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CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago was marked with protest that erupted into violence, a violence that stunned the world as it looked on in disbelief. Youthful demonstrators had gathered in great numbers to express to recognized government leaders their dissatisfaction with inhumanity, injustice, prejudice, hypocrisy, or militaristic repression. The vast majority of demonstrators were intent on a peaceful expression of their dissent but, at the same time, they were fully expecting violence to develop. Although it was incited by a small minority of police and protestors a riot of tremendous proportions became a fact. That which occurred has been described and documented as a police riot as well as a riot of our youth.\(^1\) The actual violence in Chicago finally dissipated, but the complex human problems which led to protest have continued throughout our society.

Two fundamental American rights came into sharp conflict in Chicago: man's right to dissent, and a community's right to protect

its citizens and property. In two successive weeks the Supreme Court handed down rulings on both rights as they relate to students in schools. On March 3, 1969, the court upheld the right of students to wear black armbands protesting the war in Vietnam because this was considered nondisruptive expression of dissent. Justice Hugo Black objected because he feared it would subject schools "to the whims and caprices of their loudest-mouthed but maybe not their brightest students." One week later, on March 10, 1969, the Supreme Court ruled that students who engaged in aggressive and violent demonstration were not protected by the guarantees in the First Amendment of the Constitution. This ruling gave school administrators a definition of dissent and a guideline by which school disorder could be brought under control.

Youth in colleges and high schools throughout the world are restless and rebellious. Thousands of students have walked out of schools to back demands for educational change. They are excited by the rapid growth of technology and the dynamic changes taking place in modern society. They are also disturbed by the complexity of technology that threatens to destroy their identity and confused by schools which do not teach the necessary skills to help them live in a

---

2 Time, March 7, 1969, p. 47.
4 Newsweek, June 16, 1969, p. 29.
fast-changing society.

Demonstrations on the education scene have undergone a change from those in France, Japan, and Poland or from the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley in 1964 which were political protests. More recent demonstrations have been academic protests. Young people feel compelled to act, and will not be restrained by physical force or legalistic rulings. They are demanding to be heard. They will not wait indefinitely to deal with today's issues, and they see adults as being unprepared - conceptually, technically, and morally - to handle molar problems such as war, human rights, and pollution.

When students have engaged in demonstrations, most efforts by political and educational leaders have been to stop the protests by whatever means seemed most expedient. In some places in the United States it has been announced that disruptions of school operations will not be tolerated. Legislators in California, for example, have proposed over a hundred laws to curb dissident students. Lawmakers at every level of government have tended to respond to the demands that protest be brought under control by passing more laws. Adults have become irritable over deviancy and nonconforming behavior in youth. Their tolerance for all nonconformity has been reported at a dangerous low throughout the world. But we need a much more adequate answer than how to curb protesting youth. We need to understand the basic causes of their unrest.

---

5William C. Kvaraceus, "Deviancy or Dry Rot in the Classroom," Educational Leadership, XXIV, 7(April, 1967), 585-587.
The ugly confrontation has moved into the high schools and "... it is sure to become more confused and irrational, engulfing not just an educational elite but the entire community in a bitter and painful conflict." Until recently much more attention had been given to protests on the college campus. Reports of unrest among high school students in Los Angeles, Cincinnati, Chicago, New York, Columbus, Ohio, and other cities all over the country suggest that the function of the high school is being challenged. And it is not only the students who have indicated dissatisfaction. The taxpayers also may have been indicating their dissatisfaction when they voted down half of all school bond issues across the country in the November elections of 1968.

In Columbus, Ohio, disruptions of major proportions in two high schools and one junior high school occurred in less than a month. They began on February 12, 1969, when a volunteer student counselor employed by the Columbus Metropolitan Area Community Action Organization was requested by the principal of a junior high school to give up an office which he had been occupying in the school for several months. The early closing of a senior high school on February 13 was forced by riotous conditions that included setting numerous fires and the detonation of bombs in lockers. These incidents followed the removal by the principal of a poster in a Black History Week display.

---


7Ibid, p. 38.
On February 24, seventy-three students in still another high school were arrested and suspended for ten days when they refused to attend class at the request of the principal.

Numerous public meetings were sponsored by the Parent Teacher Association, the public schools, and community organizations. After two weeks it was obvious that there was still a failure to communicate. Two meetings at the high schools were billed as "fact finding" sessions, but they were reported to have deteriorated rapidly into turbulent statement-making confrontations between parents and school officials. A brush-fire pattern of confrontations seemed to emerge.

Major concerns of the parents in one of the high schools were for more rigid discipline, safety of students, reported resignation of faculty members, and the possibility of permanent expulsion for students who were chronic problems. After two members of the faculty declared in a public meeting that the problem was simply disciplinary and they believed the principal would do what was necessary, parents and teachers were requested to promise him their support in more rigid discipline. "A nearly unanimous, boisterous applause followed the request and the crowd dispersed before an official adjournment was possible." In a letter of resignation to the superintendent, one teacher said, "... conditions conducive to effective learning ..."
have degenerated to such an extent that even the personal safety of students and teachers is no longer assured . . . "10

In the other high school the issues " . . . were clearly between black students and the administration,"11 and most of the racial tensions involved adults more than the students themselves. Parents demanded an increase in Negro faculty members in addition to the two who were already among the eighty-seven teachers, a Negro administrator at the school, and an evaluation of the school by the Ohio State Department of Education. Of the seventy-three suspended students, six were required to remain out of class for the full ten day suspension period and the others were readmitted after an interview with school officials.

The Urban Education Coalition recommended a long range plan to be adopted for calming school disturbances. This plan included strengthening of community relations efforts at the school administration level, establishment of assessment committees in every school with membership to include students, parents, and teachers, and a weekly television or radio program as a forum for open discussion of problems in the school system.12 This recommendation came as part of a position paper of the coalition because, as Thomas


12Graydon Hambrick, "Plan to End School Disturbances Urged," Columbus Dispatch, March 5, 1969, p. 5A.
McCullough said: "We believe that new methods of working with students must be created so that action can be taken before the police are called." Within a week the superintendent announced, as an administrative decision, the formation of advisory committees on school affairs in the high schools of Columbus. These committees were to be composed of twelve members, four students, four parents of children in the school, and four persons from the faculty, with the principal to serve as an ex-officio member. Their functions were to provide administrators with the sentiments of parents and students on school operations, to give a forum for airing topics, to set priorities for attention, and to make recommendations to principals.

As the school year came to a close relative peace had been restored to the schools of Columbus, but not until the bitter and painful conflict had engulfed a large part of its community. The riotous situation in the schools had dissipated, but the complex human problems that led to protest remained to be solved.

In a recent in-depth survey of the high schools of the United States, a majority of the parents felt that maintaining discipline was more important than student intellectual self-inquiry; that it was more important to crack down on unruly students than to understand them. Yet, they still were optimistic about the younger generation. Only a small minority of parents felt that student participation in policy making was important or were even aware that their children

---

13 Ibid, p. 5A.
felt strongly on the matter, and only a low percentage of the parents agreed that the major role of the school should be to teach skills to live in a fast-changing society, most of them clinging to college preparation as the main role of the high school. Significantly, in all these issues where students and their parents sharply disagreed, teachers and principals were more closely allied with the students than were their parents. One of the conclusions reached by the survey was: "If high schools are to draw abreast of the times and help achieve understanding between the generations, our best hope lies with the teachers."^15

Problem

While three schools in Columbus were experiencing major disruptions among their students, there were others that functioned normally. Among the schools that remained calm were some in which there had been recent rapid increases in the number of Negro students in the school, and where black students had a difficult time identifying with the school. But these situations did not erupt into open defiance of the schools. Other schools enrolled dissident students, experienced racial tensions, and were dismayed by student grievances, but conflict did not break out between school and community or between school personnel and students.

Why did some schools remain calm? After a Columbus newspaper

interviewed several students and staff members at one of these schools that had experienced no student upheaval, it was reported that teachers were willing to talk about controversial issues in the classrooms, that students were asked to form a representative group which could be sensitive to big problems while they were still small, and that changes were being made.\(^{16}\)

However, we need to know much more about all of the phenomena associated with rebellion. The growing concern about rebellion in the public schools requires all public school people to ask themselves if there are certain situations and practices in the schools which bring about unwanted and unexpected behavior patterns among students. This particular study was concerned with school, teacher, and student variables in terms of amount of openness and consequent effect on attitudes and behavior among students.

**Hypotheses**

The general hypothesis investigated in this study was that deviant and nonconforming attitudes and behavior patterns among students in high schools would be affected significantly by the interaction between "openness" in students and "openness" in school situations, and could be predicted in meaningful ways.

Specific hypotheses of this study which related to attitudes were:

\(^{16}\) Lucinda Inskeep, "Linden's Approach to Big Problems Is to Catch Them Small," *Columbus Dispatch*, February 27, 1969, p. 58.
(1) Open students will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes toward school than closed students.

(2) There will be more nonconforming attitudes among students in closed schools than among students in open schools.

(3) Open students in closed schools will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than open students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than closed students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than closed students in closed schools.

Specific hypotheses of this study which relate to behavior were:

(4) Open students will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students.

(5) There will be more nonconforming behavior among students in closed schools than among students in open schools.

(6) Open students in closed schools will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than open students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students in closed schools.

**Definitions**

Conceptual definitions of openness among teachers and students, openness in the school, and deviant or nonconforming behavior among students are necessary for this study. Openness among
teachers, openness among students, and openness in the school situation will be operationally defined as independent variables in this study. Nonconforming or deviant behavior will be defined operationally as a dependent variable. Because the terms do not have precise definitions that are uniformly agreed upon by everyone, conceptual definitions of them are therefore essential in presentation of the problem.

Openness among teachers and students is conceptualized as a characteristic of a person's belief-disbelief system, which assumes a dynamic relationship between the personality and the way a person thinks. Degree of belief is distributed along a continuum from intense belief to only slight belief, depending upon the different shades and degrees of viewpoints experienced by the individual. This conception posits four organizing principles or elements as basic: his view of authority, his tolerance for ambiguity, his ability to synthesize new concepts, and the extent of knowledge he holds.

The view of authority would vary from person to person and would influence openness in the belief-disbelief system. For example, a person's acceptance of authority might vary from uncritical acceptance of authority to a critical evaluation of all authority in reaching a decision.

Every person has an individual tolerance for ambiguity. Some people have a compelling need to have things plain, simple, and clear.

---

Others are willing, even eager, to relate to and work with ideas and situations which are complex, confused, and difficult to understand.

People differ in their synthesizing new concepts into their belief system. Some people are unwilling and seemingly unable to accept ideas when the outcome would require changing their views. Others are both willing and able to accept new ideas even when it is perceived that such a synthesis will make it necessary to change completely their previously held viewpoints. Some people are compelled to make new ideas and experiences conform to their old belief system even by distorting them in order to avoid recognizing the newness of ideas and experiences. Others seek ways to explore, consider, and evaluate new ideas with a view to understanding them and making a new synthesis in their belief system.

Finally, people differ greatly in the extent of knowledge they hold on conflicting viewpoints. Some people know almost nothing about situations and ideas in which they do not believe, while others seem to know as much about situations and ideas they disbelieve as the ones they believe. It is within such a framework that openness among teachers and students is defined. Conceptually this characteristic is distributed along an open-closed continuum.

Openness in the school situation is seen as a characteristic of the relationship between school administrators, the teachers, and students. An open school situation is one in which criticism and feedback from teachers and students are used in formulating school practices and policies. A closed school situation is one in which
criticism and feedback from teachers and students are not used in formulating school practices and policies. In open schools there are opportunities for students and teachers to help in the development and formulation of school policy. In closed schools there are not. In an open school situation students and teachers are encouraged to criticize existing policies. In a closed school situation they are discouraged or actually prevented from making criticisms of school policies. In an open school situation the students and teachers feel psychologically safe in exploring new ideas (e.g. discussing controversial issues in class). In a closed school situation they feel psychologically insecure in such exploration. Furthermore, teachers and students in an open school are proud to be associated with their school. They do not see policies as inflexible and impersonal. Each person feels that his contribution is important. The closed situation is one in which teachers and students feel their contributions are unimportant and in which they experience little freedom or flexibility.

Attitudes are defined as predispositions to behave in certain ways. Nonconforming attitudes are conceptually defined as predispositions to behave in nonconforming ways. A person's attitudes are assumed to be closely related to his behavior. It was assumed that a person might have attitudes of nonconformity and not exhibit any nonconforming behavior. His attitudes toward education and his school were relevant to the problem.

Nonconforming behavior is conceptually defined as that
behavior which is not in conformity with beliefs and practices generally accepted by the school. For example, it has been legally prescribed that students will attend school regularly. Those students who fail or refuse to attend school are nonconforming. Beyond legal rules and regulations there are specific rules which relate to behaviors that are understood and generally accepted by students in a particular school. These rules may relate to appearance, to movement in the halls, or assigned areas for smoking. In any case it would be considered nonconforming behavior when a student either refused or failed to act according to the accepted practice in a particular school or even in a particular classroom. Rebellion may be covert as well as overt. It may very well be that, psychologically, apathy is closely related to open rebellion. Because it is not necessary for an individual to openly defy a system to be thoroughly in disagreement with the system, attitudes as well as behaviors were examined in this study.

Summary

The ugly student outbreaks on college campuses have begun to sweep through public school systems all over the country. There is clearly a relationship between revolt on the college level and revolt on the high school level. Perhaps there has been a covert rebellion under way for several years in the public schools which has only recently become overt as students have become more vociferous. It is reasonable to believe that rebellion on the college campus with
its freer atmosphere had roots which reached down into the high school where the students were required to conform to a traditional American educational system in a thoroughly authoritarian manner. It may be that the schools have actually taught students how to think independently and critically of the issues that already confront us in the world of tomorrow, their world, and they do not like some of the trends that are emerging. For whatever reason, student revolt in our schools is one of our most serious problems.

As adults make increasing demands for cracking down on dissident students, schools need to determine how much student dissent can be tolerated in the schools, how open schools can be to student demands, and what effect openness in the schools and classrooms has on student behavior. This study is an attempt to answer some of these gnawing questions.

The next chapter will outline a theory with which to address this problem and review the literature related to such a theoretical approach.
The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between school, teacher, and student variables in terms of openness and a consequent effect on behavior among students. It was hypothesized that deviant and nonconforming behavior patterns among students in high schools would be affected by the interaction between openness in students and openness in school situations. Six specific hypotheses were stated which related to the general hypothesis.

This chapter will outline a theory of rebellion. The four specifics postulated in the theory will be used as an outline to review the literature relating to the study.

A THEORY OF REBELLION

The problem explaining deviant behavior among our youth in ways that the conditions under which it would most likely occur required some large synthetic theory that unified the phenomena of rebellious behavior.

Hundreds of articles describing rebellion have been written in magazines and newspapers. Hundreds of programs in all the media have surveyed parents, educators, youth, and others throughout our society. There have been many descriptions of rebellion from every
perspective but in all the literature there has been very little that
gave any explanation. It has been disturbing that people have seemed
captive to this crisis that they themselves created.

Frymier has presented a general theory on the phenomena of
rebellion that would apply widely to all social systems.¹ He
theorized that there was a significant relationship between
authoritarianism and the phenomena of rebellion. This study was
planned to find a relationship among variables that were described in
the network of interrelated variables of this theory.

Frymier postulated four specifics in explaining rebellion:
a controlling person or group; a controlled person or group; a
relationship between these two persons or groups; and a context in
which this relationship occurs. The dimensions of the two types of
participants and of the context in which they had their relationship
were described on an authoritarian-nonauthoritarian continuum. The
relationships between these two were described on a rebellious-
nonrebellious continuum.

¹Jack R. Frymier, "Authoritarianism and the Phenomena of
Rebellion," Curriculum Decisions ↔ Social Realities,
(Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum
Development, 1968), 57-78.
the presence of encouragement and opportunity, will result in rebellion. ²

The four postulates in the theory of rebellion could be applied to public education where the controlling person was a teacher, the controlled person was a student, the relationship was between the professional educator and the student, and the context was the school climate. This is conceptualized in Figure 1 in which the controlling person or group is a teacher or group of teachers, the controlled person or group is a student or group of students, the arrows represent the relationship between the two

Figure 1

Pupil-Teacher Relationships in a School Context

²bid, p. 60.
persons or groups, and the school house represents the context within which these two have this relationship. Uneven lengths of the two arrows indicate an uneven power relationship between teachers and students. Even lengths of the two arrows would imply equalitarian relationships between the two groups. In his concept of rebellion, Frymier presumed an "unequal distribution of power and/or material goods and/or social acceptance."\(^3\)

Considering the concepts of authoritarian and nonauthoritarian, as they referred to the participants and to the context in which they related, eight different situations were identified as possible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWERFUL</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>POWERLESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Authoritarian</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authoritarian</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This model suggested that different kinds of relationships would probably exist within each of the eight different situations. For example, in situation number three described above

\(^3\)Ibid, p. 60.
(i.e., authoritarian teacher, democratic school climate, and authoritarian student) one would expect a very different relationship to exist than might occur in situation number six (i.e., democratic teacher, authoritarian school climate, and democratic student).

Frymier defined a relationship continuum by assuming that intentionality, rationality, and degree of physical violence present were important aspects of relationships among people. This continuum arranged conceptual opposites in an assumed order of importance from the most positive humanistic relationships to the most negative anti-humanistic relationships.

By taking representative examples of behavior that might be associated with the different kinds of relationships, outlined above,

---

4 Ibid, p. 70.
5 Ibid, p. 71.
several questions emerge which are relevant to the problem in this study. Is there a higher incidence of protest among students in an authoritarian school environment than in a nonauthoritarian school environment? Does an authoritarian school situation have a different affect on attendance from a nonauthoritarian school situation? Does an authoritarian teacher have a different affect on attendance in a class from a nonauthoritarian teacher? Are democratic processes as capable of satisfying grievances presented by students as more authoritarian processes? Are the pressures on students in democratic school situations different from pressures on students in authoritarian school situations? Is there a difference in the extent of altruistic behavior generated in an authoritarian situation?

Knowing what is already known about human behavior it would be possible to hypothesize about these relationships within the framework of the Frymier theory. It is reasonable to assume that the eight different relationships outlined according to degree of violence, intentionality, and rationality have some correlation with the eight different situations outlined according to the authoritarian or nonauthoritarian nature of the participants and context of the situation. This theory presented a way of approaching a study of student behavior in schools by relating the personality of people in schools and the school climate to student behavior. The remainder of this chapter will review literature related to the specifics postulated in this theory.
THE CONCEPT OF AUTHORITARIANISM IN PEOPLE

Participants in the Frymier theory of rebellion were classified as either controlling or controlled persons and were described on an authoritarian-nonauthoritarian continuum. Professional literature has offered many views that should be considered in a discussion of authoritarian and democratic people. Some of these views are reviewed here as relevant to the theory of rebellion and to this study.

In the knowledge explosion, authority would seem essential. Authority and authoritarianism have been distinguished from one another by educators. In cases where they have not been so distinguished, authoritarianism has become mistaken for expert authority. "To forego authoritarianism raises but does not in itself answer the question of authority in education." 6

Authority operates in education when people require guidance from sources outside themselves. Students in school lean on authority to fulfill their purposes or ends. Expert authority is a triadic relationship between a competent bearer, a subject with a need he cannot meet by himself, and a field of authority delimited by the need of the subject and the competence of the bearer. The community of discourses that make up curriculum finds its leadership among a group of expert discoursers. Good teachers recognize the

need for expert authority.

Much of the contemporary effort of American education to reconceive its function in terms of the 'democratic outlook', both the best and the worst of it, is perhaps best understood and judged as the effort of deliberate educators to locate the 'democratic community' which is the effective and justifiable bearer of pedagogical authority. 7

Rule-authority is similar to expert authority in that it too has a triadic relationship between a competent bearer, a subject with a need he cannot meet by himself, and a field of authority. It functions to create order. However, external authority is the instrument of authoritarianism.

Liberal-democrats cannot combat authoritarianism with the advocacy or practice of a partly fictitious and abstract 'freedom'. They must discover (in part rediscover), advocate, and propagate a type of authority organically united with freedom and individuality. 8

Like good teachers, external authority should try to make itself useless.

Our problem in education would seem to be to help young people make the shift from external authority to internal authority. The teacher who advocates freedom for the learner to internalize and individualize authority but opposes this freedom to become authoritarian will have failed to "... locate and critically maintain and extend the solid and continuing bases of value, method,


8 Ibid, p. 28.
and practice (the 'authorities') on which he and his group . . . of teachers have been operating. A procedure must be found that prepares for the unknown changing future. "External authority gone, we must help our youth to find the only real authority that can command respect, the internal authority of 'how it works when tried'."10

Internal authority is a process, movement, and change. When the learner can realize the reality of process, movement, and change he will find security more in change than in an unchanging world. "The capacity to become educated depends, it would seem, on the capacity of the individual to relinquish what he has held, and build new habit patterns in keeping with environmental demands."11 To help learners build new habit patterns and to make them ready for the "bright light of truth" requires that teachers also realize the security of internal authority, not authoritarianism. "To steer between being useless and authoritarian, so that he can help the group attain its ends, is the great art of teaching."12

Wisdom begins when a person finds out he does not know what he thinks he knows. Personality is continually changing-becoming. The modern world does not want people to defend their existing

9Ibid, p. 17.


12Ibid, p. 96.
behavior but to change it to something more effective, "The surest way to lose truth is to pretend that one already wholly possesses it."¹³ It is internal authority that allows people to continually change, continually grow, continually become.

This concept of authority is opposed to authoritarianism, where submission to an autocratic will leads to the disintegration of a well integrated person. The leader principle in an autocracy is based on allowing only one person to make decisions. In an autocratic or authoritarian organization a hierarchy is formed. "The further up the hierarchy a man stood, not the more, but the less influence did he have on shaping decisions and the more he lived only by the leader's will."¹⁴ In the classroom, the more the student submits to the will of an authoritarian teacher, the less influence he has in making decisions. Students would have very little opportunity to develop the power of independent thinking in an authoritarian classroom.

Adorno and his colleagues made an extensive study of the authoritarian personality.¹⁵ In his massive study the dynamic factor of personality was "made to order for explaining the common trend in


The two opposite personalities, authoritarian and equalitarian, were found to be syndromes of dynamically related factors. A positive correlation, although not high, was established between conventional values and prejudice. Few persons had only a single set of values. Usually a value system was determined according to primacy and degrees of importance among different values. The phenomena of prejudice were essentially irrational. Rational arguments in such phenomena were not found to have much effect. Appeals to submissiveness to authority or to conventionality were found to have had significant effect. In the attempt to measure the potentially anti-democratic personality, this study found authoritarianism to be characteristic of the conservative "Right" ideology.

In later research, Horton reported a positive correlation of fascist or conservative ideology with the acceptance of Marxist views. This suggested that authoritarianism is more likely characterized by extreme views, both "Right" and "Left", than by extreme conservative views alone. Corder described the findings this way:

The results of this research have revealed that the authoritarian individual is a supreme conformist to middle-class ideas, ideals, and to authority. His conformity is compulsive and irrational and is an attempt to find security by merging with the herd,

\[16\] Ibid, p. 56.

or by submitting to some higher power or authority. He sees the world as menacing and unfriendly. Threatened and anxiety ridden, he must seek security somewhere, and the best security is to surrender to a powerful authority. To him life is a power system into which he must fit. He doesn't have to wield power himself as long as he can be near it. 18

Research by social scientists has described personality along an authoritarian-democratic continuum by many different terminologies. Some of these include stasis-process, 19 inadequate-adequate, 20 open-closed, 21 and necrophilial-biophilial. 22 The precise definitions differ among these different theses but each one has contributed to extending and clarifying the use of this concept in education.

There is little doubt for the social scientist that the democratic society and democratic values promise the greater individual fulfillment and happiness; in our society there is both clinical and experimental evidence to support the conclusion that the democratic life is more constructive, less frustrating, and less generative of conflict and maladjustment than the authoritarian way. 23

The importance of studies of this nature has been expressed by Bennis and Slater who have taken the position "that democracy

18 Ibid., p. 104.
23 Remmers, op. cit., p. 20.
(whether capitalistic or socialistic is not at issue here) is the only system that can successfully cope with the changing demands of contemporary civilization. Adaptability to change was seen as the most important single determinant of our survival. Although the autocratic or authoritarian structure has been quicker, neater, and more efficient for simple tasks in static conditions, the democratic or egalitarian structure seemed to work better for acceptance of new ideas, flexibility in working out new problems, and high morale in adapting to changing conditions. Their position was not that democratic ways of behaving would necessarily be pleasant or comfortable for society. It would be a functional necessity for survival.

In Rogers' stasis-process continuum he traced seven stages of process relating to human behavior which ranged from incongruency to congruency, from being unwilling to communicate to desiring to communicate, from failing to recognize problems to feeling subjectively responsible to become involved in problems, and from avoiding relationships with others to being open and free in relationships with others. On the stasis end of the Rogers' scale a person was fixed and rigid in his feelings and experience. At the process end of the scale there was an immediate rich experience of new feelings with a basic trust in his feelings.

The Combs and Snygg thesis about adequate people was


25 Rogers, op. cit.
particularly relevant for educators. They felt that education to be really effective would have to deal with the whole phenomenal field of the individual which was the entire universe as perceived at the instant of action. A person's perceptions were considered to be his own personal realities and although the phenomenal self was complex it was by no means disorganized. Adequate people could be analyzed by their behaviors and by their perceptions of themselves, their self concepts. They were described as holding a positive view of themselves, having a capacity for acceptance, maintaining a high degree of identification with others, and living comfortably with problems.26

Fromm has related his study to the recent protest and revolt in schools and observed that students revolted against being used as objects, against boredom in life.27 They hungered for life and needed a synthesis of soul and knowledge. He saw increased participation in education, greater awareness of others, and greater participation in political affairs as promising answers to this problem. This related to his development of a continuum that extended from a syndrome of decay, which was characterized by necrophilia, malignant narcissism, symbiotic-incestuous fixation, to a syndrome of growth which was characterized by biophilia, love of man, and independence.28

26Combs and Snygg, op. cit.
28Fromm, op. cit.
Frymier has presented a diagram which represents a totality of behavior from democratic to authoritarian by including interrelated factors for which positive correlations existed. He did not develop this outline as a theory of behavior but rather as a synthesis of contributions of many social scientists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRATIC</th>
<th>AUTHORITARIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Distorted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Time</td>
<td>Overconcern With Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTIVE</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE CHALLENGED ADEQUATE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE THREATENED INADEQUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>Rejecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>Hateful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>DEPENDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equalitarian</td>
<td>Dominant-Submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Suggestible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIVE</th>
<th>Does Not Listen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gets Thru&quot;</td>
<td>Arouses Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands</td>
<td>Does Not Comprehend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Openness among people was conceptually defined in the first chapter of this study. The literature related to this idea was particularly important in applying openness to the Frymier theory. One of the most useful frames of reference for research of human

---

behavior in a changing society has been provided by Rokeach in his organization of belief-disbelief systems.

The belief system is conceived to represent all the beliefs, sets, expectancies, or hypotheses, conscious and unconscious, that a person at a given time accepts as true of the world he lives in. The disbelief system is composed of a series of subsystems rather than merely a single one, and contains all the disbeliefs, sets, expectancies, conscious and unconscious, that, to one degree or another, a person at a given time rejects as false.  

He assumed that everything a person believed was organized within a system which had three major dimensions: a belief-disbelief dimension, a central-peripheral dimension, and a time-perspective dimension. These three dimensions were theoretically combined to describe different degrees of open or closed mindedness. It was hypothesized that differences in cognitive and emotional behavior existed between persons characterized as open and closed.  

A basic characteristic that defined the degree of openness or closedness of a belief system was:

... the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside.  

Another basic characteristic that defined openness and closedness in belief systems was the conflict between two powerful

---

30 Rokeach, op. cit., p. 33.
31 Ibid, p. 57.
32 Ibid, p. 57.
motives: the need to know and understand and the need to avoid threatening aspects of reality. Openness should result when the need to know predominated and when the need to ward off threat was absent. "But as the need to ward off threat becomes stronger, the cognitive need to know should become weaker, resulting in more closed belief systems."  

The Rokeach research distinguished between the structure and the content of belief systems. His theory has been widely applicable. It offered a broad general explanation of the organization of a person's belief system regardless of the specific elements of his system.

Kemp compared the problem solving abilities of those who were low in dogmatism to those who were high in dogmatism. He found that those who scored low on the dogmatism scale were superior in critical thinking to those who scored high. Those who scored high on dogmatism made more errors in problems that required consideration of several factors in reaching a decision than those who scored low on dogmatism.  

In a similar study, Kemp compared two groups of college students who were matched in intelligence and degree of open and closed-mindedness. Both groups were taught by the same instructor. The experimental group was given help in solving critical thinking

33ibid, p. 67-68.

problems and the control group was given no such help. He concluded that in permissive, psychologically safe, small group situations those with open minds showed greater improvement in critical thinking than those with closed minds.\textsuperscript{35}

In another study, Kemp found that college students who scored high on the dogmatism scale had more and different interests than they indicated on vocational interest inventories and tended to distort their responses in order to be consistent with what they felt authority figures expected. Those who scored low on the dogmatism scale appeared to be more confident, more independent, and more ready to examine a new experience. It seemed that closed-mindedness affected students' performances on vocational interest inventories.\textsuperscript{36}

In further research, Kemp found that open-minded persons perceived themselves to be more closed-minded than indicated by the dogmatism scale and those with closed belief systems perceived themselves as more open-minded than indicated by the scale.\textsuperscript{37} It was assumed from this study that self-perception was affected by dogmatism.

Musella found that closed-minded elementary principals were

\textsuperscript{35}C. Gratton Kemp, "Improvement of Critical Thinking in Relation to Open-Closed Belief Systems," \textit{Journal of Experimental Education, XXXI}, 3(Spring, 1963), 321-323.


influenced by the similarity of belief-disbelief systems of teachers whom they rated for effectiveness.\textsuperscript{38} The similarity of belief-disbelief systems of teachers had no effect on the ratings made by open-minded principals. Closed-minded principals had difficulty in perceiving favorably those teachers whose belief-disbelief systems were different from their own.

In summary, it has been found that persons who were high on ethnic prejudice, authoritarianism, or dogmatism scales, as compared with those who were low, were more rigid in problem solving, concrete in thinking, more narrow in grasp of a particular subject, intolerant of ambiguity, premature in closure, distorted in memory, unclear in goal selection, dependent, more insensitive to others, and pessimistic. Those who were low on ethnic prejudice, authoritarianism, or dogmatism scales as compared to those who were high, were characterized as more flexible, abstract in thinking, broader in their grasp of a particular subject, tolerant of ambiguity, more accurate in memory, clear in goal selection, independent, more sensitive to others, and optimistic.

Studies using the Rokeach dogmatism scale have shown it to measure authoritarianism independent of a particular ideology. It seemed appropriate to measure the participants in the Frymier theory. Reliability and validation studies of the Rokeach dogmatism scale will be cited in the next chapter.

The next section of this chapter will review literature that

has related to openness in the school climate, the context in which teachers and students have their relationship.

The Concept of Openness in Organizational Climate

The degree of openness in the school is a characteristic of the relationship between the school administration, teachers, and students. It is the interrelationship of these three relationships in the school environment.

The performance of people may be predicted with greater accuracy when the psychological properties have been worked into the prediction equations. Studies have shown that personality variables had an effect on individual behavior but that alone was not enough. "We may be able to say something about the readiness of an individual to break into violence, but we are pretty much in the dark as to the remaining necessary conditions under which an outbreak would occur."39 The situation or context in which people perform would certainly be considered among the remaining necessary conditions for predicting human behavior.

This was evident in a staff report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence which has investigated civil disturbances in Chicago, Miami, Cleveland, and Washington and has published several studies, "Violence in America," "Firearms and Violence in American Life," and "The Politics of Protest."

39Adorno, op. cit., p. 972.
This nation cannot have it both ways. Either it will carry through a firm commitment to massive and widespread political and social reform, or it will develop into a society of garrison cities where order is enforced without due process of law and without consent of the governed. 40

The problem that has faced government was one of the oldest problems in politics - the problem of non-violent transfer of power. The nation has become one to employ more people in services than in tangible goods. New knowledge and skills have become necessary for leadership because "... the pivotal function in the leader's role has changed from a sole concern with the substantive to an emphasis on the interpersonal." 41

An effective climate for group behavior would have many of the same characteristics of an effective participant in the group. It was Plato who drew an analogy between a despotic state and a despotic individual and found the same characteristics in both. Most social scientists would agree that an effective collaborative climate:

... should include the following ingredients: flexible and adaptive structure, utilization of member talents, clear and agreed-upon goals, norms of openness, trust, and cooperation, interdependence, high intrinsic rewards, and transactional controls, i.e., members of the unit should have a high degree of autonomy and a high degree of participation making key decisions. 42

---


41 Bennis and Slater, op. cit., p. 101.

Bennis and Slater extended this idea to the problem of student unrest that has faced us in education.

Universities are, of course, a special case but until they take a serious look at their 'anomic' existence, there is little hope that they will solve their vexing problems. The Berkeley riots were symptomatic of at least four self-contained, uncommunicating social systems (students, faculty, administration, regents) without the trust, empathy, and interaction, to say nothing of tradition, to develop meaningful collaboration. 43

It would be possible for teachers to know what was right according to principles of education in a democratic society and still behave in inappropriate ways because they were 'evaluated by surface effects, administrative tastes, community opposition, or superficial comfort for the administrative machinery.' 44 There have been efforts to define the personality of a school. Such a definition could be used to build a more collaborative climate.

Pace 45 grouped colleges into six patterns: selective private liberal arts colleges; large academically-oriented public universities; non-selective universities; strong denominational colleges; technical colleges; and moderate denominational schools. He administered his College and University Environment Scales to randomly selected students with the assumption that the perception of the environment

43 Ibid., p. 105.
by the students was more important in determining its effect on the behavior of students than other perceptions might be. Five dimensions of college environment were described by five scales: (1) practicality, which combined entrepreneurial and bureaucratic features with an emphasis on concrete and realistic elements of order, organization, and system; (2) community, which was defined as the support and cohesiveness that was often associated with small colleges; (3) awareness, including self-understanding and personal involvement with the world’s problems and the conditions of man; (4) propriety, which was carefully differentiated from conventionality (since hippies had conventions) to be defined as decorum, politeness, consideration, thoughtfulness, and caution; and (5) scholarship, the pursuit of knowledge, academic achievement, and vigorous competition for it. 46

In this study of the educational structure of college environment Pace found that selective private liberal arts colleges were scholarly, aware, more proper than rebellious, and unconcerned with practicality. Large academically-oriented public universities were similar to selective private liberal arts colleges but were less proper and scaled less on community. Non-selective universities were dissimilar to any other group and generally from each other. Strong denominational schools were shown to be high on practicality, community and propriety but low on awareness. Technical colleges

46 Ibid.
emphasized scholarship but were low on community and awareness. The moderate denominational colleges and a few teachers' colleges were shown to be high on practicality and community but low on scholarship.

The Pace study showed that students' perceptions were meaningful in defining the educational structure of colleges. They did discriminate among the six patterns of colleges and it seemed possible that student perceptions could be useful in discriminating openness among different public schools in the same system.

A study of the organizational climate by Halpin and Croft made a major contribution by developing an instrument, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.\(^{47}\) This instrument provided a convenient way to assess the climate of the elementary school. By organizational climate they referred to the social interaction between the principal and the teachers in a school.

Research literature has reported many different ways of classifying the attributes of group behavior. Halpin and Croft reduced organizational climate to three recurring schemata: the source from which interactions stemmed; the effectiveness-ineffectiveness of the organization; and, the relationship between social needs of the individual as a group member and the social control imposed on him.

as a price to be a member of the group.48

After a series of analyses of three forms of the OCDQ, eight dimensions were presumed to be measured by eight subtests. The first four of these dimensions related to teachers' behavior and the last four related to principals' behavior. They were defined as follows:

Disengagement described a group that no longer had any criterion of value in a task oriented situation.

Hindrance was perceived by teachers when the principal burdened them with routine work rather than facilitating their work.

Esprit referred to a feeling of satisfaction of social needs and a sense of accomplishment in their work as teachers.

Intimacy described the gratification of social needs as separate from task-accomplishment.

Aloofness described a principal who kept himself at a distance from his staff.

Production Emphasis referred to a principal who supervised closely, was directive, and was not sensitive to feedback from his staff.

Thrust differed from 'production emphasis' in that the principal attempted to motivate teachers by an example he personally set.

48 ibid, pp. 16-17.
Consideration characterized the principal who treated the teachers "humanly."\(^{49}\)

From these eight dimensions six major clusters emerged as profiles which have been defined as six organizational climates. These prototypes were named and ranked in order from "Open" to "Closed." This terminology was determined in part by Rokeach\(^{50}\) and was similar to Lewin's hypothesis about the structure of "mind."\(^{51}\) The open climate was marked by functional flexibility, the closed climate by functional rigidity. The whole definition of the organizational climate was influenced by both Rokeach and Lewin in that it was "... construed as the organizational 'personality' of a school; figuratively, 'personality' is to the individual what 'climate' is to the organization."\(^{52}\)

The rank order of the six organizational climates is shown in Table 1. The numbers in the table represent double-standardized scores (both normative and ipsative), with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Open climates were characterized by highest scores among teachers in the dimension of esprit and by highest scores among principals in the dimension of thrust. Closed

\(^{49}\)Ibid, pp. 29-32.

\(^{50}\)Rokeach, op. cit.


\(^{52}\)Halpin and Croft, op. cit., p. 1.
climates were marked by highest scores among teachers in the dimension of disengagement and lowest scores in esprit. Among principals the closed climate was indicated by lowest scores in the dimensions of thrust and consideration.

TABLE 1
Prototypic Profiles for Six Organizational Climates Ranked in Respect to Openness versus Closedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climates</th>
<th>Group's A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Leader's E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Characteristics:**
A = Disengagement  
B = Hindrance  
C = Esprit  
D = Intimacy

**Leader Characteristics:**
E = Aloofness  
F = Production Emphasis  
G = Thrust  
H = Consideration

---

Serendipity revealed the importance of "authenticity" in organizational climate. The group and the leader were observed to be genuine, authentic, and real in certain situations. In others they
were observed to be playing a role that served as a protective cloak to hide their real identity. The authors believed that the "chief consequence of the present study is our identification of the pivotal importance of 'authenticity' in organizational behavior."53

In the implications of this research, a study by Guba, Jackson, and Bidwell was cited which suggested that candidates who select teaching as a career were not those who would be likely to facilitate openness in organizational climate.54 From administering the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to teacher-trainees and veteran teachers they noted "... the characteristics seem to fit the cultural stereotype of the teacher as sexually impotent, obsequious, eternally patient, painstakingly demanding, and socially inept."55

Related studies using the OCDQ have extended the work done by Halpin and Croft. Anderson, in a study of the relationships between organizational climate of elementary schools and personal variables of the principals, found that "some attributes of leader personality appear to be associated with leadership effectiveness."56

53 Ibid, p. 80.
55 Ibid, p. 4.
Brown replicated the Halpin and Croft study.\textsuperscript{57} Among other findings, he concluded that principals tended to view the climates of their schools more favorably than their teachers did and cautioned researchers not to be overly dependent on arbitrary classifications of climate conceptualized by other investigators.

Null made an investigation into the relationship between personal variables of teachers and the way they perceived the eight dimensions of the organizational climate.\textsuperscript{58} He was concerned that the behavior of teachers and principals as perceived by colleagues might differ in varying degrees from actual behavior. His study indicated that teachers with a particular pattern of personality traits perceived organizational climate in a unique way. For instance, teachers with a "good" attitude toward children, as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, perceived all eight dimensions of the organizational climate in a manner indicative of an open climate whereas teachers with a "poor" attitude toward children perceived the organizational climate as more closed.

Sargent used the OCDQ in thirty-three high schools drawn at

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{57}Robert J. Brown, \textit{Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools}, (Minneapolis: Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., University of Minnesota, 1965).}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{58}Eldon J. Null, \textit{Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools}, (Minneapolis: Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., University of Minnesota, 1967).}
random to study the organizational climate at the high school level.\textsuperscript{59} Previous work had been done only with elementary schools. He found that the personalities of the principals were somewhat related to the high schools' organizational climates but there was very little relationship between any of the personality characteristics and the degree of openness in high schools. There was striking disagreement between the perspectives of school climate by teachers and those by principals with principals seeing all dimensions in a more favorable light than the teachers. Consistently nearer agreement was noted in the open schools than in closed schools. The teachers, regardless of department, agreed among themselves about school climate dimensions with greater agreement in open schools than in closed schools. Teachers in open schools felt their schools were more effective and expressed greater satisfaction in their work than did their counterparts in closed schools. This suggested that climate might have been the explanation. The size of the school had no relationship to the extent of openness in the school nor to the extent of agreement among teachers regarding school climate. The location of the school, urban or suburban, had no relationship to the proportion of open and closed schools.

In summary, research has shown that perceptions of students, teachers, and principals have provided useful information for the

study of school climate. It recalled "... that the only reality is a perception, located somewhere behind the eyes." It seemed logical to use perceptions of teachers and students to define school climate in this study.

The next section will review literature about student behavior as it is effected by the relationships among teachers, students, and school climate.

The Effect of Teachers and Schools on Student Behavior

The Frymier theory suggested that different kinds of relationships would probably exist within the eight different authoritarian-democratic situations that were postulated. In this study it was specifically hypothesized that nonconforming behaviors would be exhibited more among open students in closed situations and less among closed students in closed situations. It was generally theorized that deviant and nonconforming behavior patterns among students in high schools would be affected by the interaction between varying degrees of openness in school situations. There have been many studies concerned with effects of personal relationships and environment on human behavior.

Just as people and environment have been described as authoritarian and nonauthoritarian or open and closed, so could relationships among people and between people and their environments

\(^{60}\text{Kelley, op. cit., p. 35.}\)
be described as authoritarian and nonauthoritarian or open and closed. Dimensions of freedom and order have been meaningfully, even though simply, diagrammed to show the relationship of autocracy, democracy, and laissez-faire. In Figure 2, it is seen that democracy was not a mean or mid-point between laissez-faire and autocracy. It was probably not equal in amount of freedom to that in laissez-faire nor was it equal in amount of order to that in autocracy as pictured in the diagram. Although the diagram could depict concepts of autocracy and laissez-faire with meaning, it was more inadequate for the concept of democracy.

Figure 2

Dimensions of Freedom and Order in Autocracy, Democracy, and Laissez-faire

Democracy required a third dimension that would include friendliness and intercommunication among people within an environment. This third dimension would be high in democracy yet low in both autocracy and laissez-faire. Moreover, democracy was more than the sum of these three dimensions. "It is a different pattern, a fresh synthesis."\textsuperscript{62} In the classroom, permissiveness or restriction and lenience or punishment as the only alternatives are inappropriate because they disregard democratic leadership. Critics of schools have referred to their permissiveness without discriminating between democratic and laissez-faire schools. Democratic leadership implied internalized responsibility on the part of the controlled person as well as the controlling person.

The Lewin, Lippitt, and White classical study of aggressive behavior in experimental situations compared the individual behavior and group behavior of boys' club members under authoritarian, democratic, or laissez-faire leadership.\textsuperscript{63} The authoritarian leadership determined policy, dictated steps to be taken in activities, dictated membership of working groups, was friendly or impersonal, but remained aloof and was not hostile. Democratic leadership determined policy through group discussion and decisions, suggested alternative steps to reach goals allowing students to make their choice, allowed the group

\textsuperscript{62}Ibid, p. 136.

to select work companions, was objective in praise and criticism, and was a regular group member without doing too much of the work. The effect of serendipity was important to this study in that there emerged a concept of laissez-faire leadership that had not been planned. Laissez-faire leadership was noticed in some individuals who were attempting to be democratic and failed to communicate effectively with the group or to effect what Lippitt and White later called a "fresh synthesis" of the freedom and order dimensions of leadership.

In this experiment, autocracy provided a much more rigid social group than democracy. Hostility was thirty times as frequent in the autocratic group as in the democratic group. However, aggression levels were noted to vary greatly in the autocratic situation. A nonaggressive reaction to autocracy was observed which was described as dull, submissive, repressive, and apathetic. Elements that played a dominant role in spontaneous aggression by the group were tension, space of free movement, and the rigidity of group structure. The rigidity of the group was seen to function as a restraining force against locomotion away from the group or from the position within the group.

Later reflections on these studies by the authors showed a more careful analysis of the data and gave more insight to aggressive behavior as it had been observed in the experiments.\[64] Three major

---

\[64\]Lippitt and White, op. cit.
factors were seen to encourage aggressive behavior: the absence of a respected adult, idleness, and frustration leading to psychological tension. There was a great amount of critical discontent and aggressive behavior in the aggressive reaction to autocracy. On days when boys had made a transition to a freer atmosphere there often had occurred a phenomenon of release behavior which suggested the presence of previous frustration or covert rebellion to authoritarian leadership. The authors summarized this later analysis: (1) laissez-faire was not the same as democracy; (2) democracy could be efficient; (3) autocracy could create much hostility; (4) autocracy could create discontent which doesn't appear on the surface; (5) there was more dependence and less individuality in autocracy; (6) there was more group mindedness and friendliness in democracy.65

Democracy has been seen as a form of authority, not a denial of it. Riots and revolutions have occurred whenever the ruling class appeared weak or vacillating. This was true with the East German riots of 1953, with Hungary in 1956, and with the Czechoslovakian rebellion in 1968. It could be generalized that weakness in the power group is a more important factor than the amount of discontent in determining rebellion.

"Both the experimental and historical facts suggest that the royal road to dictatorship is not a strengthening of democratic government but a weakening of democratic government, a slipping

65 Ibid., p. 87.
into anarchy which sets up the psychologically inevitable urge to escape from anarchy into tyranny.°6

This idea has also been used in reference to our present educational problem. "The growth of the attitude of acceptance toward anything done by alienated adolescents and young persons is an invitation to educational anarchy."87

There were several values that were found necessary in strengthening a democracy.68 There must be open-mindedness in the relationships among the group. The principle of free speech is of value only if there is free open listening on the part of the group. Individuals must experience self-acceptance and self-confidence. This is a large role for adults in a democracy, for teachers in schools, as they influence children's behavior. There must be a sense of realism among democratic people. "The humility of the true scientist, in the face of the immensity of the facts he does not know, is psychologically akin to the humility of the true democrat in the face of the emerging ideas of other group members."69 Strong democracy requires freedom from status-mindedness. Democratic people must escape from the whole equality-inequality frame of references and subscribe to a concept of fairness that would include equal

---

66 Ibid. p. 137.


68 Lippit and White, op. cit., pp. 230-234.

69 Ibid. p. 233.
rights and opportunities.

The behavior of students has repeatedly been shown to be influenced by their perceptions of teachers, their perceptions of schools, and the interrelationships they experience with teachers and schools. This influence is profoundly strong.

If schools exist to help children learn to behave in democratic ways, then teachers must be democratic, too. Presenting children with appropriate behaviors to perceive is more than a cliche; children learn1 from others. In fact, children tend to become the kind of people their teachers are. 70

Bennington College was planned to relate in nonauthoritarian ways to female students. They had neither grades nor credit hours and students were given an opportunity to develop a highly individualized program. Students were regular members of an Educational Policies Committee. Social rules, academic distinctions, and formal requirements were seen as potential barriers to both intellectual and social development.

In a study of students at Bennington, Newcomb found there were norms of school-standards on which there was acknowledged consensus within the group of students and sanctions were attached to these standards.71 The most powerful sanction was peer acceptance or rejection. Students were found to be more "unconventional" and


"rebellious" than those at Vassar. Figure 3 identifies four subgroups that were described in this study. The "Social Group" served to insulate its members from pressure to change toward dominant forms of "individualism" and "intellectuality." At Bennington the "collegiate" subculture was deviant rather than dominant. This study, made twenty-five years after graduation, supported the idea that "deviations are not necessarily dysfunctional for a social system, . . . any more than conformity is necessarily functional."72

Figure 3

Dimensions of Individualism and Intellectuality among Four Subcultures Identified at Bennington College

Another study was made in which the degree and kind of student protest was found to be related to college environment.

---

characteristics as perceived by students. The study was important for college administrators who sought a better understanding of the phenomena of protest on the college campus.

Much of the deviant behavior has been seen as positive and necessary. Dr. Allen Moore saw rebellious students as brilliant and deeply concerned about the student in college. The revolt was seen to be against an authoritarian structure in the schools. Another observed that: "They are articulate, irreverent, humorless, and relentless in their contempt for what they view as adult hypocrisy." Their relationships in school and society have resulted in contemptuous behavior.

Lewin found the total behavior technique a fruitful approach for studying the dynamics of group behavior. His study supported the propositions of the Yale theory: strength of frustration was dependent, in part, on the strength of motivation; frustration frequently produced aggression; aggression may be inhibited by social restraint; aggression was directed against interfering agents; and

---


social restraint decreased the ratio of direct to indirect aggression.

Just as frustration from school restraint has produced aggressive behavior by students against others, there is also some evidence that students have directed overt aggressive behavior toward themselves in self-destruction or suicide. In one study of student suicide it was stated "... that the school and its culture was involved in twelve of the twenty cases studied."

There was not one case in large schools of any significant personal interaction between teacher and students. "The most striking facet of educational involvement in the cases studied was the lack of social identification within the educational milieu." The closedness of the schools was strongly indicated by their consistent refusal to cooperate with this study of school-age suicide.

The major implication of these findings is that these students were subjected over long periods of time to frustration producing academic environments. Many were forced to compete in a situation where achievement and favorable recognition were highly improbable. The recognition they did receive was to be officially classified as a failure.

Classroom behavior of teachers has been found significantly related to behavior of students. In one study, teachers of more concrete belief systems displayed less resourcefulness, more


78 Ibid, p. 78.

79 Ibid, p. 87.
dictatorialness, and more punitiveness than more abstract teachers.\textsuperscript{80}

Greater abstractness, greater resourcefulness, less dictatorialness, and less punitiveness were associated with more educationally preferable performances of children. Concrete belief systems have been identified with closed mindedness and abstractness with open mindedness. More educationally preferable behavior of children was associated with teachers who were more abstract, more resourceful, less dictatorial and less punitive.

Fischer felt that professors in colleges have revolted against administration as evidenced by passing routine jobs and teaching of undergraduate courses to graduate students, by seizing a big share of power from the trustees, and by devoting a majority of their time to research and graduate programs.\textsuperscript{81} He described dissident student behavior as counter-revolting against their impersonal relationship with these academics whom he described as "hard-shelled conservatives on questions of university reform, no matter how radical they are on other issues."\textsuperscript{82}

School drop-outs have expressed their rebellion against schools in another way. In one study\textsuperscript{83} sixty-three different


\textsuperscript{82}Ibid, p. 12.

defenses against the frustrating and tension producing relationships in schools were divided into two major categories: covert or autoplastic and overt or alloplastic. Autoplastic defenses were generally within the individual and attempted to avoid or escape the environment. Suicide would generally be considered as an autoplastic defense behavior. Alloplastic defenses were attempts to discharge tension or frustration through behavior intended to alter the environment. Provocation would be considered an alloplastic defense behavior.

A character disturbance was differentiated from a neurotic disturbance. A character disturbance was a maladaptive total way of life whereas a neurotic disturbance was a maladaptive response to a specific stress. There have been those who believed that student unrest in the schools has reflected a maladaptive total way of life on the part of youth in our modern society. Others recognized student unrest as a neurotic disturbance, a maladaptive response to a school curriculum they considered to be irrelevant or to a school climate that was closed. The authors were certain that the majority of students were challenged and responded positively to the increased demands of the schools; but they were equally certain that others were harmed by this pressure. From their case study of 105 students they reported: "All students were unsuccessful in adapting to some school requirement or regulation, . . ."\(^84\)

In his study of a high school, Stinchcombe found that high

\(^{84}\)bid, p. 247.
school rebellion involved an expression of alienation from authority.\textsuperscript{85} He found this "expressive alienation" to be an organization of attitudes toward the school environment. It was believed to have existed when students skipped school or were sent out of the class.

There were some students who held rebellious attitudes who hadn't rebelled and others who rebelled but had not held rebellious attitudes.

There were four hypotheses supported by the Stinchcombe study. Students identified as rebellious had a psychological set. They were more likely to hold hedonistic, negativistic, alienated, and autonomous attitudes than students who were not rebellious.

Second, it was observed that rebellion occurred when the future status was not clearly related to the present performance of the student. This was an interesting hypothesis in that it has often been held that deviant values were traceable to past experiences, not to the orientations to the future. High school students who were rebellious often felt that school performance was unimportant and sometimes unrelated to aspirations they had set for themselves. This had implications for schools that offer traditional college preparatory programs to students who do not aspire to continue their education in college.

Third, when symbols of formal school culture failed to provide a satisfactory identification with the role of the adolescent, students identified with adult symbols and became alienated from

their adolescent society. This was indicated passively by girls who claimed adult status through early marriage before 18 years of age. Boys actively indicated their claim to adult status and alienation from adolescence by declaring the necessity of a car in high school and the right for an adolescent to smoke. Those who claimed few adult rights were likely to be college preparatory students.

Fourth, among those failing in school, those under the most pressure to succeed were found to be the most rebellious because rebellion was a way of rejecting pressure. The relationship of social class to rebellion was found weak and unreliable in this study which was different from an earlier thesis that "... social behavior of adolescents is related functionally to the position their families occupy in the social structure of the community." Hollingshead found a significant relationship between social class and adolescent behavior. However, his research design in looking for such a relationship between social class and adolescent behavior was much more complex than Stinchcombe's.

Stinchcombe developed a theory of social structure and anomie in which he postulated that the universality of success subjected people to the same standards and ignored they had different opportunities to succeed. Those people subjected to the greatest strain between success goals and legitimate opportunities to succeed

---


87 Stinchcombe, op. cit., Chapter 6.
were likely to lose their commitment to their goals, reject legitimate means for reaching their goals, or both. According to his theory, different types of deviant behavior would occur depending on which action they took. For instance, a ritualistic observance of competitive struggle in the classroom could result from a lack of commitment to goals. Cheating in class could result from a rejection of legitimate means for reaching success goals. Apathy in classroom performance could result from both losing a commitment to success goals and rejecting means for reaching such goals. Stinchcombe theorized that rebellious behavior would result from an ambivalence both to success goals and the means for attaining them.

In summary, studies have shown an association between student behavior and relationships among students, teachers, and school climate. These relationships have been manifest in student behavior and may be located on a relationship continuum theorized by Frymier.

This chapter has given a review of the literature related to the elements of the Frymier theory. The function of a theory is to predict the relationships among naturally occurring phenomena and not the phenomena themselves. The next chapter will outline the methodology designed to test the power of this theory in predicting some of the relationships occurring in the phenomena of student nonconforming behavior in school.
CHAPTER III

METHODS USED FOR GATHERING DATA

In the first chapter it was stated that this study is concerned with school, teacher, and student variables in terms of openness and the consequent effect on behavior among high school students. The second chapter reviewed a theory of rebellion and literature related to the specific elements of this theory. This chapter will describe the community and schools in which this study was conducted. It will also outline the methodology used to gather and analyze the data.

Description of the Community and Its Schools

The population for this study was drawn from six senior high schools in the Columbus School System, Columbus, Ohio. The school system with an enrollment of more than 100,000 was one of the largest in America and had experienced a very rapid rate of growth since 1950. The city of Columbus experienced many of the problems of other large cities, with one area classified "... as an emerging ghetto with attendant problems" in a major study of the city's schools.¹

¹The Ohio State University Advisory Commission on Problems Facing the Columbus Public Schools, A Report to the Columbus Board of Education, (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1968), p. 18.
The Ohio State University recommendations to the Columbus School System\(^2\) included concern for the alienation syndrome and achievement motivation among the students.

As a total group Columbus Public School students appear to demonstrate no tendency toward estrangement from society between the end of junior high school and the end of senior high school. On the contrary, we find some tendency toward increased self concept and toward greater feeling of mastery of the environment and one's own destiny as students move through the schools. \(^3\)

There were some marked differences in the responses of students from individual schools. Considerable alienation was found to exist among lower socio-economic groups of students. "The data which we have accumulated here, however, do not point to wholesale educational alienation among students in priority schools, or to consistently low motivation for achievement in such schools."\(^4\)

In regard to integrated education there appeared to be no strong opposition among the students. When the issue of busing was "... removed the vast majority of respondents appeared to be positively disposed or unconcerned about integration in schools."\(^5\)

Among the adult population the majority were found to favor integrated school settings. There was found some intense local "disagreement

\(^2\)ibid.

\(^3\)ibid, p. 297.

\(^4\)ibid, p. 299.

\(^5\)ibid, p. 276.
about the schools on the part of some citizens which had grown out of several circumstances including the increased realization of the importance of public education in our society and the demands for equal opportunity through school integration.

Recommendations which were made were accepted and widely implemented by the school board. The public expressed its support six months after the report was received by approving a large operating levy necessary to finance school improvement. The community had made itself aware of problems and had cooperatively moved ahead in a positive direction to meet these problems.

However, major disruptions among the students were to occur in three Columbus secondary schools within a year after these recommendations were made and accepted. The problems experienced in schools of other large cities were experienced in Columbus also. In spite of general support of the schools by the public, there were still grievances among people in the community and among students in the schools. It was a community where a study of student behavior in the schools could have real significance.

Selection of Schools and Participants

The initial selection of the schools was made from a rank ordering of all the high schools in the Columbus School System by five school administrators in the central office who were asked to rank the

---

6 Ibid.
thirteen high schools from the most open to the least open. (See Appendix A) Open schools were defined as those in which there was an opportunity for students and teachers to contribute to the development of school policy, in which students and teachers were encouraged to criticize existing policy, in which it was psychologically safe to explore new ideas, and in which the individual student or teacher felt that his contribution was important. Interjudge reliability on these rankings was checked by determining the Kendall Coefficient of concordance $W$, which is an index of the divergence of actual agreement shown in the data from the maximum possible agreement. The value of $W$ was 0.874. The chi-square value of 52.44 was statistically significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. It was concluded that agreement among the five supervisors was significant.

Educators in the College of Education at The Ohio State University who worked closely with the Columbus Schools were also asked to rank the schools from most open to least open. These were considered expert observers in education, and included supervisors of student teaching who had made regular visitations in all of the high schools this year, professors who had conducted research in the high schools within the last year or had maintained extensive contact with the public schools, and college administrators whose responsibilities had brought them into a close relationship with Columbus schools and community. Of those who were invited to participate, five responded with a complete rank ordering of the schools. The value of $W$ for these
five was .36 which was significant at .05.

The rank orderings of public school administrators and college observers were combined to obtain a broader perspective than would be possible from only one group of respondents. The combination of ten rank orderings was statistically significant at the .001 level of confidence. It was concluded that the agreement among these ten observers was higher than it would be by chance and reliable enough for initial selection. The rank orderings of both groups are shown in Table 2. The administration had requested that school participation be voluntary for this study. Approval was received from six schools, A B C D E F, to carry out the study. These schools were ranked 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, and 13 by the five administrators in the central office, as shown in the Table 2. This approval was contingent on keeping the identity of the schools confidential throughout the written report of findings and maintaining anonymity of all students and teachers who participated in the study. Therefore, for purposes of this report, the schools have been identified by letter and not by name.

The school system had developed a plan for assigning priorities among schools in order to make decisions about appropriating programs and services funded primarily by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The priority system ranged from Priority I to Priority V and designated certain schools as non-priority. Priority I referred to those schools which were eligible for a greater concentration of compensatory programs and services than
### TABLE 2

Rank Ordering of Columbus Schools from Most Open to Least Open by Public School Administrators and College Observers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Office Administrators</th>
<th>Ohio State University Observers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A A J J A</td>
<td>J J A H H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J B A A J</td>
<td>K A B D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B H B B C</td>
<td>B C M L E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H J H C B</td>
<td>C B H A M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I C I I M</td>
<td>A K I K A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C L M H I</td>
<td>D M L C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>K K C D K</td>
<td>E E K M G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L M D K L</td>
<td>I I C B K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D D K M D</td>
<td>L H D G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M I L L H</td>
<td>M D E I I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E E F F G</td>
<td>H L J J B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>G F G E E</td>
<td>F F F F J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F G E G F</td>
<td>G G G E L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square analysis:
- for total group = 62.16
- for central office administrators = 52.44
- for university observers = 21.60

*aTo conceal their real identities letters have been used to refer to the schools instead of names.

\[ p < .001 \quad c p < .05 \]
schools ranked lower in priority. Since priority schools were required to be in areas with the greatest incidence of poverty, these designations have been used here to give a general description of the socio-economic level of the areas served by each of the six schools.

Among the six selected schools, the three most open included a non-priority school with a low percentage of Negro enrollment, a Priority II school with a high percentage of Negro enrollment, and a Priority III school with a moderate percentage of Negro enrollment. The three least open schools included two non-priority schools with a low percentage of Negro enrollment and a Priority II school with a moderately high percentage of Negro enrollment. These descriptions are depicted in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Prioritya</th>
<th>Approximate Per Cent of Negro Enrollmentb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Non-priority</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Priority II</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Priority III</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Non-priority</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Non-priority</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Priority II</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

aThe Ohio State University Advisory Commission of Problems Facing the Columbus Public Schools, p. 30.
bIbid, p. 23.
Each of the schools which participated in this study did so voluntarily. Similarly, the twelfth grade students and teachers within each of these schools participated voluntarily. Those who volunteered represented forty-six percent of the teachers and thirty-two percent of the twelfth grade students in the six schools. A larger percentage of students and teachers volunteered from the two schools ranked least open than from the two ranked most open. Table 4 shows the distribution of the sample among the six schools that participated in this study.

**TABLE 4**

Research Sample in the Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Twelfth Grade Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement of Participants**

The Frymier theory postulated a controlling person or group and a controlled person or group which were described along an authoritarian-nonauthoritarian continuum. In this study teachers have
been assumed to be the controlling persons or group and students
to be the controlled persons or group. It was necessary to describe
teachers and students along an authoritarian-nonauthoritarian
continuum to test the theory and the hypotheses of this study. It
was assumed that the Rokeach dogmatism scale was appropriate for this
description.

Rokeach developed a dogmatism scale with which he had intended
to analyze and measure the "... properties held in common by all
forms of authoritarianism..." He had observed that the Adorno
F-scale measured a conservative "right" authoritarianism. Dogmatism
was defined as "... a relatively closed cognitive organization of
beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set
of beliefs about absolute authority..." 8

Three major hypotheses had been tested to determine the
construct validity of the dogmatism scale. First, it was hypothesized
that the dogmatism scale measured general authoritarianism and not
"right" authoritarianism only as had been reported by the Adorno
F-scale. Second, it was hypothesized that the Rokeach conception of
dogmatism was related both to left-of-center and right-of-center forms
of intolerance. Third, it was hypothesized that strong group
pressures would lead to greater dogmatism.

7Hilton Rokeach, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An
Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological
Monographs, LXX, 18(1956), 3.

8Ibid, p. 5.
An extensive series of validation studies have been made in which the dogmatism scale differentiated between groups of people "known" to be either open or closed-minded, between Catholic students and Protestant students, and between Communists and liberals in England. 9 In his "Doodlebug Problem" Rokeach demonstrated the validity of his scale in measuring an individual's total belief system. 10 There was no significant difference in the way open or closed people analyzed the problem. There was, however, a significant superiority in the way open-minded individuals synthesized the new beliefs necessary to the solution of the problem.

Reliability for the test-retest procedure was considered satisfactory. 11 The reliability coefficient for an English college sample was .81 and for an English worker sample it was .78. Samples subsequently tested in American universities had reliability scores which ranged from .68 to .93. It was found suitable for use among high school students with a test-retest reliability of .82 and a correlation of .74 with eight teachers who agreed at .92. 12

It seemed appropriate to relate authoritarianism to dogmatism and to be able to define it operationally by use of the Rokeach

---

11 Rokeach, op. cit., p. 9.
dogmatism scale to measure the degree of openness among teachers as controlling persons and among students as controlled persons. It was included as the first 40 items of the two instruments developed for use in this study. These instruments are included as Appendix B and Appendix C.

Measurement of Context

In order to test the general hypothesis that behavior of students was affected by the interaction between openness in students and openness in school situations, it was necessary to describe schools along an open-closed continuum. Rank ordering of Columbus high schools by central office supervisors and administrators was used in the initial selection of schools in this study. The amount of agreement among these educators was found to be statistically significant, but ordinal numbers indicated nothing more than a rank order. They did not indicate degrees of openness in the schools. Rank order of schools was not considered an adequate description of openness for the purposes of this study even though it seemed adequate for the initial selection of schools.

The context in which the controlling person or group and the controlled person or group had their relationship was also described along an authoritarian-nonauthoritarian continuum. In this study, context was interpreted as school climate or environment and was placed on an open-closed continuum which matched the terminology used in studies of organizational climate using the Organizational Climate
Description Questionnaire and matched the terminology describing teachers and students. However, in the Halpin and Croft studies openness related more directly to teacher morale, esprit, than has been conceptualized here. It was assumed that there was a considerable amount of similarity between the two ideas of openness. Investigators using the OCDQ have been studying relationships between personal variables of members of the teaching staff and organizational climate or between personal variables of the principal and organizational climate, whereas, this study was to concern itself with relationships which affected the students more directly.

The OCDQ was an instrument that sought principal and teaching staff perceptions of organizational climate. Fifteen items in both instruments used for this study sought perceptions of school climate from teachers and students. There were several items used in these instruments that had been suggested by items in the OCDQ. For example,

(OCDQ-number 36) The principal uses constructive criticism.
(Teacher Questionnaire-number 54) This school has welcomed positive criticism I have offered to improve our school program.
(Student Questionnaire-number 68) School authorities do not ignore suggestions made by students.

(OCDQ-number 46) Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
(Teacher Questionnaire-number 55) I feel free to allow discussions on controversial issues in my class.
(Student Questionnaire-number 63) My parents and I have been free to
choose the general program I've taken in school.

(OCDQ-number 52) The rules set by the principal are never questioned.

(Teacher Questionnaire-number 44) School authorities encourage teachers to evaluate existing school policy.

(Student Questionnaire-number 65) Since I've been in the school I know there have been times when school rules have been changed after some school authorities have talked it over with students.

Other items were developed from Ryan's definitions of authoritarian-democratic, aloof-responsive, and inflexible-adaptable dimensions of teacher behavior. An open school climate should be democratic, responsive, and adaptable. More specifically it should ask for pupil opinion, encourage students to make their own decisions, and respond to all students. An open school should be approachable to all students, give all students an equal chance, and respond to reasonable requests. Just as organization climate was construed to be the "... organizational personality of a school..." so were characteristics of a democratic and open teacher construed to be the characteristics of a democratic and open school climate.

Other items were selected for their face validity. The sections which sought perceptions of students and teachers about school climate contained fifteen items in the teacher question-

---


14 Halpin and Croft, op. cit., p. l.
naire (41-55) (Appendix C), and seventeen items in the student questionnaire (56-72) (Appendix B). On the basis of extensive research by the persons described above, these items were assumed to be valid for the purposes of this study.

Measurement of Nonconforming Behavior and Attitudes

The dependent variable under investigation in this study was nonconforming behavior. It was assumed that nonconforming behavior was located on the relationship continuum as one kind of rebellion conceptualized by Frymier. Any behavior of students who failed or refused to act in conformity with beliefs and practices generally accepted in the school was defined as nonconforming behavior.

It was very difficult to define nonconforming behavior operationally. Even with a liberal interpretation of nonconforming behavior, very few incidents were identified. Two high schools that had experienced overt expressions of dissent on the part of students did not participate in the study. A similar problem was reported in a psychological study of frustration.15 In contrived experimental studies, basic information about the consequences of frustration for children had been repeatedly verified. However, another researcher extended the investigation to children in situ and found fewer incidents of frustration than had been expected. Even more than this, "... meaningful relationships could not be found between

---

frustration and consequent behavior such as . . . regression . . . and other theoretically meaningful behavioral manifestations.16

Nonconforming behavior was operationally defined in three different ways: teachers' perceptions of nonconforming behavior in students; students' perceptions of nonconforming behavior in themselves; and a review of school attendance and disciplinary records. These were attempts not only to record the frequency of different nonconforming behaviors, but also to assign weight to the relative importance of the different behaviors. For instance, it was assumed that it would be more serious for students to record unexcused absences than to chew gum.

Several items found significant in a study of rebellion or expressed alienation in high school were adapted for use in both the teacher's and student's questionnaires.17

(Stinchcombe) Have you ever skipped school with a gang of kids
(whether or not you got caught)?
(Teacher Questionnaire-number 61) There have been unexcused absences from my class this year.
(Student Questionnaire-number 13, Section II) I have had unexcused absences this year.

(Stinchcombe) Have you ever been sent out of class to the office by

16ibid, p. 5.
a teacher you didn't get along with?

(Teacher Questionnaire-number 66) I have sent students out of class this year for disturbing the class.

(Student Questionnaire-number 3, Section II) I have been sent out of class for disturbing the class this year.

(Stinchcombe) Have you ever personally cheated on any assignment or test or in reporting your grade, or have any of your friends cheated for you when correcting one of your tests, during the past month?

(Teacher Questionnaire-number 60) I am aware that cheating on assignments or tests happens in my classroom.

(Student Questionnaire-number 12, Section II) I have cheated on an assignment or on a test this year.

There had been great concern in the schools about student dress and appearance. It has been reported that adults were more disturbed about the appearance of youth than their behavior.18 Columbus schools had indicated there were dress codes which were important to the control and management of the schools. There were four items in the teacher questionnaire and two in the student questionnaire that related to student dress and appearance. Because of the importance adults had attached to appearance and dress, they were suggested as items which should indicate nonconforming or

18 William C. Kvaraceus, "Deviancy or Dry Rot in the Classroom," Educational Leadership, XXIV, 7(April, 1967).
deviant behavior.

The Columbus school administration was concerned about the influence of people outside the school on student behavior. They reported that repeated interviews with rebellious youths in Columbus schools had failed to show any connection between influence outside the schools and student dissent. One item was included in the student questionnaire (Section II, number 15) (Appendix B) to address this concern. It was felt that students might respond more openly on an anonymous questionnaire than in direct questioning. Even though it was not considered relevant to this study, it was recognized some serendipitous relationship could be found by such an item.

Seventeen items on the teacher questionnaire (numbers 66-72) (Appendix C) and twelve items on the student questionnaire (Section II, numbers 1-6 and 9-14) (Appendix B) comprised the group of questions developed to operationally define student nonconforming behavior as it might be perceived by teachers and students. In addition to responding to these, both groups were requested to list the school rules most often disobeyed. This offered an opportunity for the respondents to express themselves more openly about deviant behavior of students.

The third operational method for defining nonconforming behavior was to examine school records for objective evidence of this behavior in attendance and discipline reports. It was expected there would be similarity in the information yielded by these different sources but that there would also be substantial differences which
could obtain a more comprehensive operational definition of non-conforming behavior.

In a study of nonconforming and deviant youth\textsuperscript{19} it was found that college students and non-students could be discriminated by their evaluations of formal education as they responded to a series of questions. This gave some support to Stinchcombe's hypothesis that rebellious youth have a certain psychological set. Items were taken from both studies to make up a section on the student questionnaire (numbers 41-55) (Appendix B). This section sought to define deviant and nonconforming attitudes of students toward their schools, teachers, and formal education.

A few background items were added to both instruments. Tenure, age, and sex of the teachers were included to make it possible to control these variables in analysis. Student variables included sex and length of time in the school so that they too could be controlled in analyzing the data.

\textbf{Test Administration}

All senior students in the six selected schools were invited to participate voluntarily in the study. The entire testing was completed during the third week of May, two weeks before the close of school. It required a forty minute period to complete the

student questionnaire, and each school was completed in one day.

All teachers in each of the six schools were given a copy of the questionnaire and requested to complete it at their own convenience. No member of the administrative staff was included in the teacher sample.

Summary

In summary, a group of five central office administrators from the Columbus School System was asked to rank the high schools in Columbus from the most open to the least open. Six schools from this ordering were asked to give approval for this study to be conducted. The selected schools represented extremes on the open - closed continuum, as judged by those who made the rankings.

Test instruments were administered to seniors and teachers in all six schools. The student instrument (Appendix B) contained the Rokeach dogmatism scale, Form E, fifteen items about student attitudes toward schools and teachers, seventeen items about student perceptions of school climate, twelve items about student behavior in school, and two items about student background. The teacher instrument (Appendix C) contained the dogmatism scale, fifteen items about teacher perceptions of school climate, seventeen items about student behavior in school, and three items about teacher background. The instruments were developed using items from many studies which were related to school climate and student behavior in high school. They were assumed to be valid for the purpose of this study.
Interviews were conducted with staff members in each of the schools and with members of The Ohio State University staff who worked closely with the Columbus Schools. These interviews were set up to provide a general description of the schools and student behavior which might not have been shown in data gathered by the instruments.

The next chapter contains an analysis of the findings reported in the data.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The general hypothesis investigated in this study was that deviant and nonconforming attitudes and behavior patterns among students in high schools would be affected by the interaction between openness in students and openness in school situations and might be predicted in meaningful ways. Two questionnaires were developed for teachers and students to measure the extent of nonconforming behavior in the schools as perceived by students and teachers. Deviant and nonconforming behavior was further investigated by a study of official school records. The instruments were administered to teachers and twelfth grade students in six high schools in the Columbus school system, which represented extremes on the open - closed continuum as judged by those who made a rank ordering of the schools. This chapter will present the findings in this study.

Description of the Schools and Participants from the Data

The initial selection of schools was made from a rank ordering of all high schools in the Columbus school system according to openness as perceived by five school administrators in the central office. The agreement among these rankings was found to be significant at the .001 level. It was further compared with rankings made by five
expert educational observers in The Ohio State University College of Education. Agreement between both groups in their rankings of the schools was significant also at the .001 level. However, the ordinal numbers in rankings did not indicate any quantities that could be associated with degrees of openness in the schools. They only suggested that certain schools were more open than others. Degrees of openness were measured separately by perceptions of teachers and students as they responded to items in the questionnaires.

The mean scores of responses to fifteen items of the teacher questionnaire relating to openness in the schools are shown in Table 5. They indicate quantitative differences among the six participating schools.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (open)</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (open)</td>
<td>41.31</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (open)</td>
<td>41.86</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (closed)</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (closed)</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>11.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (closed)</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher mean scores indicate more openness in schools.*
Mean scores indicate that teachers in schools A, B, and C perceived their schools as more open than teachers in schools D, E, and F perceived theirs. Values of $t$ are shown in Table 6. These show significant differences between each of the schools initially ranked most open and each of those ranked least open.

**TABLE 6**

Values of $t$ for Teacher Perceptions of Openness among Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among open schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - B</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - C</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - C</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Closed schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - E</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - F</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - F</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between open and closed schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - D</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - E</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - F</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - D</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - E</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - F</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - D</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - E</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - F</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a_p < .001$

$b_p < .01$

$c_p < .05$
As shown in Table 6, teachers in the three schools ranked most open (A, B, and C) perceived their schools to be more open than teachers in those ranked most closed (D, E, and F) perceived theirs. In every comparison the differences were statistically significant. School D was perceived by teachers as more closed than the other two closed schools, significant at the .01 level.

In an effort to determine whether students who were in open and closed schools saw their school situations differently, mean scores of responses to seventeen items of the student questionnaire relating to openness in the schools were calculated. The results are shown in Table 7. They indicate differences among the six participating schools with the higher mean scores appearing more frequently in the more open schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean Scorea</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (open)</td>
<td>39.07</td>
<td>15.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (open)</td>
<td>43.95</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (open)</td>
<td>39.76</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (closed)</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (closed)</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (closed)</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aHigher mean scores indicate more openness in schools.
Mean scores indicate that students in schools A, B, and C perceived their schools as more open than students in schools D, E, and F perceived theirs. Values of $t$ are shown in Table 8. Students' perceptions, like teachers' perceptions, showed there were significant differences between each of the schools initially ranked most open and each of those ranked least open.

**TABLE 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among open schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - B</td>
<td>-1.342</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - C</td>
<td>-0.303</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - C</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among closed schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - E</td>
<td>-2.677$^b$</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - F</td>
<td>-1.519</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - F</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between open and closed schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - D</td>
<td>3.937$^a$</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - E</td>
<td>1.982$^c$</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - F</td>
<td>2.477$^c$</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - D</td>
<td>3.847$^a$</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - E</td>
<td>2.618$^b$</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - F</td>
<td>2.926$^b$</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - D</td>
<td>4.621$^a$</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - E</td>
<td>2.555$^c$</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - F</td>
<td>3.073$^b$</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a p \leq .001$

$^b p \leq .01$

$^c p \leq .05$
Students and teachers in open schools perceived their schools more open than did students and teachers in closed schools. The differences in every case were beyond the .05 level of significance. These data gave support that the selection of schools in this study had been adequately made to satisfy the definition of openness in school climate.

The Rokeach dogmatism scale was used to measure the degree of openness among teachers and students. The mean scores on the dogmatism scale for teachers and students are shown in Table 9. Differences in mean scores of teachers and students among the participating schools were not as much a function of the degree of openness as they were of other factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teacher Mean Scores</th>
<th>Student Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (open)</td>
<td>125.32</td>
<td>159.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (open)</td>
<td>137.42</td>
<td>172.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (open)</td>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>162.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (closed)</td>
<td>125.60</td>
<td>155.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (closed)</td>
<td>128.29</td>
<td>159.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (closed)</td>
<td>131.31</td>
<td>165.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher mean scores indicate more dogmatism.

The dogmatism scores were much higher among the students than
among teachers. They indicated that teachers were more open than students. It was expected this would be true.

The findings in this section have been reported to describe the schools, teachers, and students in regard to openness. They have shown that differences between open and closed schools were significant. These data provided the operational definition of openness in schools, in teachers, and in students. The following sections will present findings related to the six specific hypotheses of this study.

**Findings Related to Nonconforming Attitudes in Students**

The first three specific hypotheses in this study related to nonconforming attitudes of students toward school. They were:

**Hypothesis 1** - Open students will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes toward school than closed students,

**Hypothesis 2** - There will be more nonconforming attitudes among students in closed schools than among students in open schools,

**Hypothesis 3** - Open students in closed schools will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than open students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than closed students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than closed students in closed schools.
Fifteen items in the student questionnaire were used as a measure of student attitudes toward school which were related to nonconforming behavior. Mean scores of all students, in regard to openness, are shown in Table 10.

**TABLE 10**

Mean Scores on a Measure of Student Attitudes toward School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (open)</td>
<td>37.77</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (open)</td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>14.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (open)</td>
<td>39.66</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (closed)</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (closed)</td>
<td>37.51</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (closed)</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aHigher scores indicate more negative and nonconforming attitudes toward school.*

To test the three hypotheses relating to student attitudes, ninety-three open and ninety-three closed students were selected by random numbers from the total sample in both open and closed schools.

A chi-square analysis was made of the data supplied by these 372 students, ninety-three in each of the four cells. This analysis is shown in Table 11.
TABLE 11
Chi-Square Analysis of Open and Closed Students in Open and Closed Schools on a Measure of Attitudes toward School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open Students</th>
<th>Closed Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Schools</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>7201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Schools</td>
<td>3649</td>
<td>3583</td>
<td>7232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>7233</td>
<td>14433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2\) overall = 1.87 ns
\(X^2\) for openness of students = .08 ns
\(X^2\) for openness of schools = .07 ns

As can be seen in the table, there were no significant differences between attitudes of open students and those of closed students, between attitudes of students in open schools and those in closed schools, nor among the interactions of these two variables. These data did not support the hypotheses about student attitudes toward school. Therefore, Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were rejected.

Findings Related to Nonconforming Behavior of Students

There were three specific hypotheses concerned with nonconforming behavior of students in high school. They were:

Hypothesis 4 - Open students will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students,

Hypothesis 5 - There will be more nonconforming behavior among
students in closed schools than among students in open schools,

Hypothesis 6 - Open students in closed schools will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than open students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students in open schools, who will exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students in closed schools.

There were seventeen items in the teacher questionnaire which were used as a measure of teacher perceptions of student behavior. There were twelve items in the student questionnaire which were used as a measure of student perceptions of student behavior. The mean scores of teacher responses and student responses are shown in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (open)</td>
<td>16.39Teachers</td>
<td>5.83Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (open)</td>
<td>24.77Teachers</td>
<td>6.54Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (open)</td>
<td>19.18Teachers</td>
<td>5.43Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (closed)</td>
<td>18.83Teachers</td>
<td>3.94Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (closed)</td>
<td>17.65Teachers</td>
<td>5.73Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (closed)</td>
<td>21.20Teachers</td>
<td>5.02Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher mean scores indicate more nonconforming behavior.
The differences between teacher scores and student scores were expected because teachers were reporting their perceptions of behavior of students as a group. The students were reporting their perceptions of their own individual behavior.

An analysis of variance of teachers' scores on a measure of their perceptions of student behavior was made. The unit of analysis was the school. The results are shown in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**

A Simple Analysis of Variance of Scores by Teachers on a Measure of Their Perceptions of Student Behavior in Six Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1463.93</td>
<td>292.79</td>
<td>9.23a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5331.06</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6794.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ap < .01

As seen in the table, an F ratio of 9.23 was obtained which is statistically significant at the .01 level. A multiple comparisons test was performed to determine where these differences were located. The results of this test are shown in Table 14. It may be seen that teachers in school B reported student behavior as more nonconforming than the teachers in schools A, C, D, and E. This accounted for the significant F obtained in the analysis of variance but did not show that behavior of students, as perceived by teachers, was different
in schools identified as open from that in schools identified as closed.

TABLE 14
Matrix of Differences for Sheffe' Multiple Comparison Test on a Measure of Teacher Perceptions of Student Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Scores</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>18.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>8.38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>7.12&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>5.94&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>5.59&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>p < .05

These data suggested there were other factors than openness in the schools which might account for these differences. This is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

An analysis of variance of students' scores on a measure of their perceptions of their own behavior was made. The unit of analysis was the school. The results are shown in Table 15. It includes responses from the total sample of 613 students in the six participating schools.
TABLE 15

A Simple Analysis of Variance of Scores by Students on a Measure of Their Perceptions of Their Own Behavior in Six Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65.83</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>0.46a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>17368.97</td>
<td>28.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>17434.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aNot significant

As seen in Table 15 there was no significant difference found in an analysis of student scores among the participating schools.

These data were then analyzed for 372 students selected by random numbers from the total sample. A chi-square analysis is shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16

Chi-Square Analysis of Open and Closed Students in Open and Closed Schools on a Measure of Their Perceptions of Their Own Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open Students</th>
<th>Closed Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Schools</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Schools</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>2540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ overall = 4.26a

$X^2$ for openness of students = 4.42a

$X^2$ for openness of schools = 0.76 n.s.

$^a p < .05$
As seen in Table 16 there was more nonconforming behavior observed among open students than expected. More nonconforming behavior than expected was observed among open students in closed schools and among closed students in open schools. Less nonconforming behavior than expected was observed among open students in open schools and among closed students in closed schools. These findings supported Hypotheses 4 and 6. They did not support Hypothesis 5. There was no difference between student perceptions of their behavior in open schools and those in closed schools.

An examination of official school records for evidence of nonconforming behavior in attendance and discipline reports was made. It was expected that definitions of unexcused absences and behavior warranting suspension from school would be generally uniform throughout the system.

There were 1190 unexcused absences in the three schools identified as most open and 489 in the three schools identified as most closed. This record is summarized in Table 17.

TABLE 17
Attendance Record in Participating Schools, 1968-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Excused Absences</th>
<th>Unexcused Absences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open (A, B, and C)</td>
<td>3867</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed (D, E, and F)</td>
<td>4068</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 272.78, \text{ significant at .001 level.} \]
Computation of chi-square for these data indicated there was a difference between the number of unexcused absences in schools identified as closed which was statistically significant at the .001 level. However, this difference was in the opposite direction of that expected and stated in Hypothesis 5.

There were five students suspended from schools identified as most open and thirty students suspended from schools identified as most closed. This record is presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18

Suspensions in Participating Schools, 1968-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number Suspended</th>
<th>Number Not Suspended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open (A, B, and C)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed (D, E, and F)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 16.54$, significant at .001 level.

Computation of chi-square for these data indicated there was a difference between the number of students suspended from schools identified as open and the number from schools identified as closed which was statistically significant at the .001 level. This difference was in the expected direction stated in Hypothesis 5.

The results of the analyses of data presented in this section showed that Hypothesis 4 was supported when perceptions of behavior by students were used as the measure for student behavior. Because of the required anonymity of participants in the study it was not
possible to use teacher perceptions of student behavior or school records to test this hypothesis. Open students did exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students. Hypothesis 4 was accepted.

The findings related to Hypothesis 5 were equivocal. An analysis of teacher perceptions of student behavior indicated other factors than openness in the schools were influencing their observations. Student perceptions of student behavior indicated no significant difference between schools identified as open and those identified as closed. An investigation of school records yielded contradictory information. The number of unexcused absences were significantly more among open schools than among closed schools; whereas, the number of suspensions were significantly more among closed schools than among open schools. Because of these ambiguous findings it could not be accepted that there was more nonconforming behavior among students in closed schools than among those in open schools. Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

Hypothesis 6 was supported in part when students' perceptions of behavior were used as the measure of student behavior. Open students in closed schools were more nonconforming than all other students. Closed students in closed schools were more conforming than all other students. However, open students in open schools were not shown to be more nonconforming than closed students in open schools. Hypothesis 6 was accepted in part.
Discussion and Conclusions

One of the conclusions of this study was that perceptions of professional educators and high school seniors supplied valid and reliable data about openness in schools. This supported research by Halpin and Croft, Anderson, Brown, Null, and Sargent, all of whom have made extensive investigations about the organizational climate of the schools through perceptions of principals and teachers.

The initial selection of schools was made from a rank ordering of all high schools in the system by central office supervisors. From the very beginning several differences between open and closed schools were noted in the participating schools. All schools had read an abstract of the proposed study before they agreed to participate. When they were contacted to work out specific details all schools identified as open seemed enthusiastic about the study and willing to accommodate the research in any way that was suggested, even when this would be inconvenient. All the schools identified as closed seemed uncomfortable about their part in the study and were insistent on having the test administration follow patterns determined by the local staff. This could in no way be interpreted as their being uncooperative, but a difference was noted.

After the preliminary details had been made, an entirely different phenomenon was experienced. Students in closed schools participated much more extensively than those in open schools. There were 411 voluntary participants from closed schools and only 202 from
open schools. The same announcement was made in all schools but the response was much greater in closed schools.

The major difference between the rankings of the schools according to openness and the ratings of openness given by teachers and students was that both the teachers and the students perceived school D as significantly more closed than the other two closed schools. It had been ranked as 8, whereas the other two had been ranked as 11 and 13 among the thirteen schools.

The conclusion that perceptions of people connected closely with the schools gave valid and reliable data about openness in schools was particularly relevant to this study. Had there not been agreement among the participants all of the findings would have been equivocal at the outset.

The dogmatism scores of students and teachers indicated that teachers were much more open than students. It was expected this would be true. People should become more open with age, experience, and education. This has been noted in other studies whenever the dogmatism scale has been administered to two groups who differed in age, experience, or education.

The scores did not differ between participants in open schools and those in closed schools. It was noted that dogmatism scores were higher among participants, both teachers and students, from the three priority schools than among participants from the three non-priority schools. There seemed to have been a socio-economic factor at work which was not under investigation nor under control in this study.
Dogmatism seemed more related to the socio-economic level of the community which was served by the schools than by the degree of openness found in the participating schools.

The Rokeach dogmatism scale seemed to have provided an adequate measure of openness for the participants in this study. There was no indication that these data were not valid and reliable for use in this study. It was felt that measures of openness in schools, openness in teachers, and openness in students had provided an adequate operational definition of the three specifics postulated in the Frymier theory: a controlling group; a controlled group; and a context in which both groups have a relationship.

The dependent variables of this study, student behavior and attitudes were measured in four ways: a measure of behavior as perceived by teachers; a measure of behavior as perceived by students; an investigation of school records for evidence of nonconforming behavior; and a measure of student attitudes toward school. In addition to these measures of behavior, teachers and students responded to a question asking them to list the rules most often disobeyed in the schools.

Behavior of students as perceived by teachers indicated there was a significant difference among the schools but related to some other factor than openness in the schools. There seemed to be a relationship between teacher perceptions of student behavior and the socio-economic level of the school. This could have been that behavior was more nonconforming among priority schools than among non-priority
schools or that responses from teachers in priority schools reflected a middle class bias.

There were striking differences between teacher perceptions of behavior and student perceptions of behavior. This was to be expected because teachers were reporting behavior of the group and students were more often reporting their own individual behavior. It seemed logical to assume that every teacher's perceptions would indicate there was nonconforming behavior among students, whereas, a majority of the students would exhibit conforming behavior.

In two schools, B and F, where teachers reported the most nonconforming behavior, the students reported the least. This could have been a reflection of middle class bias on the part of teachers. To say this another way, what might be considered nonconforming behavior in one school might be considered conforming behavior in another. Leaving the school campus for lunch was a conforming behavior in some schools but a nonconforming behavior in others. In other behaviors, such as dress and appearance, it could be that what teachers observed as nonconforming behavior by students, was very conforming among the students' peers.

The student measures of behavior and attitude were related. This was particularly evident in the extreme scores. Students in School B indicated the most conformity in both behavior and attitude of all the participating schools. Students in school D indicated the least conformity on both measures. There were no significant differences in the mean scores on behavior of students in the
participating schools.

There was a difference in scores on student behavior, significant at the .05 level, between open and closed students regardless of which school they attended. It was not known that the behavior of open students was actually more nonconforming than closed students. It could be that open students were more candid about reporting their behavior than closed students. Because of the anonymity of the subjects it was not possible in this study to measure individual behavior in any way except as the student wished to report it.

There was no difference in mean scores on the measure of student attitudes among the six participating schools. It is possible the instrument was not sensitive to the students' real attitudes toward school. It could be there was no difference among students' attitudes in this study.

Evidence of nonconforming behavior among students in the participating schools was sought in disciplinary and attendance records. There was a difference, significant at the .001 level, in the number of recorded unexcused absences between open schools and closed schools. The record showed that students in open schools experienced unexcused absences much more than students in closed schools. There were several reasons suggested for this. School officials stated the definition of an unexcused absence was not the same from school to school. In some schools an unexcused absence was recorded when a person did not bring an excuse from home the day
immediately following an absence. In others it was considered an
excused absence any time an excuse was presented. It was possible
that students in open schools did not feel the same amount of pressure
to attend school as students in closed schools. It was possible that
the staff in open schools felt more at ease in reporting unexcused
absences to the central office. For these reasons, these data might
be explained.

The report of suspended students showed a difference,
significant at the .001 level, between the number suspended from open
schools and the number suspended from closed schools. Among the six
schools there were six times as many students suspended from closed
schools as were suspended from open schools. As in the case of
unexcused absences, several suspensions could have been unreported or
unrecorded. However, the legal implications in a suspension would
seem to be much more serious than in an unexcused absence. It was
possible that a suspension was an overt act of rebellion against the
school which could be related to the degree of openness in the school.
It also raised the question: Did suspensions measure differences in
behavior of students or in school administrators? Administrators in
closed schools might have been less tolerant of nonconforming
behavior than those in open schools. If this was the case, a greater
degree of nonconforming behavior might actually have been taking
place in open schools before a suspension was awarded.

Nonconforming behavior as evidenced in unexcused absences and
in suspensions reported in official school records did show
statistically significant differences, beyond the .001 level in both cases, between open and closed schools. This gave support to the general hypothesis that deviant and nonconforming behavior patterns among students in high schools would be affected by varying degrees of openness in school situations.

Attempts were made in this study to quantify behavior of students in a variety of ways because the behavior of students is too complex to be viewed from any single perspective. It was recognized that this was still inadequate and at times even inappropriate but it was an attempt to address the problem empirically. There were many dimensions of student behavior which were not measured. Some of these were suggested in the data obtained from student and teacher responses to the final item on both questionnaires which asked them to list the three school rules most often disobeyed in their school.

The school rules reported most often to have been disobeyed in the schools were institutional regulations. They were not often related to any sound pedagogy, theoretical or practical, and included such concerns as chewing gum, hair regulations, dress codes, traffic in the halls, and lunchroom regulations. Extensional remarks were evoked from both teachers and students and these have been studied to add to a discussion of nonconforming behavior. It has been stated that student behavior and performance in school has often been evaluated on the adjustment made to institutional expectations. These expectations constitute what Jackson referred to as the "hidden curriculum" which was developed by educators as a second curriculum
in the schools.¹

The responses of both teachers and students covered a wide range of nonconforming behaviors. It supplied information that was not found in any other part of the investigation. A tabulation of these responses indicated a need to categorize the various behaviors. Different ways of grouping them suggested different degrees of importance could be attached to the categories of behavior depending on the order they were placed. The Frymier theory conceptualized a humanistic--anti-humanistic continuum of human relationships. On this continuum, a behavior such as the use of drugs would be considered a violent, egotistic, and rational behavior among the most anti-humanistic on the continuum. Although drug use was a concern of the schools and has been a part of the phenomena of rebellion across the country, it might not be considered as much rebellion against the high school as it might be rebellion against adolescent status or rebellion against the whole society. It was assumed that other behaviors, perhaps less serious in nature, would be more rebellious against the school and more closely related to degrees of openness on the part of teachers, students, and school climate.

In addition to responses of teachers and students to the questionnaire, interviews were held with both teachers and students which gave some further insight into the deviant behavior patterns found in the six high schools. From all these data, six categories of

student behavior emerged. These categories were arranged in an order of their relationship to the students' direct alienation or rebellion against the schools.

First, the most direct rebellion against the schools was seen in such behaviors as truancy, destroying school property, and boycotting the school. With the exception of truancy these behaviors were destructive and violent or inciting to violence. They would have been near the anti-humanistic extreme of the Frymier relationship continuum. Truancy was included in this category because it was an expression of general rebellion against the school. All these behaviors worked directly toward the total ineffectiveness of the school and were a primary concern of the schools.

Other overt acts of aggression were reported occasionally by both teachers and students in this study. This constituted a second category of deviant student behavior and included fighting among students and verbal abuse directed toward students and teachers. As a rebellious activity it was often physically or psychologically destructive and violent. However, it was usually more limited in scope and affected fewer people in the school. It did not touch the total effectiveness of the schools in the same way that behaviors in the first category had. In a listing of nonconforming behaviors in the school it was considered as less rebellious than general rebellion against the school.

There were several dissenting behaviors directed against regulations felt necessary by the school but regarded as somewhat
less important by students. This third category of behaviors was always nonviolent in nature and could be grouped at the third or fourth level on the Frymier continuum of relationships as nonviolent, egotistic, and rational or irrational in nature. They included breaking lunchroom regulations, cutting certain classes (but not a full day of school), tardiness, and infractions of driving regulations around the school. Behaviors in this category were numerous but they were not usually as disruptive of the total operation of the schools as the first two categories of behavior.

The fourth group of dissident behaviors were open infractions of rules that were often considered capricious and arbitrary by students and teachers. Among these activities were chewing gum, sleeping in class, talking in the library, improper use of hall passes, leaving campus during closed lunch periods, travel in the wrong direction on empty stairs and in empty halls, cutting study halls, and holding hands. This type of behavior was directed more against the rule itself than against the school. Many teachers and most students did not seem to regard disobeying rules in this category as affecting the operation of the school.

A fifth group of behaviors was an expression of alienation against the community, against society in general, or against an adolescent subculture. They included such behaviors as smoking, drinking, gambling, use of drugs, and sexual impropriety or promiscuity. In some cases they were simply the adoption of adult status symbols as a revolt against their adolescent status. In others they were
violent acts of rebellion. The school was deeply concerned with these problems because they were often of a very serious nature. When these were considered apart from other behaviors they did not necessarily constitute rebellious activity against the school. Many of those who expressed alienation against their adolescent status or against the adult community would be expected to express their alienation against the school in behaviors included in other categories.

The sixth category of behaviors was separated from the others in that it represented ways students have sought a special identity of their own. All schools had some kind of written or tacit code of dress and behavior. Students who seemed to refuse to accept the code did so, not because they thought it trivial and deserving to be ignored and not because they were rebelling against school, but because hair styles and dress styles accepted by their youth culture were very different from those accepted by an older generation. The appearance of students alone was not enough to make them suspect as riotous or rebellious. Other behaviors and attitudes had to be in concert with nonconforming appearance before rebellion could be defined.

By locating each of the rule infractions within its proper category and assigning values from one to six, with six indicating an infraction most directly alienated or rebellious against the school and one indicating the least, it might be possible to develop an index of nonconforming behavior for each of the schools. Such an index could be useful in developing an instrument to measure student
behavior in terms of rebellion directed against the school.

One observation in reading student responses was meaningful in a descriptive sense. There were five instances in which students in closed schools were obscene in their responses. There was no obscenity in any of the responses from students in open schools.

Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of this study. Openness among the schools was found to differ significantly between open and closed schools as ranked by central office supervisors and Ohio State University educators and as perceived by teachers and students. Neither teachers nor students differed significantly between open and closed schools in their scores on the Rokeach dogmatism scale. Significant differences in perceptions of student behavior by teachers were reported but these differences were not attributed to variables under investigation in this study. There was no difference between students in open schools and those in closed schools in their attitudes toward school. Nonconforming behavior reported by students was greater among open students than closed students, significant at .05 level. It was also found that open students in closed schools reported more nonconforming behavior than was expected and closed students in closed schools reported less than was expected. There was no difference in the amount of nonconforming behavior reported by students in open schools as compared to that reported by students in closed schools. The greater number of
unexcused absences in open schools was significant at the .001 level and the greater number of suspensions in closed schools was significant at the .001 level.

The following conclusions were made from these results:

1. Perceptions of central office supervisors, university educators, teachers, and students can furnish reliable data for determining openness in high schools.

2. Individual student behavior is reported as more nonconforming by open students than by closed students.

3. Open students in closed schools do not conform as much as would be expected, whereas closed students in closed schools do conform more than would be expected.

4. There are many factors which affect nonconforming behavior in the schools besides openness of teachers, openness of students, and openness of school climate.

5. The Frymier theory of rebellion is a meaningful conceptual tool which offers a framework to study the phenomena of student behavior and attitudes in school.

The last chapter will present a summary of the entire study and give implications for further research.
Summary and Implications for Further Study

Many schools across the country have erupted with student protest, conflict, and violence. But all schools have not. Most of the schools have faced the same tensions and the same problems that have been listed as causes for student protest. Some have experienced general student upheaval and others have not. This study was concerned with the phenomena of student rebellion. Specifically, it was concerned with school, teacher, and student variables in terms of openness and their consequent effect on behavior among students.

The general hypothesis was that deviant and nonconforming behavior patterns among students in high schools were affected significantly by the interaction between openness in students and openness in school situations and might be predicted in meaningful ways. There were six specific hypotheses in this study. Hypotheses related to student attitudes were:

1. Open students would exhibit more nonconforming attitudes toward school than closed students.
2. There would be more nonconforming attitudes among students in closed schools than among students in open schools.
3. Open students in closed schools would exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than open students in open schools, who would exhibit...
more nonconforming attitudes than closed students in open schools, who would exhibit more nonconforming attitudes than closed students in closed schools.

Hypotheses related to student behavior were:

(4) Open students would exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students.

(5) There would be more nonconforming behavior among students in closed schools than among students in open schools.

(6) Open students in closed schools would exhibit more nonconforming behavior than open students in open schools, who would exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students in open schools, who would exhibit more nonconforming behavior than closed students in closed schools.

The rationale for the study followed the Frymier theory of rebellion which postulated four specifics in explaining rebellion: a controlling person or group; a controlled person or group; a relationship between these two persons or groups; and a context in which this relationship occurred. The dimensions of the controlling participants, controlled participants, and the context in which they related were described on an authoritarian-nonauthoritarian continuum. The relationships between the participants were described on a rebellious-nonrebellious continuum.

In this study the controlling person was the teacher; the controlled person was the student; and the context in which they related was the school climate. These three specifics were described
on an open-closed dimension. The relationships were described on a conforming-nonconforming dimension.

Two instruments were developed, one for teachers and one for students, which included items to be used in describing the participants and the school climate on an open-closed continuum. They also included items to describe the students' relationships with the school along a conforming-nonconforming continuum. School records were also reviewed for a better definition of student behavior.

Measurement of the participants along an open-closed continuum was accomplished by using the Rokeach dogmatism scale. The sections of the questionnaires developed for measuring school climate were adapted from several items in the Halpin and Croft Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and from Ryan's definitions of authoritarian-democratic, aloof-responsive, and inflexible-adaptable dimensions of teacher behavior. The sections of the questionnaire developed for measuring nonconforming behavior were adapted from items in Stinchcombe's study of rebellion in high school. The section of the student questionnaire which attempted to measure student attitudes toward school were adapted from items in the Stinchcombe study and from the Watts and Whittaker study of evaluations of formal education by college students and non-students. The questionnaires required less than an hour to complete.

Six high schools in the Columbus school system agreed to participate in this study. The thirteen high schools had been previously ranked from the most open to the least open by five
central office supervisors and by five educators in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. In the six participating schools there were 174 teachers and 613 students who took part in the study. The administration of the instruments was done during the last two weeks in May, 1969.

It was concluded that perceptions of professional educators and students were reliable data for determining openness in high schools. This conclusion was reached after school supervisors rank ordered the high schools with agreement significant at the .001 level and after teachers and students discriminated between the three open and three closed schools beyond a .05 level in every case.

It was concluded that open students reported their own behavior as more nonconforming than closed students. The difference between open students and closed students in their responses to the section of the questionnaire developed to measure nonconforming behavior was significant at the .05 level.

Open students in closed schools did not conform as much as would be expected while closed students in closed schools conformed more than would be expected. This conclusion was related to students' perceptions of their own behavior.

It was concluded that there were many other factors affecting nonconforming behavior besides openness in teachers, in students, and in school climate. Until some of these other variables (many of them apparently sociological) are identified and controlled in further studies the extent of the effect of openness on student behavior may
Finally, it was concluded that the Frymier theory was a meaningful conceptual tool to gain an understanding of the phenomena of rebellion. It served as a useful framework in setting up the research design.

These findings suggest implications for further research in the area of student unrest. These implications are discussed in the next section.

Implications for Further Research

This study has left many questions unanswered. Answers to questions raised by this study may come through continued research in general areas listed below:

(1) This study had encountered other factors besides openness among participants and openness in context which have seemed to influence student behavior in the schools. Behavior as perceived by teachers suggested that the socio-economic level of the community served by the school might be related to nonconforming behavior of students. This study was not designed to measure the effect of socio-economic factors on behavior. A study designed to relate socio-economic variables with the specifics of the Frymier theory as they influence student behavior in the schools would contribute to effective school planning. Is there a school climate that is generally good for all communities, or is there one school climate more effective for lower socio-economic levels and another school climate more effective for
higher socio-economic levels?

(2) Anonymity of the subjects in this study precluded any opportunity to determine the effect of the teacher in the classroom on individual behavior. Teacher influence on the individual student and on the entire behavioral pattern of the student would appear to be substantial. We do not know the effect of an open or a closed teacher on student behavior in the school. Much emphasis has been placed on training teachers to teach effectively in the inner city. If openness is a characteristic more necessary in urban schools than in suburban schools we need to know this in selection of teachers for teacher training. Many agree with "... the hypothesis that it is the school itself rather than individual teachers that provokes the students' discomfort."1 If this is true we still need to know how much of the school is made up of the teacher and his influence. Whenever conflict breaks out in the school, the school administration is immediately brought under close scrutiny. How much of student behavior is determined by the teacher in the classroom before the conflict actually took place?

(3) When schools were being selected to participate in this study several people were requested to rank order the high schools from most open to most closed. It was observed that responses to the request repeatedly referred to the openness of the principal instead of the school. It seemed that the organizational climate of the

school and the openness of the principal were closely related in the minds of those who ranked the schools. This study did not include any measure of openness of the principal as a part of the design. The principal seemed to be a great influence on school climate in informal observation. A study of the relationship of the degree of openness of the principal to openness in the school might show how great his influence was. A longitudinal study of the effect of a new principal on openness in the school might indicate how long it took this influence to characterize the school climate. Sargent found striking and consistent differences between teacher and principal perspectives of organizational climate in high schools. How would the principal's perception of his own school, in regard to openness, compare with perceptions of teachers, students, supervisors, and university educators?

(4) It was concluded in this study that teachers', supervisors', students', and university educators' perceptions furnished reliable data for determining openness in schools. Do parents, community leaders, and school board members agree with these perceptions? Even more, do parents, community leaders, and school board members want open or closed schools? How much influence does the community have on the openness of the school? Even if it were determined that open schools effected better behavioral patterns among students than closed schools, and if educators found ways to change organizational climate through such means as transfers of school personnel, reorganization of schools, transfers of students, and in-service programs, it would still
be possible that parents, communities, and school board members would not allow it to happen.

(5) A separate study to define deviant and nonconforming behaviors was suggested by this study. Whenever a student was suspended from school or sent out of a class it was suggested this was sometimes an indication of nonconforming behavior on the part of the principal or teacher as much as the student. Nonconforming behavior in one school might be conforming behavior in another. Nonconforming behavior as defined by teachers might be conforming behavior as defined by students. Nonconforming behavior in the school might be conforming behavior in the home. Better ways of defining nonconforming behavior will be necessary before definitive studies of the phenomena of rebellion will be possible.

(6) It would also seem important to develop measures for covert rebellion in the schools. It is possible that students develop a psychological set for rebellion. A study of the attitudes that lead up to rebellion would allow educators to prevent destructive conflict instead of cope with it. There was some indication in this study that student attitudes, as measured, were related to student perceptions of their own behavior. Student riots on college campus might have been founded in covert rebellion which had taken root while students were in high school. We are still very much in the dark as to when an outbreak might occur but it may be assumed that behind any overt rebellious action there lay a predisposition to rebel.

(7) Openness might be related to school output in other terms than
pupil behavior. It should be related to academic achievement, 
teacher tenure, mental health of students, student morale, and many 
others. It would not be enough to measure the effect of openness on 
behavior alone. How does it effect the total productivity of the 
school?

(8) The relationship of length of time in school to the effect of 
openness on students might be relevant in a study of student behavior. 
In the Lewin, Lippitt, and White study with boy's club members it 
was observed that students often acted aggressively immediately upon 
being switched from an authoritative atmosphere to one that was 
freer. Does this phenomena occur when students are transferred to a 
new school? How long does it take for the school climate to have an 
effect on student behavior and student attitudes?

This study was conducted during the final month of school. 
Perhaps the school climate changes throughout the school year and 
works a different effect on student behavior from month to month. It 
is possible that pupil attitudes toward school change depending on 
what time of year it is. Are nonconforming behaviors more likely to 
occur at certain times of the year or under certain climatic conditions 
and is there a changing relationship between the effect of openness on 
such factors?

(9) If it can be shown that there are significant relationships 
between openness in teachers, in students, or in schools, and student 
behavior, ways should be found to develop openness in schools. 
Perhaps an in-service program would prove effective in bringing about
more openness in schools. It is possible that school organization has an effect on openness in the schools.

(10) This study has shown a statistically significant relationship between openness of students and their behavior. Schools have often advocated openness in students as one of their most important goals. As they have moved toward this goal have they also been willing to accept accompanying patterns of nonconforming behavior? Perhaps they have advocated openness but have opposed it operationally with a deeper concern for institutional expectations of student behavior.

There are obviously many questions left to be answered? There are countless others that remain to be asked. The answers to these complex problems can come only through continued and rigorous research.
APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RANK ORDERING OF SCHOOLS
ACCORDING TO OPENNESS

I am conducting a study in the Columbus Schools which is concerned with school, teacher, and student variables in terms of amount of openness and the consequent effect on student behavior. Would you rank order the following Columbus schools from most open (1) to least open (13), as your experience with the schools has shown them to be?

Brookhaven __________ Mohawk __________
Central __________ North __________
East __________ Northland __________
Eastmoor __________ South __________
Linden McKinley _________ Walnut Ridge __________
Marion Franklin _________ West __________
Whetstone __________

Open schools are defined as those in which criticism and feedback from teachers and students are perceived as being used in formulating school practice and policies; there are opportunities for teachers and students to contribute to school policy; teachers and students are encouraged to criticize existing policies; teachers and students feel psychologically safe in exploring new ideas (e. g., discussing controversial issues in class); each person feels his
contribution is important; and, policies are seen as flexible and people oriented, not rigid and impersonal.

As an expert observer in education your opinion is very valuable to this study. Thank you.

Cy Hawn
APPENDIX B

STUDY OF SCHOOL CLIMATE AND STUDENT BEHAVIOR

(Student Questionnaire)

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

DIRECTIONS

Using only a number 2 pencil, blacken the appropriate response on the answer sheet above the number that corresponds to the number beside each statement. Please mark every statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Mark 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, depending on how you feel in every case.

0 = I disagree very much
1 = I disagree on the whole
2 = I disagree a little
3 = I agree a little
4 = I agree on the whole
5 = I agree very much

122
1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.

15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.

16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

30. There are two kinds of people in this world, those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

41. Most of what I learn in school is worthwhile.

42. I don't think my school is really preparing me for life outside the school the way it should.

43. My school is the best school in the country.

44. If it were left completely up to me I'd leave school before graduating.

45. My school does not really provide an opportunity to work with the important problems of young people.

46. I had more respect for education when I was in the 7th grade than I do now.

47. I think most classes encourage me to think for myself rather than merely memorizing facts.

48. It's a student's own business if he wants to smoke and the school should do away with smoking boundaries.

49. Adults generally seem to be concerned more about the appearance of young people than about their academic performance.

50. In many ways my school is not keeping up with the times.

51. High school does more to break down values than to build them up.

52. I do not think my teachers openly say what they really believe.
53. I think students really need a car of their own to have their share of fun in high school.

54. I feel that most of my teachers are really interested in me.

55. I feel that the students conform well to a standard of behavior set by the school.

The following section is about your school. The only correct response is your response based on your experience in the school. Please mark every statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it, just as you did the previous items.

56. Before this school made any rules about cars at school it would be normal for the students to be asked for their reactions and suggestions.

57. Before the school made any rules about student dress and behavior in school, it would be normal for the students to be asked for their ideas.

58. Before the school made any policy about homework, it would be normal for the students to be asked about it.

59. If I felt a school rule was unfair, the school authorities would want me to bring this to their attention.

60. If my parents felt a school rule should be changed, the school authorities would want to know about it.

61. Student suggestions for improving the lunches at school have been encouraged.

62. Student suggestions have been used to improve the lunch program.

63. My parents and I have been free to choose the general program I've taken in school.

64. People who live in my neighborhood often come to the school with any school problem they might have.

65. Since I've been in this school I know there have been times when school rules have been changed after some school authorities have talked it over with students.

66. This school is very open to my ideas and suggestions.

67. Most of the teachers in this school work with students to help them decide important topics to study in class.
68. School authorities do not ignore suggestions made by students.

69. This school gives all students an equal chance regardless of how they act.

70. This school treats all students the same regardless of their appearance.

71. Authorities in this school are usually calm and don't lose their temper.

72. Authorities in this school accept me as I am every day.

On the following items please mark the answer sheet to indicate the right response.

73. I have attended this school
    0 = this year only
    1 = two years
    2 = three years
    3 = more than three years

74. My sex is
    0 = Male
    1 = Female

NOTE: Please answer the remaining items on the second answer sheet.

The following section relates to items of behavior in this school. All information will be kept confidential and will be used to study patterns of behavior among high school students in schools today.

Please make your response according to the frequency each statement seems to have occurred this year in this school. Mark 0, 1, 2, 3, depending on how you perceive each statement.

    0 = Never
    1 = Seldom
    2 = Occasionally
    3 = Often
1. I smoke at school.
2. I have been suspended from school this year.
3. I have been sent out of a class for disturbing the class this year.
4. There are several school rules which I do not obey.
5. (Boys) I have been asked to get my hair cut by some school authority this year.
   (Girls) A school authority sometime this year has suggested that my appearance did not follow school policy.
6. I have been with a group of students who discussed some of the school rules with school authorities.
7. I have discussed some of the school rules with a teacher.
8. Teachers have reprimanded me for disturbing the class.
9. I have been in fights (in which I hit someone or someone hit me) at school this year.
10. My parents have been requested to come to school to discuss my behavior in school.
11. I have skipped school this year with a group of my friends (whether or not you were caught).
12. I have cheated on an assignment or on a test this year.
13. I have had unexcused absences from school this year.
14. I purposely wear clothing or hair styles that I know have been expressly forbidden at school.
15. I have been influenced to break school rules by someone outside the school.

On the reverse side of the answer sheet please answer the following question:
The school rules most often disobeyed in this school this year were:
1. ______________________ 2. ______________________ 3. ______________________
APPENDIX C

STUDY OF SCHOOL CLIMATE AND STUDENT BEHAVIOR

(Teacher Questionnaire)

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

DIRECTIONS

Using only a number 2 pencil, blacken the appropriate response on the answer sheet above the number that corresponds to the number beside each statement. Please mark every statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Mark 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, depending on how you feel in every case.

0 = I disagree very much
1 = I disagree on the whole
2 = I disagree a little
3 = I agree a little
4 = I agree on the whole
5 = I agree very much
1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.

15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.

16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a
handful of really great thinkers.

19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty 'wishy-washy' sort of person.

24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

30. There are two kinds of people in this world, those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothin at all."

39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

The following section is about this school. The only correct response is your response based on your experience in the school. Please mark every statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it just as you did the previous items.

41. Teachers in this school have an active role in making school policy for students.

42. Teachers have an active role in making school policy that relates to teachers in this school.

43. It would be normal to ask students for their ideas before any school policy was made about students' cars at school.

44. School authorities encourage teachers to evaluate existing school policy.

45. It would be normal to ask students for their suggestions in the development of a policy on homework.

46. If a school system policy about professional leave seemed to work against my professional growth school authorities would want to be informed about it.

47. Students would normally be asked for their suggestions before any policy about student dress or behavior at school would be adopted.

48. If a parent felt a school policy was unfair, he would be
encouraged to let the school know about it.

49. This school is very open to students' ideas and suggestions.

50. Since I've been in this school there have been times when school rules have been changed at the suggestion of students.

51. This school treats all students the same regardless of their appearance.

52. This school gives all students an equal chance regardless of how they act.

53. I work with students to help me decide important topics to study in class.

54. This school has welcomed positive criticism I have offered to improve our school program.

55. I feel free to allow discussions on controversial issues (e.g. race relations, sex, etc.) in my class.

The following section relates to items of behavior in this school. All information will be kept confidential and will be used to study patterns of behavior among high school students in schools today.

Please make your response according to the frequency each statement seems to have occurred in your experience this year in this school. Mark 0, 1, 2, 3, depending on how you perceive each statement.

0 = Never
1 = Seldom
2 = Occasionally
3 = Often

56. Students wear clothing that has been expressly forbidden in this school.

57. Students wear hair styles that have been expressly forbidden in this school.

58. I have requested parents to come to school to discuss the behavior of their children.
59. Students have used offensive, abusive, or disrespectful language to me.

60. I am aware that cheating on assignments or tests happens in my classroom.

61. There have been unexcused absences from my class this year.

62. I have asked boys to get their hair cut this year.

63. I have suggested to girls that their appearance did not follow school policy.

64. Students protest to me about rules in other classes.

65. Students protest to me about rules in my class.

66. I have sent students out of class this year for disturbing the class.

67. I have apprehended students smoking in the school.

68. I have had to break up fights among students this year.

69. The behavior of students in this school this year has been outstanding.

70. The behavior of students in the school this year has been better than most other schools.

71. The behavior of students in this school has been worse than most other schools.

72. The behavior of students in this school has been very poor.

On the following items please mark the answer sheet for the appropriate response.

73. I have taught ________ years in this school, including the present year.

   0 = less than 2
   1 = two to four
   2 = five to seven
   3 = eight to ten
   4 = eleven to fifteen
   5 = more than fifteen
74. My age is ________ years.

0 = less than 25
1 = twenty-five to thirty
2 = thirty to forty
3 = forty to fifty
4 = fifty to sixty

75. My sex is ________.

0 = Male
1 = Female

On the reverse side of the answer sheet please answer the following question:

The school rules most often disobeyed this year were:

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
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