expected in three major areas: units of the college, positions within the college, and between colleges themselves. Differences were expected among the seven concepts. Differences in concept means were found only among the seven concepts. The instrument is reliable and valid.

Individuals interviewed all expressed interest in establishing positive, productive working climates. All four community college presidents interviewed expressed a desire to assess the climate of their organizations. There are not the financial resources to accomplish lengthy assessment projects; therefore, the 35-item instrument that resulted from this study could be administered to a community college to assess the organizational climate as the first step in establishing a productive organization.

© Copyright by Sharon Martin
June 1983

All Rights Reserved

Development and Validation of an Instrument to
Assess the Organizational Climate in Community Colleges

by
Sharon Martin

A THESIS
submitted to
Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

Completed November 29, 1983

Commencement June 1984

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Professor of Vocational Education
in charge of major

Redacted for privacy

Chair of Department of Vocational and
Technical Education

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented November 29, 1983

Word Processed by Jordis L. Young for Sharon Martin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this to my parents, Lovina and Clifford Goranson, and to my children, Mark and Karen Kirby, who loved me and encouraged me throughout this effort. My appreciation also goes to Dr. Warren N. Suzuki for his belief in me and support of my professional growth. The support and guidance provided by my doctoral thesis committee throughout my graduate studies are appreciated. Dr. Larry J. Kenneke served as my Major Professor. Committee members were Dr. Charles E. Carpenter, Ms. Mary Jane Grieve, Dr. J. Phillip O'Neill, Dr. Sharon A. Wallace, and Dr. Charles F. Warnath.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1, INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Rationale	1
Review of Related Literature	6
Trust	7
Participative Decision Making	7
Open Communication	8
Consistent Philosophy	9
Professional Development	10
Team Development	11
Stability	12
Summary	13
CHAPTER 2, PILOT TEST	15
Test Item Pool Development	15
Collecting Pilot Test Data	17
Procedures for Selecting Items for the Field Test	18
Trust	21
Participative Decision Making	24
Open Communication	27
Consistent Philosophy	31
Professional Development	34
Team Development	37
Stability	40
Summary	44
CHAPTER 3, FIELD TEST	46
Sample	46
Instrument	48
Procedures	48
Internal Consistency	50
Construct Validity	52

CHAPTER 4, CONCLUSIONS	65
Summary	65
Conclusions	68
Implications	68
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 70
 APPENDIX A: Pool of Test Items	 73
APPENDIX B: Organizational Climate Survey, Pilot Study	82
APPENDIX C: Pilot Study Statistics	91
APPENDIX D: Organizational Climate Field Study	135
APPENDIX E: Field Study Statistics	141
APPENDIX F: Administration and Interpretation of Instrument	168

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Trust Concept - The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed	22
2 Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Decision Making - The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed	26
3 Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Open Communication Concept - The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed	29
4 Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Consistent Philosophy Concept - The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed	33
5 Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Professional Development Concept - The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed	36
6 Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Team Development Concept - The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed	39
7 Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Stability Concept - The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed	43
8 Number of Response Rate for the Field Test	47
9 Number and Percentage of Respondents by College Position and College Unit	47

10	Summary of the Disposition of Field Test Items for all Seven Concepts Showing Six-Item Alpha Coefficient, Five-Item Alpha Coefficient, and Four-Item Alpha Coefficient	51
11	Intercorrelation Coefficients Among Concepts	53
12	t-Test of the Differences Between the Means of All Possible Pairs of Concepts	54
13	Analysis of Variance by College Unit	59
14	Analysis of Variance by Position	61
15	Analysis of Variance by College	63

Tables in Appendix C

C-1	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	91
C-2	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Nine Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	93
C-3	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the First Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	94
C-4	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the Second Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	95
C-5	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the Third Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	96
C-6	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	97
C-7	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	98
C-8	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Eight Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	99

C-9	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the First Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	100
C-10	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the Second Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	101
C-11	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	102
C-12	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	103
C-13	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the First Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	104
C-14	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the Second Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	105
C-15	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the Third Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	106
C-16	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	107
C-17	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	108
C-18	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Nine Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	109
C-19	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	110
C-20	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Professional Development</u>	111
C-21	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Professional Development</u>	112

C-22	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Professional Development</u>	113
C-23	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Team Development</u>	114
C-24	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Team Development</u>	115
C-25	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	116
C-26	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For Ten Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	117
C-27	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	118
C-28	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For The First Set of Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	119
C-29	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For The Second Set of Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	120
C-30	Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	121
C-31	Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test Addressing Concept <u>Trust</u>	122
C-32	Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept <u>Participative Decision Making</u>	123
C-33	Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test Addressing Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	124
C-34	Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	125
C-35	Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test Addressing Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	126

C-36	Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	127
C-37	Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test Addressing Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	128
C-38	Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept <u>Personnel Development</u>	129
C-39	Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test Addressing Concept <u>Personal Development</u>	130
C-40	Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept <u>Team Development</u>	131
C-41	Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test Addressing Concept <u>Team Development</u>	132
C-42	Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	133
C-43	Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test Addressing Concept <u>Stability</u>	134

Tables in Appendix E

E-1	Means and Standard Deviation for All Concepts in Field Study	142
E-2	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	143
E-3	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Trust</u>	144
E-4	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	145
E-5	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	146
E-6	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	147

E-7	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	148
E-8	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	149
E-9	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	150
E-10	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Professional Development</u>	151
E-11	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Professional Development</u>	152
E-12	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Team Development</u>	153
E-13	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Team Development</u>	154
E-14	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	155
E-15	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept <u>Stability</u>	156
E-16	Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept <u>Trust</u>	157
E-17	Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept <u>Decision Making</u>	157
E-18	Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept <u>Open Communication</u>	158
E-19	Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept <u>Consistent Philosophy</u>	158
E-20	Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept <u>Professional Development</u>	159
E-21	Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept <u>Team Development</u>	159

Development and Validation of an Instrument to Assess The Organizational Climate in Community Colleges

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to develop a valid and reliable measure of the organizational climate in a community college, as perceived by community college administrators, faculty, and staff, utilizing the seven factors proposed by Ouchi (1981).

Rationale

Higher education, in general, and community colleges, in particular, have come under attack in recent years. Legislators and taxpayers have questioned the role and mission as well as the programs and courses that are being consistently offered at the community college. Whether or not community colleges should provide general education, community service, and continuing education and how much of each should be offered are issues (Breneman, 1981; Burrioni, 1976). Students whose expectations are not fulfilled as a result of their education are suing institutions, and there is strong public distrust of the quality of the educational product (Nichols, 1982).

Limited resources seem a certainty for the future. The boom era of the 1960s and 1970s is over (Priest, 1976). Increasing costs in a period of rapid inflation--combined with the leveling or declining of enrollment resulting in a moratorium on wage increases, new programs, and construction--compound the problems facing managers and boards of trustees (Breneman, 1981; Mayhew, 1979).

There is a cry for accountability and increased productivity in our educational institutions by the consuming public. What is productivity in the community college? Priest (1976) defines productivity at the community college level as "the relationship between goals produced and manhours expended." He claims that productivity is an issue to be dealt with; but he agrees with others (Bess, 1979; Janetos, 1976; Lee, 1977) that in education it is almost impossible to quantify the product and the services. Lee (1977) further emphasizes the need for a productivity ethic throughout education to expand and fulfill the educational role.

Ouchi (1981) addresses the issue of productivity and its relationship to the organizational climate. Ouchi's "Theory Z" approach is that "productivity is a problem that can be worked out through coordinating individual efforts in a productive manner and of giving employees that incentive to do so by taking a cooperative long-range view." Ouchi has tested his approach and has identified seven factors that must be present in an organizational climate to achieve

maximum productivity: trust, participative decision making, open communication, consistent philosophy, professional development, and stability. Theory Z is based on a study of Japanese industry. It adapts Japanese practices to the cultural aspects of American society. Many American firms (e.g., IBM, Hewlett Packard) have adopted these principles for their companies and have increased their productivity substantially (Ouchi, 1981).

Who is responsible for establishing these factors and assuring their implementation into the organization? Ouchi concludes that the climate of the organization is set by the manager or leader at the top. Others support this view (Drucker, 1978; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974; Hampton et al., 1978; Stogdill, 1974). Top managers provide role models and set the tone for the entire organization (Blake et al., 1981). Michael Maccoby (1981) suggests that leadership begins at the top, but it is not enough. "For technology based companies and government bureaucracies to function effectively interdependent teams at different levels need leaders" (Maccoby, 1981, p. 98). Leadership then extends to all administrators. Marsh (1980) states that an organization functions well when there is a density of competent administrators, not one.

Administrators at the community college level are not born--they are nurtured and developed (Zion, 1977). Administrators are recruited from a wide range of sources: public schools, industry, business, and four-year institutions. Characteristically, many are unprepared as

administrators for community colleges, as they lack the broad-base knowledge of the community college philosophy and operations. Others are recruited from the teaching ranks at many levels and need assistance with management skill training (Mayhew, 1979). Managers are expected to do more with less (Peters, 1978). With the emphasis on increased productivity management, the one who is the organizer and implementer of available resources becomes the key target for examination. Personnel comprises the largest share of the community college budget. It is an expensive resource that deserves managing (Burns, 1979; Evans, 1968).

Management theories have evolved through many stages. Theory X, designated by McGregor (1960) as the scientific management approach dominated the early thinking. This approach concentrated on fear, punishment, and the belief that people dislike work and avoid it. Critics of scientific management (e.g., McGregor, 1960; Maslow, 1965) present an alternative view of management. Theory Y, typified as the human relations approach, assumes that people have a psychological need to work and want achievement and responsibility (McGregor, 1960). This emphasis on the humanistic element was well received by some and severely criticized by others. Drucker (1978) maintained that the human relations approach had definite overtones of psychological manipulation to gain control, which is no better than the controlling style of scientific management. The underlying goal of both theories

is that there will be increased productivity by using the theory prescribed.

Additional controversy centers around the scientific management approaches and human relation approaches in that both are incomplete. Even Maslow (1965), a long-term humanist and supporter of the human relations approach, concluded that one must replace or supplement the security and certainty of scientific management with a different structure.

The early Ohio State Studies (Fleishman, Harris, & Burth, 1955) called for leaders that combine initiation of structure (getting the work out) with consideration (perceived human needs). Fiedler and Chemers (1974) in their contingency model refer to task orientation combined with relationship orientation as desirable for successful leadership.

Additional support for the consideration of both approaches is proposed by Herzberg (1966) in which he focuses on sixteen factors to be considered in work motivation. He identified six motivators, including achievement, recognition, possibility of growth, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. Also included in his theory were hygiene or maintenance factors, supervision, company policy, working conditions, interpersonal relations, status, job security, salary, and personal life.

Both Theory X and Theory Y are combined in the Theory Z approach (Ouchi, 1981). His research of Japanese and American companies has

documented increased productivity in organizations with a climate that contains the seven factors. Ouchi describes the process of assessing an organization as the first step in determining its climate. His research methods are time consuming and costly. Ouchi brings a team of research assistants into an organization utilizing observation methods over many months. This is an expensive process. Community colleges cannot afford the research teams necessary to determine the climate of their organization. A more efficient method of assessing an organization is needed by community college administration to determine which factors are deficient thereby affecting productivity. The development of an instrument that could be administered to the entire staff would provide the necessary data to develop an organizational climate profile.

Review of Related Literature

Ouchi identifies seven factors that must permeate the organization at all levels if it is to achieve maximum productivity. This is the ideal organizational climate and should produce the optimum results from the people in the organization. The seven factors are: trust, participative decision making, open communication, consistent philosophy, professional development, team development, and stability (Ouchi, 1981). Each factor will be discussed so that items for the instrument can be generated.

Trust

Trust can be defined as a firm belief or confidence in the honesty and integrity of another person. Vertical and horizontal trust are key factors identified by Ouchi (1981) that are essential to an organization's productivity. Vertical trust exists between managers and workers. Horizontal trust exists between peers in the organization (Bender, 1977; Young, 1980). Handy (1973) says that management of people in an organization must be based on reciprocal trust at all levels. Trust forms the basis for many other factors in the organizational climate. Levinson (1976) expands the view of trust to include the idea that where there is no trust, there is no commitment and that a leader is powerless without the trust of his followers. Carhart and Collins (1977) further related trust to institutional goals and found that without trust and respect, institutional goals could not be agreed upon.

Participative Decision Making

There are two distinct parts in this process: participative and consensus decision making. The participative process is the heart of Theory Z's approach to management. It provides a mechanism for the dissemination of information and communication, reinforces commitment to the organization's goals and objectives, and assists in establishing trust at all levels (Ouchi, 1981).

Control, the opposite of the participative process, is equalized in community colleges by systems of formal participation which may cause a threat to some community college administrators (Tannenbaum et al., 1976-77; Nichols, 1982). This loss of control is viewed positively by others who consider hierarchy bad and argument good. Important decisions must be exposed to possible dissent before implementation (Handy, 1973). Carhart (1977) supports the view of diversity but says that it slows the process down although enriching it.

Full participation is important throughout the process although there is some disagreement about whether a voice is more important than a vote (Carhart & Collins, 1977). Dr. B. J. Hodge, Professor of Management at Florida State, describes an ideal style of climate that uses human resources and includes a fundamental assumption of full participation in the decision-making process.

Open Communication

Throughout the literature, there are many references to the importance of open communication in management. Open communication may be defined as imparting information and knowledge. Carhart and Collins (1977) report that paranoia results when people do not know what is happening, and that an attitude of openness and a built-in process of communication is necessary if a community college is going to be effective. People want to and should know as much as possible about their work environment.

Communication may be further delineated as vertical (up and down) and horizontal (lateral) throughout the organization. Communication should be vertical and horizontal with feedback at all times (Ouchi, 1981). There is some evidence that there is incongruency about communication in an organization as perceived by administrators and the rest of the staff. Pesuth (1976), using Likert's profile, found that administrators perceived the communication flow downward and upward in the organization; while the remainder of the staff perceived the communication flow to be one way--downward.

Consistent Philosophy

A productive organization consists of managers and employees who have individual goals and objectives but agree upon a central set of organizational goals and objectives, a commitment which sets the tone for the wholistic rather than individualistic approach to management (Ouchi, 1981). Carhart and Collins (1977) agree with Ouchi and state that institutional goals must be agreed upon by the whole organization.

Drucker (1978) stresses the importance of the manager setting the goals and objectives of the organization, thereby setting its tone. The major role of the manager is the initiator of structure by clarifying paths and goals. The management by objective movement is built around the philosophy of commitment of the organization to the

achievement of goals and objectives. Peters (1978) charges community colleges to effectively utilize limited resources by organizing a team approach to goals and objectives.

Professional Development

If 85 per cent of the costs in community colleges are dedicated to human resources, then it follows that a prime target is the development of the people in the organization. "Developing people still requires a basic quality in the manager which cannot be created by supplying skills or by emphasizing the importance of the task. It requires "integrity of character" (Drucker, 1978). Training and cross-training are two elements in this process. There is much support for the concept of staff training. Carhart and Collins (1977) identified a strong professional staff development program as the key to the success of the community college. The League for Innovation in the Community College has listed staff development as a top priority item (Harmons, 1974).

An expansion of this concept is the area of cross-training. This process takes two forms: expanding the knowledge of other inter-relating areas by information and idea exchange (Bess, 1979), and broadening of career path development (Ouchi, 1981) where managers move, laterally and horizontally as well as vertically, thereby

increasing their personal knowledge of other areas and increasing enthusiasm and commitment to the organization as a whole. Bess (1979) also concludes that university faculty members are not as productive or as satisfied as they could be because of their narrow focus, and suggests crosslinking with other areas for a broader perspective.

Team Development

The quality control circle or QC circle is a method of management sharing responsibility for solving problems of coordination and productivity (Ouchi, 1981). Ouchi further touts the QC circle as a useful method for improving productivity and morale. Drucker (1978) in analyzing the Theory Z approach, concludes that this is the major difference from other theories. Theory Z organizes the responsibility, as opposed to other theories that organize the authority. Communication is facilitated in small groups and all people in the organization need to voice thoughts on issues (Carhart & Collins, 1977; Pollay et al., 1976).

Young (1980) speaks of identifying work units which are organized around goals that have a whole task to be completed. Tannenbaum et al. (1976-77) studied the formal committee structure in the community college and concluded that the formal committee structure may not achieve the positive effects that members presume to achieve because the participation and authority must be authentic. Young (1980) concludes that organizational units in the university compete, rather than cooperate.

To the extent that control and authority is delegated to teams determines the amount of credibility perceived by others and the real participation and commitment is felt by the participants (Hodge, 1977; Peters, 1978). Geering (1980) states that true leadership is a shared process, a group function, and the product of interaction.

Stability

There is some controversy about the concept of stability (security). The terms mean different things to different individuals and organizations. Hampton (1978) states that size of the organization influences the need for stability--the larger the organization the stronger the need. In Japanese organizations, stability is lifetime employment and a highly structured organization. Ouchi (1981) claims this concept can be interpreted by American organizations as long-term employment, and that there exists much more long-term employment in American organizations than perceived by Americans. Marsh (1980) states that organizations evolve in a conservative manner and tend to remain stable and sustain existing roles. Community colleges are highly structured, but little is known of length of employment as a variable.

McGregor's comparison of theory Y and Theory X (McGregor, 1960) points to the assumption in Theory X that individuals want security by a discussion about physical and psychological needs, not unlike Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1954).

Summary

Ouchi (1981) identified seven factors that must be present in an organization to achieve maximum productivity. Those seven factors or concepts are further delineated into subconcepts by Ouchi and others (Bender, 1977; Lee, 1977; Levinson, 1976).

Trust, the first concept, can be defined as a firm belief or confidence in the honesty and integrity of another person. Vertical and horizontal trust, subconcepts of trust relate to levels within the organization and the breadth and depth of trust.

The Participative Decision Making Concept has two subconcepts: Participation and consensus decision making. The extent to which all levels participate and the dissent and diversity of opinion are key factors in this concept.

Open Communication contains three subconcepts, the imparting of information and knowledge and the direction of communication vertically and horizontally. These are descriptors that form the basis for communication in an organization.

Consistent Philosophy is divided into two subconcepts, individual goals and objectives and their relationship to the total organization. The commitment of the total organization to a central set of goals and objectives is an important factor in establishing a consistent philosophy.

Cross training and staff training are the identified components within professional development. Staff training includes all aspects of the development of people. Cross training relates to the specific form of training individuals with broader perspective and developing generalists rather than specialists.

Two factors were identified within Team Development that were important to the concept: The structure of the teams or who should participate and the role of teams or how much power and influence they should have. The organization of the teams is an issue here.

Stability, the last concept, is the most controversial. Stability means different things to different individuals and different organizations. Long-term employment and security are the subconcepts identified as the most descriptive of the concept.

The seven concepts and the fifteen subconcepts provided the basis for the generation of items described in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 2

PILOT TEST

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the process used to develop and pilot test the initial instrument that was designed to measure the organizational climate of community colleges. The chapter is divided into three major sections: Test Item Pool Development, Collecting Pilot Test Data, and Procedures for Selecting Items for the Field Test Instrument.

Test Item Pool Development

A minimum of eight items was generated for each concept that was specified at the end of the prior chapter. A total of eighty-three items were developed (Appendix A). The content for these items was primarily based on ideas and descriptors that Ouchi (1981) used when he described each concept. Descriptors used by others cited in the related literature (e.g., Bender, 1977; Carhart & Collins, 1977; Levinson, 1976) also served as the basis of item wording. In a few cases, two items, each with a different approach, were written from a similar description. More items were developed than would be used in the final instrument to insure that there were adequate choices for the respondents (Gronlund, 1982).

A panel of judges was organized to evaluate each test item in

terms of respondent perceptions of the relevance of the item wording. The panel consisted of 15 representatives of five community colleges in Washington. All levels in an organization were utilized in the panel: 5 each from administration, faculty, and classified staff. They represented colleges picked at random from an alphabetical list of colleges. The associate dean of instruction at each institution was asked to select at random three respondents, one each from administrative, faculty, and classified staff to participate in a panel of experts to evaluate the pool of test items. Each panel member was asked to review each item as to whether it described its associated concepts. They were also asked to indicate whether the wording of the item would be understood by respondents. A random sample of five panel members was interviewed to determine if any additional modifications or additions to the instrument were needed for clarity by respondents. Based on these options, 71 items were retained, 3 items were omitted, 10 items were modified, and 2 items were added. The 83 items were included in the pilot test instrument (Appendix B). The modifications were primarily concerned with definitions of terms, clarity, and specificity of items.

A seven-point rating scale was used to permit greater differentiation of responses (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1965). Although five intervals are normally associated with summated rating scales, the number of choices is dependent on the nature of the items and

respondents' ability to differentiate. Five intervals were originally validated with general populations. The population that will eventually use this instrument (e.g., community college administration, faculty, classified) are likely more discriminating than the general population. Intervals or choices were: strongly agree, agree, partially agree, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Collecting Pilot Test Data

Two items of information were included in the instrument to identify a respondent: organizational unit and type of position within the college. Choices for college unit were: instruction, student services, administrative services, and other. Types of positions from which respondents could choose were: administrative, faculty, and classified staff. Information collected with these items was eventually used to establish construct validity during the field test. Educational institutions in general and community colleges in particular tend to be conservative in nature and consistent structurally. They are therefore quite similar. Because the presidents set the climates for their organizations (Drucker, 1978; Fiedler, 1974; Hampton, 1978; Ouchi, 1981), the responses among units and colleges could very well have been homogeneous.

The pilot test instrument was administered to an entire staff of a community college in Western Washington. The sample consisted of

11 administrators, 40 full-time faculty members, and 40 full-time classified staff members. All segments of the community college's organization were represented: instruction, student services, and administrative services. The instruments were distributed during an all-college meeting. Respondents were asked to fill out the questionnaire based on the perspective of their current positions.

Two faculty members, two administrators, and two classified staff members selected at random were interviewed to obtain a second view of the questionnaire. Three major findings resulted from the interviews:

1. Some of the terms relating to organizational behavior were unclear and needed additional definitions.
2. The items relating to commitment of the total organization needed more specificity. They suggested that the levels of administration should be identified specifically rather than grouping them.
3. The subjects indicated that the instrument was too long and took too much time.

Procedures for Selecting Items for the Field Test

In considering the length of the final instrument, three factors were considered: the internal consistency of the instrument, the usability or ease of administration, and response rate. The total

number of items should be limited so that the time necessary to complete the test would be relatively short (Dillon, 1978). In the instrument the number of pages should appear reasonable to potential respondents (Dillon, 1978; Henderson, Morris, & Fitz-Gibbon, 1978; Vaughn, 1951). Therefore, the final instrument should contain approximately 35 items. To assure that an appropriate set of five items were available for each concept in the final instrument, an additional item was selected for a total of six items.

Because the seven concepts are independent measures of the climate of an organization, each concept was examined separately. The goal of the analysis for each concept was to maximize the internal consistency reliability. That is, the six items that were used in the field test should be the most homogeneous for the concept. Data provided by the respondents were compiled with the help of the Cyber computer in Oregon State University's Milne Computer Center. The procedure "Reliability" in the "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al., 1975) was used to select items for and then determine the reliability of (i.e., internal consistency) coefficients for each concept.

The Reliability procedure provides a variety of useful information (see Appendix C for an example of data that are provided). A critical statistic that is provided is the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for internal consistency and the summary of the one factor repeated

measure analysis of variance from which the coefficient is computed. The Cronbach's Alpha method is analogous to computing all possible combinations of split-halves of the items representing a concept and reporting an average of all of those coefficients. Also reported are item statistics. Particularly important to item selection were data provided under the column "Alpha if item deleted" and, to a lesser degree, coefficients of correlation reported under "Corrected item to concept correlation." The Alpha coefficient for an item represents the internal consistency of all items being considered if that item is deleted.

Items were eliminated using a step-down process. First, all items representing a concept were entered into the reliability procedure. Second, the overall Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was noted. Third, the Alpha coefficients listed under the Alpha column if item deleted for each item were then examined. Fourth, if the removal of the item improved the overall Alpha coefficient--that is, increased the internal consistency of the remaining items, the item was removed. This process was repeated with the remaining items until the six most internally consistent items for the concept remained. Summaries of the process for each concept are reported in Tables 1 through 7. The detailed description of the statistics are reported in Appendix C.

Trust

Of the 11 items representing the concept trust (Table 1), 5 items were deleted in the step-by-step process using Cronbach's Alpha Method (Cronbach, Rajaratnam, & Gleser, 1963) described in detail earlier. These items were less internally consistent with the entire set of items in the concept. They were:

- 30. Where there is no trust between people in an organization there is no commitment to the organization's goals and objectives.
- 39. I can't trust anyone in this organization.
- 47. Trust is not needed between departments/divisions.
- 69. When you leave on vacation, you can trust your coworkers to assume your responsibilities.
- 76. Cooperation is more important than competition in achieving productivity.

The most internally consistent set of items with an Alpha Coefficient of .77 that were used for the field test were the following:

- 1. Trusting my superiors increases my productivity in the organization.
- 9. I only need to trust myself in this organization.
- 15. Trusting the people that work for me increases my productivity in the organization.
- 23. Trust between levels of the organization is important.
- 54. It is important to the organization to trust your peers.
- 80. I don't need to cooperate with my peers.

=====

Table 1
Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Trust Concept
The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When
Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Deleted</u>				
30.	Where there is no trust between people in an organization there is no commitment to the organization's goals and objectives.	11	.62	.63
39.	I can't trust anyone in this organization.	11	.62	.69
47.	Trust is not needed between departments/divisions.	7	.77	.76
69.	When you leave on vacation, you can trust your coworkers to assume your responsibilities.	7	.71	.76
76.	Cooperation is more important than competition in achieving productivity.	7	.77	.78
<u>Items Selected</u>				
1.	Trusting my superiors increases my productivity in the organization.	6	.77	.77
9.	I only need to trust myself in this organization.	6	.77	.72
15.	Trusting the people that work for me increases my productivity in the organization.	6	.77	.68

continued....

Table 1 (continued)

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Selected (Continued)</u>				
23.	Trust between levels of the organization is important.	6	.77	.72
54.	It is important to the organization to trust your peers.	6	.77	.73
80.	I don't need to cooperate with my peers.	6	.77	.74

* Appendix C reports the statistical findings in detail.

=====

The items in the trust concept that remained after the analysis seem to support the idea that trust between levels of the organization must be present for increased productivity in the organization (Handy, 1973; Ouchi, 1981). Levinson (1976) supports this idea and further emphasizes the need for trust between levels in an organization by saying that without the trust of his or her followers, the leader is powerless.

Participative Decision Making

There were eleven items in the concept participative decision making (Table 2). Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient computed for this group eliminated five items. They are listed as follows:

- 2. Everyone in my department should agree on important issues.
- 10. In making decisions everyone must have a vote as well as a voice in my department
- 24. Agreement is not important in decision making.
- 40. Decision thinking is more important than decision making.
- 55. Participation reinforces commitment to the organization.

The best set of six items with an Alpha Coefficient of .66 were the following:

- 16. Consensus decision making (where agreement is reached) leads to more productive and satisfied employees.
- 32. Being involved in the decision-making process promotes trust at all levels.
- 48. Communication is facilitated by participation.
- 62. Decisions made in isolation without input enable the people in the organization to be more productive.
- 70. Only "selected" people should participate in decision making.
- 77. Decisions made behind closed doors make for a more productive organization.

Participation seems to be the thread between the items remaining in the participative decision-making concept for the field test.

Ouchi (1981) identified the participative process as the heart of Theory Z's approach to management as it provides the mechanism for communication and the building of trust at all levels. Hodge (1977) and Drucker (1978) support this view of the importance of participation in a productive organization.

Table 2

Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Decision Making Concept
The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When
Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Deleted</u>				
2.	Everyone in my department should agree on important issues.	11	.40	.54
10.	In making decisions everyone must have a vote as well as a voice in my department.	7	.52	.65
24.	Agreement is not important in decision making.	7	.63	.65
40.	Decision thinking is more important than decision making.	11	.40	.47
55.	Participation reinforces commitment to the organization.	11	.40	.42
<u>Items Selected</u>				
16.	Consensus decision making (where agreement is reached) leads to more productive and satisfied employees.	6	.66	.64
32.	Being involved in the decision-making process promotes trust at all levels.	6	.66	.59
48.	Communication is facilitated by participation.	6	.66	.63

continued....

Table 2 (Continued)

		Analysis*		
Item No.	Item Text	Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Selected</u> (Continued)				
62.	Decisions made in isolation without input enable the people in the organization to be more productive.	6	.66	.62
70.	Only "selected" people should participate in decision making.	6	.66	.53
77.	Decisions made behind closed doors make for a more productive organization.	6	.66	.64

* Appendix C reports the statistical findings in detail

=====

Open Communication

Examination of the 15 items (Table 3) in terms of items to corrected total scores and Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for those 15 items representing the open communication concept, eliminates the following 9 items:

3. People want to and should know as much as possible about their work environment.
25. Keeping people in the dark facilitates communication.
41. The communication flow in an organization should be upward (from classified staff in an organization to top management).
49. The communication flow should be downward (from top administration down).

- 56. Administrators communicate mostly downward.
- 63. All people want to be able to communicate with the level above them.
- 67. It is more important to communicate with other sections and departments than within your own department or section.
- 71. Listening as well as talking is important in communication.
- 81. There is more communication within sections and departments than between sections and departments.

The six most internally consistent items in the open communication concept with an Alpha Coefficient of .62 are listed below:

- 11. The less people know the better.
- 17. A communication system that works is important in a healthy organization.
- 21. It is only important to communicate within your own section or department.
- 31. Organizational structure facilitates communication.
- 34. Paranoia exists when there is a lack of communication.
- 78. Feedback is important to communication in an organization.

Table 3

Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Open Communication Concept
The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When
Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Deleted</u>				
3.	People want to and should know as much as possible about their work environment.	15	.26	.27
25.	Keeping people in the dark facilitates communication.	7	.54	.55
41.	The communication flow in an organization should be upward (from classified staff in an organization to top management).	15	.26	.28
49.	The communication flow should be downward (from top administration down).	15	.26	.28
56.	Administrators communicate mostly downward.	15	.26	.37
63.	All people want to be able to communicate with the level above them.	15	.26	.37
67.	It is more important to communicate with other sections and departments than within your own department or section.	7	.55	.62
71.	Listening as well as talking is important in communication.	7	.50	.51
81.	There is more communication within sections and departments than between sections and departments.	15	.26	.32

continued....

Table 3 (Continued)

		Analysis*		
Item No.	Item Text	Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Selected</u>				
11.	The less people know the better.	6	.62	.49
17.	A communication system that works is important in a healthy organization.	6	.62	.57
21.	It is only important to communicate within your own section or department.	6	.62	.49
31.	Organizational structure facilitates communication.	6	.62	.59
34.	Paranoia exists when there is a lack of communication.	6	.62	.63
78.	Feedback is important to communication in an organization.	6	.62	.62

* Appendix C reports the statistical findings in detail

Whereas the levels of the organization were an important factor in the items remaining in the trust concept, the items containing reference to levels of the organization in regards to communication, were eliminated. The communication items that remained in the field test dealt with organizational structure and systems in a generalized sense and centered mostly on the ideas of the importance of feedback in communication and letting people in the organization know what is going on.

This supports Carhart and Collins's (1977) idea that an open communication system is necessary if a community college is going to be effective.

Consistent Philosophy

There were 11 items in the consistent philosophy concept (Table 4). The five least internally consistent items were deleted according to Cronbach's alpha method. They were:

- 5. Individual goals and objectives are more important than organizational goals and objectives
- 18. There should be a consistent philosophy for everyone in the organization.
- 35. It takes the commitment of everyone to the organization's goals and objectives for the organization to be successful.
- 42. Only the administrators need to be committed to the organization's goals and objectives.
- 50. The top administrator sets the tone of the organization by clarifying the organization's goals and objectives.

The 6 most internally consistent items in the consistent philosophy concept that were included in the field test were:

- 26. Individual goals and objectives must be compatible with organizational goals and objectives.
- 33. The president of the college feels that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
- 57. Middle managers (directors and division chairs) feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.

- 64. Faculty feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
- 74. Classified staff feels that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
- 83. The deans feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.

All of the 6 items that were selected for the field test in the consistent philosophy concept with the exception of item 26 dealt with specific levels of the organization. The respondents perceived that the president, deans, middle managers, faculty, and classified staff felt that the goals of the organization were clear and well defined. This seems to substantiate Carhart and Collins (1977) and Ouchi (1981) who claim that all managers and employees must agree on a central set of goals and objectives in order to be productive.

=====

Table 4

Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Consistent Philosophy Concept
The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When
Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Deleted</u>				
5.	Individual goals and objectives are more important than organizational goals and objectives.	9	.75	.67
18.	There should be a consistent philosophy for everyone in the organization.	11	.67	.72
35.	It takes the commitment of everyone to the organization's goals and objectives for the organization to be successful.	11	.67	.68
42.	Only the administrators need to be committed to the organization's goals and objectives.	9	.75	.76
50.	The top administrator sets the tone of the organization by clarifying the organization's goals and objectives.	9	.75	.57
<u>Items Selected</u>				
26.	Individual goals and objectives must be compatible with organizational goals and objectives.	6	.81	.82
33.	The president of the college feels that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.	6	.81	.79

continued.....

Table 4 (Continued)

		Analysis*		
Item No.	Item Text	Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Selected</u> (Continued)				
57.	Middle managers (directors and division chairs) feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.	6	.81	.74
64.	Faculty feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.	6	.81	.76
74.	Classified staff feels that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.	6	.81	.76
83.	The deans feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.	6	.81	.76

* Appendix C reports the statistical findings in detail

=====

Professional Development

A review of the item to corrected total coefficients and Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for the nine items representing the professional development concept indicated that three items should be eliminated as they were less internally consistent within the concept (Table 5). They were:

19. Staff development should not be a high priority in community colleges.
27. Staff training should be well planned to benefit the organization.
36. Staff training is a waste of time and money.

The best six candidates for the field test instrument with the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of .61 were:

6. People need staff development throughout their careers.
44. Expanding the knowledge of other departments and sections of the college by information and idea exchange is useful in an organization.
51. It is not necessary to know about other areas in the college.
58. The broadening of career path development where managers move laterally increases enthusiasm and commitment to the organization as a whole.
65. A specialist (one who knows a lot about a few things) is more important to an organization than a generalist (one who knows something about a lot of things).
73. Cross-training would increase the productivity of the organization because people could appreciate the limitations and resources of other areas.

The items that survived the analysis tend to fit into the category of cross-training, which is described by Ouchi (1981) as the training of individuals in other areas or departments of the organization so that everyone has an appreciation of the resources and limitations of the entire organization. Bess (1979) supports this idea and points to the expansion of the faculty focus as a way to improve the productivity of the university.

=====

Table 5
Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the
Professional Development Concept
The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When
Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Deleted</u>				
19.	Staff development should not be a high priority in community colleges.	7	.60	.61
27.	Staff training should be well planned to benefit the organization.	9	.51	.60
36.	Staff training is a waste of time and money.	9	.51	.52
<u>Items Selected</u>				
6.	People need staff development throughout their careers.	6	.61	.59
44.	Expanding the knowledge of other departments and sections of the college by information and idea exchange is useful in an organization.	6	.61	.58
51.	It is not necessary to know about other areas in the college.	6	.61	.58
58.	The broadening of career path development where managers move laterally increases enthusiasm and commitment to the organization as a whole.	6	.61	.51

continued.....

Table 5 (Continued)

		Analysis*		
Item No.	Item Text	Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Selected</u>				
65.	A specialist (one who knows a lot about a few things) is more important to an organization than a generalist (one who knows something about a lot of things).	6	.61	.54
73.	Cross-training would increase the productivity of the organization because people could appreciate the limitations and resources of other areas.	6	.61	.51

* Appendix C reports the statistical findings in detail

Team Development

The concept team development contained nine items (Table 6). Deletion of three items by Cronbach's Alpha method, items 7, 13, and 20 was accomplished according to the method described earlier. These items had a lower internal consistency with the other 6 items. The items were as follows:

7. In organizing a team or Quality Control Circle all levels of the organization must be represented.
13. Teams (Quality Control Circles) are a way for people to waste time.

20. Teams (Quality Control Circles) need to be organized around goals that have a whole task to be completed.

The best set of six items with an alpha coefficient of .64 were:

28. Teams (Quality Control Circles) organize the responsibility within the organization.
37. Administrators should guide and direct the teams (Quality Control Circles).
45. Participation and authority must be authentic (real) in order for teams to be effective.
52. Control and authority must be delegated to teams (Quality Control Circles) for them to have credibility.
59. The teams (Quality Control Circles) are a useful method for improving productivity and morale.
66. The role of the teams (Quality Control Circles) is to carry out the administrator's ideas.

The items deleted describe the organization of the teams. Individuals interviewed upon completion of the pilot test expressed the most confusion and concern with this concept. They felt that most people who would be tested in community colleges would be unfamiliar with Theory Z terms and suggested a definition list be included in the field test instrument. This was added and respondents in the field test phase commented on its usefulness.

Table 6

Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Team Development Concept
The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When
Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed

		Analysis*		
Item No.	Item Text	Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Deleted</u>				
7.	In organizing a team or Quality Control Circle all levels of the organization must be represented.	9	.63	.63
13.	Teams (Quality Control Circles) are a way for people to waste time.	9	.63	.64
20.	Teams (Quality Control Circles) need to be organized around goals that have a whole task to be completed.	9	.60	.63
<u>Items Selected</u>				
28.	Teams (Quality Control Circles) organize the responsibility within the organization.	6	.64	.57
37.	Administrators should guide and direct the teams (Quality Control Circles).	6	.64	.57
45.	Participation and authority must be authentic (real) in order for teams to be effective.	6	.64	.52
52.	Control and authority must be delegated to teams (Quality Control Circles) for them to have credibility.	6	.64	.57

continued.....

Table 6 (Continued)

		Analysis*		
Item No.	Item Text	Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Selected</u>				
59.	The teams (Quality Control Circles) are a useful method for improving productivity and morale.	6	.64	.61
66.	The role of the teams (Quality Control Circles) is to carry out the administrators ideas.	6	.64	.61

* Appendix C reports the statistical findings in detail

=====

The items that were included in the field test instrument dealt with who has the authority to guide and direct the teams. Drucker (1978) points to the quality control circle as the major difference between Theory Z and other theories as it organizes the responsibility in the organization. Other researchers (Geering, 1980; Hodge, 1977; Peters, 1978) state that the control and authority of the teams as perceived by others is critical to the team's success.

Stability

For the 15 items representing the stability concept, examination of the items to corrected total score correlational coefficients indicated that 9 items should be eliminated (Table 7). They are:

4. Organizations are conservative in nature.
8. Long-term employment of individuals provides organizational stability.
14. People are mobile and move every three to five years.
22. A highly structured organization provides stability for the employees.
29. The longer an employee works for an organization the more valuable he/she is to that organization.
38. People work longer in one position than perceived by most people.
43. The people in larger organizations feel a need for less stability, order, and direction.
53. If an individual is competent and talented he/she is secure within the organization.
68. Salary is a measure of security in an organization.

It should be noted that item 4 was inadvertently excluded from the final set of six (Table 7). If it had been included with the other 5 then it would have replaced item 75 with a resulting Alpha Coefficient of .57. Although the exclusion of item 4 resulted in an apparently less internally consistent scale for the stability concept, the use of item 75 in its place did not critically decrease it.

The remaining six items with an Alpha Coefficient of .50 follow:

46. An organization should only keep people for three years to promote change.
60. Organizations change radically all the time.
72. Organizations remain fairly stable over time and do not change radically.

- 75. Physical as well as psychological needs must be filled in order for an individual to feel secure within an organization.
- 79. Security is not important to people.
- 82. Security is not important to the organization.

The items that remained are an interesting group. Four of the six were negatively posed. Two of the items, 60 and 72, were the same statement written positively and negatively. Security is mentioned in items 79 and 82. Stability and change are mentioned in half of the items. The conservative and highly structured nature of community colleges could be a contributor here (Bess, 1979; Breneman, 1981; Marsh, 1980; Tannenbaum, 1976-77).

Table 7

Disposition of Pilot Test Items for the Stability Concept
The Number of Items Being Considered and Alpha Coefficient When
Item was Deleted, and the Alpha Coefficient if the Item was Removed

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Deleted</u>				
4	Organizations are conservative in nature.	6	.52	.57
8	Long-term employment of individuals provides organizational stability.	10	.52	.53
14.	People are mobile and move every three to five years.	15	.32	.32
22.	A highly structured organization provides stability for the employees.	15	.32	.35
29.	The longer an employee works for an organization the more valuable he/she is to that organization.	10	.52	.52
38.	People work longer in one position than perceived by most people.	7	.46	.50
43.	The people in larger organizations feel a need for less stability, order, and direction.	15	.32	.32
53.	If an individual is competent and talented he/she is secure within the organization.	15	.32	.39
68.	Salary is a measure of security in an organization.	15	.32	.36

continued.....

Table 7 (Continued)

Item No.	Item Text	Analysis*		
		Number of Items	Alpha	Alpha If Deleted
<u>Items Selected</u>				
46.	An organization should only keep people for three years to promote change.	6	.50	.44
60.	Organizations change radically all the time.	6	.50	.45
72.	Organizations remain fairly stable over time and do not change radically.	6	.50	.51
75.	Physical as well as psychological needs must be filled in order for an individual to feel secure within an organization.	6	.50	.47
79.	Security is not important to people.	6	.50	.43
82.	Security is not important to the organization.	6	.50	.37

* Appendix D reports the statistical findings in detail

=====

Summary of Pilot Test

Eighty-three items were initially developed for the pilot test instrument. A panel of experts was used to establish the face validity of the items. Of the 83 items in the pilot test instrument, 42 items were selected for the field test instrument. This constituted 6

items for each of the seven concepts. Alpha coefficients of internal consistency range from .50 to .81.

The complete list of items remaining for the field test are found in Appendix D.

The items that survived the analysis seem to adequately represent the review of literature as described in each concept section. There was a mixture of negatively and positively worded items selected and a balance of one-, two-, and three-line items remained. Items that focused on levels of the organization were selected in the Trust and Consistency Philosophy concepts, but were eliminated in the Communication concept. This raises the question that perhaps communication within levels of the organization is not as important as is communication in general throughout the entire organization, but it is critical to the trust and consistent philosophy of an organization.

CHAPTER 3

FIELD TEST

Sample

Three community colleges in the State of Washington were selected as representative of all community colleges in the Northwest, based on the following criteria: size, location, and organizational structure. The size ranged from the smallest college at 1600 FTE to the largest college at 4,500 FTE, and represented a rural agricultural, a light industrial, and an urban residential population. One of the three colleges represented a multi-college district, while the other two were single college districts. All three colleges were traditionally structured with deans, associate deans, and directors at the administrative level, and division chairs or department heads at the faculty level.

All persons in each of the organizations were asked to participate in the study. The response rate was 43 per cent (286 of 622 subjects) (Table 8). The distributions of respondents by their positions type and administrative unit were as follows: Administrative Unit with 25.0 per cent of the total administrators and 17.3 per cent of the total classified staff for 10.1 per cent of the total respondents; Instruction unit with 35.0 per cent of the administrators, 94.1 per cent of the faculty, and 56.3 per cent of the total respondents; Students' Services Unit with 25.0 per cent of the total administra-

tors, 5.2 per cent of the total faculty, and 17.5 per cent of the total respondents; the other category consisted of 15.0 per cent of the administrators, .7 per cent of the faculty, and 35.5 per cent of the classified for 16.1 per cent of the total respondents (Table 9). Because of the number of subjects available in each cell, three one-way analyses of variance were used instead of a two-way analysis of variance to examine the construct validity of the instrument.

Table 8
Number of Response Rate for the Field Test

	<u>College 1</u>	<u>College 2</u>	<u>College 3</u>	<u>Total</u>
Potential Subjects	136	227	299	662
Response	71	83	132	286
Response Rate	52%	37%	45%	43%

Table 9
Number and Percentage of Respondents by
College Position and College Unit

<u>College</u>	<u>College Position</u>							
	<u>Administrators</u>		<u>Faculty</u>		<u>Classified</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Administrative	10	25.0	0	0	19	17.3	29	10.1
Instruction	14	35.0	128	94.1	19	17.3	161	56.3
Student Services	10	25.0	7	5.2	33	30.1	50	17.5
Other	6	15.0	1	.7	39	35.5	46	16.1
Total	40	100.0	136	100.0	110	100.0	286	100.0

Instrument

The field test instrument was constructed by utilizing the six most internally consistent items for each of the seven concepts for a total of 42 items that were identified as a result of the item analysis of pilot test data (Appendix D). The items were randomly arranged and contained positive and negative statements. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire from their own perspective in their current positions. They were asked to respond to a seven-point rating scale to determine greater differentiation of responses (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1965). Intervals or choices were: strongly agree, agree, partially agree, neutral, partially disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Based on the input from the pilot test, items that might be misunderstood and would need further clarification were noted with asterisks (*) and a definition list was added to the end of the field test (Appendix D).

Procedures

Each college president was initially contacted by telephone and an appointment was set up to visit him and anyone he deemed appropriate to discuss the possibility of using their college as a field test site. The presidents in each case were positive and interested in participating in the survey but had concerns about the reactions of

their staff members. In order to gain the commitment of the staff, a formal presentation was made to the instructional council for each college. Copies of the instrument were distributed and the council members discussed the advantages and disadvantages of participating in the survey. Each member voted and in each case the decision was to participate in the study.

Procedures for distributing and collecting the survey were discussed for each college. At two of the colleges the deans of instruction were the persons responsible for collecting the surveys and the director of personnel was responsible at the third college. The presidents were responsible for distributing the instruments to the administrators, and a designated administrator--different in all three colleges--was assigned to distribute and collect from the classified staff. The collection of the surveys in all three cases at all levels was accomplished by setting up a central location so that people could voluntarily turn in their completed surveys. The voluntary nature of the collection could bias the results; however, it was felt that additional pressure could result if people were forced to participate by their administrators and create additional biasing.

The respondents were given three days to return their instruments. the surveys were collected in one central place on each campus and were mailed or delivered in person. The surveys were three different colors for ease of handling and distinguishing individual colleges.

Internal Consistency

The SPSS Reliability procedure was used to analyze the six items representing each concept. As discussed in Chapter 2, Pilot Test, one of the purposes for the analysis was to reduce the size of the instrument by removing one item from each concept. By this procedure the instrument length would be reduced to 35 items. The effect of reducing the items for each concept to four was also examined to determine whether or not the internal consistency would be lowered for each concept. The means and standard deviations and the intercorrelation coefficients for the items in each concept are presented in Appendix E.

The summary of the results of using SPSS Reliability procedure for the six, five, and four items in each of the seven concepts is shown in Table 10. The detailed description of the statistics are reported in Appendix E. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for internal consistency for 6 items ranged from .35 to .81. For each of the seven concepts the item to corrected total score correlation coefficient and the Cronbach's Alpha with the item removed were examined to see if five items markedly reduced the internal consistency for the concept. Removal of an item did not affect the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient markedly for six of the seven concepts, and it improved the internal consistency of one concept.

=====

Table 10
Summary of the Disposition of Field Test Items
for all Seven Concepts Showing Six-Item Alpha Coefficient,
Five-Item Alpha Coefficient,
and Four-Item Alpha Coefficient

Concept	6-Item Alpha Coefficient	5-Item Alpha Coefficient	4-Item Alpha Coefficient
Trust	.79	.78	.76
Participative Decision Making	.76	.75	.73
Open Communication	.54	.54	.53
Consistent Philosophy	.81	.88	.87
Professional Development	.47	.60	.56
Team Development	.35	.46	.48
Stability	.38	.41	.41

=====

To determine the advisability of using four items to represent each concept rather than five for the final instrument, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for all possible combinations of four items were examined for each concept (Table 10). With the exception of one concept, team development, the internal consistency would be reduced for two concepts and would not affect the internal consistency for the other five concepts. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of internal consistency for five items ranged from .41 to .88.

Construct Validity

A priori, the responses by classified staff, faculty, and administrators should be fairly consistent throughout the organization. It also seems reasonable to assume that there should be no differences in responses between the units within the college. Finally, respondents should differentiate among the concepts. Intercorrelation coefficients among the concepts are shown in Table 11. Sixteen of the 20 correlation coefficients were significant ($p \leq .05$) but relatively low. This seems to indicate that the subjects were differentiating among the concepts. Furthermore, t-tests of the differences between the means of all possible pairs of concepts strongly indicated that they perceived the concepts differently. As can be viewed in Table 12, means for 20 of the 21 pairs of concepts were significantly different.

Outcomes of tests to determine differences between concept means by administrative unit in colleges, types of personnel, and institutions were expected. Subjects who were in administrative services, instructional services, students' services, and other units did not respond differently on all seven concepts (Table 13). Administrators differed in their ratings of the concept trust ($F = 3.23$, $ndf = 2,269$, $p = .04$) from the faculty members and the classified staff, but the mean concept scores among the three types of personnel did not differ for the other six concepts (Table 14). Only one of the concepts,

Consistent Philosophy, was viewed differently ($F = 17.87$, $ndf = 2,274$, $p = .00$) by respondents in each of the three colleges (Table 15).

=====

Table 11
Intercorrelation Coefficients Among the Concepts
(Information within Each Cell is Presented in Descending Order of
Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient,
Number of Subjects, and Probability)

Concept	<u>Trust</u>	<u>Decision Making</u>	<u>Open Communi- cation</u>	<u>Consist- ent Philo- sophy</u>	<u>Profes- sional Develop- ment</u>	<u>Team Develop- ment</u>
Decision Making	.52 286 .00					
Open Communication	.63 286 .00	.57 286 .00				
Consistent Philosophy	.09 277 .07	.12 277 .02	.07 277 .13			
Professional Development	.44 286 .00	.50 286 .00	.48 286 .00	.07 277 .13		
Team Development	.38 283 .00	.40 283 .00	.27 283 .00	.11 276 .03	.42 283 .00	
Stability	.18 286 .00	.21 286 .00	.21 286 .00	.15 277 .01	-.01 286 .44	.07 283 .11

=====

Table 12
t-Test of the Differences Between the
Means of All Possible Pairs of Concepts

Concept	\bar{X}	s	s	ndf	p

TRUST					
286	6.14	.76	5.84	285	.00
	5.96	.58			
PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING					

TRUST					
286	6.25	.72	6.48	285	.00
	6.00	.59			
COMMUNICATION					

TRUST					
277	6.26	.73	24.81	276	.00
	4.21	1.23			
CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY					

TRUST					
286	6.25	.74	13.3	285	.00
	5.60	.82			
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT					

TRUST					
283	6.25	.75	26.59	282	.00
	4.81	.38			

Table 12 (Continued, 2)

Concept	\bar{X}	s	s	ndf	p

TRUST					
286	6.25	.75	6.49	285	.00
	5.77	.72			
STABILITY					

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING					
286	5.97	.88	-.66	285	.39
	6.01	.69			
COMMUNICATION					

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING					
277	5.98	.87	29.82	276	.00
	4.21	1.23			
CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY					

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING					
256	5.68	.88	7.27	285	.00
	5.60	.82			
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT					

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING					
283	5.98	.23	20.21	282	.00
	4.81	.88			

Table 12 (Continued, 3)

Concept	\bar{X}	s	s	ndf	p

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING					
286	5.97	.88	3.25	245	.00
	5.77	.72			
STABILITY					

COMMUNICATION					
277	6.02	.65	22.25	276	.00
	4.21	1.23			
CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY					

COMMUNICATION					
286	6.01	.59	8.76	285	.00
	5.60	.82			
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT					

COMMUNICATION					
283	6.81	.69	4.46	258	.00
	4.81	.88			

COMMUNICATION					
286	6.01	.58	20.91	282	.00
	5.77	.72			
STABILITY					

Table 12 (Continued, 4)

Concept	<u>X̄</u>	<u>s</u>	<u>s</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>p</u>

CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY					
277	4.21	1.23	-16.10	276	.00
	5.60	.32			
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT					

CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY					
276	4.22	1.23	6.99	275	.00
	4.82	.88			

CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY					
277	4.21	1.23	-19.66	276	.00
	5.78	.71			
STABILITY					

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT					
283	5.63	.31	14.51	282	.00
	6.31	.88			

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT					
286	5.60	.82	-2.58	285	.00
	5.77	.72			
STABILITY					

Table 12 (Continued, 5)

<u>Concept</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>s</u>	<u>s</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>p</u>

283	4.81	.88			
	5.77	.72	-14.71	282	.00

STABILITY

=====

Table 13
Analysis of Variance by College Unit

TRUST

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	2.30	3	.77	1.58	.20
Within Groups	<u>114.87</u>	<u>237</u>	.48		
TOTAL	117.16	240			

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	1.53	3	.51	.75	.53
Within Groups	<u>162.18</u>	<u>237</u>	.68		
TOTAL	162.71	240			

COMMUNICATION

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	1.19	3	.40	.96	.41
Within Groups	<u>97.86</u>	<u>237</u>	.41		
TOTAL	99.05	240			

CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	8.77	3	2.92	2.06	.11
Within Groups	<u>331.51</u>	<u>233</u>	1.42		
TOTAL	340.28	236			

Table 13 (Continued, 2)

=====					
<u>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u>					
<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	.40	3	.13	.22	.88
Within Groups	<u>140.85</u>	<u>237</u>	.57		
TOTAL	141.24	240			
=====					
<u>TEAM DEVELOPMENT</u>					
<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	.30	3	.10	.14	.94
Within Groups	<u>168.67</u>	<u>234</u>	.72		
TOTAL	168.97	237			
=====					
<u>STABILITY</u>					
<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	2.89	3	.96	1.91	.13
Within Groups	<u>119.93</u>	<u>237</u>	.51		
TOTAL	122.83	240			
=====					

Table 14
Analysis of Variance by Position

TRUST

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	3.64	2	1.82	3.23	.04
Within Groups	<u>151.27</u>	<u>269</u>	.56		
TOTAL	154.90	271			

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	.87	2	.43	.64	.53
Within Groups	<u>181.97</u>	<u>269</u>	.68		
TOTAL	182.84	271			

COMMUNICATION

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	1.60	2	.80	1.75	.18
Within Groups	<u>122.86</u>	<u>269</u>	.46		
TOTAL	124.46	271			

Least square difference: Classified = faculty < administrators

Mean = 6.20 6.21 6.54

Table 14 (Continued, 2)

CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	6.06	2	3.03	2.01	.14
Within Groups	<u>391.24</u>	<u>260</u>	1.50		
TOTAL	379.30	262			

=====
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	2.01	2	1.01	1.68	.19
Within Groups	<u>161.06</u>	<u>269</u>	.60		
TOTAL	163.07	271			

=====
TEAM DEVELOPMENT

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	2.23	2	1.12	1.50	.22
Within Groups	<u>197.59</u>	<u>266</u>	.74		
TOTAL	199.82	268			

=====
STABILITY

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	1.28	2	.64	1.24	.29
Within Groups	<u>138.62</u>	<u>269</u>	.52		
TOTAL	139.89				

=====

Table 15
Analysis of Variance by College

TRUST

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	.30	2	.15	.26	.78
Within Groups	<u>165.09</u>	<u>283</u>	.58		
TOTAL	165.39	285			

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	3.93	2	1.96	2.57	.08
Within Groups	<u>216.42</u>	<u>283</u>	.76		
TOTAL	220.35	285			

COMMUNICATION

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	.22	2	.11	.23	.79
Within Groups	<u>134.66</u>	<u>283</u>	.48		
TOTAL	134.88	285			

CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	48.21	2	24.10	17.87	.00
Within Groups	<u>369.56</u>	<u>274</u>	1.35		
TOTAL	417.76	276			

Table 15 (Continued, 2)

=====					
<u>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u>					
<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	1.04	2	.52	.78	.46
Within Groups	<u>189.56</u>	<u>283</u>	.67		
TOTAL	190.60	285			
=====					
<u>TEAM DEVELOPMENT</u>					
<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	.76	2	.38	.49	.61
Within Groups	<u>216.71</u>	<u>280</u>	.77		
TOTAL	217.47	282			
=====					
<u>STABILITY</u>					
<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>ndf</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between Groups	2.53	2	1.26	2.44	.09
Within Groups	<u>146.50</u>	<u>283</u>	.52		
TOTAL	149.02	285			
=====					

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to develop a valid and reliable measure of the organizational climate in a community college as perceived by community college administrators, faculty, and classified staff, utilizing the seven concepts proposed by Ouchi (1971). The initial instrument used in the pilot test was organized around the seven concepts. Items were generated for each of the concepts and submitted to a panel of experts. The 83-item pilot test instrument was administered to an entire community college staff (54 subjects) in Washington. A random sample of that staff was interviewed for a second view of the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha method was used to assess the internal consistency of the instrument. Based on the results, 42 items were selected for the field test instrument.

The field test instrument was administered to the entire staff of three community colleges in Washington. Two hundred eighty-six of the subjects provided usable responses. The SPSS Reliability procedure's Cronbach's Alpha Method for determining internal consistency was used to analyze the data. Coefficients of reliability for the seven 5-item concepts ranged from .41 to .88. A 35-item instrument was developed to increase response rate and face validity. In six of the seven concepts, the Alpha coefficient was not significantly diminished and was improved in one concept. Differences in responses were

not found in four major areas: units of the college, positions within the college, between colleges themselves, and among the seven concepts. Differences in concept means were found only among the seven concepts. The 35 items contained in the instrument follow:

1. Trusting my superiors increases my productivity in the organization.
2. People need staff development throughout their careers.
3. The less people know, the better.
4. Consensus decision making (where agreement is reached) leads to more productive and satisfied employees.
5. A communication system that works is important in a healthy organization.
6. Trust between levels of the organization is important.
7. Teams (Quality Control Circles)* organize the responsibility within the organization.
8. The president of the college feels that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
9. An organization should keep people for only three years to promote change.
10. Being involved in the decision-making process promotes trust at all levels.
11. Trusting the people who work for me increases my productivity in the organization.
12. Organizational structure facilitates communication.
13. Participation and authority must be authentic or real in order for teams to be effective.
14. The role of the teams (Quality Control Circles)* is to carry out the administrators' ideas.
15. Expanding the knowledge of other departments and sections of the college by information and idea exchange is useful in an organization.

16. It is important to the organization to trust your peers.
17. Communication is facilitated by participation.
18. Middle managers (directors, division chairs, and associate deans) feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
19. Control and authority must be delegated to teams (Quality Control Circles)* for them to have credibility.
20. The broadening of career path development* where managers move laterally increases enthusiasm and commitment to the organization as a whole.
21. Organizations change radically all the time.
22. Paranoia exists when there is a lack of communication.
23. Decisions made in isolation without input enable the people in the organization to be more productive.
24. Security is not important to people.
25. Feedback is important to communication in an organization.
26. Faculty feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
27. I don't need to cooperate with my peers.
28. Classified staff feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
29. Cross-training would increase the productivity of the organization because people could appreciate the limitations and resources of the other areas.
30. Organizations remain fairly stable over time and do not change radically.
31. The teams (Quality Control Circle)* are a useful method for improving productivity and morale.

32. Decisions made behind closed doors make for a more productive organization.
33. Security is not important to the organization.
34. The deans feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.
35. It is not necessary to know about other areas in the college.

Conclusions

The instrument is reliable if administered under similar circumstances. The instrument is usable as a total unit to assess the organizational climate of a community college with characteristics similar to those described in the field study. The length of the instrument (35 items) should facilitate its administration as described in the summary.

Implications

The 35-item instrument may be administered to any community college in the Northwest with similar characteristics to acquire information on the organizational climate. The instrument could give the president of a community college the information necessary to construct an organizational climate profile. It could be used within divisions of the college or as a self-study. This profile would point out deficiencies in the organization that could be improved through

organizational change, inservice, and human resource development. Instructions for administration and interpretation of the data are included in Appendix F.

Another method should be utilized in conjunction with the questionnaire to establish concurrent validity. A case study approach could supplement the data from the questionnaire and results could be compared and analyzed.

Further study should concentrate on establishing norms that would give standards against which community colleges could measure their performances. Caution should be used without established norms in the interpretation of the data.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bender, Robert L. Management Principles for the Community College Administrator, Brevard Community College, Cocoa, Florida, 1977.
- Bess, James L. "Generalists, Specialists, and Academic Organization." Association for the Study of Higher Education, April 1979.
- Blake, R.; Mauton, J.; and Williams, M. The Academic Administrator Grid. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Breneman, David W., and Nelson, Susan C. Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1981.
- Burns, R. D. "Need for Purposefulness." Current, Washington, D.C., January 1979.
- Burroni, Jerry. "Has the College Organization Kept Pace?" New Directions for Community Colleges, Spring 1976.
- Carhart, John I., and Collins, Charles C. Governance: A Community College Model. Pittsburg, California: Community College Press, Las Medanos College Bookstore, 1977.
- Cronbach, Lee J.; Rajaratnam, Negaswari; and Gleser, Goldine C. "Theory of Generalizability: A Liberation of Reliability." The British Journal of Statistical Psychology XVI, No. 2 (November 1963): 138-163.
- Dillon, Don A. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Drucker, Peter F. Management. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Evans, M. G. "The Effects of Supervisory Behavior Upon Worker Perception of their Path: Goal Relationships." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1968.
- Fiedler, Fred, and Chemers, Martin. Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1974, pp. 63-81; 91-93.
- Fleishman, E. A.; Harris, E. F.; and Burth, H. E. "Leadership and Supervision in Industry." Unpublished paper, Ohio State University, 1955.

- Geering, Adrian D. "An Analysis of Leadership Theory and its Application to Higher Education." Unpublished paper, Adelaide College of the Arts and Education, Australia, October 1980.
- Gronlund, Norman. Constructing Achievement Tests. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1982.
- Harmons, James O. Proceedings: The Conference on Questions and Issues in Planning Community College Staff Development Programs, University of Pennsylvania, Center for the Study of Higher Education, July 1974.
- Hampton, D.; Fiedler, Fred; and Chemers, M. Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman & Co., 1978.
- Handy, C. Management by Consent. London: University of London, Institute of Education, May 1973.
- Henderson, M. E.; Morris, L. L.; and Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. How to Measure Attitudes. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1978.
- Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: The World, 1966.
- Hodge, B. J. Governance: A Community College Model. Pittsburgh, CA: Community College Press, Las Medanos College Bookstore, 1977.
- Janetos, Peter. "Performance Management: Staying on Top of the Job." Journal of College and University Personnel, October-November 1976.
- Lee, John. Management Principles for the Community College Administrator. Cocoa, FL: Brevard Community College Press, 1977.
- Levinson, H. Leadership Versus Management. Cambridge: The Levinson Institute, 1976.
- Maccoby, Michael. The Leader. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1981.
- Marsh, James G. "How We Talk and How We Act: Administrative Theory and Administrative Life." Seventh David D. Henry Lecture, Illinois University, Urbana, September 1980.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.
- Maslow, A. H. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand, 1965.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. Surviving the Eighties. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Tide of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Nichols, David A. "Can Theory Z Be Applied to Academic Management?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1 September 1982.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. H.; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, K.; and Bent, Dale H. SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Osgood, Charles E.; Suci, George E.; and Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Ill. Press, 1965.
- Ouchi, William. Theory Z. New York: Avon, 1981.
- Pesuth, F. T. "A Survey of the Management System at St. Petersburg Junior College Using Likert's Profile." Doctoral Dissertation, Nova University, April 1976.
- Peters, J. K. "Possible Applications of Management by Objectives to the Community College." Unpublished paper, University of California, Los Angeles, 1978.
- Pollay, Richard; Taylor, Ronald; and Thompson, Marsh. "A Model for Horizontal Power Sharing and Participants in University Decision Making." Journal of Higher Education, March-April 1976.
- Priest, Bill J., and Pieheman, John E. "Increasing Productivity in the Community College." Speech given to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Conference, 1976.
- Stogdill, R. M. Handbook of Leadership. New York: Macmillan/Free Press, 1974.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S.; Cook, Robert A.; Peterson, Mark F.; and Cardoze, Stephen. Research on Control and Participation in C.C.N.I.E Report, National Institute of Education, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, 1976-77.
- Vaughn, K. W. "Planning the Objective Test." In Educational Measurement, edited by D. F. Lindquist. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1951.
- Young, David A. "Organizational Theory." Implications for Design Administrators Update, VIN3, Winter 1980.
- Zion, Carol. "A Focus for Administrative Growth and Evaluation." Journal of the College and University Personnel, Summer 1977.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
POOL OF TEST ITEMS

POOL OF TEST ITEMS

You have been selected as a participant in a panel of experts to evaluate a set of test items that describe organizational climate in the community college. There are two steps in this judgmental process:

1. Please check each item as to whether it describes the concepts indicated. Check Yes___ if the statement does describe; check No___ if the statement does not describe.
2. Please check each item as to whether it is understandable and clear. Check Yes___ if the statement is clear; check No___ if the statement is unclear.

Concept 1: Trust

Describes the Understand/
Concept Clear

Sub-concept: Vertical Trust

- | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Trusting my superiors increases my productivity in the organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) I only need to trust myself in an organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) Trusting the people that work for me increases my productivity in the organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) Trust between levels of the organization is important. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Where there is no trust, there is no commitment to the organization's goals and objectives. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 6) I can't trust anyone in this organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Sub-concept: Horizontal Trust

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Trust is not needed between departments/divisions. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) It is important to the organization to trust your peers. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) It is only important to trust myself. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 1: Trust			
Sub-Concept: Horizontal Trust (Cont.)		Describes the Concept	Understand/ Clear
4)	When you leave on vacation, you can trust your co-workers to assume your responsibilities.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
5)	Cooperation is more important than competition in achieving productivity.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
6)	I don't need to cooperate with my peers.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
Concept 2: Participative Decision Making			
Sub-concept: Consensus Decision Making		Describes the Concept	Understand/ Clear
1)	Everyone in the department should agree on important issues.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
2)	Everyone must have a vote as well as a voice in a department.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
3)	Consensus decision making leads to more productive and satisfied employees.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
4)	Agreement is not important in decision making.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
5)	Being involved in the decision making process promotes trust at all levels.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
6)	Decision thinking is more important than decision making.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
Sub-Concept: Participation			
1)	Communication is facilitated by participation.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
2)	Participation reinforces commitment to the organization.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
3)	Decisions made in isolation without input enable the people in the organization to be more productive.	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___

Concept 2: Participative Decision MakingSub-Concept: Participation (Cont.)Describes the
ConceptUnderstand/
Clear

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 4) Only "certain" people should participate in decision making. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Decisions made behind closed doors makes for a more productive organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 3: Open CommunicationSub-concept: Information and Knowledge

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) People want to and should know as much as possible about their work environment. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) The less people know the better. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) A communication system is important in a healthy organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) Keeping people in the dark facilitates communication. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Paranoia exists when there is a lack of communication. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Sub-concept: Vertical Communication

- | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| 1) The communication flow should be upward. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) The communication flow should be downward. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) Administrators communicate mostly downward. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) All people want upward communication. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Listening as well as talking is important in communication. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 3: Open Communication (Cont)
Sub-concept: Horizontal Communication

Describes the
Concept

Understand/
Clear

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Feedback is important to communication in an organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) There is more communication within sections and departments than across sections and across departments. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) It is only important to communicate within your own section. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) Organizational structure facilitates communication. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) It is more important to communicate with other sections and departments. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 4: Consistent Philosophy

Subconcept: Individual Goals and Objectives

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Individual goals and objectives are more important than organizational goals and objectives. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) All staff members do not need to agree on a central set of goals and objectives. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) There should be a consistent philosophy for everyone in the organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) Individual goals and objectives must be compatible with organizational goals and objectives. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Subconcept: Commitment of the Total Organization

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) It takes the commitment of everyone to the organization's goals and objectives to be successful. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) Only the administrators need to be committed to the organization's goals and objectives. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 4: Consistent Philosophy
Subconcept: Commitment of the Total organization (Cont.)

Describes the
Concept

Understand/
Clear

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 3) The administrator sets the tone of the organization by clarifying the organization's goals and objectives. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) Middle managers feel that the goals of the organizations are clear and well defined. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Faculty members feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 6) Classified staff feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 5: Professional Development

Sub-concept: Staff Training

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) People need staff development throughout their careers. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) Staff training is a vital medium for communication and the solution of problems. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) Staff development should be a high priority in community colleges. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) Staff training should be well planned to benefit the organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Staff training is a waste of time and money. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Sub-concept: Cross Training

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Expanding the knowledge of other inter-relating areas by information and idea exchange is useful in an organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
|---|--------------|--------------|

Concept 5: Professional Development
Sub-concept: Cross Training (Cont.)

Describes the
Concept

Understand/
Clear

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 2) It is not necessary to know about other areas in the college. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) The broadening of career path development where managers move laterally increases enthusiasm and commitment to the organization as a whole. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) A specialist is more important to an organization than a generalist. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Cross training would increase the productivity of the organization because people could appreciate the limitations and resources of the other areas. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 6: Team Development

Structure of Teams

- | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| 1) In organizing a team or QC Circle all levels of the organization must be represented. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) QC Circles are a way for people to waste time. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) Teams need to organize around goals that have a whole task to be completed. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) Quality Control Circles organize the responsibility within the organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Administrators should guide and direct the teams. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Sub-concept: Role of Teams

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Participation and authority must be authentic in order for the team to be effective. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
|---|--------------|--------------|

Concept 6: Team Development
Role of Teams (Cont.)

Describes the
Concept

Understand/
Clear

- | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| 2) To the extent control and authority is delegated to teams determines the amount of credibility perceived by others. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) The Quality Control Circle is a useful method for improving productivity and morale. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) The role of the Quality Control Circle is to carry out the administrator's ideas. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 7: Stability

Sub-concept: Long-term Employment

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Long-term employment of individuals provides organizational stability. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) People are mobile and move every three to five years. | | |
| 3) A highly structured organization provides stability for the employees | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 4) The longer an employee works for an organization the more valuable he/she is to that organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) People work longer at one position than perceived by most people. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 6) An organization should only keep people for three years. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Sub-concept: Security

- | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| 1) An individual's talent provides security within the organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 2) Organizations change radically all the time. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 3) Salary is a measure of security in an organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

Concept 7: StabilitySubconcept: Security (Cont.)Describes the
ConceptUnderstand/
Clear

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 4) Physical as well as psychological needs must be filled in order for an individual to feel secure within an organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 5) Security is not important to people. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 6) Security is not important to the organization. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 7) The people in larger organizations feel a need for less stability, order, and direction. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 8) Organizations remain fairly stable over time and do not change radically. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |
| 9) Organizations are conservative in nature. | Yes___ No___ | Yes___ No___ |

APPENDIX B
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SURVEY
PILOT STUDY

Other _____

6. People need staff development throughout their careers.

Strongly Agree

Organizational Climate Survey (Cont.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7. In organizing a team or Quality Control Circle all levels of the organization must be represented.							
8. Long-term employment of individuals provides organizational stability.							
9. I only need to trust myself in this organization.							
10. In making decisions, everyone must have a vote as well as a voice in my department.							
11. The less people know, the better.							
12. Individual goals and objectives are more important than organizational goals and objectives.							
13. Teams (Quality Control Circles) are a way for people to waste time.							
14. People are mobile and move every three to five years.							
15. Trusting the people who work for me increases my productivity in the organization.							
16. Consensus decision making (where agreement is reached) leads to more-productive and satisfied employees.							
17. A communication system that works is important in a healthy organization.							
18. There should be a consistent philosophy for everyone in the organization.							

Organizational Climate Survey (Cont.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. Staff development should not be a high priority in community colleges.							
20. Teams (Quality Control Circles) need to be organized around goals that have a whole task to be completed.							
21. It is only important to communicate within your own section or department.							
22. A highly structured organization provides stability for the employees.							
23. Trust between levels of the organization is important.							
24. Agreement is not important in decision making.							
25. Keeping people in the dark facilitates communication.							
26. Individual goals and objectives must be compatible with organizational goals and objectives.							
27. Staff training should be well planned to benefit the organization.							
28. Teams (Quality Control Circles) organize the responsibility within the organization.							
29. The longer an employee works for an organization the more valuable he/she is to that organization.							
30. Where there is no trust between people in an organization there is no commitment to the organization's goals and objectives.							

Organizational Climate Survey (Cont.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
31. Organizational structure facilitates communication.							
32. Being involved in the decision-making process promotes trust at all levels.							
33. The president of the college feels that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
34. Paranoia exists when there is a lack of communication.							
35. It takes the commitment of everyone to the organization's goals and objectives for the organization to be successful.							
36. Staff training is a waste of time and money.							
37. Administrators should guide and direct the teams (Quality Control Circles).							
38. People work longer in one position than perceived by most people.							
39. I can't trust anyone in this organization.							
40. Decision thinking is more important than decision making.							
41. The communication flow in an organization should be upward (from classified staff in an organization to top management).							

Organizational Climate Survey (Cont.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
42. Only the administrators need to be committed to the organization's goals and objectives.							
43. The people in larger organizations feel less of a need for stability, order, and direction.							
44. Expanding the knowledge of other departments and sections out of the college by information and idea exchange is useful in an organization.							
45. Participation and authority must be authentic (real) in order for teams to be effective.							
46. An organization should only keep people for three years to promote change.							
47. Trust is not needed between departments/divisions.							
48. Communication is facilitated by participation.							
49. The communication flow should be downward (from top administration down).							
50. The top administrators set the tone of the organization by clarifying the organization's goals and objectives.							
51. It is not necessary to know about other areas in the college.							
52. Control and authority must be delegated to teams (Quality Control Circles) for them to have credibility.							

Organizational Climate Survey (Cont.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
53. If an individual is competent and talented he/she is secure within the organization.							
54. It is important to the organization to trust your peers.							
55. Participation reinforces commitment to the organization.							
56. Administrators communicate mostly downward.							
57. Middle managers (Directors & Division Chairs) feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
58. The broadening of career path development where managers move laterally increases enthusiasm and commitment to the organization as a whole.							
59. The teams (Quality Control Circles) are a useful method for improving productivity and morale.							
60. Organizations change radically all the time.							
61. It is only important to trust myself in the organization.							
62. Decisions made in isolation without input enable the people in the organization to be more productive.							
63. All people want to be able to communicate with the level above them.							

Organizational Climate Survey (Cont.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
64. Faculty members feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
65. A specialist (one who knows a lot about a few things) is more important to an organization than a generalist (one who knows something about a lot of things).							
66. The role of the teams (Quality Control Circles) is to carry out the administrator's ideas.							
67. It is more important to communicate with other sections and departments than within your own department or section.							
68. Salary is a measure of security in an organization.							
69. When you leave on vacation, you can trust your co-workers to assume your responsibilities.							
70. Only "selected" people should participate in decision making.							
71. Listening as well as talking is important in communication.							
72. Organizations remain fairly stable over time and do not change radically.							
73. Cross training would increase the productivity of the organization because people could appreciate the limitations and resources of the other areas.							

Organizational Climate Survey (Cont.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
74. Classified staff members feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
75. Physical as well as psychological needs must be filled in order for an individual to feel secure within an organization.							
76. Cooperation is more important than competition in achieving productivity.							
77. Decisions made behind closed doors make for a more productive organization.							
78. Feedback is important to communication in an organization.							
79. Security is not important to people.							
80. I don't need to cooperate with my peers.							
81. There is more communication within sections and departments than between sections and departments.							
82. Security is not important to the organization.							
83. The deans feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							

APPENDIX C
PILOT STUDY STATISTICS

Table C-1
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Trust

<u>Item-Total Statistics</u>				
<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	58.71	21.50	.39	.58
9	58.71	22.79	.40	.59
15	58.85	22.04	.46	.58
23	58.55	22.39	.52	.58
30	59.55	22.87	.14	.63
39	59.75	22.02	.05	.69
47	58.51	24.08	.20	.61
54	59.04	22.08	.52	.57
69	60.79	18.70	.30	.61
76	59.51	18.92	.53	.54
80	58.51	23.96	.28	.61

<u>Source of Variation</u>					
	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	111.71	48	2.32		
Within People	656.36	490	1.33		
Between Measure	240.52	10	24.05	27.76	.00
Residual	415.87	480	.86		
TOTAL	768.07	538	1.42		

Alpha = .62
n = 49

Table C-2
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Nine Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Trust

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	47.80	15.34	.55	.68
9	47.80	17.25	.46	.70
15	48.04	16.28	.57	.68
23	47.83	17.43	.48	.70
47	47.69	17.97	.36	.72
54	48.22	16.93	.53	.70
69	49.98	13.81	.30	.78
76	48.69	14.22	.52	.69
80	47.69	18.22	.37	.72

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	107.01	48	2.23		
Within People	438.67	392	1.12		
Between Measure	208.78	8	26.10	43.59	.00
Residual	229.39	384	.60		
TOTAL	545.67	440	1.24		

Alpha = .73
n = 49

Table C-3
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The First Set of Seven Pilot Test Items
Addressing the Concept Trust

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	37.08	8.32	.54	.72
9	37.08	9.78	.46	.74
15	37.22	6.80	.64	.70
23	37.02	9.72	.54	.73
47	36.87	10.40	.33	.76
54	37.40	9.57	.52	.73
76	37.87	7.48	.50	.75

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	82.28	48	1.71		
Within People	147.42	294	.50		
Between Measure	32.48	5	5.41	13.56	.00
Residual	114.93	288	.39		
TOTAL	229.71	342	.67		

Alpha = .77
n = 49

Table C-4
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The Second Set of Seven Pilot Test Items
Addressing the Concept Trust

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	34.79	12.29	.52	.65
9	34.79	14.12	.39	.68
15	34.93	13.10	.55	.65
23	34.73	14.11	.45	.68
54	35.12	13.69	.50	.67
69	36.87	10.40	.31	.76
76	35.59	10.78	.56	.63

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	112.57	48	2.34		
Within People	370.28	294	1.25		
Between Measure	174.20	6	29.03	42.64	.00
Residual	<u>196.08</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>.68</u>		
TOTAL	482.85	342	1.41		

Alpha = .71
n = 49

Table C-5
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For the Third Set of Seven Pilot Test Items
Addressing the Concept Trust

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	37.08	8.28	.54	.73
9	37.08	9.74	.45	.75
15	37.22	8.72	.65	.71
23	37.02	9.65	.54	.74
54	37.41	9.37	.56	.75
76	37.88	7.44	.50	.78
80	36.88	10.40	.39	.76

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	81.71	48	1.70		
Within People	144.00	294	.48		
Between Measure	32.48	6	5.41	13.98	.00
Residual	<u>111.51</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>.39</u>		
TOTAL	225.71	342	.66		

Alpha = .77
n = 49

Table C-6
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Trust

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	31.5	4.96	.41	.77
9	31.5	5.50	.52	.72
15	31.7	4.84	.67	.68
23	31.5	5.58	.56	.72
54	31.9	5.50	.50	.73
80	31.3	6.01	.47	.74

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	59.54	48	1.24		
Within People	77.63	245	.31	5.59	.00
Between Measure	8.11	5	1.62		
Residual	<u>69.56</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>.29</u>		
TOTAL	137.21	293	.49		

Alpha = .77
n = 49

Table C-7
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Decision Making

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
2	54.08	26.98	-.20	.54
10	54.31	19.05	.25	.31
16	53.11	22.46	.46	.30
24	54.05	19.93	.25	.32
32	53.22	19.77	.45	.25
40	54.35	26.79	-.15	.47
48	53.05	24.37	.17	.37
55	53.07	26.31	-.07	.42
62	52.52	24.29	.20	.36
70	53.43	20.29	.36	.28
77	52.86	23.32	.26	.34

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	119.60	50	2.39		
Within People	997.09	510	1.95		
Between Measure	277.36	10	27.73	19.26	.00
Residual	<u>719.72</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>1.43</u>		
TOTAL	111.69	560	1.99		

Alpha = .40
n = 51

Table C-8
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Eight Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Decision Making

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
10	39.90	17.97	.28	.63
16	38.69	21.90	.41	.59
24	39.60	19.23	.24	.63
32	39.08	18.97	.46	.56
48	38.62	22.91	.25	.61
62	38.08	22.90	.28	.61
70	38.98	17.98	.52.	.53
77	38.42	21.66	.36	.59

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	161.62	51	3.17		
Within People	554.88	364	1.52		
Between Measure	132.90	7	18.98	18.06	.00
Residual	421.97	357	1.13		
TOTAL	716.50	415	1.73		

Alpha = .52
n = 63

Table C-9
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The First Set of Seven Pilot Test Items
Addressing the Concept Decision Making

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
10	35.01	12.41	.29	.65
16	33.80	16.43	.37	.59
32	34.19	13.76	.43	.56
48	33.73	17.18	.23	.62
62	33.19	16.70	.34	.60
70	34.09	12.55	.55	.51
77	33.53	16.05	.34	.60

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	140.35	51	2.75		
Within People	413.71	312	1.32		
Between Measure	105.78	6	17.63	17.52	.00
Residual	307.92	306	1.00		
TOTAL	554.07	363	1.52		

Alpha = .63
n = 52

Table C-10
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The Second Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Decision Making

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
16	34.11	15.31	.35	.59
24	35.11	12.41	.25	.05
32	34.50	12.45	.46	.54
48	34.03	15.41	.32	.60
62	33.50	15.78	.29	.61
70	34.40	11.73	.51	.52
77	33.84	14.99	.32	.60

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	130.93	51	2.56		
Within People	365.42	312	1.17		
Between Measure	75.45	6	12.57	13.27	.00
Residual	<u>289.97</u>	<u>306</u>	<u>.94</u>		
TOTAL	496.35	363	1.36		

Alpha = .63
n = 52

Table C-11
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Decision Making

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
16	29.23	10.37	.30	.64
32	29.61	7.77	.45	.59
48	29.15	10.21	.32	.63
62	28.61	10.12	.38	.62
70	29.51	6.84	.57	.53
77	28.96	9.92	.31	.64

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	105.49	51	2.06		
Within People	215.16	260	.82		
Between Measure	35.06	5	7.01	9.93	.00
Residual	180.09	255	.70		
TOTAL	320.66	311	1.03		

Alpha = .66
n = 52

Table C-12
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Open Communication

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
3	77.55	24.60	-.02	.27
11	77.15	22.56	.19	.21
17	77.05	22.87	.45	.18
21	77.51	22.08	.22	.19
25	76.96	23.95	.24	.22
34	77.91	22.17	.21	.20
31	78.57	21.80	.14	.21
41	80.57	21.73	.03	.27
49	80.17	21.84	.03	.28
56	78.85	26.52	-.22	.37
63	78.04	21.35	.19	.19
67	78.04	24.43	.02	.26
71	77.34	23.45	.14	.26
78	77.35	22.98	.33	.20
81	78.42	24.64	-.09	.32

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	77.35	46	1.68		
Within People	1574.53	658	2.39		
Between Measure	770.65	14	55.05	44.00	.00
Residual	803.88	644	1.25		
TOTAL	1651.88	704	2.35		

Alpha = .26
n = 47

Table C-13
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For the First Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Open Communication

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
11	36.76	9.02	.33	.43
17	36.55	9.97	.53	.42
21	37.10	8.39	.43	.38
34	37.55	8.96	.27	.45
63	37.67	9.35	.07	.58
71	36.92	9.45	.16	.51
78	36.94	10.73	.19	.49

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	81.08	48	1.69		
Within People	285.71	294	.97		
Between Measure	44.58	6	7.42	8.85	.00
Residual	<u>241.21</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>.84</u>		
TOTAL	366.79	342	1.07		

Alpha = .50
n = 49

Table C-14
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The Second Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Open Communication

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
11	37.12	7.57	.39	.45
17	37.02	8.69	.57	.45
21	37.47	7.67	.35	.47
25	36.92	9.45	.32	.51
34	37.92	7.95	.26	.51
63	38.04	7.62	.14	.61
78	37.31	9.55	.18	.53

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	72.48	48	1.51		
Within People	254.85	294	.87		
Between Measure	56.15	6	9.36	13.58	.00
Residual	<u>198.70</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>.69</u>		
TOTAL	327.34	342	.96		

Alpha = .54
n = 49

Table C-15
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The Third Set of Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Open Communication

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
11	35.48	9.63	.47	.46
17	35.39	11.41	.51	.48
21	35.84	9.76	.42	.45
31	36.92	9.45	.29	.51
34	36.29	10.78	.23	.53
63	36.48	10.66	.09	.62
78	35.67	12.10	.22	.53

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	91.43	48	1.90		
Within People	338.57	294	1.15		
Between Measure	91.14	6	15.19	17.68	.00
Residual	<u>247.43</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>.86</u>		
TOTAL	430.00	342	1.26		

Alpha = .55
n = 49

Table C-16
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Open Communication

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
11	29.90	7.05	.53	.49
17	29.80	9.12	.44	.57
21	30.24	6.90	.54	.49
31	31.33	6.81	.34	.59
34	30.69	8.30	.21	.63
78	30.08	9.66	.18	.62

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	85.31	48	1.78		
Within People	245.33	245	1.00		
Between Measure	81.62	5	16.32	23.93	.00
Residual	<u>163.71</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>.68</u>		
TOTAL	330.64	293	1.13		

Alpha = .62
n = 49

Table C-17
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Consistent Philosophy

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
5	46.10	44.23	.23	.66
18	46.00	48.22	-.02	.72
26	45.34	44.39	.32	.65
33	40.32	39.15	.51	.61
35	45.97	45.57	.16	.68
42	44.39	47.25	.22	.66
50	45.73	42.28	.34	.64
57	47.58	40.78	.52	.61
64	47.41	41.22	.39	.63
74	47.93	41.52	.46	.62
83	47.04	39.19	.52	.61

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	206.51	45	4.58		
Within People	1069.45	480	2.32		
Between Measure	397.01	10	39.70	26.56	.00
Residual	672.44	450	1.49		
TOTAL	1275.85	505	2.52		

Alpha = .67

n = 46

Table C-18
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Nine Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept
Consistent Philosophy

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
5	35.91	38.53	.27	.67
26	35.65	38.28	.37	.57
33	36.13	33.98	.51	.17
42	34.70	42.84	.10	.76
50	35.54	37.72	.28	.57
57	37.39	34.15	.62	.06
64	37.22	33.86	.53	.17
74	37.74	34.60	.59	.07
83	36.85	33.07	.59	.07

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	222.94	45	4.95		
Within People	821.78	368	2.23		
Between Measure	373.82	8	46.73	37.56	.00
Residual	<u>447.91</u>	<u>360</u>	<u>1.24</u>		
TOTAL	1044.72	413	2.53		

Alpha = .75
n = 46

Table C-19
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Consistent Philosophy

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
26	19.13	26.42	.33	.82
33	19.60	22.86	.48	.79
57	20.86	21.80	.72	.74
64	20.69	21.63	.60	.76
74	21.21	22.48	.65	.76
83	20.32	21.38	.62	.76

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	236.78	45	5.26		
Within People	373.16	230	1.62		
Between Measure	145.75	5	20.15	28.84	.00
Residual	<u>227.40</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>1.01</u>		
TOTAL	609.95	275	2.21		

Alpha = .81
n = 46

Table C-20
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For All Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Professional Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
6	44.26	19.41	.34	.47
19	44.34	15.74	.29	.45
27	44.96	21.95	-.15	.60
36	44.51	18.72	.17	.50
44	44.53	19.13	.40	.46
51	44.46	19.86	.28	.48
58	46.21	16.28	.31	.45
65	46.00	16.74	.24	.48
73	45.84	15.42	.41	.40

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	122.63	51	2.40		
Within People	699.55	416	1.68		
Between Measure	223.47	8	27.93	23.94	.00
Residual	<u>476.07</u>	<u>408</u>	<u>1.16</u>		
TOTAL	822.24	467	1.76		

Alpha = .51
n = 52

Table C-21
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Professional Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
6	32.28	15.95	.29	.57
19	32.96	13.88	.22	.61
44	32.65	16.47	.34	.56
51	32.48	17.31	.23	.58
58	34.23	12.73	.42	.51
65	34.01	13.35	.32	.55
73	33.86	12.31	.49	.48

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	137.10	51	2.68		
Within People	533.42	312	1.70		
Between Measure	201.67	6	33.61	31.00	.00
Residual	331.75	306	1.08		
TOTAL	670.53	363	1.84		

Alpha = .60
n = 52

Table C-22
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Professional Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
6	26.50	12.41	.25	.59
44	26.86	12.15	.32	.58
51	26.68	12.21	.31	.58
58	28.44	8.44	.44	.51
65	28.23	8.53	.39	.54
73	28.07	8.62	.43	.51

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	117.98	51	2.31		
Within People	430.00	260	1.65		
Between Measure	197.79	5	39.55	43.44	.00
Residual	<u>232.20</u>	<u>255</u>	<u>.91</u>		

TOTAL

Alpha = .61
n = 52

Table C-23
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Team Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
7	36.44	30.38	.21	.62
13	37.08	31.90	.12	.64
20	37.24	30.59	.28	.60
28	38.11	26.32	.49	.55
37	38.37	27.46	.34	.59
45	36.24	30.96	.31	.60
52	37.64	26.82	.43	.56
59	37.17	29.64	.41	.58
66	39.62	30.42	.20	.62

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	173.81	44	3.95		
Within People	905.22	360	2.51		
Between Measure	390.34	8	48.79	33.29	.00
Residual	515.87	352	1.46		
TOTAL	1080.03	404	2.67		

Alpha = .63
n = 45

Table C-24
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Six Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Team Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
28	22.15	16.13	.42	.57
37	22.42	15.38	.42	.57
45	20.28	19.34	.29	.62
52	21.68	15.90	.42	.57
59	21.22	18.99	.32	.61
66	23.66	17.22	.34	.61

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	169.20	44	3.84		
Within People	596.50	225	2.65		
Between Measure	295.12	5	59.02	43.08	.00
Residual	<u>301.37</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>1.36</u>		
TOTAL	765.70	269	2.84		

Alpha = .64
n = 45

Table C-25
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For All Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Stability

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
4	70.06	28.14	.15	.28
8	69.31	28.64	.19	.26
14	70.18	30.45	.05	.32
22	70.52	32.25	-.05	.35
29	70.14	29.53	.14	.28
38	69.91	32.07	.33	.32
43	68.91	31.86	.05	.31
46	68.41	30.03	.25	.26
53	71.62	33.98	-.15	.39
60	69.68	28.55	.18	.26
68	69.41	31.82	-.04	.36
72	70.50	27.98	-.24	.24
75	69.10	31.41	.05	.31
79	68.10	31.28	.27	.28
82	68.43	29.48	.42	.24

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	104.63	47	2.22		
Within People	1607.86	672	2.39		
Between Measure	610.85	14	3.63	28.79	.00
Residual	<u>997.01</u>	<u>658</u>	<u>1.51</u>		
TOTAL	17.12.49	719	2.38		

Alpha = .32
n = 45

Table C-26
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Ten Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Stability

<u>Item-Total Statistics</u>				
<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
8	48.08	22.95	.10	.53
29	48.87	22.06	.19	.51
43	47.87	24.01	.13	.52
44	48.81	20.61	.20	.50
46	47.16	22.97	.27	.48
60	48.42	21.16	.23	.40
75	47.85	22.45	.24	.48
79	46.85	23.41	.43	.47
82	47.18	21.98	.54	.44
72	49.36	21.82	.20	.50

<u>Source of Variation</u>					
	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	125.73	48	2.61		
Within People	849.70	441	1.92		
Between Measure	308.05	9	34.22	27.29	.00
Residual	<u>541.64</u>	<u>432</u>	<u>1.25</u>		
TOTAL	975.43	489	1.99		

Alpha = .52
n = 49

Table C-27
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For Seven Pilot Test Items Addressing the Concept Stability

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
29	33.35	11.52	.10	.50
46	31.63	11.61	.27	.41
60	32.90	10.30	.20	.44
75	32.33	11.52	.19	.48
79	31.33	12.14	.41	.39
82	31.65	11.06	.53	.33
72	33.89	11.06	.14	.47

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	96.96	48	2.02		
Within People	581.71	294	1.98		
Between Measure	269.81	6	44.97	41.52	.00
Residual	311.90	288	1.08		
TOTAL	678.67	342	1.98		

Alpha = .46
n = 49

Table C-28
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The First Set of Six Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Stability

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
4	27.79	8.95	.41	.48
46	26.16	13.24	.22	.56
60	27.42	10.29	.36	.51
72	28.40	10.12	.40	.48
79	25.86	14.00	.27	.56
82	26.18	13.50	.28	.55

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	126.58	49	2.58		
Within People	541.00	250	2.16		
Between Measure	270.79	5	54.16	49.10	.00
Residual	<u>270.21</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>1.10</u>		
TOTAL	667.59	299	2.23		

Alpha = .57
n = 50

Table C-29
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For The Second Set of Six Pilot Test Items Addressing
the Concept Stability

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
46	27.14	9.20	.26	.44
60	28.40	7.45	.26	.45
72	29.34	8.43	.15	.51
75	27.85	8.97	.20	.47
79	26.83	9.84	.36	.43
82	27.16	8.93	.47	.37

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	92.18	48	1.92		
Within People	454.33	245	1.85		
Between Measure	221.90	5	44.38	45.82	.00
Residual	232.42	24	.96		
TOTAL	546.57	293	1.86		

Alpha = .50
n = 50

Table C-30
Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept Trust

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

Item	1	9	15	23	30	37	47	54	69	76
9	.32 51 .01									
15	.41 51 .00	.47 52 .00								
23	.33 51 .01	.31 52 .01	.51 52 .00							
30	.05 51 .37	-.01 52 .46	.11 52 .23	.16 52 .13						
39	-.17 51 .11	.00 52 .48	-.17 52 .12	.17 52 .11	.20 52 .08					
47	.31 51 .01	.33 52 .01	.29 52 .02	.28 52 .02	.08 52 .29	-.26 52 .03				
54	.13 50 .18	.29 51 .02	.55 51 .00	.49 51 .00	.01 51 .46	.17 51 .12	.19 51 .09			
69	.27 50 .03	.17 51 .12	.15 51 .15	.10 51 .25	.06 51 .35	.10 51 .24	.10 51 .25	.22 50 .07		
76	.53 51 .01	.14 52 .17	.36 52 .01	.27 52 .02	.26 52 .03	.07 52 .31	.22 52 .06	.43 51 .00	.34 51 .00	
80	.30 51 .016	.30 52 .01	.32 5252 .01	.29 52 .02	-.18 52 .10	.01 52 .48	.50 52 .00	.42 51 .00	.01 51 .46	.10 52 .25

Table C-31
Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test
Addressing Concept Trust

Item No.	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
1	51	6.54	.89
9	52	6.37	.63
15	52	6.20	.69
23	52	6.39	.57
30	52	5.50	1.10
39	52	5.35	1.60
47	52	6.52	.58
54	51	6.02	.62
69	51	4.08	1.63
76	52	5.56	1.14
80	52	6.54	.50

Table C-32
Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept
Participative Decision Making

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

Item	2	10	16	24	32	40	48	55	62	70
10	.01 52 .46									
16	.16 52 .13	.30 52 .02								
24	-.09 52 .27	.09 52 .26	.25 52 .04							
32	.12 51 .21	.20 52 .08	.31 52 .01	.22 52 .06						
40	-.07 51 .30	-.05 51 .36	-.11 51 .21	.20 51 .08	-.06 51 .35					
48	-.31 52 .01	-.04 52 .38	.15 52 .14	.14 52 .15	.27 52 .03	-.08 51 .28				
55	-.33 52 .01	-.11 52 .22	.05 52 .37	-.03 52 .41	.03 52 .43	-.20 51 .08	.41 52 .00			
62	-.12 52 .18	.10 52 .23	.16 52 .13	-.04 52 .38	.14 52 .15	-.12 51 .20	.21 52 .07	.08 52 .29		
70	-.22 52 .06	.25 52 .04	.11 52 .22	.16 52 .13	.53 52 .00	-.20 51 .08	.25 52 .04	.10 52 .24	.43 52 .00	
77	-.17 52 .12	.23 52 .05	.26 52 .03	.17 52 .00	.07 52 .31	-.21 51 .07	.16 52 .13	.16 52 .12	.24 52 .04	.32 52 .01

Table C-33
Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test
Addressing Concept Decision Making

Item No.	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
2	52	4.06	1.75
10	52	4.58	1.79
16	52	5.79	.75
24	52	4.89	1.63
32	52	5.40	1.23
40	51	4.57	1.24
48	52	5.87	.77
55	52	5.85	.75
62	52	6.40	.72
70	52	5.50	1.29
77	52	6.06	.87

Table C-34
Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept Open Communication

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

Item	3	11	17	21	25	31	34	41	49	56	63	67	71	78
11	.02 52 .45													
17	.18 52 .10	.27 52 .03												
21	-.18 52 .10	.62 52 .00	.17 52 .11											
25	.15 52 .15	.24 52 .05	.50 52 .00	.17 52 .11										
31	.26 52 .03	.37 52 .00	.22 52 .06	.16 52 .13	-.05 52 .36									
34	.01 52 .47	.16 52 .13	.23 52 .05	.14 52 .16	.00 52 .50	.14 52 .38								
41	-.14 51 .16	-.12 51 .20	-.02 51 .45	-.24 51 .05	.07 51 .30	-.04 51 .39	.07 51 .32							
49	-.01 50 .47	-.06 50 .35	.06 50 .33	-.04 50 .40	.03 50 .41	-.02 50 .44	.12 50 .21	.15 50 .15						
56	-.22 51 .06	-.13 51 .18	-.25 51 .04	-.03 51 .42	-.16 51 .13	-.10 51 .25	-.07 51 .31	.25 50 .04	-.04 49 .38					
63	.13 52 .17	.04 52 .38	.29 52 .02	-.08 52 .28	.22 52 .06	.04 52 .38	.12 52 .20	-.06 51 .34	.21 50 .07	.20 51 .09				
67	.03 51 .42	.18 51 .11	-.02 51 .45	.19 51 .09	-.05 51 .35	.01 51 .48	.02 51 .46	-.23 50 .06	.04 49 .38	-.25 50 .04	.11 51 .23			
71	.03 52 .42	.00 52 .49	.23 52 .05	.16 52 .13	.18 52 .10	.07 52 .31	.12 52 .21	-.19 51 .09	.02 50 .44	-.25 51 .04	-.04 52 .39	.10 51 .25		
78	.21 52 .07	-.15 52 .14	.40 52 .00	-.11 52 .21	.18 52 .10	.24 52 .04	.28 52 .02	.00 51 .50	.01 50 .48	-.23 51 .05	.16 5251 .13	.26 52 .04	.16 51 .12	
80	-.07 51 .31	-.05 51 .38	.19 51 .10	-.04 51 .40	.16 51 .14	-.09 51 .26	-.05 51 .36	.07 50 .32	-.32 49 .01	-.12 50 .20	.12 51 .21	-.04 50 .40	.12 51 .20	.09 51 .26

Table C-35
Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test
Addressing Concept Open Communication

Item No.	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
3	52	6.19	.87
11	52	6.52	.94
17	52	6.62	.49
21	52	6.06	1.20
25	52	6.70	.47
31	52	5.16	1.27
34	52	5.75	1.03
41	51	3.06	1.69
49	50	3.48	1.66
56	51	4.77	1.27
63	52	5.64	1.34
67	51	5.67	.79
71	52	6.37	1.10
78	52	6.35	.59
81	51	5.31	1.32

Table C-36
Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept Consistent Philosophy

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

Item	5	18	26	33	35	42	50	57	64	74
18	-.07 51 .31									
26	.22 51 .06	-.09 51 .27								
33	.36 48 .01	-.13 48 .08	.31 48 .02							
35	.12 51 .20	.29 52 .02	-.02 51 .44	.32 48 .01						
42	.40 51 .00	.30 51 .01	.17 52 .12	.03 51 .43	.23 48 .05	52				
50	.17 50 .11	.04 51 .40	.06 50 .34	.33 47 .01	.26 51 .04	.05 51 .36				
57	.03 48 .43	-.10 49 .24	.18 48 .11	.42 48 .00	-.14 49 .16	-.02 49 .45	.12 48 .20			
64	.13 51 .18	-.14 52 .15	.33 51 .01	.21 48 .08	-.23 52 .05	-.09 52 .26	.10 51 .23	.70 49 .00		
74	.18 51 .10	-.08 52 .30	.35 51 .01	.32 48 .01	-.23 52 .05	-.01 52 .46	.12 51 .19	.58 49 .00	.58 52 .00	
83	-.04 48 .39	-.11 49 .23	.14 48 .18	.55 47 .00	.08 49 .29	-.05 49 .39	.32 48 .02	.53 48 .00	.47 49 .00	.45 49 .00

Table C-37
Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test
Addressing Concept Consistent Philosophy

Item No.	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
5	46	4.98	1.39
18	46	5.09	1.67
26	51	5.20	1.20
33	48	4.75	1.44
35	52	5.17	1.29
42	52	6.21	.80
50	51	5.31	1.35
57	49	3.45	1.23
64	52	3.56	1.39
74	52	3.06	1.20
83	49	3.92	1.47

Table C-38
 Interrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept
Personnel Development

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

Item	<u>6</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>65</u>
19	.21 52 .07							
27	.04 52 .38	-.13 52 .18						
36	.23 52 .05	.42 52 .00	-.08 52 .28					
44	.36 52 .01	.19 52 .09	.00 52 .49	.32 52 .01				
51	.51 52 .00	-.09 52 .27	.09 52 .26	.12 52 .20	.53 52 .00			
58	.11 52 .23	.16 52 .14	-.15 52 .15	-.09 52 .27	.10 52 .23	.16 52 .13		
65	.03 52 .41	.03 52 .42	-.15 52 .15	-.03 52 .43	.17 52 .12	.09 52 .27	.37 52 .00	
73	.14 52 .17	.30 52 .02	-.07 52 .32	-.02 52 .44	.16 52 .13	.09 52 .27	.39 52 .00	.35 52 .01

Table C-39
Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test
Addressing Concept Personnel Development

Item No.	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
6	52	6.46	.61
19	52	5.79	1.53
27	52	5.77	1.15
36	52	6.21	1.11
44	52	6.10	.60
51	52	6.27	.60
57	52	4.52	1.38
65	52	4.73	1.43
73	52	4.88	1.35

Table C-40
Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept
Team Development

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>59</u>
13	.10 .25 50							
20	.34 50 .01	.07 49 .32						
28	.30 48 .02	.19 47 .10	.15 48 .15					
37	.04 51 .38	.07 50 .33	.13 51 .19	.38 49 .00				
45	-.07 51 .30	.34 50 .01	.07 51 .31	.18 49 .11	.07 52 .31			
52	.09 51 .27	.07 50 .32	.31 51 .01	.33 49 .01	.38 52 .00	.20 52 .08		
59	.09 50 .28	.43 49 .00	.14 50 .16	.25 48 .04	.28 51 .02	.37 51 .00	.37 51 .00	
66	-.01 51 .47	-.19 50 .09	-.06 51 .34	.34 49 .01	.29 52 .02	.16 52 .13	.21 52 .07	.09 51 .28

Table C-41
Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test
Addressing Concept Team Development

Item No.	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
7	51	5.80	1.38
13	50	5.14	1.34
20	51	5.00	1.14
28	49	4.10	1.43
37	52	3.77	1.55
45	52	6.02	.96
52	52	4.60	1.50
59	51	5.04	1.11
66	52	5.27	1.42

Table C-42
Intercorrelation of Pilot-Test Addressing the Concept Stability

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

Item	4	8	14	22	29	38	43	46	53	60	68	72	75	79
8	-.1794 50 .11													
14	.06 51 .33	.03 51 .43												
22	-.08 51 .30	.27 51 .03	-.28 52 .02											
29	.03 51 .43	.46 51 .00	-.01 52 .47	.20 52 .08										
38	.01 50 .47	.02 50 .45	.15 51 .15	.08 51 .30	.11 51 .23									
43	-.14 51 .16	.09 51 .27	-.15 52 .15	-.05 52 .35	-.04 52 .39	-.17 51 .12								
46	.04 51 .38	.09 51 .27	.24 52 .05	-.11 52 .22	.05 52 .37	.13 51 .18	.14 52 .17							
53	-.02 51 .46	.06 51 .35	-.03 52 .42	.10 52 .23	-.07 52 .31	-.13 51 .18	-.08 52 .29	-.27 52 .03						
60	.33 50 .01	-.04 50 .40	.01 51 .46	-.01 51 .48	-.05 51 .374	.06 52 .33	.03 51 .43	.02 51 .45	-.28 51 .02					
68	-.05 51 .37	-.03 51 .42	.05 52 .35	-.07 52 .30	-.26 52 .03	-.15 52 .15	.15 52 .15	.07 52 .31	.04 52 .40	.13 51 .18				
72	.46 51 .00	-.16 51 .13	-.03 52 .41	-.01 52 .48	.05 52 .36	-.09 51 .26	-.01 52 .48	.07 52 .31	.07 52 .32	.37 51 .00	.15 52 .14			
75	.01 51 .46	.08 51 .29	-.08 5252 .29	-.06 52 .34	.01 51 .48	-.05 52 .35	.37 52 .00	.13 52 .18	-.14 51 .17	.10 52 .25	-.25 52 .04	-.08 52 .29		
79	.12 51 .20	.16 51 .13	-.09 52 .26	-.08 52 .28	.23 52 .05	-.04 51 .39	.29 52 .02	.29 52 .02	-.18 52 .10	.09 51 .28	-.07 52 .32	.07 52 .30	.30 52 .02	
82	.07 51 .31	.28 51 .02	-.07 52 .31	.10 52 .24	.25 52 .03	-.04 51 .38	.34 52 .01	.43 52 .00	-.18 52 .11	.16 51 .13	-.02 52 .45	.03 52 .42	.45 52 .00	.62 52 .00

Table C-43
Means and Standard Deviation for Pilot-Test
Addressing Concept Stability

Item No.	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>SD</u>
4	51	4.53	1.63
7	51	5.33	1.36
14	52	4.39	1.47
22	52	4.10	1.46
29	52	4.46	1.34
38	51	4.73	.98
43	52	5.73	.95
46	52	6.21	.89
53	52	2.90	1.40
60	51	4.98	1.42
68	52	5.19	1.50
72	52	3.96	1.40
75	52	5.52	1.08
79	52	6.50	.58
82	52	6.20	.72

APPENDIX D
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
FIELD STUDY

Appendix D

Organizational Climate Field Study

Sharon Allen - Olympia Tech.

College Name _____

College Unit:

Position:

Instruction

Classified

Student Services

Faculty

Administrative Services

Administrative

Other

Instructions:

Please fill this out from your own perspective in your current position. This is a perception questionnaire, so it measures how you agree or disagree with the statement about the climate of the organization based on your perception or opinion. Thank you for filling this out.

1. Trusting my superiors increases my productivity in the organization.
2. People need staff development throughout their careers.
3. The less people know, the better.
4. Consensus decision making (where agreement is reached) leads to more productive and satisfied employees.
5. I only need to trust myself in this organization.
6. A communication system that works is important in a health organization.
7. Individual goals and objectives must be compatible with organizational goals and objectives.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Partially Disagree

Neutral

Partially Agree

Agree

Strongly Agree

Organizational Climate Field Study
(Continued)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8. Trust between levels of the organization is important.							
9. It is only important to communicate with your own section or department.							
10. Teams (Quality Control Circles)* organize the responsibility within the organization.							
11. The president of a college feels that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
12. An organization should only keep people for three years to promote change.							
13. Being involved in the decision-making process promotes trust at all levels.							
14. Trusting the people who work for me increases my productivity in the organization.							
15. Organizational structure facilitates communication.							
16. Participation and authority must be authentic or real in order for teams to be effective.							
17. The role of the teams (Quality Control Circles)* is to carry out the administrators ideas.							
18. Expanding the knowledge of other departments and sections of the college by information and idea exchange is useful in an organization.							

Organizational Climate Field Study
(Continued)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. It is important to the organization to trust your peers.							
20. Communication is facilitated by participation.							
21. Middle managers (Directors, Division Chairs, and Associate Deans) feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
22. Control and authority must be delegated to teams (Quality Control Circles)* for them to have credibility.							
23. The broadening of career path development* where managers move laterally increases enthusiasm and commitment to the organization as a whole.							
24. Organizations change radically all the time.							
25. Paranoia exists when there is a lack of communication.							
26. Decisions made in isolation without input enable the people in the organization to be more productive.							
27. Security is not important to people.							
28. Feedback is important to communication in an organization.							

Organizational Climate Field Study
(Continued)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
29. Faculty feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
30. I don't need to cooperate with my peers.							
31. Classified staff feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
32. Physical as well as psychological needs must be filled in order for an individual to feel secure within an organization.							
33. Cross-training would increase the productivity of the organization because people could appreciate the limitations and resources of the other areas.							
34. Organizations remain fairly stable over time and do not change radically.							
35. The teams (Quality Control Circles)* are a useful method for improving productivity and morale.							
36. Decisions made behind closed doors make for a more productive organization.							
37. Security is not important to the organization.							

Organizational Climate Field Study
(Continued)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
38. A specialist (one who knows a lot about a few things) is more important to an organization than a generalist (one who knows something about a lot of things).							
39. The deans feel that the goals of the organization are clear and well defined.							
40. Only "selected" people should participate in decision making.							
41. Administrators should guide and direct the teams (Quality Control Circles)*.							
42. It is not necessary to know about other areas in the college.							

* Definition List

Quality Control Circle - a small group of people selected from all levels of the college which has a specific task to accomplish.

Broadening Career Path Development - an opportunity for administrators to be placed in a comparable position in a different section of the college, e.g., an Associate Dean of Instruction becomes an Associate Dean of Students, for the purpose of increasing their knowledge of other areas.

APPENDIX E
FIELD STUDY STATISTICS

Table E-1
Means and Standard Deviation for All Concepts in Field Study

<u>Concept</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>\bar{x}</u>	<u>s</u>
Trust	286	6.25	.76
Decision Making	286	5.97	.88
Communication	286	6.01	.69
Consistent Philosophy	277	4.21	1.23
Professional Development	286	5.61	.82
Team Development	283	4.83	.88
Stability	286	5.78	.72

Table E-2
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Trust

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	31.33	14.94	.53	.76
5	31.29	14.31	.49	.78
8	31.13	15.53	.64	.74
14	31.27	16.25	.54	.76
19	31.27	15.96	.59	.75
30	31.05	15.68	.53	.76

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	946.41	266	3.56		
Within People	1005.67	1335	.75		
Between Measure	15.46	5	3.09	4.15	.00
Residual	<u>990.46</u>	<u>1330</u>	<u>.74</u>		
TOTAL	1952.08	1501	1.22		

Alpha = .79
n = 367

Table E-3
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Trust

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
1	25.16	9.13	.50	.76
8	24.97	9.48	.65	.71
14	25.10	10.08	.54	.74
19	25.10	9.80	.60	.73
30	24.88	9.72	.51	.75

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	762.50	257	2.86		
Within People	685.60	1072	.64		
Between Measure	13.75	4	3.44	5.46	.00
Residual	<u>671.65</u>	<u>1068</u>	<u>.63</u>		
TOTAL	1448.10	1339	1.08		

Alpha = .78
n = 268

Table E-4
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Decision Making

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
4	29.70	18.79	.42	.75
13	29.77	16.79	.55	.71
20	29.65	18.25	.54	.72
26	29.45	17.79	.46	.74
36	29.45	17.17	.64	.69
40	30.17	15.47	.47	.75

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	1038.66	251	3.98		
Within People	1336.83	1310	1.02		
Between Measure	93.13	5	16.63	19.54	.00
Residual	<u>1243.71</u>	<u>1305</u>	<u>.95</u>		
TOTAL	2375.50	1571	1.51		

Alpha = .76
n = 262

Table E-5
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Decision Making

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
4	24.21	11.28	.43	.73
13	24.28	9.88	.54	.69
20	24.15	10.97	.55	.69
26	23.95	10.50	.47	.72
36	23.97	10.34	.58	.68

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	818.75	263	3.11		
Within People	551.20	1056	.81		
Between Measure	22.52	4	5.63	7.15	.00
Residual	823.63	1052	7.79	7.15	.00
TOTAL	1669.95	1319	1.27		

Alpha = .75
n = 265

Table E-6
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Open Communication

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
3	29.68	10.81	.34	.47
6	29.59	11.36	.45	.46
9	30.10	10.44	.19	.54
15	31.08	9.36	.27	.51
25	30.75	10.02	.25	.51
28	29.96	11.26	.38	.47

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	99.69	259	2.32		
Within People	1854.00	1300	1.43		
Between Measure	467.16	5	93.43	87.25	
Residual	<u>386.84</u>	<u>1295</u>	<u>.07</u>		
TOTAL	2453.69	1559	1.57		

Alpha = .54
n = 260

Table E-7
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Open Communication

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
3	23.54	7.79	.31	.49
6	23.45	8.29	.42	.46
15	24.95	6.25	.28	.53
25	24.61	6.75	.28	.52
28	23.32	8.00	.40	.46

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	540.92	260	2.05		
Within People	1455.60	1044	1.39		
Between Measure	469.60	4	117.43	123.83	.00
Residual	<u>936.00</u>	<u>1040</u>	<u>.95</u>		
TOTAL	1996.52	1304	1.53		

Alpha = .54
n = 261

Table E-8
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Consistent Philosophy

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
7	21.18	36.83	.08	.88
11	21.64	28.43	.60	.78
21	22.03	27.82	.71	.75
29	22.45	26.42	.74	.74
31	22.69	27.12	.65	.76
39	22.01	27.89	.73	.74

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	1661.55	247	6.73		
Within People	1925.33	1240	1.55		
Between Measure	359.09	5	71.82	56.63	.00
Residual	<u>1566.24</u>	<u>1235</u>	<u>1.27</u>		
TOTAL	35.86.88	1487	2.41		

Alpha = .81
n = 248

Table E-9
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Consistent Philosophy

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
11	16.43	24.89	.64	.87
21	16.81	24.48	.75	.84
29	17.23	23.52	.74	.85
31	17.46	23.80	.68	.86
39	16.79	24.69	.75	.84

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	1819.37	247	7.37		
Within People	1048.40	992	1.05		
Between Measure	161.65	4	48.41	45.13	.00
Residual	<u>845.75</u>	<u>988</u>	<u>.90</u>		
TOTAL	2865.77	1239	2.31		

Alpha = .88
n = 248

Table E-10
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Professional Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
2	25.22	11.96	.31	.39
18	25.35	12.80	.36	.39
23	27.01	9.79	.33	.36
33	26.34	9.90	.37	.33
38	28.20	14.29	.08	.60
42	25.01	12.49	.26	.41

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	669.50	260	2.57		
Within People	3697.83	1305	2.83		
Between Measure	1916.52	5	383.30	279.74	.00
Residual	<u>1781.31</u>	<u>1300</u>	<u>1.37</u>		
TOTAL	4367.33	1565	2.79		

Alpha = .47
n = 261

Table E-11
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Professional Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
2	21.92	11.09	.30	.56
18	22.04	11.89	.36	.55
23	23.71	8.46	.38	.53
33	23.05	8.47	.43	.49
42	21.91	10.91	.34	.55

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	755.66	263	2.88		
Within People	1930.40	1055	1.82		
Between Measure	701.07	4	175.41	150.19	.00
Residual	<u>1225.73</u>	<u>1852</u>	<u>1.16</u>		
TOTAL	2889.05	1319	2.03		

Alpha = .60
n = 264

Table E-12
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Team Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
10	24.43	14.37	.14	.33
16	22.70	15.28	.19	.37
17	23.73	12.30	.27	.23
22	23.83	12.66	.24	.25
35	23.98	13.35	.23	.27
41	24.35	15.47	.03	.46

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	727.19	246	2.96		
Within People	2825.50	1235	2.29		
Between Measure	477.83	5	95.57	50.	.00
Residual	<u>2347.67</u>	<u>1230</u>	<u>1.91</u>		
TOTAL	3552.69	1481	2.40		

Alpha = .35
n = 247

Table E-13
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Team Development

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
10	20.16	11.31	.23	.41
16	18.44	12.64	.25	.41
17	19.47	11.32	.15	.48
22	19.57	10.47	.24	.40
35	19.72	10.15	.36	.31

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	762.73	248	3.08		
Within People	2060.40	996	2.07		
Between Measure	401.82	4	100.46	60.08	.00
Residual	<u>1658.58</u>	<u>992</u>	<u>1.67</u>		
TOTAL	2823.13	1244	2.27		

Alpha = .46
n = 249

Table E-14
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 6 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Stability

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
12	28.21	11.78	.16	.35
24	29.52	9.49	.24	.30
27	28.28	10.95	.15	.36
32	28.77	12.59	.05	.41
34	30.00	9.16	.22	.32
37	28.41	10.73	.28	.29

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	605.14	263	2.30		
Within People	2577.50	1320	1.95		
Between Measure	714.25	5	142.85	100.82	.00
Residual	<u>1863.25</u>	<u>1315</u>	<u>1.42</u>		
TOTAL	3183.64	1533	2.01		

Alpha = .38
n = 264

Table E-15
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
For 5 Field Test Items Addressing the Concept Stability

Item-Total Statistics

<u>Item</u>	<u>Concept Mean If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Concept Variance If Item Deleted</u>	<u>Corrected Item To Concept Correlation</u>	<u>Alpha If Item Deleted</u>
12	22.34	10.78	.13	.41
24	23.65	7.98	.29	.28
27	22.41	9.79	.15	.40
34	24.14	8.03	.22	.35
37	22.55	9.69	.26	.32

Source of Variation

	<u>SS</u>	<u>NDF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Between People	662.47	263	2.52		
Within People	2280.00	1056	2.16		
Between Measure	711.45	4	177.86	119.29	.00
Residual	<u>1568.55</u>	<u>1052</u>	<u>1.49</u>		
TOTAL	2942.47	13192	2.23		

Alpha = .41
n = 264

Table E-16
Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept
Trust

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S</u>
1	285	6.12	1.25
5	284	6.16	1.38
8	282	6.33	.94
14	282	6.19	1.00
19	282	6.21	.93
30	280	6.41	1.06

Table E-17
Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept
Decision Making

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S</u>
4	280	5.93	1.10
13	284	5.76	1.38
20	283	5.96	1.02
26	274	6.18	1.21
36	278	6.15	1.13
40	276	5.45	1.59

Table E-18
Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept
Open Communication

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S</u>
3	282	6.53	1.05
6	284	6.65	.67
9	283	6.12	1.33
15	279	5.11	1.46
25	273	5.47	1.32
28	279	6.27	.77

Table E-19
Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept
Consistent Philosophy

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S</u>
7	285	5.16	1.50
11	263	4.77	1.52
21	258	4.38	1.40
29	263	3.94	1.54
31	265	3.73	1.58
39	260	4.38	1.37

Table E-20
Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept
Professional Development

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S</u>
2	283	6.22	1.11
18	282	6.09	.81
23	269	4.43	1.56
33	277	5.08	1.50
38	274	3.27	1.39
42	281	6.21	1.09

Table E-21
Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept
Team Development

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S</u>
10	267	4.14	1.39
16	272	5.86	1.06
17	273	4.86	1.59
22	273	4.76	1.58
35	271	4.60	1.41
41	270	4.24	1.64

Appendix E-22
Means and Standard Deviation for Field-Test Addressing Concept
Stability

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S</u>
12	284	6.40	1.07
24	274	5.14	1.48
27	281	6.35	1.29
32	276	5.86	.96
34	272	4.63	1.60
37	278	6.25	1.06

Table E-23
 Interrelation of Field-Test Addressing the Concept Trust
 (Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>19</u>
5	.37 283 .00				
8	.41 281 .00	.30 276 .00			
14	.41 281 .00	.32 280 .00	.45 278 .00		
19	.43 .00 281	.33 .00 281	.46 .00 278	.47 .00 278	
30	.32 279 .00	.37 278 .00	.53 276 .00	.32 276 .00	.43 277 .00

Table E-24
 Interrelation of Field-Test Addressing the Concept Decision Making
 (Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>36</u>
13	.40 278 .00				
20	.36 278 .00	.43 281 .00			
26	.25 269 .00	.33 272 .00	.38 272 .00		
36	.29 274 .00	.39 276 .00	.43 276 .00	.45 271 .00	
40	.23 273 .00	.34 274 .00	.32 275 .00	.25 269 .00	.47 274 .00

Table E-25
 Interrelation of Field-Test Addressing the Concept
Open Communication

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>
6	.26 281 .00				
9	.17 281 .00	.24 281 .00			
15	.20 276 .00	.23 277 .00	.11 276 .00		
25	.14 270 .00	.24 272 .00	.06 270 .15	.16 267 .01	
28	.20 276 .00	.31 278 .00	.11 277 .04	.22 273 .00	.29 271 .00

Table E-26
 Intercorrelation of Field-Test Addressing the Concept
Consistent Philosophy
 (Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>31</u>
11	.00 263 .47				
21	.02 258 .36	.53 256 .00			
29	.14 263 .01	.51 256 .00	.67 252 .00		
31	.04 265 .26	.48 256 .00	.56 252 .00	.68 256 .00	
39	.07 260 .14	.63 254 .00	.70 252 .00	.56 256 .00	.55 254 .00

Table E-27
 Interrelation of Field-Test Addressing the Concept
Professional Development
 (Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>38</u>
18	.18 280 .00				
23	.22 268 .00	.20 268 .00			
33	.20 274 .00	.27 274f .00	.35 267 .00		
38	.05 273 .23	.01 273 .45	-.05 265 .20	-.08 270 .09	
42	.18 279 .00	.34 279 .00	.20 267 .00	.26 274 .00	-.16 273 .00

Table E-28
 Interrelation of Field-Test Addressing the Concept
Team Development

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>38</u>
16	.06 259 .17				
17	.02 262 .39	.18 266 .00			
22	.14 261 .01	.19 267 .00	.05 269 .21		
35	.30 259 .00	.18 262 .00	.12 265 .03	.28 266 .00	
41	-.16 259 .00	-.15 261 .01	.25 266 .00	-.03 266 .30	-.20 266 .00

Table E-29
 Interrelation of Field-Test Addressing the Concept
Stability

(Information within each cell is presented in descending order of
 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient,
 number of subjects and probability)

Correlation Coefficient, Numbers of Subjects and Probability by Item

<u>Item</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>34</u>
24	-.07 272 .14				
27	.14 279 .01	.01 272 .41			
32	.12 275 .03	-.08 268 .09	.04 276 .25		
34	-.06 270	.46 269	-.02 271	.04 270	
37	.31 276 .00	.08 269 .09	.28 276 .00	.09 273 .08	.01 269 .43

APPENDIX F
ADMINISTRATION AND INTERPRETATION
OF THE INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX F

Administration of the Instrument

Several factors should be addressed when administering the organizational instrument climate.

1. The college examined should be similar in characteristics and organizational structure to those in the field study.
2. Complete instructions should be included with the instrument, as shown in Appendix D.
3. Procedures should be examined to maximize participation and to minimize biasing of the results.

Interpretation of the Instrument

The following steps should be followed in the interpretation of the data.

1. Score each item.
2. Reverse the value (1-7, 7-1) of the negative items.
3. Compute means and standard deviation for each item within each group, level, and position.
A caution: If there is only one person in a group, do not use that distinction in order to protect the respondent.
4. Look at groups of items within the concept and compare scores to see if there are patterns within the concept (Table F-1).
5. Look at all of the items to see if there is an emerging pattern.
6. Utilizing the middle score (neutral) as a benchmark, look at differences between the concepts.
7. Graph the concept scores. The lower scores would be the first place to begin identifying areas for improvement.

Table F-1
Organizational Climate Instrument
Scoring Table

Item	Concept	Negative/Positive
1	TRUST	P
2	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	P
3	OPEN COMMUNICATION	N
4	DECISION MAKING	P
5	OPEN COMMUNICATION	P
6	TRUST	P
7	TEAM DEVELOPMENT	P
8	CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY	P
9	STABILITY	N
10	DECISION MAKING	P
11	TRUST	P
12	OPEN COMMUNICATION	P
13	TEAM DEVELOPMENT	P
14	TEAM DEVELOPMENT	N
15	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	P
16	TRUST	P
17	DECISION MAKING	P
18	CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY	P
19	TEAM DEVELOPMENT	P
20	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	P
21	STABILITY	N
22	OPEN COMMUNICATION	P
23	DECISION MAKING	N
24	STABILITY	N
25	OPEN COMMUNICATION	P
26	CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY	P
27	TRUST	N
28	CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY	P
29	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	P
30	STABILITY	P
31	TEAM DEVELOPMENT	P
32	DECISION MAKING	N
33	STABILITY	N
34	CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY	P
35	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	N