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This study explores the organizational nature of instructional supervision in schools. A conceptual model of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) structure and effects of school supervisory behaviors is presented. The model is based on an organizational conception of instructional supervision that views the variety of supervisory behaviors, interactions and decision making engaged in by school personnel as forming a unique supervisory subculture within the school organization. The model suggests that a school's overall O/S structure is determined through the complex interrelationship of an array of macro- and micro-level communicative elements or supervisory events. These macro- and micro-level elements are, in turn, influenced by a number of supervisory variables, including: degree of centralization of administrative influence, level of vertical communication, teacher sense of professional autonomy, professional rapport, degree of communicative depth, goal consensus, and metaphorical perceptions of supervisory roles. The interrelationships among these supervisory variables contribute to the formation of a resulting O/S climate within a school. Conceptual definitions of these variable constructs within the O/S model are presented. The model posits multiple, reciprocal relationships occurring among school inputs (i.e., school personnel - administrators, teachers and peer professionals), O/S structure, resulting O/S climate and school outcomes.

The model is operationally defined through the development of a quantitative measure of overall O/S climate in schools -- the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI). This quantitative measure is further refined through a qualitative field analysis of outlier and comparison schools identified from survey results. Thus, in this study, the quantitative measure of school O/S climate serves as the independent variable.
The dependent variables in this study are three recognized indices of effectiveness: (1) school effectiveness (student achievement as measured by standardized achievement test scores); (2) organizational effectiveness (teachers' and administrators' overall perceptions of organizational effectiveness as measured by the Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE) (Miskel, Fevurly, & Stewart, 1979; Mott, 1972); and (3) school holding power (as measured by student attendance).
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

This study explores the nature and effects of organizational structures that are created and utilized by school administrators, teachers and peer professionals to frame their supervisory behaviors and decision making. This is done through the development and testing of a conceptual model of the organizational structure of instructional supervision. The chapter begins by discussing the background and rationale for the study. Elements from open social systems theory and relevant organizational climate frameworks are briefly discussed as they relate to the conceptual work of the study. Following this, a model of the organizational structure of instructional supervision in schools is presented and variables described. A summary of results of pilot studies initially exploring variable relationships within the model is provided. Research questions guiding the study are then delineated. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the contents of the following chapters.

Background

Several conditions existing in the literature have provided an impetus for this study. The literature on school supervision has traditionally been predominantly practitioner-oriented, providing supervisory models emphasizing the hierarchical and managerial functions of administrative supervisory roles (Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980; Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989; Sullivan, 1980; Valverde, 1982). This literature, while tangential to the main body of organizational writings in educational administration, nonetheless expresses a functional view of supervision that is consistent with the administrative science mentality that has pervaded theoretical work within the field of
educational administration in this century (Greenfield, 1991). In fact, this functional view of supervision has recently begun to be discounted within the supervision literature itself, being replaced with newer calls for the incorporation of shared decision-making and collaborative leadership models into practitioners' professional relations (Hord, 1986; Lieberman, 1986).

Even with these newer collaborative models, however, the primary focus has most often been on viewing supervisory role behavior and decision making in schools as isolated micro-events, that is, as individual and discrete supervisory actions involving teachers with principal supervisors and/or peer coaches. These supervisory micro-events typically take the form of individual supervisor observations of teachers during one or more class periods accompanied by a pre- and/or post-observation supervisory conference. This micro-event conceptual approach to supervision is the predominant theme found in the extant instructional supervision literature, particularly as exemplified in the body of writings on clinical supervisory practices (Cogan, 1973; Garman, 1982, 1986; Goldhammer, 1969; Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980) as well as in more recent writings on professional development (Glatthorn, 1987, 1990) and developmental supervision (Glickman, 1980, 1985; Glickman & Gordon, 1987). While these micro-events arguably comprise a fundamental part of supervisory practice in schools, these behaviors can be considered as only one among a variety of supervisory activities engaged in by school administrators and teachers within the context of the total supervisory life of schools.

The kinds of supervisory activities typically found in schools are quite diverse and varied. Supervisory activities engaged in by school personnel can include, but are not limited to, such things as involvement of teachers and administrators (and sometimes
instructional supervisors) on instructional and curricular improvement teams and committees (Oliva, 1988, 1989; Wiles & Bondi, 1984), tenured teacher supervision of intern teachers (Alfonso & Goldsberry, 1982), formal and informal peer or colleague supervisory activities (Alfonso & Goldsberry, 1982; Goldsberry, 1980; Roper, Deal & Dornbush, 1976), individual and/or group (collaborative) planning of inservice efforts and staff development activities (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978), etc. Considered collectively, these processes comprise an interrelated, multidimensional network of supervisory activity that helps shape and distinguish a school’s supervisory environment. This supervisory network provides an organizational structure fostering an overall supervisory climate in which professional roles are cultivated and supervisory decisions are made. With the emphasis placed in the literature on the micro-event aspects of supervision, little consideration has been given to ways in which these supervisory roles and decisions are formed, structured and sustained organizationally, and to the nature of the supervisory climate that supports them.

Within the body of organizational writings in educational administration, the notion of instructional supervision as a distinct organizational phenomenon is not directly addressed. The literature and conceptual theory base in educational administration, in fact, is still in its nascent stages (Swafford, 1990; Willower, 1987, 1988), particularly in describing the supervisory behaviors, interactions and practices of professionals in schools. Although schools have long been recognized as formal organizations (Bidwell, 1965), general agreement exists regarding the inadequacies of traditional organization theory and rational-bureaucratic models in explaining schools as organizations (Griffiths, 1979).

In reaction to these traditional approaches, some alternative theoretical models have emerged in recent years depicting school organizations as "organized anarchies" or "loosely
coupled systems" (Cohen & March, 1974; March & Olsen, 1976; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Weick, 1976) and as "garbage cans" of organizational decision making (Cohen & March, 1974; Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972; March & Olsen, 1976). These models, reflecting elements found in the literature in organizational sociology, focus specifically on contextual decision making in educational organizations. While providing some new and interesting metaphorical perspectives on schools as organizations - particularly on "non-rational" features of administrative life (Willower, 1988), these conceptual models have not provided any detailed framework for studying the unique and specialized organizational environments that characterize schools (Estler, 1988). Additionally, these models essentially seek to study schools at a general macro-level of analysis. Offering generalized images for considering schools as organizations, these approaches fail to delineate specific operational variables and variable relationships. As a result, little empirical work has actually been done based on these approaches (Willower, 1988, p. 743). Thus, these models have not provided any comprehensive means for considering the multidimensional variety and complexity of supervisory behaviors found in schools.

Paralleling these developments in school organization theory, the 1970s also witnessed the emergence of a substantial body of research focusing on the identification and analysis of "effective" schools (Bossert, 1988; Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984). This research came as a response to the controversial 1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity Study report (Coleman, et al., 1966) that stated that school resources have minimal impact on student achievement independent of student background characteristics. The effective schools research linked differences in building-level achievement to differences in school characteristics and school organizational climate (Educational Research Service (ERS), 1983,
ERS (1983) reported that:

No single factor accounts for building-level success in generating higher levels of student achievement. Instead, school effectiveness research showed exemplary pupil performance to result from many policies, behaviors, and attitudes that together shaped the learning environment. Yet the research disclosed important similarities between many instructionally effective schools. Frequently, these similarities pertained to aspects of the learning climate. The research findings suggested that specific climate factors exerted a major impact on the level of performance that schools ultimately attained. (p. 25)

Effective schools studies have identified a variety of climate factors positively affecting school performance. While noting that effective school climates are typically characterized by such things as an orderly and safe environment and a general atmosphere of positive learning expectations for students, many studies have also identified specific climate factors relating to the quality of the supervisory environment within recognized effective schools. These factors include: (1) effective communication between teachers and principals (New York City Board of Education, 1979); (2) regular administrative response to teachers’ difficulties (New York City Board of Education, 1979); (3) good rapport and cooperative atmosphere between administrators and teachers (Venezky & Winfield, 1979); and (4) a sense of shared instructional decision making resulting from joint administrator and teacher involvement in instructional advisory and policy groups (Phi Delta Kappa, 1980; California State Department of Education, 1977). In addition to collaborative relationships between administrators and teachers on instructional matters, research findings have portrayed the climate among professional staff in effective schools as highly collaborative and harmonious as well (Fetters, Collins, & Smith, 1968; Phi Delta Kappa, 1980; Venezky & Winfield, 1979).
Based primarily on a limited number of case studies, the effective schools literature typically identifies five correlates of effective schools: (1) strong administrative leadership; (2) high performance expectation for students; (3) a safe and orderly environment conducive to teaching and learning; (4) an emphasis on the acquisition of basic skills; and (5) a system of monitoring student progress (Edmonds, 1979). These characteristics of effective schools have been identified as important factors contributing to an overall school climate that promotes academic achievement. As Edmonds (1979) notes, "What effective schools share is a climate in which it is incumbent on all personnel to be instructionally effective for all pupils" (p. 22).

However, while input-output studies of effective schools have produced research findings emphasizing the important influence of mediating variables such as school climate on student learning outcomes, effective schools research has been largely atheoretical, practitioner-oriented and prescriptive in its approach. In summarizing critiques of effective schools research, Hoy and Ferguson (1985) state that "it appears that the research on effective schools is limited by the same weakness as the research on effective organizations - the absence of both a sound theoretical framework and a careful definition and measurement of the concept" (pp. 117-118). Similarly, the construct of "school climate" employed in the school effectiveness literature seems nebulously defined and in need of clarification. As Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) point out:

...positive school climate has become part of the effective school rhetoric and is advocated by educational practitioners and reformers as a specific means for improving student achievement. Nonetheless, two nagging problems remain. First, there is no common understanding of the meaning of school climate. The rhetorical use of climate has obscured the need for clear definition. Second, there is little systematic empirical evidence linking school climate as a scientific construct with academic achievement. (p. 2)
In addition to the effective schools findings, evidence exists from a number of other studies probing the relationship between supervisory behaviors and school output variables that supervisory (leader) behavior is influenced by a variety of mediating variables impacting school effectiveness indices (e.g., Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Dwyer, Bossert, Rowan, & Lee, 1983; Ellett & Walberg, 1979). Studies such as these highlight the fact that school climate, and in particular, the professional supervisory learning environment, is an important determinant of school outcomes. Additionally, although there have been recent studies that address the relationship between supervisory expertise and school organizational climate (Nelon, 1988; Street, 1988), these studies characteristically have approached instructional supervision from a micro-event perspective, without consideration of larger, organizational dimensions of instructional supervision. Although these studies have provided some useful insights, further empirical research may be impeded due to the need for clearer conceptual and operational definitions of the school climate construct that more accurately reflect the multiple organizational structures and interactive processes influencing supervisory behavior.

This lack of construct definitional clarity in the school effectiveness and school climate literatures has spawned increasing interest among researchers in exploring alternative theoretical and empirical approaches. Indeed, the inherent complexity of school organizational climate as a construct has led some researchers to direct attention to studying individual elements within school organizational culture. For example, a body of studies has emerged focusing on the student subculture in schools as one important dimension of school organizational life (Packard, 1988). As schools have been described in the past as complex miniature societies (Waller, 1932), renewed emphasis is currently being placed on
the usefulness of investigating the multiple subcultures found in schools (Firestone & Corbett, 1988, Willower, 1984, 1986, 1988). Additionally, the strong connection between a school’s culture or subcultures and the resulting organizational climate produced has been recognized by researchers (Anderson, 1982).

This interest in the multidimensional nature of school organizations reflects a recognition within the general organization theory literature that organizational effectiveness is a multidimensional rather than a unidimensional construct (Campbell, 1977, p. 18). Further acknowledgment of this multidimensionality can be found in the psychology literature as well. For example, Cronbach (1957) provides a persuasive rationale for conducting integrated research that extends the study of complex organizations to include consideration of variability within organizations, situational context, and the richness of interactions among individual subelements and groups. For Cronbach, examining the complexity of human behavior requires models of social organization that go beyond the explanation of single variable relationships to a multidimensional perspective that considers multiple interactions and interrelationships among a large number of variables.

Considering schools as unique organizations consisting of multiple subculture "collectivities" (Willower, 1986, p.36), and in view of the lack of specific theoretical and empirical work in this area, it seems appropriate to begin to focus research attention on the professional learning environment created in schools as a unique organizational phenomenon. Of particular interest is the supervisory climate that is produced and sustained by school members within this environment. This supervisory climate, created and maintained by administrators, teachers and peer professionals as they engage in supervisory behaviors and decision making within the course of ongoing professional interactions, can be considered
reflective of a unique and complex supervisory subculture of schools. This supervisory subculture, possessing its own infrastructure and functioning as an integral part of a school’s total organizational fabric, perhaps impacts directly on school organizational life and affects learning outcomes.

In reviewing the state of theoretical and empirical research on schools as organizations, Willower (1986) affirms that "...an empirical literature on organizational culture in educational settings is needed, as is more writings on what have been called the subcultures, especially the adult ones" (Willower, 1986, pp. 36-37). Moreover, Anderson (1982), in her comprehensive review of the school climate literature, concludes that:

...we are left with many gaps in our knowledge of school climate. The exact mechanisms by which individual and group level variables interact to create a climate conducive to positive student outcomes is very unclear...the need now is for conceptually based research aimed at improving models of school climate effects rather than merely adding to the already long list of separate variables or reaffirming their association with climate or outcomes. (pp. 411-12)

These sentiments are echoed most recently by Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991), who exhort that "...until school climate is carefully defined and its dimensions mapped and measured, little progress will be made in determining which aspects of climate are directly related to student achievement" (p. 2).

These comments suggest a strong consensus among researchers for the need for further study of individual dimensions of organizational life contained within schools. One important dimension in need of clearer definition and empirical study involves the nature of the professional supervisory subculture of schools, and the supervisory climate that supports it.
This study is formulated in response to the above combination of conditions existing in the literatures on instructional supervision, school effectiveness and schools as organizations. The study addresses a perceived need in the educational administration literature for the development and testing of a conceptual model that considers the supervisory behaviors and professional learning activities of administrators, teachers and peer professionals as comprising an important supervisory subculture within schools. The model presented in this study provides the conceptual basis for a clearer articulation of the climate construct as it relates to the supervisory subculture of schools and the formulation of a more useful instrument for measuring the impact of the supervisory subculture on indices of school effectiveness.

**Conceptual Framework of the Study**

This study develops a conceptual model of school supervision that seeks to explain the typical daily instructional supervisory actions and behaviors of school personnel as constituting an essentially organizational phenomenon. An Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Model of Instructional Supervision is developed in the study positing multiple, reciprocal relationships existing among school personnel, a variety of organizational/supervisory (O/S) supervisory structure and climate variables, and selected indices of school effectiveness. In the O/S model developed in this study, supervisory structures and various supervisory climate interactive dimensions are conceptualized as forming a multidimensional template for considering relative levels and quality of personnel supervisory interactions that combine to shape and define a unique supervisory subculture in schools. The O/S model developed in the study forms the basis for the development of a new empirical measure of school organizational/supervisory climate and the generation of a series of study research questions.
A detailed description of O/S model development efforts and a thorough explication of the model is presented in Chapter Two.

**Statement of the Problem**

The major problem posed in this study is twofold. First, the study addresses a perceived need in the literature for a conceptual framework that synthesizes relevant perspectives from organization theory, instructional supervision, school climate and school effectiveness research to provide a more comprehensive and integrated model of the organizational structure and dynamics of professional supervisory behaviors of administrators and teachers in schools. The study addresses this dimension of the problem through the development and refinement of a conceptual model of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) structure of instructional supervision in schools, along with the development of conceptual definitions for the variables comprising the model.

Secondly, no instruments have been developed to specifically measure the organizational nature of instructional supervision in schools. Although existing instruments offer opportunities for measuring various aspects or variables associated with general school climate (Anderson, 1982), these do not adequately address nor do they provide a comprehensive means for assessing the multiple, interrelated factors contributing to the formation of the professional learning climate distinguishing a school’s supervisory subculture. The study addresses this second dimension of the problem through the development of a quantitative measure of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate of instructional supervision in schools. The instrument developed serves to operationally define the O/S climate construct subsumed within the proposed O/S structure model.
Additionally, the conceptual development of the O/S framework comes in response to a perceived lack of definitional clarity of key constructs contained in the effective schools literature. There are two problems found within this literature that this study specifically addresses: (1) the effective schools literature has not been clear on exactly what effectiveness means, and (2) there is a need to clarify the relationship between indices of effectiveness and elements of the supervisory climate of schools.

Purpose

In this study, the supervisory subculture of schools is conceptualized as a complex organizational phenomenon, comprised of a variety of intervening variables mediating supervisory behavior and decision making and school effectiveness. The model utilized in this study considers these variables and variable relationships as operating within a multidimensional organizational framework involving a nesting of various micro-communicative elements and events within larger macro-communicative ones, together constituting a school's complete O/S structure. These micro and macro supervisory dimensions, considered collectively, are further conceptualized as comprising a broad organizational fabric of supervisory behavior in a school shaping the school’s professional learning environment and overall organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate.

Thus, this study is designed to explore the nature and effects of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) structures that functionally unify the macro and micro communicative elements comprising the supervisory subculture of schools. The O/S model presented in this study provides a conceptual framework for the development and empirical testing of a supervisory climate instrument designed to obtain a better understanding of the critical variables and relationships mediating the instructional supervisory behaviors of
school professional personnel and recognized indices of school effectiveness. The study allows for an initial investigation of the reliability and criterion-related validity of the instrument within a school effectiveness design.

Significance of the Study

This study is important for several reasons. First, the conceptual framework proposed in this study offers a shift of focus to viewing supervision in schools as essentially an organizational phenomenon. In contrast to more generalized approaches to viewing supervisory behavior within school organizations presently in the literature, this study focuses on the school professional learning environment as an important supervisory subculture of schools. In so doing, this study seeks to provide a clearer understanding of the unique relationship of this supervisory subculture to various school outcomes.

Secondly, by focusing on the professional learning environment as one unique subculture nested within the complex organizational life of schools, this study serves an integrative research function in the literature by combining elements and perspectives of instructional supervision with the study of schools as organizations. The O/S framework presented in this study provides the conceptual basis for an inclusive representation of the organizational dynamics and relationships existing among school supervisory variables, school climate and school outcomes. Additionally, through focusing on the nature and effects of the unique organizational structures and climate characterizing school supervisory subculture, this study provides information useful in clarifying some of the tenets posited in the effective schools literature regarding the connections between school climate and school effectiveness.
Thirdly, this study contributes to the existing educational administration literature base through the development and testing of a conceptual framework of the organizational structure and effects of school supervisory subculture. Thus, this study is significant in providing a clearer understanding of variables and variable relationships affecting the organizational/supervisory climate of schools, as well as clarifying the nature and extent of variable linkages among O/S structure, supervisory climate and selected indices of school effectiveness. The O/S model presented in this study provides a conceptual means for delineating a more refined conception and clearer articulation of the school climate construct, by allowing for the conceptualization and development of an empirical instrument that measures the quality of the professional learning climate produced in schools.

The development and testing of the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) in this study is important for several reasons: (1) it provides a multi-dimensional inventory of the nature of school supervisory climate when none existed; (2) it generates a useful empirical means for clarifying the relationship between the supervisory climate of schools and indices of school effectiveness; and (3) it constitutes a practically administered means that can be used in future research to further test model relationships. In addition, using the OSCI within the study design yields information about the psychometric characteristics of the instrument.

This study is also important because it uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The quantitative OSCI measure developed in this study contributes to the existing repertoire of available school climate instruments. The qualitative dimension of this study, involving follow-up interviews conducted in selected schools, is also of value for a number of reasons: (1) it provides an opportunity to cross-check
information obtained from quantitative survey results through the use of indepth interview techniques; (2) it produces a variety of valuable data useful in refining the model and survey instrument; and (3) it generates important natural setting information leading to a better understanding of the nature of variation in the supervisory climate within schools, as well as identifying possible underlying variables that contribute to between school differences in school O/S structure, climate and effectiveness.

Finally, the O/S model developed for this study provides a conceptual basis for further generation and testing of hypotheses concerning the relationships among O/S variables and indices of school effectiveness.

Study Variables

Conceptual/Operational Definitions

This section presents conceptual and operational definitions of the key variables in the study. A discussion of conceptual model building efforts leading to the development of these constructs along with a full explication of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) model is presented in Chapter Two. The subsections that follow present conceptual definitions of major study variables followed by an operational definition of each.

Independent Variable(s)

O/S Climate - O/S Climate is defined as educators’ perceptions of the overall professional learning environment existing in a school. It is an index of the school’s overall professional learning climate within which supervisory roles are enacted, and supervisory decisions are structured and carried out. O/S Climate will be operationalized by school mean scores on subscales of the
organized/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) instrument developed in this study.

Dependent Variables (Definitions of Effectiveness)

In this study, effectiveness is operationalized by three measures: (A) School Effectiveness, (B) Organizational Effectiveness, and (C) School Holding Power. Conceptual and operational definitions of each are presented below.

(A) School effectiveness: School effectiveness is defined as the overall level or quality of student academic achievement or student productivity evident in a school. School mean achievement is operationalized in this study by school level score results on the California Achievement Test (1987) standardized achievement test.

(B) Organizational effectiveness: Organizational effectiveness is defined as the extent to which organizational members are able to establish and accomplish organizational goals in a manner that is efficient, adaptable and flexible to the needs of the organization, and that ensures a high quantity and quality level of organizational product. Organizational effectiveness is operationalized in the study using school professional staff and administrator mean scores on the Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE) (Miskel, Fevrury & Stewart, 1979; Mott, 1972)

(C) School holding power: School holding power is defined in this study as the positive attractability or valence of the school organization for student clientele. School holding power is operationalized in the study by
school-wide student average daily attendance (ADA) figures computed over all reporting periods for the study school year.

Research Questions

Since this exploratory study focused on inductive model building rather than deductive derivation of hypotheses from competing frameworks, the research question format was utilized in lieu of hypothesis statements. Since the model building efforts used in this study were at the exploratory stage, the use of research questions to guide the study allowed for a certain amount of data analysis flexibility as relationships among variables were examined. In addition to providing information on initial O/S model building and refinement work, the study provides data bearing on the psychometric validity and reliability of the OSCI. Following is a list of primary and supplemental research questions that guided the study. Chapter Two provides a detailed discussion of model building efforts leading to the formulation of these research questions.

Primary Research Questions

Question 1: Are there bivariate relationships between the various O/S climate dimensions (and/or individual O/S variables within these dimensions) and the various school effectiveness indices?

1a. If question one is affirmed, are these relationships statistically independent of school socioeconomic status?

Question 2: Are there multivariate relationships among the set of O/S climate dimensions (independent variables) and the various school effectiveness measures (dependent variables)?
2a. Which dimensions and what combination of OSCI dimensions account for/explain the most variance in the various school effectiveness measures examined?

2b. Is there a significant multivariate relationship between the set of school effectiveness variables and the set of OSCI variables when analyzed collectively?

**Question 3:** Does within-school variance on various O/S climate dimensions explain/account for significant amounts of variation among the school effectiveness indices?

**Question 4:** What relationship exists between administrator and professional staff perceptions of O/S climate dimension levels among schools?

**Question 5:** Are there schools with similar demographic characteristics (e.g., SES, grade level), but with differing relationships between effectiveness indices and O/S climate characteristics?

**Question 6:** Are there qualitative differences between schools that are the most extreme in the relationship between O/S climate dimensions and organizational effectiveness, and in levels of organizational effectiveness?

**Supplemental Research Questions**

In addition to the primary research questions, a variety of supplemental research questions were addressed in this study as they emerged from the results of the primary data analyses. For example:

- Do school groups differ in their O/S climate levels when compared on selected demographic variables (e.g., SES, school size, urban/rural, and so on)?
Limitations

1. The generalizability of the results obtained from this study may be limited by the nature of the schools in the sample.

2. Generalizations about the O/S climate in schools and its differential relationship to school effectiveness may be limited by the small number of schools used in the qualitative data collection and analysis procedures.

Assumptions

1. Respondents were reasonably honest when completing the surveys. Personal perceptions of survey respondents were assumed to be valid and reliable indicators of organizational/supervisory events occurring in the everyday life of their schools.

2. The criterion used to include schools in analyses pertinent to the research questions (40% or more respondents in a given school) was sufficient to ensure stable school-level indices of the variables measured.

Summary

Chapter one presents an overview of the study and a preliminary description of conceptual and operational definitions guiding the study. The significance of the study is presented along with a statement of the problem. Primary and supplemental research questions derived from the conceptual model of the study and guiding the research questions are then delineated. The chapter concludes with statements concerning the limitations, assumptions and significance of the study.

Chapter Two presents a detailed description of model development efforts and an explication of the O/S Model of Instructional Supervision. Relevant conceptual frameworks leading to the development of the expanded O/S model employed in the study are also
discussed. Chapter Three presents a review of related literature and research. Chapter Four provides a discussion of the methodology and procedures employed. Chapter Five includes the results of the study. The final chapter presents a discussion of major findings, conclusions and implications of the study.
CHAPTER TWO: MODEL DEVELOPMENT

Chapter Two presents an overview of specific theoretical frameworks contributing to the development of the O/S model. A brief description of the results of O/S model pilot development efforts is also included. A detailed discussion of the O/S model is then presented along with conceptual and operational definitions of key terms and variables. The chapter concludes with an explication of the manner in which the model conceptually guides the study’s research questions.

Conceptual Frameworks

The following sections present brief overviews of perspectives and definitions of school effectiveness and school climate selected from the existing literature. These selected frameworks were reviewed as part of preliminary model development activities. Elements from these frameworks were then considered in terms of: 1) their usefulness as precursor concepts providing some conceptual grounding in existing literature, and 2) their ability to serve as initial bases for subsequent development of O/S model constructs and variables.

Perspectives on School Effectiveness

Schools as Open Social Systems

Viewing school organizations as dynamic and complex open social systems, Hoy and Ferguson (1985) propose a multidimensional definition of school effectiveness based on a synthesis of two organizational frameworks: (1) the goal model (Steers, 1977), and (2) the systems model (Campbell, 1977). In comparing these two models, Hoy and Ferguson

---

1 A comprehensive review of the relevant literature bases from which these frameworks were selected is provided in Chapter Three.
explain that the goal model stresses the successful attainment of specific objectives, while the systems model is more concerned with internal consistency, the ability to adapt, and the optimization of resources. In proposing a synthesis of these two frameworks, Hoy and Ferguson emphasize the importance of both ends and means in considerations of an organization's effectiveness:

> It is assumed that all formal organizations, such as schools, attempt to achieve certain objectives and to develop group products through the manipulation of material and human resources, hence, the study of effectiveness is concerned with both organizational means and ends. Consequently, organizational effectiveness is defined as the extent to which any organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members. (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985, p. 121)

Employing a Parsonian framework (Parsons, 1960), Hoy and Ferguson describe a general model of school effectiveness subsuming four dimensions: (1) organizational adaptation in the form of successful accommodation to internal and external forces (adaptation); (2) organizational productivity in terms of the extent to which the organization is successful in setting and accomplishing its internal goals (goal attainment); (3) organizational cohesiveness in the form of the absence of intraorganizational conflict (integration); and (4) organizational commitment in the form of members' motivation and commitment to the organization (latency) (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985, p. 122). The model of school effectiveness proposed by Hoy and Ferguson is depicted in Figure A.1 (Appendix A). Hoy and Ferguson's model, based on a conception of schools as open social systems, suggests a multidimensional definition of effectiveness in which overall effectiveness of the school organization is defined in terms of four operational indicators of the effectiveness
dimensions (i.e., innovation, academic achievement, cohesiveness, and organizational commitment), involving multiple school subgroups within a short-term time perspective.

Definitions of School Effectiveness

Mott (1972) has developed a multi-faceted measure of organizational effectiveness that, like the Hoy and Ferguson (1985) model, is also patterned on Parsons' (1960) social functions framework. In Mott's formulation, organizational effectiveness is conceptualized as the perceived subjective evaluation of an organization based on four criteria: (1) quantity and quality of product and services, (2) efficiency of production, (3) adaptability, and (4) flexibility. Mott's (1972) view of organizational effectiveness, reflecting Parsons' (1960) emphasis on the functional imperatives guiding social organizations, recognizes a broad range of organizational outcomes, the need for effective adaptation to both environmental and internal contingencies, and a concern for production and goal achievement.

Mott (1972) devised the Index of Organizational Effectiveness (IOE) to measure the four criteria or elements of organizational effectiveness applicable to a wide variety of organizational types. The product quantity and quality elements of effectiveness focus on two important aspects of the outcomes of an organization. The element of efficiency encompasses the organization's ability to maintain a high level of functional operation and production. Adaptability, as conceptualized by Mott, involves two categories: (1) the anticipation of problems and awareness of new technical processes; and (2) the prompt implementation of timely solutions and utilization of new processes and equipment. Flexibility refers to an organization's ability to make quick adjustments in operation and to deal effectively with emergency situations. Employing slight modifications in the original instrument wording to fit educational settings, Miskel, Fervurly and Stewart (1979) have
applied Mott's four dimensional framework of organizational effectiveness to the study of school organizations.

**Perspectives on School Climate**

**Climate and School Effectiveness**

Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979) have proposed a "mediated" model of school effectiveness. Within this model school inputs (SI), such as school student and professional personnel, are seen as affecting student outcomes (SO) directly as well as through the mediating influence of school social structure (SS) and school social climate (SC) (Figure A.2, Appendix A). Anderson (1982) has expanded upon this basic framework by employing an organizational climate taxonomy devised by Tagiuri (1968). Tagiuri's climate taxonomy defines an organization's total climate or environment as consisting of four dimensions: (1) its ecology (the physical and material aspects); (2) its milieu (the social dimension concerned with the presence of persons and groups); its social system (the social dimension concerned with the patterned relationships of persons and groups); and (4) its culture (the social dimension concerned with belief systems, values, cognitive structures, and meaning). In synthesizing the Brookover et al. model and the Tagiruiian climate taxonomy, Anderson presents an expanded causal model conceptualizing "...all possible interactions among the dimensions of the environment as they affect student outcomes both directly and as mediated by school climate" (Anderson, 1982, p. 405) (Figure A.3, Appendix A). In the Anderson model, multiple, reciprocal relationships are depicted as existing among school organizational dimensions (taxonomy), school climate and student outcomes. As illustrated in Figure A.4 (Appendix A), the organizational climate dimensions described by Tagiuri (1968) and incorporated into the Anderson expanded causal model
parallel rather closely the four-tiered Parsonian framework used by Hoy and Ferguson (1985).

**Definitions of School Climate**

In reviewing studies related to the conceptualization and testing of various operational measures of school climate, Anderson notes that the school climate instruments thus far developed have consisted of either general measures of the "total" school climate or instruments focusing on the classroom context (Anderson, 1982). However, although formal attempts to conceptualize and operationalize specific dimensions of school supervisory climate from an organizational perspective are not evident in the literature, research efforts have been directed at identifying and testing various climate factors relating to administrative practices in schools (Ellett & Walberg, 1979).

For example, *The School Survey* (Coughlan, 1970; Coughlan & Cooke, 1974) has been developed to measure teacher morale or satisfaction with the working environment. This teacher satisfaction inventory has been used extensively in conjunction with other measures of school learning climate, such as *The Learning Environment Inventory* and *The My School Inventory* (Ellett, Masters, & Pool, 1978; Ellett, Payne, Masters, & Pool, 1977). Another instrument, *The School Description Inventory* (Anderson, 1970; Anderson & Tissier, 1973) has been used to measure teachers' perceptions of the bureaucratic characteristics of secondary school environments. The SDI measures six dimensions or subscales associated with the level of bureaucracy evident in a school (i.e., hierarchy of authority, rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, technical competence, and specialization).
Although instruments such as those mentioned above have predominantly focused on single factors associated with school administrative practice, there has been initial work done by some researchers towards more thoroughly defining and operationalizing school organizational structure and environment. For example, in an effort to more accurately define the complex nature of school organizational life, Firestone and Herriott (1982) have conceptualized and operationalized seven dimensions for identifying and clarifying the salient differences between two contrasting popular images of school organizational environments -- the school as a rational bureaucracy, and the school as an anarchy or loosely coupled system. Their model is formulated based on a general conception of the rational bureaucracy as a "closed system" and the anarchy or loosely coupled system as an "open system". The seven organizational dimensions are: (1) goal consensus, (2) vertical communication, (3) enforcement of formal rules, (4) centralization of influence, (5) legitimacy of administrative influence, (6) teacher classroom autonomy, and (7) openness to environment.

These seven dimensions provide a conceptual framework from which Firestone and Herriott construct an "image-level" hypothesis stating that the overall organizational environments of secondary schools conform more to rational bureaucracies, whereas elementary school environments more resemble anarchies. Their conceptual framework suggests that salient organizational and environmental differences existing in schools with competing images would require the seven organizational dimensions to vary uniformly. Firestone and Herriott (1987) operationalized two of the seven organizational dimensions (goal consensus and centralization) and reported initial empirical evidence supporting their basic hypothesis. A study by Logan (1989) on school coupling structure presents more
recent evidence indicating that the school climate picture is far more complex and less systematic than previously espoused by Firestone and Herriott (1987). The Logan (1989) study provides evidence suggesting that when these climate variables are considered in terms of definitions of school effectiveness, the organizational structure of schools becomes even more complex (see Chapter Three, pp. 49-50).

A Proposed Framework for Examining Relationships Between Supervisory Climate and School Effectiveness

In an effort to develop a meaningful conceptual framework for better understanding the organizational nature and effects of instructional supervision in schools, elements of the conceptual frameworks described above were expanded and integrated into ongoing model development efforts. These efforts resulted in the formulation of a proposed conceptual framework focusing on particular organizational/supervisory (O/S) structures and effects characterizing the supervisory subculture of schools. This framework forms the basis for further conceptualization of supervisory structure and climate variables and variable relationships comprising the model.

The dimensions of the Parsonian (1960) framework and the Tagiurian (1968) climate taxonomy were employed as conceptual templates aiding the refinement of O/S climate dimensions. A conceptual mapping of O/S climate dimensions with those of existing frameworks is depicted in Figure A.5 (Appendix A). These supervisory climate dimensions and variables were then incorporated, along with elements from the Brookover/Anderson causal framework, into an O/S model depicting the relationships among school inputs, supervisory structure and climate, and school effectiveness indices.
**Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Model of Instructional Supervision**

Figure 1 (p. 29) presents a proposed model of the organizational structure of school instructional supervision. The model illustrates the multiple, reciprocal relationships existing among the organizational **structure** of instructional supervision in the school (ecology), the **inputs** of various school personnel (milieu), and the **professional supervisory interactions** (social system and culture) represented by the various interrelationships among macro- and micro-level O/S climate variables within the model. These structural and social dimensions, along with multiple interactions and interrelationships among O/S variables, are conceptualized as collectively shaping the **professional learning environment** distinguishing a school’s **professional supervisory subculture**. The O/S structure and resulting overall O/S climate of a school’s supervisory subculture are depicted as being important organizational phenomena mediating school inputs (professional personnel and students) and measures of school outcomes (effectiveness).

Within the model, school **O/S structure** refers to the particular organizational mix of supervisory activities engaged in by school members on both the micro-communicative and macro-communicative levels. These two levels of supervisory activity allow for a wide range and variety of supervisory encounters, behaviors and practices to occur in any given school context. For example, instructional supervisory activities might typically include a number of individual administrator-teacher supervisory interactions, such as casual conversations and ongoing memos, as well as the often spontaneous informal chats that can be a characteristic and recurring feature of everyday supervisory life in schools. Taken together, these individual supervisory actions and events can be considered as **micro-communicative elements** nested within larger O/S structures in schools. Among these larger
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Figure 1: Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) model of the organizational structure and dynamics of instructional supervisory practices within the school supervisory subculture
structures, or macro-communicative elements, are professional activities such as administrator supervising of various departmental and/or grade level faculty curriculum planning and instructional projects, administrative and/or teacher (group) planning of various staff development activities and school inservice workshops, administrators’ and teachers’ joint participation in supervisory meetings, professional development activities, curricular planning sessions, etc. Considered collectively, these micro- and macro-communicative elements contribute to establishing an overall professional learning environment within a school.

O/S climate in the model is conceptualized as a perceptual phenomenon involving staff members’ affective and qualitative perceptions regarding a school’s adult supervisory learning environment. It refers to both individual and collective perceptions of the nature and quality of professional supervisory interactions. These perceptions are reflective of the professional norms and supervisory values and expectations infusing school organizational life. The O/S climate construct is further conceptualized by seven perceptual dimensions of supervisory interactive behavior. These dimensions address members’ perceptions of supervisory roles, and relative levels of centralization, vertical communication, professional autonomy, rapport, communicative depth, and goal consensus characterizing supervisory interactions.

Additionally, the O/S climate of a school is viewed as being processual - that is, it continually emerges from and is a function of the ongoing supervisory interactions and behaviors of school professional members. This processual aspect refers to the dynamic and fluid nature of school supervisory practices and the multiple interactions among O/S structures, climate dimensions, and person variables. The model depicts member interactions
and behaviors as occurring within the organizational context of the O/S structure existing in a school at any given time. The O/S climate found in a given school will be a function of the multiple interrelationships existing among school personnel (inputs), interactive O/S climate dimensions and the specific kinds of supervisory activities legitimated by and engaged in within the school (O/S structure).

Thus, instructional supervision as broadly defined in the model encompasses the wide variety of professional activities typically occurring in schools. For example, the O/S model suggests that principals, as part of their normal instructional supervisory activities, engage in classroom observations of teaching and learning, along with the pre and/or post conferences with teachers that frequently accompany these observations. Depending upon the individual school context, the specific "O/S structure" of these observations and conferences will vary. In one school, for instance, teachers may be accustomed to receiving an informal memo from the principal, announcing and/or reminding them of an upcoming classroom visit. In such a school, several informal chats and casual conversations between the principal and individual teachers about "how things have been going" in the classroom may augment or even preempt a more formal pre-observation conference. In other school contexts, professionals possibly operating under different sets of cultural norms and contrasting supervisory values will engage in equally valid but different supervisory behaviors. Thus, underlying cultural norms and values about what constitutes agreed upon supervisory behavior are directly related to school O/S structures. The O/S structures that professionals cultivate and maintain in the school organization, however, are not isolated individual occurrences. The O/S model suggests that the multi-level instructional supervisory activity engaged in by school members constitutes an organizational
phenomenon that directly affects the school's supervisory climate and shapes the school's particular professional learning environment.

In viewing the components and elements within the O/S model and their interrelationships, several possibilities arise for explaining professional learning environments in schools. For example, two schools might have essentially the same macro- and micro-communicative elements (O/S structures) but, because of the manner in which staff members in each of the schools interact and carry out these structures, the resulting O/S climate in each school could be substantially different. Similarly, the qualities of O/S climates in the two schools could be fairly similar, but could result from substantially different O/S structures.

Thus, the model depicts a school's professional learning environment as arising from complex interactions and interrelationships among an array of variables (structural elements (ecology), persons (milieu), and O/S climate dimensions (social system and culture)) affecting school outcomes. Organizationally, the professional learning environment constructed and sustained by staff members within a school is considered as contributing to the shape and definition of a unique supervisory subculture existing as a subunit within the school’s total organizational culture.

Because of the complex nature of the multiple variable interactions posited in the model, the exploratory study described here limited its focus to dimensions of O/S climate and their relationship to three indices of effectiveness (school effectiveness, organizational effectiveness and school holding power). The O/S model is employed in this study as a conceptual guide and as a basis for the generation of research questions. Key constructs involved in the articulation of the model are formally defined below.
Conceptual Definitions

Instructional Supervision

The definition of instructional supervision employed in this study encompasses not only the supervision of classroom instruction but also recognizes the wide range of possible supervisory encounters, behaviors and actions engaged in by school personnel as forming part of the organizational structure of the school supervisory subculture.

Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Structure

School O/S structure, as depicted in the model, provides a conceptual means for considering the complexity of the interrelationships among macro- and micro-communicative elements existing within a school’s supervisory subculture. It refers to the particular kinds and sets of designated supervisory actions and behaviors that comprise the normal supervisory activities of a school. A school’s O/S structure results in a perceived supervisory climate present in the school organization.

Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Climate

School O/S climate is defined as educators’ perceptions of the overall professional learning environment existing in a school. The O/S climate is a measure of the health of the school’s supervisory subculture. It is an index of the school’s overall professional learning climate within which supervisory roles are enacted, and supervisory decisions are structured and carried out.

Professional Learning Environment

The O/S model defines the professional learning environment as the total set of adult learning conditions in a school that result from the combined multiple interactions among
school professional personnel, O/S structure and the various climate dimensions on both the macro- and micro-communicative levels.

**School Supervisory Subculture**

The school supervisory subculture is defined in the O/S model as a distinctive organizational subunit within the total organizational culture of schools. As such, it possesses a unique set of cultural norms, supervisory values, and organizational symbols defining educators' behaviors and interactions that collectively shape and determine a school's professional supervisory practices which subsequently impact school outcomes (effectiveness).

**Operational Definitions**

**Independent Variables** (Definition of School Climate)

In this study, O/S climate is operationalized by scores for each dimension/level of the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) developed in this study. The OSCI instrument is divided into two item-category levels: the micro-communicative level, and the macro-communicative level. Contrasting micro- and macro-item subsets under each of seven dimensions described below are used to operationalize both communicative levels of the instrument. A school's overall O/S climate level as measured by the OSCI can be thought of as an aggregate index of interrelationships existing among macro and micro-communicative variables within the school supervisory subculture. Conceptual definitions of each of the seven dimensions of the O/S climate construct represented in the OSCI are:

- **centralization** (of administrative influence): the degree to which administrators have superior influence over teachers regarding school supervisory activities and decisionmaking
vertical communication: the extent to which general supervisory information, as well as supervisory decisions affecting both individual teachers and teacher groups within the school, is circulated in a "top-down", hierarchical manner

professional autonomy (teacher sense of): the degree to which teachers feel they are directly involved in structuring supervisory decisions affecting them personally, and the degree to which teachers have input in formulating ongoing assessments of the supervisory needs of the school organization

rapport: the degree of mutual trust and professional affinity perceived by organizational members as they engage in supervisory interactions

communicative depth: the relative level at which knowledge and meanings are structured and conveyed among organizational members. Communicative levels can be considered to extend on a continuum from superficial, formalized interchanges to interactions among organizational members at the deepest, normative levels.

goal consensus: the extent of agreement among professional members regarding the specific supervisory needs and goals of the school organization

(metaphoric) role perception: the kind and intensity of supervisory metaphors utilized by teachers and administrators in describing aspects of the school professional learning environment

Dependent Variables (Definitions of Effectiveness)

In this study, effectiveness is operationalized by three measures:

(A) School effectiveness: an outcome measure of student productivity; school mean achievement as measured by school level score results on standardized achievement tests (California Achievement Tests, 1987)
(B) **Organizational effectiveness**: administrator and teacher perceptions of organizational effectiveness as measured by scores on the *Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness* (IPOE) (Miskel, Fevurly & Stewart, 1979; Mott, 1972)

(C) **School holding power**: index of student average daily attendance (ADA)

**Summary of Pilot Studies**

Pilot studies completed prior to this study served as vehicles for the initial developmental work on O/S model constructs, and provided preliminary empirical evidence supporting the refined O/S model constructs. These pilot studies are briefly summarized below.

**Interactive Behavior and the Classroom Learning Environment**

An initial classroom-level study was completed in 1989 focusing on interactive aspects of classroom teaching and learning environments (Claudet & Ellett, 1990). This study utilized a large classroom observation dataset (n=1000) consisting of individual classroom observations of teaching and learning by trained assessors. The purpose of the study was to determine the feasibility of using recorded assessor observation notes of classroom lessons as a means of studying relationships among student engagement rates, teacher performance on teaching effectiveness indicators, kinds of classroom role metaphors utilized by teachers and students in their normal interactive behaviors, and classroom robustness levels (an index of classroom climate). A variety of metaphor types of classroom behaviors were discerned from assessor fieldnotes and then categorized on a transferential/transactional metaphor continuum.
The results of this pilot study provided tentative evidence that use of specific teaching/learning metaphors by teachers and students in classrooms is associated with teachers' differential performance on teacher effectiveness indicators, as well as with levels of student engagement in learning. Findings also indicated a strong connection between these variables and classroom robustness levels. The relatively high variable intercorrelations obtained in this study provided initial research evidence supporting the feasibility of conceptualizing about and using the role metaphor construct as a legitimate variable in analyses of interactive behaviors within learning environments.

Supervisory Behavior and the Professional Learning Environment

A qualitative study of supervisory behaviors in conference settings was completed in nine schools (Claudet, Chauvin & Loup, 1991). A substantial amount of qualitative field note and interview data was generated through completion of a series of non-participant observations of 61 supervisory conferences involving administrators, teachers and peer professionals, and through a series of indepth pre/post interviews with participants. Additionally, information on administrator and teacher beliefs and perspectives regarding classroom supervisory practices was obtained through the efforts of in-school teacher/researchers, who compiled written assertions based on ongoing conversations with their professional cohorts. These data were then categorized, coded and analyzed using an interpretive methodology procedure described by Erickson (1986).

Analyses of conference field data, in conjunction with data on participants’ beliefs regarding supervisory practices, resulted in the identification of a series of supervisory role metaphors that served as conceptual frames for educators’ behaviors and actions. The role metaphors discerned were cross-checked for accuracy via post-conference follow-up
conversations with participants and researcher participants. These efforts resulted in the development of a Supervisory Conference Dialogue/Behavior Typology, which was useful in the initial conceptualization and development of O/S structure and climate variables comprising the O/S model (Claudet, Chauvin, & Loop, 1991).

These two pilot studies provided opportunities for preliminary conceptualization of O/S constructs and initial investigation of the nature and relationships among organizational/supervisory variables. This pilot work was useful in providing some initial grounding of constructs in school-level data. School-level indicators of organizational/supervisory behavior emerging in pilot data were helpful in developing and refining individual constructs and in hypothesizing about their functioning within the professional learning environments and supervisory subcultures found in schools.

Summary

Chapter Two consists of a presentation and discussion of Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) model development efforts. Perspectives on climate and organizational effectiveness relating to the O/S model are included, followed by a discussion of pertinent existing frameworks informing the O/S model. The O/S model is then presented, along with conceptual definitions of key variables and a discussion of the organizational structures and relationships posited in the model. Finally, a discussion of pilot studies conducted probing preliminary O/S construct and sub-construct relationships completes the chapter.
CHAPTER THREE: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Introduction

Chapter three presents a review of related literature and research. This review provides the basis for understanding the ways in which topics and constructs related to organizational culture, climate and effectiveness have been described and utilized in recent literature and research, particularly with regard to the study of schools as organizations. The chapter is divided into three sections: 1) perspectives on schools as organizations; 2) related literature on instructional supervision; and 3) school effectiveness research. Research findings are synthesized in these areas, and an appraisal of an existing need for further inquiry is presented.

Schools as Organizations

Historical Overview

Both theory and research in the field of educational administration has traditionally followed the lead of movements in the social and behavioral sciences (Getzels, 1977; Hoy, 1982; Hoy & Miskel, 1982). In particular, theory in educational administration has been guided by strong influences from classic organizational thought, human relations theory and the behavioral science approach (Hoy, 1982, pp. 1-2). Within the educational administration literature, while substantive contributions have been made, theoretical investigation into the organizational nature of schools historically has been limited and its specific parameters are still not clearly defined (Griffiths, 1988). It is generally acknowledged that educational administration as a theoretical field of inquiry is still in its developmental stages (Griffiths, 1988; Swafford, 1990; Willower, 1975, 1987, 1988).
Bidwell’s (1965) classic review and analysis of the school as a formal organization can be considered to mark the beginning of serious attempts to understand the organizational nature of schools (Allison, 1983, p. 15). Bidwell’s treatment of the school as a formal organization is significant in that it represented an initial attempt "to move toward a formulation of the organizational character of schools" (Bidwell, 1965, p. 972). Willower (1975) notes of Bidwell’s work that "...while it was theoretically eclectic, it was an important contribution to the literature on theory in educational administration" (Willower, 1975, p. 81).

Following Bidwell’s pioneering efforts in delineating formal characteristics of school organizations, subsequent analyses have approached the study of schools from a variety of perspectives. Various conceptualizations in the literature have focused on particular aspects or dimensions of the organizational character of schools, such as: school "educational environment" (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967); school "coupling structure" (Cohen & March, 1974; March & Olsen, 1976; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Weick, 1976); and more recently, school organizational "culture" (Bates, 1984; Lieberman, 1988; Lieberman & Miller, 1984) and the related notion of school organizational "climate" (Hoy, 1990; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Kelley, 1980). Recent interest among educational administration theorists in the nature of the organizational culture and climate of schools reflects the comprehensive treatment afforded these constructs within the general organization literature. The following sections will briefly examine connections to this broader organizational theory base, as well as review particular conceptual and operational definitions which these constructs have acquired in educational studies.
Organizational Culture and Climate

Social Organization Perspectives

In the social sciences, organizational culture is a key construct enjoying a long and established tradition. The construct itself forms part of a long legacy of research within sociology and general organization theory dealing with the nature and structure of organizations. The study of organizational structures and behavior within these disciplines has precipitated an array of organizational system metaphors for explaining organizational life. These system metaphors have been frequently employed in the organization theory literature and include such classic depictions of organizations as "mechanistic" or "bureaucratic systems" (Fayol, 1949; Gilbreth, 1911; Gouldner, 1954; Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Mooney & Reiley, 1931; Taylor, 1911; Weber, 1946, 1947), "political systems" (Blau, 1964; Burns, 1961; Greiner & Schein, 1988; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; March, 1962; March & Simon, 1958; Pettigrew, 1973), and "biological" or "living systems" (Bennis, 1966; Haire, 1959; Levinson, 1972; Maslow, 1943; Miller, 1972, 1978; Parsons, 1951). (For further discussion of various theories of organizational systems and structure, and of the nature of contrasting organizational images and their treatment within the organization theory literature, see: Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Meyer, 1977; Mintzberg, 1979; Morgan, 1983, 1986, 1989; Perrow, 1979; Pondy, Frost, Morgan, & Dandridge, 1983; Williamson, 1990.)

In all of these frameworks, the "culture" produced by the organizational system becomes an important consideration.

Historically, the importance of culture in organizational life has been frequently cited by social and industrial psychologists. For example, during the 1930s and 1940s, a number of individuals (e.g., Barnard, 1938; Mayo, 1945; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939), "...were
stressing the importance of work group norms, sentiments, values, and emergent interactions in the workplace in descriptions of the nature and functions of informal organization" (Hoy & Miskel, 1987, p. 245).

Later, during the 1950s, Selznick (1957) argued for consideration of organizations as "institutions" rather than as mere "rational organizations". Selznick suggested that organizations are "infused with value that goes beyond the technical requirements at hand". As "culture-embued" institutions, organizations possess a distinctive identity as a direct result of this value infusion. Hoy and Miskel (1978), in their review of the historical development of the concept of organizational culture, point out that organizational culture is really a conceptual frame for describing the "...feel, sense, atmosphere, character or image of an organization. It encompasses many of the earlier notions of informal organizations - norms, values, ideologies, and emergent systems" (p. 246). More recently, Ouchi (1981) has portrayed the organizational culture that emerges in work organizations as an integral and compelling force shaping the activities and behaviors of organizational members. In work organizations possessing a well-defined culture, the basic function of executive leadership becomes that of shaping and molding this culture, integrating it with the goals of the organization (Ouchi, 1981).

Other theorists have emphasized the pervasiveness of organized social activities -- rites, ceremonies and ritual structures -- that characterize organizations, and the importance attached to them by organizational members (e.g., Louis, 1985; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Rosaldo, 1984; Trice & Beyer, 1985). Deal and Kennedy (1982) suggest that the sets of core values underlying such social activities help define the basic character of an organization and imbue it with a sense of identity (p. 2). In discussing the nature of social
transactions and how individuals relate to cultural situations from a broader sociological perspective, Bruner (1986) explains that in the past decade there has been a revolution in the definition of social/organizational culture. According to Bruner (1986), the newer definition of social culture is:

...a move away from the strict structuralism that held that culture was a set of interconnected rules from which people derive particular behaviors to fit particular situations, to the idea of culture as implicit and only semi-connected knowledge of the world from which, through negotiation, people arrive at satisfactory ways of acting in given contexts. (p. 65)

Organizational sociologists are increasingly approaching the study of social organizations in ways that seek to capture the multidimensionality of organizational activity and member behavior that was felt to be lacking in earlier structural-functionalist paradigms.

Definitions of Organizational Climate

From a general perspective, the notion of organizational climate has been widely utilized within sociology and in the field of industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology in the study of corporate organizations. Definitions of organizational climate in corporate settings have highlighted factors such as member individual/group interactions, maintenance of professional roles, and negotiation of shared organizational meanings, norms and values, as constituting important aspects of corporate organizational climate.

For example, in a recent study of 62 U.S. corporations, Peters and Waterman (1982) emphasize the interactive dimension of organizational relationships among the people within an organization as being a key factor defining the organization's climate and contributing to its ongoing excellence. In reporting their findings, Peters and Waterman characterize the climate of "excellent" corporate organizations as typified simultaneously by both "loose" and "tight" properties; that is, an organizational climate fostering a dedication to the central
values of the company, combined with tolerance for all employees who accept those values. In their study of corporate organizational life, Peters and Waterman conclude that human interpersonal relations, professional role formation and the structuring of organizational interrelationships among individuals and subgroups are very important determinants of the resulting organizational climate produced (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

School Culture and Climate

School Organization Perspectives

Within the literature on schools as organizations, the inherent multidimensional nature of school culture has long been recognized. For example, it has been suggested that the school organization in many respects functions as a miniature society, operating with its own set of common cultural norms, values, and symbols (Waller, 1932). More recently, Sarason (1971) notes that "...the culture of the school is too differentiated and complex, available knowledge and viewpoints too variegated, to be encompassed" (1971, p. vii).

Focusing on the multidimensional nature of school organizations, Willower (1984, 1986, 1988) has suggested that a school’s culture is in fact comprised of a variety of constituent groups with a diversity of interests. Arguing against viewing organizational culture as a homogeneous phenomenon, Smircich (1983) has called attention to the complexity and competitiveness that appears to be a distinctive feature of the multidimensional nature of organizational culture. As Smircich states:

Much of the literature refers to an organizational culture, appearing to lose sight of the great likelihood that there are multiple organizational subcultures, or even countercultures, competing to define the nature of situations within organizational boundaries (p. 346).

Recognition among researchers in recent years of the inherent multidimensional nature of school organizational culture has led to initial investigation of specific school "subcultures".
Further inquiry into the specific nature and functioning of individual school subcultures is now recognized as an emerging new direction for studies of school organizations (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

Research has already been conducted on student subcultures (Packard, 1988) and, as a result of such studies, broader questions have begun to emerge regarding the specific nature of other subcultures in schools, especially the adult ones, and what are their relationships to the school’s organizational culture. However, with the exception of the student subculture studies, empirical research in educational administration has largely ignored the study of specific school subcultures (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988, pp. 298-99). In educational administration, the usefulness of studying intentional efforts to establish school cultures and the nature of the various subcultures within schools is becoming more apparent (Firestone & Corbett, 1988). As Willower (1988) exhorts, "If there are teacher, student, and even administrative subcultures in schools, how do they fit organizational culture?" (p. 734).

The inherent difficulties involved in adequately exploring the multiple dimensions of organizational culture are often compounded within the general organization literature by a mistaken conceptual blurring of the notions of organizational culture and organizational climate. Although the two terms have been viewed as somewhat overlapping, they are considered by some organizational theorists to be conceptually distinct. For example, Ashforth (1985) has suggested that the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate is that organizational culture consists of shared assumptions, values, or norms, while organizational climate can be defined as the shared perceptions of behavior (p. 837). Thus, organizational climate might be best viewed as a social perceptual
phenomenon, having the potential for reflecting deep values and beliefs embedded in the cultural norms of an organization.

In many ways, the inherent difficulty involved in deciphering the meanings of the concepts of school organizational culture and climate derives from the complex relationship and linkages that exist between school culture and climate and the structural elements that differentiate school organizations. Conceptualizing models that seek to accurately reflect the complex organizational structure of schools has occupied the minds of school organizational theorists for decades. The following section reviews several conceptions of school organizations that have been employed in the literature in educational administration to elucidate the connection between the structural components present in school organizations and the relationship and effect of these components on school organizational culture and climate.

**Structural Paradigms Informing the Study of School Organizational Culture and Climate**

This section discusses two representative structural paradigms appearing in the recent literature on school organizations. These conceptual models reflect various ways in which structural elements, functions and processes defining the nature of school organizations have been conceptualized in the educational administration literature.

**School Organizations as Structural Coupling Systems**

The traditional organizational coupling literature in educational administration in many ways developed as a reaction to the tenets of classical organizational theory with its emphasis on unity of command, span of control and pyramidal hierarchies (Fayol, 1949; Gulick & Urwick, 1937). In contrast to the "top-down" management mentality of classical theory, the literature on organizational coupling structure in schools considers both the
functional, operational aspects of schools on the one hand, and the professional autonomy of subsystems and individuals within schools on the other.

In describing the nature of the interdependencies between people in organizations, Thompson (1967) introduced the term "coupling" to describe three possible ways in which people and work could be coupled: 1) reciprocal coupling - in which workers pass their work back and forth; 2) sequential coupling - in which the workers perform their work tasks one after the other in serial fashion over time; and 3) pooled coupling - in which organization members share resources in common but otherwise work independently. Owens (1981) has observed that pooled coupling is quite commonplace in schools, where teachers typically share the building and facilities but generally work alone in their classrooms (p. 29). Thus, schools as organizations are recognized to possess characteristics of structural looseness reflective of their particular kinds of tasks, clients and technology (Bidwell, 1965; Owens, 1981).

March and Olsen (1976) and Weick (1976) have applied the term "loosely coupled systems" to educational organizations. This notion of "loose coupling" implies that in schools "...structure is disconnected from technical (work) activity, and activity is disconnected from its effects" (Meyer & Rowan, 1978, p. 79). Weick (1976, 1982) presents the notion of the administrative, operational aspects of schools as requiring "tight" coupling in order to maximize efficiency (e.g., bus schedules, payroll accounting), while emphasizing that there is also the need that individual subsystems and persons within these subsystems (i.e., teachers, counselors, department chairpersons, etc.) feel for professional autonomy in their classrooms and work situations, requiring that a "loose" coupling structure also be in place. Weick suggests that certain elements or subsystems in organizations are often tied
together loosely rather than through tight, bureaucratic linkages. Thus, in schools there is often both a loose and a tight coupling structure combination in place. Tightly coupled situations are found to have four main characteristics: 1) presence of rules, 2) agreement among individuals on what those rules are, 3) a system of inspection to see if compliance occurs, and 4) feedback designed to improve compliance. In systems that are more loosely coupled, at least one of these four characteristics is missing. Typically the missing component is either consensus on policies and procedures or inspection that occurs frequently enough so that significant deviations can be detected (Weick, 1982).

In schools, rigid organizational controls of a substantive kind extending into subsystems (e.g., regular and continuous supervision/evaluation by principals of classrooms) are commonly viewed as nonexistent (Bidwell, 1965; Dombusch and Scott, 1975; Dreeben, 1973; Lortie, 1973). Tight organizational control is found to be most apparent in schools, not in the core substantive areas of subsystem productivity (such as, instructional quality in classrooms) but in the more institutional functions of schools (i.e., selection and credentialing of teachers, topics of instruction, school accreditation, etc.). Meyer and Rowan (1978) have characterized the more bureaucratic elements recognizable in schools as "ritual structures". These institutionalized ritual structures associated with tightly-coupled structuring (e.g., standardized curricula, class scheduling, administrative policies, etc.) are, typically in schools, "decoupled" from the more substantive instructional activities and outcomes associated with school subsystems such as classrooms. This decoupling facilitates organizational smoothness and production efficiency. Through tightly controlling the elaborate "institutional myth" of schools as consisting of teacher and student credentialing, curricula specification, and formal structuring, school administrators are able to perpetuate
these ritual structures and preserve organizational legitimacy while maintaining only loose control over the internal instructional processes of the school. Preserving these ritual structures in schools serves to legitimate the organization both externally and internally (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975; Meyer & Rowan, 1978). Ouchi (1978) asserts that "coupled" (tight) and "uncoupled" (loose) structures in organizations exist symbiotically, where one structure provides the "legitimating ritual" which justifies and protects the other structure that produces the real control, allowing the organization to continue to survive in its complex, changing environment.

In arguing for the attractiveness of "loose coupling imagery" as a means of conceptualizing about schools, Weick (1976) maintains that the "soft structures" typical of loose coupling systems are readily observable among organizational elements within schools: intentions-actions, means-ends, teachers-materials, voters-schoolboard, administrators-classrooms, process-outcome, teacher-teacher, parent-teacher, and teacher-pupil. These "loosely coupled" subsystems in schools contrast sharply with other, more tightly controlled, organizational structures also commonly in place: the centralized allocation of space, funds and materials, standardization of curricula for students, administrative control over time and scheduling of students to teachers and courses, etc. (Owens, 1981; Meyer & Rowan, 1978). Aldrich (1979) has asserted that most organizations ought to be loosely coupled "internally", partially because tight coupling between subsystems would imply that any change or reaction to the environment on the part of one subsystem would necessarily have to be transmitted throughout the organization, minimizing efficiency and generating chaos.

A study by Logan (1989) provided some support for a more recent view of coupling in schools as "paradoxical" (Orton & Weick, 1988). This paradoxical view of coupling
structure conceptualized by Orton and Weick suggests that coupling in schools and other organizations might be best understood as occurring in a variety of combinations and in patterns of simultaneous coupling and uncoupling of elements. The findings of the Logan study indicated that schools may indeed be characterized by a variety of coupling patterns, and that a simple "tightly coupled" and/or "loosely coupled" system portrayal of school organizations may not be appropriate. Logan further suggested that the particular combinations of coupling features associated with effective schools may be unique and that these features may also interact with a variety of other school environment variables (e.g., school climate and other generalized elements of school learning environments) (Logan, 1989).

Thus, in utilizing coupling metaphor as a means of thinking about the nature of organizational structure in schools, various educational theorists and researchers since the 1970s have arrived at a similar conclusion - there exists in schools a puzzling duality: the presence of both tightly coupled and loosely coupled structures. This duality is readily discernible in schools via the complicated array of bureaucratic-like, tightly coupled administrative structures that are seen to be superimposed on a much more loosely coupled framework of organizational subsystems that are operationally largely autonomous, while still remaining interlinked. Willower (1980) asserts that this puzzling duality of coupling structures identifiable in schools perhaps is the norm, or equilibrium state, for educational organizations. This duality can be thought to form "...an interplay of forces and countering structures - a curious dialectic" (p. 5). As the coupling construct is seen to have some merit as a way of better understanding the complexities of structural linkages operative in schools, Willower cautions that, rather than viewing the coupling construct dichotomously, it should
be conceptualized in terms of a coupling continuum. In so doing the construct could be contextualized - it would be possible to find out what organizational and environmental features relate to varied levels of coupling. In this sense, it appears (as Willower suggests) that the coupling construct may still be in need of both further theoretical and empirical development (Willower, 1980, p. 6).

**School Organizations as Open Systems**

Theorists in educational administration writing about school organizations have characteristically portrayed schools as "open systems". This term is derived from social systems theory, in which organizations are generally viewed as being structurally "open", as "...it is virtually impossible to envisage a social system, such as a school, which is not interactive with its environment" (Owens, 1987, p. 57). As the "open systems" model depicts organizations, such as schools, as constantly interacting with their larger environment, the open social system framework itself can be quite complex.

For example, Griffiths (1964) conceptualizes a complex organization (the system) as existing in an environment (the suprasystem) and subsuming within its boundaries its own subsystems (e.g., the individual "administrative units" of the organization). In Griffiths' conceptualization, the boundaries between each of these systems is permeable, permitting constant interaction between each system and their outer and inner environments. In using this organizational model in considering schools as open systems, it becomes apparent that schools (as one administrative subsystem) continually interface with the school district (system) in which they reside, as well as with the larger community (suprasystem). One important aspect of this interrelated open systems framework is the organizational synergy that continually exists between and among individual system units. Problems in such as
complex, interrelated system develop when permeability is threatened or lost between system units, thus transforming the organization into a closed framework.

Elaborating on the conceptual work of Getzels and Guba (1957) and Abbott (1965), Hoy and Forsyth (1986) have developed an expanded framework of the school as an open social system. Their framework defines the school as a social system consisting of three interacting organizational components: (1) bureaucratic expectations (formal organization element); (2) group norms (informal organization element); and (3) individual needs (personal element). This open systems framework features both internal and external feedback dimensions that serve as regulatory devices for the organization. The internal feedback loop consists of formal bureaucratic incentive patterns as well as informal reference group norms that provide incentive patterns to influence individual behavior. Cultural, ethos and values forces reflected in the larger community in which the school resides presents an external feedback loop that "...provides additional environmental constraints that directly influence bureaucratic expectations and group norms and indirectly influence individual needs" (Hoy & Forsyth, p. 24).

The preceding structural paradigms have been variously employed in the educational administration literature to characterize the ways in which school personnel interact within the complex system of organizational functions and processes typifying schools. These structural components of school organizations serve as a social framework for personnel interactive behavior and, consequently, have been found to strongly influence the cultivation and maintenance of school organizational culture and climate (Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Owens, 1987). Thus, it seems plausible that conceptual and operational definitions of school
organizational climate should reflect this natural connection among organizational structure, culture and climate.

The next section explores conceptual definitions of organizational climate presently in the literature in the social sciences and schools as organizations. After briefly discussing definitions of organizational climate found within sociology and psychology, a review of definitions of the school climate construct is presented.

Definitions of School Organizational Climate

Paralleling efforts within the more general fields of organizational theory and sociology, there has emerged within educational administration a similarly large and diverse literature on the organizational climate of schools (Anderson, 1982; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). School climate has been generally treated in the education literature as a specific type of organizational climate. Modeled from descriptions of organizational climate developed by social and behavioral scientists, "...climate has found wide use both as a descriptive metaphor and an explanation of differences in the performance of schools (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988, p. 290).

In reviewing studies of school climate, it becomes apparent that the construct has been employed by researchers to describe a variety of differing aspects of school organizational life. For example, Lipsitz (1984) has used school climate as a way of connoting a school's overall "personality": "While not ‘all alike’, unhappy schools are often so similar that observers constantly record their deadening sameness. Happy schools have distinct personalities" (p. 30). Alternately, Lezotte (1980) describes school climate as the combination of norms, attitudes, and expectations formed in a school.
Kelley (1980) suggests that schools are social environments in which members are concerned with producing and maintaining high levels of two important environment outcomes: 1) satisfaction, and 2) productivity. The climate of the school environment is a product of the norms, beliefs and attitudes reflected in its conditions, events, and practices. According to Kelley, a school’s climate at any particular time would reflect a number of concerns in the social environment, including: student morale, the job satisfaction of staff members, the extent to which parents and patrons approve of the school and its programs, student and teacher performance, as well as concern for the development or maintenance of self-esteem and self-reliance of students and staff (p. 2). As an explanation of the meaning of school climate, Kelley states:

Some schools are cheerful and hum with excitement and purpose. Others seem to lack enthusiasm. Some classrooms are alive with expectancy. Others appear moribund. Some people who work and study in schools see each new day and each new person as opportunities for improving their understanding of the world around them. Others fear that today will be worse than yesterday. These feelings of satisfaction and productivity constitute school climate. (p. 1)

This rather vague description of school climate is echoed by Hoy and Miskel (1987) who suggest that "...[school] organizational climate is a broad concept that denotes members’ shared ‘perceptions’ of tone or character of the workplace; it is a set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of people in schools" (p. 262).

Reviews of research studies on organizational climate conducted in both sociology and educational administration have noted the intuitive appeal and wide use of the construct, while simultaneously emphasizing the nebulous nature and lack of definitional clarity with which it is conceptually and operationally employed (Anderson, 1982; Hellriegel & Slocum,
1974; James & Jones, 1974; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). This view is widely shared by theorists in educational administration who have voiced awareness of the construct definition problem that has hindered research generally within the field. Griffiths (1988) notes that lack of construct definitional clarity has unfortunately plagued the field of educational administration, acknowledging "fuzzy concepts" to be "...one of the generally accepted weaknesses in the literature of educational administration" (Griffiths, 1988, p. 29). Griffiths cites Halpin's (1958, 1970) emphatic endorsement of Bridgman's (1927) concept of operationalism as a particularly useful antidote to this fuzziness. This lack of definitional clarity is especially apparent in the educational administration literature with regard to the concept of organizational climate.

Efforts to comprehend the nature of school organizational climate have been impeded by the lack of precision with which the construct has been used in both the conceptual literature and in empirical studies. The widespread confusion in the educational administration literature as to what exactly constitutes school climate is highlighted by Miskel and Ogawa (1988):

The broad, intuitive appeal of climate as a descriptive term and as an explanatory factor as well has led to some confusion in the educational literature regarding what constitutes school climate. This problem is reflected in the wide variety of school characteristics, ranging from buildings and facilities to attitudes toward pupil control, that have been described as elements of schools' climates. The confusion results from the all-encompassing nature of the concept of climate and from the varied perspectives from which climate has been examined. (p. 290)

Indeed, Hoy, Tarter and Bliss (1990) state that "...there is no standard definition of [school] organizational climate; in fact, climate is conceptually complex and vague" (p. 260).

In their assessment of the state of development of the school climate construct, Miskel and Ogawa (1988) point to the clear need for further refinements in both the
conceptualization and operationalization of school climate as considered from an organizational and cultural perspective. Acknowledging the inadequacy of current treatments of school climate as "marking potentially fertile fields for research on the organization of schools" (p. 298), they indicate two general limitations of conventional treatments of the school organizational climate construct: (1) the conventional literature has ignored the possible existence of multiple subcultures (Gregory, 1983), each perhaps having different perceptions of a school's organizational climate; and (2) conventional treatments of school organizational climate from the cultural perspective have been limited in that climate has been treated as a static phenomenon.

Notwithstanding the imprecision in the literature regarding conceptual definitions of school organizational climate, a number of instruments have been developed to operationally define various aspects and levels of school climate. The following section presents information regarding major climate instruments that have been utilized by researchers in studies of school organizations.

**Review of School Climate Instrumentation**

This section presents a review of extant school climate instruments developed in recent years as operational definitions of the school organizational climate construct. These instruments reflect the various ways in which school organizational climate has been conceptually defined in the research literature. The section is divided into two parts, providing an overview of pertinent school-level and classroom-level organizational climate instruments that have been constructed and empirically tested in a variety of research studies in educational settings. Classroom-level instruments have been included in this review to
obtain a sense of the way instructional learning climate has been conceptualized in the literature to date at this important school organizational level.

School-Level Organizational Climate Instruments

The instruments reviewed in this section constitute a selection of the most widely recognized operational measures of school organizational climate developed and employed in various studies of educational environments in recent decades. These climate measures were typically formulated as part of activities associated with large research programs focusing on a number of relationships among school climate and other school level indices, and thus were designed and constructed based on various specific conceptualizations of school organizational climate. Hence, in a rather interesting way, the school climate measures reviewed below collectively reflect many of the inherent challenges involved in assessing relevant parameters of the complex, multidimensional climate of school organizations.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

Probably the best known of the school climate instruments is the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed by Halpin and Croft (1963). The broad influence of the OCDQ on school climate research has been generally recognized (Brown & House, 1967; Kalis, 1980; Thomas, 1976). Development of the OCDQ followed an extensive study of teacher-teacher and teacher-principal interactions in elementary schools. A final set of 64 statements were culled from an initial item pool of almost 1,000 items. Respondent data were collected and factor analyzed, resulting in the derivation of eight OCDQ instrument subscales, divided equally between the two interactive dimensions. The teacher-teacher interactive dimension (teacher characteristics) includes four subscales:
hindrance, disengagement, intimacy, and esprit. The teacher-principal interactive dimension (leader characteristics) subsumes another four subscales: aloofness, thrust, consideration, and production emphasis. Conceptual definitions constructed by Halpin and Croft (1963) for the four OCDQ instrument subscales comprising each of the two interactive dimensions are as follows:

1. Teacher-Teacher Interactive Dimension (teacher characteristics)
   a. **hindrance**: teachers’ feeling that they are burdened with routine duties, administrative paperwork, and other unnecessary "busywork"
   b. **disengagement**: teachers’ feeling of being "not with it", of merely going through the motions with no real commitment to the organization or its objectives
   c. **intimacy**: teachers’ feeling of closeness to or friendship with their co-workers; includes satisfaction of social needs but may not include a sense of accomplishment
   d. **esprit**: teachers’ "morale", or feeling of social need satisfaction in combination with a sense of accomplishment

2. Teacher-Principal Interactive Dimension (leader characteristics)
   a. **aloofness**: principal is perceived as formal, impersonal, guided by rules, and shunning personal contact
   b. **thrust**: principal is perceived positively as being dynamic and task-oriented and wanting to move the organization through personal example
   c. **consideration**: principal is perceived as warm, friendly, helpful, and personally concerned for the needs of teachers
   d. **production emphasis**: principal is perceived as highly directive and reliant on close supervision and one-way communication

From their exploratory study of 71 elementary schools, Halpin and Croft (1963) identified six basic climate profiles ranging on a continuum from open to closed: Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal, Closed. They suggested that an individual
school's climate could be described through reference to one of the profiles arrayed on the continuum.

Although the OCDQ is still a widely used school climate measure (Hoy & Miskel 1987), its limitations have been noted by a number of researchers. For example, results of some subsequent studies have indicated that the overall climate dimensions (teacher characteristics, leader characteristics) may not be as predictive of a school's effectiveness as the individual subscales (Andrews, 1965; Thomas, 1976). Other studies have found that the continuum of six climate profiles proposed by Halpin and Croft (1963) may be of questionable validity, particularly those classifications in the middle range (Kenny & Rentz, 1970; Thomas, 1976; Watkins, 1968). This validity problem concerning the mid-classifications has been noted by Hoy and Miskel (1987) as well who suggest that as these profile categories were originally devised based on elementary school data they may not be suitable for large urban secondary schools (p. 229).

**The Organizational Climate Index**

Stern and Steinhoff (1965) developed an operational measure of organizational climate designed for schools as well as other organizations called the Organizational Climate Index. The OCI was an adaption of an earlier instrument - the College Characteristics Index (CCI), which was designed to ascertain the organizational press of higher education environments as experienced by college students. The OCI was first used in 1965 in a study of the Syracuse, New York public schools. The OCI consists of a series of 300 true-false statements which teachers are asked to respond to using their own school as the reference. Analysis of participant response data collected from studies in a number of schools resulted
in the formulation of the following six OCI Climate Index Factors and their definitions (Owens, 1987):

**Factor 1: Intellectual Climate.** Schools with high scores on this factor have environments that are perceived as being conducive to scholarly interests in the humanities, arts, and sciences. Staff and physical plant are seen to be facilitative of these interests and the general work atmosphere is characterized by intellectual activities and pursuits.

**Factor 2: Achievement Standards.** Environments with high scores on this factor are perceived to stress high standards of personal achievement. Tasks are successfully completed and high levels of motivation and energy are maintained. Recognition is given for work of good quality and quantity and the staff is expected to achieve at the highest levels.

**Factor 3: Personal Dignity (Supportiveness).** Organizational climates scoring high on this factor respect the integrity of the individual and provide a supportive environment that would closely approximate the needs of more dependent teachers. There is a sense of fair play and openness in the working environment.

**Factor 4: Organizational Effectiveness.** Schools with high scores on this factor have work environments that encourage and facilitate the effective performance of tasks. Work programs are planned and well organized, and people work together effectively to meet organizational objectives.

**Factor 5: Orderliness.** High scores on this factor are indicative of a press for organizational structure and procedural orderliness. Neatness counts and there are pressures to conform to a defined norm of personal appearance and institutional image. There are set procedures and teachers are expected to follow them.

**Factor 6: Impulse Control.** High scores on this factor imply a great deal of constraint and organizational restrictiveness in the work environment. There is little opportunity for personal expression or for any form of impulsive behavior.

Scores derived on these six OCI Climate Index Factors are used to compute composite scores on two key climate dimensions: Development Press and Control Press. The Development Press composite score for a school is obtained through summing the scores for Factors 1, 2, and 3 minus the score for Factor 6. Schools obtaining high
composite scores on Developmental Press typically emphasize intellectual and interpersonal activities, are intellectually stimulating, maintain high achievement standards, and support personal expression. Schools that are high on Developmental Press are those that tend to motivate personnel, display concern for individual needs, and accept and encourage a wide range of behavior styles among organizational members.

A school’s Control Press composite score is derived by summing the individual scores for Factors 4 and 5. Schools evidencing high Control Press are typically characterized by internal environments that emphasize orderliness and structure, stress rules and channels of command, and have behavioral norms that are clear-cut, narrow and explicitly defined. The environmental emphasis in high Control Press schools is one of task-orientation rather than people-orientation.

Schools scoring high on Development Press (i.e., meeting the intellectual-cognitive and social-emotional needs of teachers) are found to be those schools that allow teachers a substantial amount of freedom to exercise initiative and to fulfill personal and professional motivational needs. Schools with high Control Press composite scores (i.e., emphasizing rules, close supervision, directive leadership, etc.) typically have more constraining environments providing teachers with less opportunities to grow and develop professionally.

Though the Stern/Steinhoff Organizational Climate Index has not been used as widely in studies of educational organizations as the OCDQ, it is based on a strong, though somewhat simplistic, theoretical conceptualization of organizational climate and has been carefully scrutinized through a long history of research for validity and reliability (Owens, 1987, p. 306).
The Profile of a School

Following an extensive, large-scale research program focusing on identifying human factors influencing organizational effectiveness, Likert and Likert (1976) developed the Profile of a School (POS) questionnaires. These questionnaires were based on earlier survey questionnaires developed by Likert (i.e., the Profile of Organizational Characteristics (POC)), that were originally used in research in business and industrial organizations (Likert, 1961, 1967). From this earlier research (including studies completed in industrial firms, healthcare organizations, public agencies, schools and military organizations), Likert was able to gather evidence enabling him to describe significant relationships among three facets of organizations: (1) an organization’s management styles; (2) the characteristics of the organization’s interaction-influence system, and (3) the effectiveness of the organization (Likert, 1961). The POC questionnaires were developed to be adaptable for use with a variety of personnel involved in school organizations, including school board members, superintendents, central office personnel, principals, department chairpersons, teachers, students in grades four through six, students in grades seven through twelve and parents.

From analyses of data collected during his research, Likert posited that there are essentially four types of management systems. Likert described each of the four management systems in terms of the organizational climate and leadership behaviors characteristic of such an organization. The four management systems and associated climate and leader behaviors Likert discerned depicted below:

**System 1: Exploitive-authoritative (or, punitive-authoritarian).** Based on classical management concepts, a Theory X view of motivation, and a directive leadership style
**System 2: Benevolent-authoritative (or, paternalistic-authoritarian).** Emphasizes a one-to-one relationship between subordinate and leader in an environment in which the subordinate is relatively isolated from others in work-related matters.

**System 3: Consultative.** Employs more of a participative leadership style in which the leader tends to consult with people individually in the process of making decisions.

**System 4: Participative (or, group interactive).** Uses Theory Y concepts of human functioning and emphasizes interaction in all of the critical organizational processes.

Likert's essential strategy was to measure characteristics of the internal functioning of an organization and relate those characteristics to measures of organizational performance. Objective measures of organizational performance were used (e.g., productivity - profitability, return on investment, etc.; rate of absence and turnover; and quality control). Likert devised a paper-and-pencil measure designed to tap organizational members' assessment of the organization's internal functioning in terms of six characteristics: (1) leadership processes, (2) motivational forces, (3) communication processes, (4) decision making processes, (5) goal-setting processes, and (6) control processes.

Through iterative development from ongoing research of the four management systems and six organizational characteristics, Likert and his colleagues first developed the **Profile of Organizational Characteristics (POC)**, which was later modified into the questionnaire form for school organizations - the **Profile of a School (POS)**. Likert employed data collected from POS questionnaires to graphically plot characteristics of interaction-influence (management) systems of individual schools. The resulting POS profiles generated can inform individual schools regarding the specific management system and associated climate features and leader behaviors that characterize each school organization.
The School Social Climate Questionnaire

The School Social Climate Questionnaire was developed by Brookover and colleagues (1979) as part of activities associated with research examining the effect of school social structure and school academic climate on school outcomes (student achievement). The original research was conducted in several stages in 68 Michigan elementary schools. Brookover and colleagues (1979) stated the rationale guiding the research study as follows:

The general hypothesis that guided this research is that the cultural or social-psychological normative climate and the student status-role definitions which characterized the school social system explain much of the variance in achievement and other behavioral outcomes of the schools. This general guiding hypothesis indicated that the norms, expectations, kinds of evaluations made of students and the definitions of appropriate student role behavior are the crucial characteristics of the school social system that affect the socialization of the students in that social system. (pp. 135-136)

To guide this examination, Brookover and colleagues (1979) conceptualized school climate as "...the composite of norms, expectations, and beliefs which characterize the school social system as perceived by members of the social system" (p. 19). Brookover conceptualized two general dimensions - norms and expectations - which served as the basis for the further operationalization of 14 climate variables associated with the perceptions of three key member units in schools - students, teachers, and principals.

An important aspect of this research was its emphasis on examining the common characteristics of the school as the social unit, as opposed to individual students and/or classrooms. The research involved an examination of relationships existing among three sets of variables: personnel inputs (i.e., socioeconomic status and racial composition of student body), social structure variables (e.g., extent of differential instructional grouping, amount
of average time devoted to instructional activities as reported by the principal, etc.), and school climate variables.

Three developmental stages of the research design formed the basis for the pretesting and piloting of initial questionnaires, and the generation of a final, factor-analyzed set of climate scales. Based on this development work, a final set of climate variables were identified for each of the three key personnel units (Brookover, et al., pp. 20-21):

**Student Climate Variables:** (1) Student Sense of Academic Futility; (2) Student Perceived Future Evaluations and Expectations; (3) Student Perceived Present Evaluations and Expectations; (4) Student Climate; and (5) Student Perception of Teacher Push and Teacher Norms

**Teacher Climate Variables:** (1) Ability, Evaluations, Expectations and Quality of Education for College; (2) Teacher Present Evaluations and Expectations for High School Completion; (3) Teacher-Student Commitment to Improve; (4) Teacher Perception of Principal's Expectations; and (5) Teacher Academic Futility

**Principal Climate Variables:** (1) Parent Concern and Expectations for Quality Education; (2) Principal's Efforts to Improve; (3) Principal and Parent Evaluation of Present School Quality; (4) Principal's Present Expectations and Evaluations of Students

A primary focus of this research was on studying the differential effects of school climate on student outcomes in high versus low achieving schools. Study findings emerging from analyses of data collected using the School Social Climate Questionnaire indicated that students in high achieving schools felt in control over their academic work, perceived their teachers and principals as having high expectations for their achievement, and believed the academic reward structure to be equitable. By contrast, students in low achieving schools were found to exhibit feelings of futility in regard to their academic performance. However, as part of their study conclusions, Brookover and colleagues (1979) affirmed that "[a]lthough having a minority or low socioeconomic student body may predispose teachers and
principals to tolerate low levels of achievement, a favorable academic climate and high achievement can be developed for such students".

The My School Inventory

The My School Inventory (MSI) represents another school level climate instrument that has been adapted from an earlier instrument, the My Class Inventory (MCI) (Anderson, 1973). The MSI was devised as essentially a school-level parallel to the My Class Inventory (MCI) for use with elementary students (see review of My Class Inventory (MCI) below). The MSI has been utilized in a number of school climate studies (Ellett, Payne, Masters, & Pool, 1977; Ellett & Walberg, 1979).

The School Survey

This school-level instrument is a satisfaction inventory designed by Coughlan (1970) to measure teacher morale or satisfaction with the school work environment. The SS has been widely used in school climate studies in conjunction with other school climate instruments such as the Learning Environment Inventory (LEI) - secondary level (Fraser, Anderson, & Walberg, 1982; Walberg, 1968), and the My School Inventory (MSI) - elementary level (Ellett, Masters, & Pool, 1978; Ellett, Payne, Masters, & Pool, 1977).

The SS consists of 120 items that measure teachers' perceptions or attitudes about 14 dimensions of school-level environment (Coughlan, 1969, 1970; Coughlan & Cooke, 1974). These work environment dimensions include: Administrative Practices, Professional Work Load, Nonprofessional Work Load, Materials and Equipment, Buildings and Facilities, Educational Effectiveness, Evaluation of Students, Special Services, School-Community Relations, Supervisory Relations, Colleague Relations, Voice in Educational Program,
Performance and Development, and Financial Incentives. Examples of studies employing the School Survey include those by Perkins (1976) and Ellett and Masters (1978).

**Pupil Control Ideology/Pupil Control Behavior Instruments**

In an effort to operationalize the distinguishing features of the student subculture in schools, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) hypothesized that the manner in which teachers and administrators view students and their behavior constitutes a pupil-control ideology that significantly affects school climate. Based on this conceptualization, the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) and Pupil Control Behavior (PCB) (Willower, 1977) instruments were developed. The Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) instrument is a measure of teacher orientation toward students on a humanistic-custodial continuum. The Pupil Control Behavior (PCB) measures students' perceptions of their teachers. Although the construct of pupil control orientation was originally conceptualized by Willower and Jones (1963) as a school climate descriptor involving teacher and student behavior, the PCB has also been used to provide information about the school context (Willower, 1975, 1977).

**The Robustness Semantic Differential Scale**

The construct of environmental robustness is a "serendipitous" by-product of an original inquiry into student and teacher attitudes about student challenges to the school's authority system called "student brinkmanship" (Licata, 1974; Licata & Johnson, 1989; Licata & Willower, 1975; Willower & Licata, 1975). The robustness construct was initially defined as the perceived dramatic content of school structure for a particular audience (i.e., teachers, students, parents and administrators) (Willower & Licata, 1975). Robustness can
thus be thought of as the high dramatic structure produced in a school by tension-creating structures (Licata & Johnson, 1989).

The notion of environmental robustness represents an attempt to further understand the nature of social situations in schools through utilizing theatrical analogies of actors, plot, setting and audience (Licata & Johnson, 1989). These theatrical analogies are derived from and reflective of Goffman’s interactive studies of dramaturgical "roles" ("self" as director, critic and audience member) as well as the nature of audience empathic role involvement (Durkheim, 1947). An important element of the robustness construct is its recognition of the inherent conflict that typifies most dramatic social situations. Examples of these dramatic or "tension-creating" situations might include faculty meetings, student-teacher confrontations in classrooms, the introduction of ‘challenging’ courses of study into the student curriculum, virtuoso teaching performances, etc. (Licata & Johnson, 1989). These tension-creating situations thus represent social interactive "dramas" in which teachers, students, administrators, etc. assume the roles of actors and participative audience members. As Willower and Licata (1975) noted, even the most dramatic interactive structures, when repeated often enough, become monotonous to an audience. Certain "relief structures" can be employed as a means of breaking this monotony (much in the way that comic relief is used in the theatre). Examples of the use of relief structures in schools might include: the changing of sports seasons, humorous ways students circumvent authority, elementary teachers’ creative use of holidays, etc. (Licata & Johnson, 1989). Thus, in developing this theatrical analogy, Willower and Licata (1975) have defined robust school environments as those in which dramatic conflict, audience monotony and relief structures are found in the kind of balance that promotes variation and maintains audience involvement.
Licata and Willower (1978) worked toward operationalizing the robustness construct through refinement of a ten-scale Robustness Semantic Deferential (RSD) based upon Osgood's semantic differential techniques (Osgood, Suci & Tennenbaum, 1957). With the RSD scale, environmental robustness was operationally defined using ten bi-polar adjectives as respondents' perceptions that a particular school "structure" was: interesting, fresh, meaningful, important, unusual, powerful, active, thrilling, action-packed and challenging; as opposed to: boring, stale, meaningless, unimportant, usual, weak, passive, quieting, uneventful and dull (Licata & Johnson, 1989; Licata & Willower, 1978).

The sample for this initial development of the environmental robustness scale consisted of 136 elementary and secondary teachers, 200 eleventh grade students, and 120 sixth grade students. Additionally, the RSD scale, using the concept "my school", was administered to 84 secondary students involved in this study as part of a test-retest reliability experiment. These students were asked to evaluate their school using the polar adjectives "good-bad" on a seven-step semantic differential scale prior to completing the RSD. Differences between mean RSD scores for students positive about their school and mean RSD scores for students neutral or negative about their school served to substantiate the robustness construct. T-tests applied to both the first and second administrations of the RSD instrument yielded t-values of 3.48 and 4.44 respectively (p < .001).

Subsequent studies employing the robustness construct on both the school and classroom level of analysis have focused alternately on the perceptions that students, teachers and principals have regarding the relative robustness of their roles.
Classroom-Level Organizational Climate Instruments

The following instruments represent various frequently employed operational measures of social and academic learning climate that have been devised for use at the individual classroom level. The instruments reviewed below reflect a number of differing perspectives in terms of the kind of interactive climate assessed, as well as the learning environment level addressed (e.g., elementary, secondary).

The Learning Environment Inventory

The Learning Environment Inventory (LEI) (Fraser, Anderson and Walberg, 1982; Walberg, 1968) is an expanded version of an earlier instrument - the Classroom Climate Questionnaire (CCI), developed by Walberg (1968), based on initial work completed by Hemphill and Westie (1950). Iterative development of the LEI included an initial version in 1968 that consisted of 14 scales, with a revised 1969 version containing 15 scales.

This revised, final version of the LEI consists of 105 statements operationalizing 15 dimensions describing typical secondary school classrooms (seven statements per dimension). The 15 dimensions of the revised Learning Environment Inventory (LEI) are as follows:

- **Cohesiveness**: Extent to which students know, help and are friendly toward each other
- **Diversity**: Extent to which differences in students’ interests exist and are provided for
- **Formality**: Extent to which behavior within the class is guided by formal rules
- **Speed**: Extent to which class work is covered quickly
- **Material Environment**: Availability of adequate books, equipment, space and lighting
- **Friction**: Amount of tension and quarreling among students
**Goal Direction:** Degree of goal clarity in the class

**Favoritism:** Extent to which the teacher treats certain students more favorably than others

**Difficulty:** Extent to which students find difficulty with the work of the class

**Apathy:** Extent to which the class feels no affinity with the class activities

**Democracy:** Extent to which students share equally in decision making related to the class

**Cliqueness:** Extent to which students refuse to mix with the rest of the class

**Satisfaction:** Extent of enjoyment of class work

**Disorganization:** Extent to which classroom activities are confusing and poorly organized

**Competitiveness:** Emphasis on students competing with each other

The individual statements employ a four-point Likert scale response format (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree). Representative items comprising the LEI include: "All students know each other very well" (Cohesiveness); "Certain students in the class are responsible for petty quarrels" (Friction); and "The class is well organized and efficient" (Disorganization).

**The Classroom Environment Scale**

The Classroom Environment Scale (CES) represents one instrument in a set of climate measures called the Social Climate Scales (Moos, 1974b) developed by Rudolf Moos to assess a variety of human interactive environments. The Social Climate Scales set also included the following instruments: the University Residence Environment Scale (URES); the Ward Atmosphere Scale (WAS) for hospitals; the Community-Oriented Programs Environment Scale (COPES); the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES); the Military Company Environment Scale (MCES); the Family Environment Scale (FES); the
Group Environment Scale (GES) for social and therapeutic groups; and the Work Environment Scale (WES). These instruments were developed as part of an elaborate program of research focusing on human interactive environments (Moos, 1974a, 1975, 1976, 1979; Moos and Insel, 1974; Moos and Spinrad, 1984).

The CES focuses on assessing the quality of the learning environment on the secondary school level. Initial research involving the CES consisted of pilot trials of a 242 item pilot-version in 22 classrooms (Trickett and Moos, 1973). Based on statistical analyses completed on this initial data, a final version of the CES was formulated. The final form of the CES consists of nine scales with 10 True-False response format items per scale. These nine scales are as follows (Moos and Trickett, 1974):

- **Involvement**: Extent to which students have attentive interest, participate in discussions, do additional work and enjoy the class

- **Affiliation**: Extent to which students help each other, get to know each other easily and enjoy working together

- **Teacher Support**: Extent to which the teacher helps, befriends, trusts and is interested in students

- **Task Orientation**: Extent to which it is important to complete activities planned and to stay on the subject matter

- **Competition**: Emphasis placed on students competing with each other for grades and recognition

- **Order and Organization**: Emphasis on students behaving in an orderly, quiet and polite manner, and on the overall organization of classroom activities

- **Rule Clarity**: Emphasis on clear rules, on students knowing the consequences for breaking rules, and on the teacher dealing consistently with students who break rules

- **Teacher Control**: The number of rules, how strictly rules are enforced, and how severely rule interactions are punished
Innovation: Extent to which the teacher plans new, unusual and varying activities and techniques, and encourages students to contribute to classroom planning and to think creatively.

Representative items comprising the CES include: "This class is more a social hour than a place to learn something" (Task Orientation); "Students don’t always have to stick to the rules in this class" (Teacher Control); and "New Ideas are always being tried out here" (Innovation). The design of the CES instrument allows it to be used to measure both the actual (or real) environment and the preferred (or ideal) environment of secondary school classrooms.

The My Class Inventory

The My Class Inventory (Anderson, 1973) is a simplified version of the Learning Environment Inventory (LEI) designed to be administered to elementary grade students (ages 8 to 12). There are four features of the My Class Inventory (MCI) distinguishing this elementary learning environment measure from the secondary level Learning Environment Inventory (LEI): (1) the MCI consists of only five of the LEI's original 15 scales, to minimize fatigue among younger respondents; (2) item wording is simplified to promote readability; (3) a simpler two-point (Yes-No) response format has been substituted for the four-point Likert scale; and (4) students record answers on the questionnaire form itself rather than on a separate response sheet to minimize transference errors.

The most recent, revised version of the MCI (Fraser, Anderson & Walberg, 1982) contains 38 items operationalizing five scales (Cohesiveness, 6 items; Friction, 8 items; Difficulty, 8 items; Satisfaction, 9 items; and, Competitiveness, 7 items). The five scales comprising the My Class Inventory (MCI) are:
Cohesiveness: Extent to which students know, help and are friendly towards each other

Friction: Amount of tension and quarreling among students

Difficulty: Extent to which students find difficulty with the work of the class

Satisfaction: Extent of enjoyment of class work

Competitiveness: Emphasis on students competing with each other

Representative items found in the MCI include: "Children in our class fight a lot" (Friction); "Schoolwork is hard to do" (Difficulty); and "The class is fun" (Satisfaction).

The MCI has been used successfully to measure young students’ perceptions of the learning environments in elementary classrooms.

Toward Further Refinements in Conceptual and Operational Definitions of School Organizational Climate

Although the instruments cited above have all been useful in providing some insights regarding the nature and effects of school climate, the complexity of variable and variable relationships associated with school personnel, school climate and school outcomes has made deciphering the true nature of school climate a particularly troublesome and elusive goal. In a comprehensive assessment of the state of school climate research and instrument development, Anderson (1982) notes that some researchers cautiously view school climate research as both possible and desirable, despite the history of previous school climate studies that were plagued by poor models, inadequate measures, too few or wrong variables (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979) and that ignored crucial variables concerned with school processes (Wilson, 1980).

In a move toward a more refined conceptualization of the school climate construct, Anderson suggests the usefulness of the organization climate taxonomy conceptualized by
Tagiuri (1968) for building more interactive, inclusive conceptual models (as well as operational definitions) of school organizational environments. Tagiuri (1968) defined "climate" and "atmosphere" as summary concepts denoting the total environmental quality within an organization. Tagiuri suggested that an organization's climate is composed of four dimensions: ecology, milieu, social system, and culture. Ecology refers to the physical and material aspects influencing an organization's climate. Milieu is a social dimension involving the presence within the organization of individuals and groups possessing particular attributes, such as social class. Social system is the social dimension concerned with the pattern of relationships existing among individuals and groups. Culture, the final social dimension, involves the belief systems, values, cognitive structures, and meanings operating within the organization (Tagiuri, 1968).

Anderson (1982) uses Tagiuri's (1968) climate taxonomy in proposing an interactive model of school organizational climate that encompasses all possible relationships among dimensions of the organizational environment and their interaction with school climate (pp. 404-07). Anderson offers this general interactive model following a comprehensive review of the state of school climate research. Noting the complexity of the possible interrelationships among school environmental variables, Anderson (1982) emphasizes the usefulness of engaging in model specification. In Anderson's (1982) view, "the most crucial step for meaningful climate research is the careful specification of causal models" (p. 404). For future study designs involving conceptual models and operational definitions of school climate, Anderson (1982) suggests that researchers should endeavor to use: 1) a wider range of relevant climate variables that are causally related to school outcomes, 2) outlier or exemplary schools as a focus of research, 3) sample stratification as a way of studying
differential climate effects, 4) indepth observation and interviews to provide information not readily apparent from survey data, 5) longitudinal studies to study school members' long-term exposure to climate variables, and 6) experimental studies (pp. 408-10).

The next section of this chapter presents an overview of recent literature on school instructional supervision. Included in this section are reviews of relevant models of supervision and perspectives on school supervisory behavior presently found in this educational literature.

Instructional Supervision

Overview

Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1981) recount the historical transformation of the concept of supervision from its initial limited focus on the formal inspection of teachers to more contemporary views of supervision emphasizing professional human relations and cooperative interaction aimed at promoting instructional improvement. This historical transformation of the focus of supervisory practice involves a "...shift from an inspectional authoritative process to one of working with people on problems of mutual concern that are related to the goal structure of the school as an organization" (Alfonso, Firth & Neville, 1981, p. 32).

As the historical focus of supervision has shifted toward an orientation emphasizing the improvement of the teaching/learning process, the term "instructional" supervision has come to refer to that specific set of processes involving administrators and other supervisors working with teachers to make classrooms better. As Sergiovanni (1982) states, "...simply stated, supervision is a human enterprise which seeks to help teachers provide high quality classroom experiences for students" (p. vii).
In recent years, a number of factors have contributed to a heightened focus on the quality and effectiveness of instructional supervision in schools. At the state level, legislative reform initiatives targeting teacher professional accountability have proliferated. Within the past two decades, the effective schools movement has produced numerous studies directing attention to the quality of teaching/learning in schools and particularly to the instructional supervisory role and influence of the building principal (Bossert, 1988; Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Pitner, 1988). Collectively, all of these factors have impacted the field of instructional supervision and have served as influences on the development and refinement of models of teaching and instructional supervisory practice. Notably, research on the improvement of teaching and on effective schools has spurred the development, for example, of the Hunter (1984) model of teaching, as well as generating new models of instructional supervision - most notably, the clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Garman, 1982, 1986; Goldhammer, 1969; Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980) and developmental supervision (Glickman, 1980, 1985, 1987) models.

Models of Instructional Supervision

This section reviews two important models of instructional supervision that have received significant treatment in the educational literature in recent decades: (1) the Clinical Supervision Model, and (2) the Developmental Supervision Model. Key components and relevant perspectives related to each of these instructional supervisory models are presented and discussed. A third subsection reviewing perspectives within the supervision literature regarding supervisory leadership roles in school organizations is then presented, as this aspect of instructional supervision is widely viewed as significantly influencing the supervisory culture and climate of school organizations.
Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision was developed by M.L. Cogan and others at Harvard University during the 1950s as a response to the perceived inadequacies of the traditional supervisory practice of simply observing a lesson and then conferring with a teacher. Reflecting some major trends of the time, clinical supervision differed from traditional views of supervision as "inspection" in espousing several propositions regarding the purposes of instructional supervision: (1) the teacher and supervisor should work together as colleagues in the supervisory process, (2) classroom teaching is a patterned and complex interaction of teacher behaviors, student behaviors and content variables that can be classified and analyzed, and (3) effective supervision involves joint analysis by the supervisor and teacher of his/her teaching (Sullivan, 1980, pp. 7-13).

The clinical supervisory model as originally devised by Goldhammer (1969) consists of the following five stages: (1) preobservation conference, (2) observation, (3) analysis and strategy, (4) supervision conference, and (5) postconference analysis (p.32). These five stages were later expanded to a cycle of eight stages by Cogan (1973). In the clinical model, the roles of the teacher and supervisor are prescribed and include instructing, conferencing, analyzing, and data gathering activities (Sullivan, 1980, p. 13).

As a systematic model for professional interaction and feedback, the clinical supervision model has provided supervisors and teachers with a concrete plan that can be used to structure supervisory practice. However, as Hoy and Forsyth (1986) caution, "...there is little or no hard evidence regarding how and if clinical supervision works" (p. 53). They point out three characteristics of the clinical supervisory model that impede its usefulness: 1) the supervisor-principal role conflict, 2) the conflict between bureaucratic and
professional norms, and 3) a motivational system stimulated by unionization trends and stressing external reward. Moreover, the focus of the model is solely at the classroom level and the micro-aspects of daily classroom teaching. Oliva (1989) asserts that "...the typical clinical model calls for a one-to-one, face-to-face relationship between the teacher and supervisor" (p. 503). Additionally, expected outcomes in the clinical model are ambiguous with no broad perspective on long-range instructional change and improvement or on the organizational relationship of teachers with the school. According to Hoy and Forsyth (1986):

Although clinical supervision represents a major advance in supervisory philosophy and technology, the problems related to teacher motivation remain. Focusing exclusively on the classroom behavior of teachers, clinical supervision ignores the effects of the school organization itself and the relationship between the school and the teacher....No supervisory system that ignores organizational context is likely to succeed. An effective supervisory model must confront the organizational constraints and opportunities in each school. The classroom is not an isolated social unit; it is an integral part of the larger school context....Improvement of instruction must be more than a rallying cry for administrators, supervisors, and teachers. Clear outcomes of supervision need to be specified and measured to assess the success of supervisory strategies and actions. (pp. 52-53)

Developmental Supervision

A developmental approach to supervision has been described by Glickman (1980, 1985, 1987). In this approach, the supervisor modifies his/her supervisory stance relative to the maturity level of the school personnel being supervised. As such, the developmental concept of supervision suggests that a supervisor can appropriately employ different leadership styles with different teachers according to different circumstances. Glickman (1987) enumerates the propositions underlying developmental supervision: (1) teachers operate at different levels of professional development; (2) because teachers operate at different levels of thought, ability, and effectiveness, they need to be supervised in different
ways; and (3) the long range goal of supervision should be to increase every teacher's and every faculty's ability to grow toward higher stages of thought.

Thus, developmental supervision is essentially a contingency approach in which the supervisor could assume any one of three supervisory leadership orientations with teachers: directive, collaborative, or nondirective. The directive approach would be used with teachers exhibiting low commitment and abstract thinking ability, whereas the nondirective approach would be employed with those teachers possessing high skills in these areas. The collaborative approach would be utilized by supervisors in dealing with teachers whose abilities tended to be mixed (Glickman, 1985).

The developmental approach emphasizes supervisory practice as a cooperative problem-solving process within the framework of a contingency model of supervisory leadership orientation. Although this contingency model does provide a certain degree of flexibility in supervisory relations, the model also is somewhat contradictory in that two of its possible supervisory styles emphasize: 1) either a hierarchical top-down stance (directive orientation), or 2) the assumption of a laissez-faire attitude by both the supervisor and teacher (nondirective orientation) (Tanner & Tanner, 1987, pp. 186-87).

**Perspectives on Supervisory Leadership**

Employing a Parsonian structural systems perspective to viewing schools as organizations, Hoy and Forsyth (1986) have proposed a "differentiated" model of supervision that is based, at least ideally, on a separation of administrative roles and supervisory roles as representing distinct levels of responsibility and control within schools. Viewing the inherent differences between administrator and supervisory functions as reflective of the traditional "line and staff" distinction drawn in traditional organizational analyses, Hoy and
Forsyth suggest that the role of instructional supervisor is a "staff" position characterized by an "informal" authority relationship with teachers based on technical expertise, and that is oriented specifically toward change and innovation - which often produce friction and tension. The role of administrator, in contrast, is a "line" position unavoidably characterized by overtones of "formal" authority, and one that is oriented towards producing stability and harmony - to maintaining a smooth running organization. In this differentiated model, "...the supervisory role requires a professional orientation, a long-term framework, a theoretical perspective, and a change orientation; [whereas] the administrative role demands a bureaucratic orientation, a short-term reference, a pragmatic perspective, and a maintenance orientation" (Hoy & Forsyth, p. 9).

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) argue that this natural juxtaposition of role orientations warrants a separation, where possible, of administrative and supervisory roles. This separation of role responsibilities, according to Hoy and Forsyth, would better enable administrators and supervisors to fulfill their distinctive professional roles more efficiently and more productively. It would allow principals to concentrate on carrying out their "line" role of professional managers of the organizational aspects of the school (e.g., maintaining bureaucratic discipline and compliance within the school, coordinating school activities, undertaking the solution of immediate problems, and managing the "short-term" operation of the school); and it would enable instructional supervisors to focus more on developing their more "technical" role orientation of working cooperatively and collaboratively with teachers toward "long-term" substantive improvements in teaching-learning processes. However, Hoy and Forsyth note that, whereas their differentiated model presents a conceptualization guided by ideal role orientations and role responsibilities, in many (if not
most) schools, organizational circumstances require these separate line and staff roles to be jointly undertaken by one individual - the building principal (p. 14).

Lucio and McNeil (1979) also recognize the organizational constraints that shape the administrator’s supervisory role and point to the inextricable link between organizational authority and supervisory influence:

We question the notion that within a line-and-staff organization school leaders are administrators and not supervisors when they exercise initiative in movements for the improvement of teaching and learning, making decisions, coordinating the work of others, and issuing directions. They are supervisors when using authority as well as supervisors when exerting influence...Supervisors are sometimes delegated authority and held responsible for results. Hence, they must hold others responsible for carrying out instructions. (pp. 26-27)

In discussing the supervisory leadership role of school principals, Willower (1984) points to the potential positive impact principals can make on academic achievement in their schools through the conscious development of "...school cultures geared to instructional excellence and individual growth based on values...shared by faculty, students, and the school community" (p. 37). This emphasis on shared cultural values hints at the possibility of broader organizational considerations in school supervisory practice. According to Willower (1984), truly effective supervisory leadership requires that principals in their daily supervisory practices adopt an organizational perspective and become "culture builders":

[principals] can...influence many of the elements that make up the culture of a particular school. In striving to help members of the school community with the organization and its mission, the principal should keep in mind that although cultures can be insular and intolerant, a school culture ought to be educative and open. The principal’s job is not just to manage the building and be an instructional technician. The principal should be a creator and user of the symbols, structures, and processes that promote educational excellence and individual growth - that is, a culture builder. (p. 12)
School Effectiveness Research

**Historical Perspective**

The effective school movement of the 1970s and '80s has a rich historical lineage in reform initiatives as well as early school effectiveness research of previous decades. The Progressive education movement of the 1930s and '40s provided a social model of education challenging existing notions and stimulated interest in the relative educational effectiveness of schools employing different educational models. In a pioneering eight-year school effectiveness research study, Chamberlin and Chamberlin (1943) employed a planned variation research design that involved making comparisons of schools using differing educational philosophies. In a careful scrutiny of the tenets of the Progressive movement using this comparison design, Chamberlin and Chamberlin generated evidence refuting the suggestion that such a social educational model was harmful to students.

Following the Progressive Education movement, educators in American public schools during the 1950s were subjected to escalating public criticism concerning the perceived "inadequacies" of the public school system, particularly in the areas of mathematics and science. The intense popular reaction to the Sputnik challenge of the 1950s resulted in a focused national effort to invigorate the public school system and toughen the core curriculum. In the 1960s, the impact of the Coleman and others Equality of Educational Opportunity study (1966) generated a groundswell of momentum for educational innovation and change that continued into the 1970s. In both decades educators reacted to calls for professional accountability and reform that were fueled by social and political protest over the perceived irrelevance of the educational system.
Many of the principal concerns of the effective school movement stem directly from issues raised by the landmark Coleman and others (1966) report, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (EEOR). The EEOR asserted, in effect, that schools have little impact on student achievement because the ability levels and socioeconomic backgrounds of students themselves are such powerful factors. Although primarily a study of the distribution of educational resources, the EEOR became possibly the most cited of school input/output studies, because of its finding that school characteristics account for an extremely small proportion of the variance in student achievement once the social composition of students is statistically controlled (Bossert, 1988; Levine & Lezotte, 1990).

The EEOR findings were based on a national survey of educational opportunity conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics of the U.S. Office of Education, with James S. Coleman as the primary author. Based on analysis of survey responses from a sample of 1,170 high schools and 3,223 feeder elementary schools having a sixth grade (with about 70 percent of schools selected actually participating in the study), the study reported results that, among other things, highlighted: 1) the great importance of family background on student achievement; and 2) the relatively small amount of variance in achievement explicitly accounted for by variations in school facilities and curriculum (Coleman, et al., 1966, p. 325). The analysis results supported the contention that school resources have minimal impact on student achievement independent of student background characteristics. In their report, Coleman and others (1966) concluded that:

...schools bring little influence to bear on a child’s achievement that is independent of his background and general social context; and that this very lack of an independent effect means that the inequalities imposed on children by their home, neighborhood, and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of school. For equality of educational opportunity through the schools must
imply a strong effect of schools that is independent of the child's immediate social environment, and that strong independent effect is not present in American schools. (p. 325)

In essence, the EEOR represented an affront to educators' conventional beliefs concerning the differential effects of the quality of physical facilities, curricula and teacher characteristics on student achievement, and "...denied the efficacy of schooling as a powerful equalizer in American society" (Madaus, et al., 1980, p. 28). Subsequent reanalyses of the EEOR data as well as new studies of school effects, while raising some questions about the causal ordering of variables used in the original analysis, produced similar findings suggesting that school resources and differences among schools accounted for only a small proportion of the variance in students' achievement as measured by standardized tests (Jencks, et al., 1972). As the work of Jencks and his colleagues substantially confirmed the EEOR findings, this subsequent study also generated findings linking students' future job success in terms of status and salary to the occupation of the parents. Together, the Coleman (1966) and Jencks (1972) studies represent the most notable of the early input/output equity studies that attempted to examine the relationship between school resources (e.g., adult/student ratio, number of books in library, etc.) and student outcomes (i.e., performance on standardized achievement tests). (For further discussion of the impact of the Coleman report on subsequent input/output studies see Averch and others, 1974; Educational Research Service, 1983; Madaus and others, 1980; Spady, 1973).

The Coleman report spawned a large number of research studies in the mid-1970s and 1980s that sought to refute its claims. Collectively, the body of subsequent effectiveness research generated by the Coleman report has been estimated to exceed well over 2,700 individual studies of effective schools and effective classrooms (Walberg, Schille
& Haertel, 1979). As these collective studies represent a rather formidable body of research, Purkey and Smith (1982) have categorized the more widely respected of these studies into three major methodological categories: (1) outlier studies, (2) case studies, and (3) program evaluations (Purkey & Smith, 1982, p. 65).

The school effectiveness outlier studies conducted during this time period focused on identifying highly effective schools (positive outliers) and unusually ineffective schools (negative outliers) and, through statistical treatments and subsequent analyses of school level characteristics, determining sets of variables associated with differential levels of student achievement. Purkey and Smith (1982, p. 64) have identified several noteworthy outlier studies, including those completed by the New York State Department of Education (1974a, 1974b, 1976), the Maryland State Department of Education (Austin, 1978), the Detroit model cities elementary schools study (Lezotte, Edmonds & Ratner, 1974), as well as elementary school outlier studies completed in Michigan (Brookover & Schneider, 1973) and Delaware (Spartz, et al., 1977).

Case studies of effective schools in the 1970s and '80s concentrated primarily on urban elementary schools, with studies by Brookover and others (1979), Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Rutter and others (1979) being notable examples. Additional studies focusing on identifying effective schools using the case method have included those by Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980), Edmonds (1979), Venezky and Winfield (1979), Weber (1971), and Wellisch and others (1978).

The research emphasis during this same period of the third methodological group, program evaluation studies, was on identifying schools successful in raising students’ reading scores. Notable program evaluation studies completed during the mid-'70s through
'*80s included those by Armor and others (1976), Trismen and others (1976), Hunter (1979), and Doss and Holley (1982). Armor (1976) studied 20 Los Angeles schools participating in a special program to improve reading. The Trismen (1976) project involved studying a national sample of compensatory reading programs. Hunter (1979) focused within three studies on determining characteristics of Michigan schools with effective compensatory education programs. The Doss and Holley (1982) study involved a program evaluation of Title I schoolwide projects. The study by Armor and others (1976) appears to be the one most often cited in the effectiveness literature as representative of the program evaluation genre.

These various studies attempted to overcome certain methodological and conceptual flaws recognized in the Coleman survey (Bossert, 1988), and were successful in producing some evidence for school effects. These studies, though, have themselves been subjected to at least two kinds of criticism dealing with: (1) methodological issues (stemming from the unwieldy and complex task of studying the social and curricular organization of schools), and (2) issues of interpretation (are characteristics of outstanding schools those that could be used to make mediocre schools better?) (Good & Brophy, 1986; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Ralph & Fennessey, 1983; Rowen, Bossert & Dwyer, 1983). However, though the studies completed using the various outlier, case study and program evaluation methodologies may have themselves been methodologically limited and by no means exhaustive, their common findings collectively served to identify five common correlates that tended to be associated with effective schools. Effective schools analyzed in these studies were found to possess: (1) strong administrative leadership; (2) high performance expectation for students; (3) a safe and orderly environment conducive to teaching and learning; (4) an emphasis on the
acquisition of basic skills; and (5) a system of monitoring student progress (Edmonds, 1979). These characteristics of effective schools have been identified by these studies as important factors contributing to an overall school climate that promotes academic achievement.

These five effective school correlates were identified by researchers at a level of specificity general enough to "...allow for a variety of manifestations in practice while still pointing toward key specific aspects of school effectiveness" (Levine & Lezotte, 1990, p. 9). In their review and analysis of research findings of studies of unusually effective schools, Levine and Lezotte (1990) expanded upon and further delineated the meanings of the five basic effective school correlates based on their review of research associated with the effective schools movement as well as other related areas of analysis and inquiry. Levine and Lezotte's expanded list of characteristics of unusually effective schools further elucidates the five common correlates culled from the effectiveness studies of the mid-1970s and 1980s. In this expanded version, Levine and Lezotte denote unusually effective schools as characterized by: (1) a productive school climate and culture, (2) a focus on student acquisition of central learning skills, (3) appropriate monitoring of student progress, (4) practice-oriented staff development at the school site, (5) outstanding leadership, (6) salient parent involvement, (7) effective instructional arrangements and implementation, (8) high operationalized expectations, and (9) sensitivity to student concerns, including student efficacy, multicultural instruction, personal development and equitable promotion policies and practices.

Notably, positive school climate has been found to be a consistently recurring feature of schools identified in research studies as unusually effective (Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Levine & Lezotte, 1990). However, the school climate construct itself has been variously
defined by researchers (Anderson, 1982). As a variety of definitions have appeared though, school climate has typically been used in effectiveness studies to identify schools having: (1) an orderly and safe environment conducive to teaching and learning (Edmonds, 1982; Taylor, 1984; Wayson, 1988); and (2) a social environment that: a) promotes feelings of belongingness and participation among students, b) delineates consequences that are equitable and clearly communicated to parents, students and staff, and c) engenders an atmosphere in which "...all adults are responsible for all students" (Wayson, 1988).

Thus, as school effectiveness reviewers have noted the methodological problems associated with designing studies that adequately address the complexities of the social and curricular organization of schools (Good & Brophy, 1986; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Ralph & Fennessey, 1983; Rowan, Bossert & Dwyer, 1983), a more basic problem derives from the difficulties associated with formulating conceptual definitions of school climate that adequately address this organizational complexity. The variety of conceptual and operational definitions employed in school effectiveness studies to date attests to the complexity of the problem (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985). Further, the lack of conceptual clarity in delineating the school climate construct has hindered efforts to elucidate the nature of the connection between school climate and school effectiveness (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

The next section further discusses various definitions and determinants of school climate employed in the extant school effectiveness literature and reviews the nature of the relationships posited in this research between school climate and school effectiveness. This further review of literature focusing on the school climate and effectiveness relationship is considered in light of recent calls (noted above) for a conceptual reexamination of the school climate construct.
School Climate and Effectiveness

Effective schools research has focused attention on the importance of the organizational setting or social climate of schools and the impact of this organizational climate, in conjunction with existing curricular and instructional practices, on school productivity (student achievement). In this sense, school organizational climate has been a key variable in much of the school effectiveness literature (Cohen, 1983; Tomlinson, 1981).

In a systematic review of 205 independent school effectiveness studies conducted from 1970-1983, Borger, Lo, Oh, and Walberg (1985) identified "school climate" as one of eight school effectiveness constructs representative of these studies. Borger and colleagues identified three primary characteristics generally associated with conceptual definitions of school climate employed in these studies: (1) a safe and orderly environment; (2) clear and consistent rules; and (3) a sense of student identification and school pride. Ninety-six percent of the studies reviewed found school climate to be positively associated with academic achievement. According to Borger and colleagues (1985), the most consistently mentioned climate variable was a "safe, orderly environment characterized by clear and consistent rules" (p. 15).

According to Ralph and Fennessey (1981), perhaps the strongest contribution to the empirical literature on school climate and effectiveness has been the study of school social systems conducted by Brookover and others (1979). As has already been discussed (see School Social Climate Questionnaire, pp. 62-64, this chapter), Brookover and others (1979) conceptualized the school social system as comprised of three interrelated sets of variables: (1) social inputs (student body composition and other personnel inputs), (2) social structure
(student status-role definitions, e.g., student grouping), and (3) school climate (the school’s cultural, or normative-psychological environment) (pp. 137-138). As Purkey and Smith (1983, p. 136) note, perhaps the most distinguishing feature of the Brookover study is that the social system model they develop as well as their conclusions they derive from their research suggest that there may be no single combination of variables that will produce an effective school. Brookover and others (1979) emphasize the following at the conclusion of their research report:

It is essential to recognize that the several aspects of the school social system which we have examined do not operate independently. The expectations and evaluations of students, their feelings of futility, and the academic norms of the school are all interrelated in varying degrees with the racial and socio-economic composition of the student body. The adult members of the school social system, who are certainly critically important in creating the characteristic climate of the school, are probably influenced by their perceptions of the student body composition. (p. 140)

These statements by Brookover and others (1979) lend some credence to the depiction of school climate as a complex school organizational variable, and also provide support for the view that organizational climate may indeed be related in some important ways to other school organizational variables, including school organizational membership and structure.

In their review of effectiveness schools research, Purkey and Smith (1983) criticize as simplistic approaches to school improvement that consist of identifying "key ingredients" of effectiveness and then mandating top-down implementation programs without sufficient consideration to how various school effectiveness characteristics may be interrelated. They propose a "school culture" approach to school improvement and effectiveness that seeks to emphasize the complexity of school organizations through recognizing multiple facets that constitute a school’s organizational culture. The integrated model they propose consists of two integrated sets of variables: (1) organizational/structural variables; and (2) process
(climate) variables. The organizational/structural variables are seen as providing the framework within which the process (climate) variables function. Purkey and Smith (1983) delineate organizational/structural variables as including: (1) school-site management, (2) instructional leadership, (3) staff stability, (4) curriculum articulation and organization, (5) schoolwide staff development, (6) parental involvement and support, (7) schoolwide recognition of academic success, (8) maximized learning time, and (9) district support. Process variables are considered to actually define the climate of the school, and include: (1) collaborative planning and collegial relationships, (2) a shared sense of community, (3) clear goals and high expectations, and (4) order and discipline (pp. 443-445). This two-dimensional, integrative school culture model focuses on school-level factors affecting school organizational culture, and is based on Purkey and Smith's view of schools as "nested layers", in which "...the outer (school) layer sets the context for the adjacent (classroom) layer" (p. 443). This notion of nesting of organizational layers within schools lends further support for the multidimensional view of school organizational climate emergent in this review, and also attests to the difficulties associated with accurately conceptualizing and operationalizing the school organizational climate variable.

As has already been discussed (see Chapter One), reviewers have noted that research on effective schools (as well as research on school organizations in general) has been hampered by the lack of a sound theoretical framework and the lack of careful definition and measurement of some of its key constructs (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). In particular, the school climate construct as identified in the research literature has been cited as in need of more precise definition and clarification. Echoing the call for continued refinement of the school climate variable and other factors appearing in
effective schools research, Joyce and Showers (1988), nevertheless, are able to distinguish three general categories within which current school effectiveness research findings regarding school climate typically fall. These three school climate categories include: (1) school learning climate, involving expectations and standards, clarity of mission, curricular organization, the monitoring of student progress, the reward structure, connectedness with parents, and the provision of opportunities to learn; (2) school social climate, including a sense of community, student involvement in governance, orientation of the peer group, and provisions for orderliness and safety; and (3) the role of the administrator, in engaging in active instructional leadership, cultivating a positive organizational climate for the school, and involving staff in collaborative decision making.

Joyce and Showers (1988) further note the important service that effective schools research has provided to the field in delineating a much clearer set of hypotheses about how to increase the positive impact of the school environment on student achievement. These hypotheses have emerged as a result of the effective schools research emphasis on viewing educational goals as being achieved through both the quality of the school social organization (school climate) and the quality of specific curriculums and individual teachers. They indicate, however, that further study of the specific nature of effective school climate and the organizational factors that inform this climate is needed, as very little of the "...[effective schools] research has been oriented toward the potentially relevant concepts that are available from social psychology and organizational theory" (pp. 48–49).

Thus, although the body of traditional school effectiveness studies is recognized for its significant contribution to the educational research literature, empirical studies examining the relationship between school climate and effectiveness have been impeded in one
important way by a lack of definitional clarity in the school climate construct. Determinants of school climate as identified in various studies have been often somewhat vaguely defined and not sufficiently grounded in any rational model of schools as organizations. In his comprehensive assessment of empirical research on school effects, Bossert (1988) sums up the problem this way:

Just about anything can become a predictor of effectiveness, given a particular image of the school as an organization. Effectiveness studies in educational administration focus on everything from the job satisfaction of teachers to the equity of policies on student discipline. What is treated as an 'effect' in one study may be seen as a factor that produces effects in another study....For example, many researchers have studied the determinants of school climate because climate factors are supposed to be related to student achievement. Yet, climate effects on student learning, although often statistically robust, are loosely defined and have no clear basis in a theory of schooling or few identifiable links to children's learning experiences. It is important to identify frameworks that can assess directly the relationships among organizational factors that affect what students accomplish in school. (p. 341)

Collective findings from school effectiveness studies completed in the wake of the Coleman (1966) study served to focus researchers’ attention on several factors relating to the social climate of schools. One factor in particular that emerged from this body of research is the strong influence of the principal’s instructional leadership role, albeit indirect, in positively affecting school climate. The following section presents a review of effective schools studies highlighting the importance of the principal’s instructional leader role in affecting the social and learning climate of schools.

Administrative Leadership

Identification of the role of the school principal as a significant agent in shaping school climate and as the most critical leadership factor influencing school effectiveness has been documented for some time in numerous studies of effective schools (e.g., Brookover
& Lezotte, 1979; Duckett, 1980; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; High & Achilles, 1986; Jackson, Logsdon, & Taylor, 1983; Sizemore, 1985, 1987; Taylor, 1984; Teddlie, Kirby, & Stringfield, 1989; Ubben & Hughes, 1987; Weber, 1971). Earlier researchers who have studied school learning climate in the context of effective schools have noted that in some cases the principal can make an important contribution to instruction (Brookover, et al., 1978, 1979; Wellisch, et al., 1978). As Edmonds (1979) has stated, "[o]ne of the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools is strong administrative leadership, without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together" (p. 32). Reviewers of effective schools research generally concur that the body of school effectiveness studies completed to date points to the importance of the principal's instructional leader role in helping to shape school learning climate and in affecting instructional achievement (Bossert, 1988; Clark, Lotto, & McCarthy, 1980; Cohen, 1981; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Purkey & Smith, 1983).

Several early studies examining the relationship between school climate and achievement obtained findings pointing to the importance of the principal's instructional leadership ability as a key determining agent in shaping a positive school learning climate and in influencing student achievement. Utilizing a case study approach in four low SES elementary schools in Michigan, Brookover and others (1979) determined that there were distinguishable differences in principal leadership and in the ways principals affected the school social system in effective and ineffective schools. This investigation of school climate and student achievement found exceptional low SES schools in which students were achieving at much higher levels than would be typical for schools with these student
populations. Brookover and others (1979) attributed these achievement disparities in these low SES schools to differences in principal leadership.

From analyses of the leadership roles of the principals in the unusually effective versus low achieving low SES elementary schools, Brookover and others (1979) derived the following findings regarding principal leadership: (1) supervision was decidedly different in the successful schools from that in unsuccessful schools, with principals in the successful schools conducting frequent classroom visitations, frequent conferences with teachers concerning student achievement, etc.; (2) principals in the successful schools demonstrated concern for achievement and communicated high expectations to both students and teachers; and, (3) principals in the successful schools exhibited a commitment to and assumed responsibility for ensuring that students could and should be achieving at relatively high levels. These study findings focusing on the relationship between school climate and student achievement supported the conclusion that effective leadership by the principal facilitates a school climate that supports student achievement.

Weber (1971), conducting indepth case studies of third grade reading instruction in four successful urban schools, found evidence supporting the positive impact of the principal on affecting students’ reading achievement. These case studies of unusually successful elementary reading programs in four inner city elementary schools reported by Weber all shared the following characteristics: (1) strong instructional leadership; (2) high expectations; (3) orderly climate; and (4) stress on reading, particularly in the primary grades. Results of analyses completed for the four schools revealed that principals in three of the schools displayed a strong emphasis on reading and exhibited an instructional
leadership focus towards reading achievement, while the fourth school's reading program was influenced positively by the area superintendent.

Similarly, another case study examining variation in reading achievement between two inner-city schools in New York (New York State Department of Education, 1974b) found that the quality of administrative leadership was a primary contributing factor to successful reading achievement among students in the higher achieving school. Administrative leader style in the high achieving school was characterized by an emphasis on establishing an orderly and efficient school environment and on generating high levels of cooperation among teachers, students and parents. Specifically, the study's findings regarding the influence of administrative leadership on reading achievement included the following: (1) administrative behavior, policies, and practices in the effective inner-city school appeared to have a significant impact on school effectiveness; (2) the more effective inner-city school was led by an administrative team that provided a good balance between both management and instructional skills; and (3) the administrative team in the more effective school had developed a plan for dealing with the reading problem and had implemented the plan throughout the school.

The foregoing representative effective school studies provide demonstrate the considerable support that studies of this nature generated for the importance of the principal's instructional leader role in shaping school learning climate and affecting school-wide student achievement. Syntheses of research findings from large samples of effective school studies support these findings as well. For example, in a review of 97 studies (59 case studies and 38 research studies) of urban elementary schools, Clark and others (1980) found considerable agreement across these studies concerning the significant role of the
principal as a positive instructional leader. From analysis of the common leadership factors emerging in these studies, Clark and others (1980) derived the following generalizations: (1) the behavior of the designated school principal or program leader is crucial in determining school success; (2) effective principals/leaders in these studies did more; they framed goals and objectives, set standards of performance, created a productive working environment, and obtained needed support; (3) the principal’s attitude toward urban education and expectations for school or program success determined the impact of the principal in exceptional schools; and (4) principals in the effective schools studied specifically focused available energies and resources on central instructional problems (i.e., improving achievement in basic skills).

More recently, Bossert (1988) has noted that "...one result of the effective schools research has been a renewed interest in the instructional management role of principals" (p. 342). However, the links between principal behavior and student achievement are complex and not clearly defined in past effective schools research. Indeed, the complexity and potential influence of the organizational dimension of school climate itself have not been fully addressed in these early studies. Bossert (1988) cautioned about the importance of considering the organizational dimension of school climate and its relationship to instructional leadership, noting that, "...the push for instructional leadership requires an understanding of the interplay among organizational structures, management, and instructional activities that enhance student achievement" (p. 341).

Additionally, recent research reviewers synthesizing findings from a variety of studies highlight the positive, though rather indirect, linkages that appear to exist between principal leader behavior and school climate. These studies and study reviews provide evidence that the principal’s influence as the primary instructional supervisor in schools is
important; but, rather than affecting classrooms directly, the principals’ influence may be best felt through his/her ability to affect the overall school learning climate. For example, Bossert and others (1982), in reviewing research focusing on effective principals and successful schools, synthesized findings indicating that the principal’s role is one of affecting school climate through manipulating the instructional organization available to teachers. Similarly, findings by Hoy, Tarter, and Bliss (1990) support the notion that "...principal influence is indirect, provided his or her actions lead to the development of a climate with a strong academic emphasis" (p. 275).

In a review and analysis of recent research on principal leadership behaviors in unusually effective schools, Levine and Lezotte (1990) delineate eight characteristics of unusually effective principals on which there appears to be considerable agreement. These characteristics have been found in various research studies to contribute to fostering a positive learning climate among teachers and students in schools. According to Levine and Lezotte, unusually effective principals have been found to regularly engage in: 1) vigorous selection and replacement of teachers; 2) bending, challenging and/or disregarding of external pressures/rules from central office; 3) buffering of faculty from external agents; 4) personal monitoring of school activities, and sense-making; 5) expending time and energy in school improvement actions; 6) providing support for teachers; 7) obtaining additional resources for their schools; 8) implementing a variety of instructional leadership functions (including development of mission and goals, managing education production, promoting academic learning climate, and developing superior work environment); and 9) acquiring and utilizing on-site instructional support personnel.
School Contextual Differences

In the late 1980s, a new direction in school effectiveness research emerged with the recognition by a few effective school researchers of the importance of considering context and multilevel effects in effective school research designs, accompanied by a call for conducting future studies of effective schools that are context-sensitive (Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989). This more recent approach to designing school effectiveness studies is based on a view that understanding the complexity of relationships among effectiveness variables such as school climate, instructional leadership and school productivity also requires consideration of key school contextual factors that mediate these relationships. These contextual factors include such school-specific variables as different grade level configurations, socioeconomic strata (SES) of student body, geographical distinctions (urban/rural), organizational structure, cultural differences, public versus private schooling, etc. (Teddlie, Kirby, & Stringfield, 1989; Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989). According to proponents of this newer research focus, these factors should be viewed as important context variables in developing more realistic models of effective schooling (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Teddlie, Stringfield, Wimpelberg, & Kirby, 1989; Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989).

Wimpelberg and others (1989) indicate that, as the body of traditional school effectiveness research (viz., studies conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s) maintained a specific "equity" focus (with a primary emphasis on studying low SES urban elementary schools), a shift in the research agenda began to emerge in the early 1980s with a move toward adopting more of an "efficiency" model (pp. 82-85). This shift to an efficiency approach was based on a growing recognition by a number of effective schools researchers
that the urban elementary school model of effectiveness was overly simplistic and not applicable to other school contexts, such as middle and secondary schools (e.g., Firestone & Herriott, 1982a; Lipsitz, 1984; Sirotnik, 1985; Virgilio, 1987). As Wimpelberg and others (1989) emphasize, the shift to an efficiency model significantly broadened the effective school research agenda to include the examination of different school contexts (e.g., middle and secondary schools); and also, more importantly, focused attention on the importance of considering the complex array of organizational factors that may collectively contribute to making any school effective (p. 88).

One of the most interesting aspects of this context-sensitive model of school effectiveness is its recognition of the importance of multilevel effects in school organizations, and its emphasis on viewing school effectiveness as a multidimensional phenomenon. As Wimpelberg and others (1989) point out, developing a multilevel view regarding the development of appropriate constructs as well as modes of measurement and analysis (Sirotnik & Burstein, 1985) will be critical to designing future research that realistically examines effectiveness in relation to our understandings of schools as complex organizations. The potential of the multilevel approach for refining school effectiveness research to account for this organizational complexity in schools encompasses, as Wimpelberg and others (1989) suggest, a broad range of organizational phenomena in schools from micro-interactions at the classroom level to school-district organizational relationships:

...the tendency in the typical effective schools study to average out classroom effects at the level of the school (or, more accurately, at the level of a single grade, extrapolated to the school) hides the effects of teacher decisions on individual children and groups within classrooms. The full range of levels available for analysis [in context-sensitive designs] could run from individual student-teacher relationships in which the student is treated as a decision
maker, through intra-classroom groupings where peer interactions and teacher decisions matter, to whole classroom settings and school/school district decision and allocation systems. (p. 99)

This multilevel effects approach is interesting given the fact that traditional school effectiveness research, in general, has largely ignored contextual considerations in the study of effective schools. This emphasis on the importance of considering school contextual factors in conducting studies of school effects seems to provide rich possibilities for the exploration of relationships among school organizational variables and school climate and culture. Indeed, as Firestone and Corbett (1988) suggest, researchers still have yet to focus on studying the nature of critical relationships among school organizational structures, leadership roles, and the intentional efforts of individuals in schools to build educational cultures (p. 338).

Finally, this most recent development in effective schools research serves an important integrative function for, as its proponents suggest, it entails a synthesis of two very complementary bodies of research -- Effective Schools and Effective Teaching research. The natural complementarity between these two research foci has been recognized as providing an important new direction for future studies of effective schools (Lezotte, 1986, p. 7). Of particular interest is the potential this integrated research approach holds for refining our understandings concerning the complex relationships existing among school climate, a variety of organizational context factors and school effectiveness.

Review Conclusions

The related literature and research reviewed in this chapter provides a conceptual and empirical base for the study. The conceptualization of the organizational/Supervisory (O/S) framework, along with the conceptual and operational development of the O/S climate
construct, is undertaken in response to a strong need perceived in the literature for the re-conceptualization and refinement of the school climate construct as presently employed in studies of school organizations (Anderson, 1982, Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Moreover, there exists within the literature little systematic empirical evidence identifying the nature and complexity of the relationships between school climate and academic achievement (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991).

Growing recognition among educational administration theorists of the inadequacies of many conventional organizational frameworks borrowed from the social sciences and applied to schools has led to increased awareness of the necessity of focusing on the unique complexity and multidimensional nature of school organizations (Allison, 1983; Griffiths, 1988). As recent literature has focused on the importance of the organizational culture and climate produced and maintained in schools (Erickson, 1987; Lieberman, 1988; Sarason, 1971), researchers and reviewers of the literature in educational administration are recognizing the usefulness of exploring the multidimensional nature of school organizations through consideration of individual school subcultures, particularly those involving school professionals (Firestone & Corbett, 1988; Willower, 1984, 1986, 1988).

The conceptual and operational development of the O/S framework along with initial refinement and testing of the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) presented in this study represents a response to the following combined conditions existing in the literature: (1) in educational administration, the study of instructional supervisory practice in schools as a unique organizational phenomenon has not yet been considered; (2) within the literature on instructional supervision, there continues to remain a relative emphasis on the micro-event aspects of supervision, neglecting the inherent multidimensional
nature of instructional supervisory practices as they occur in schools (Oliva, 1989); and (3) there is a general recognition among researchers of the need for clearer conceptual and operational definitions of the school climate construct as well as for conceptually based studies that seek to more clearly define the multiple organizational relationships existing among school inputs, mediating climate variables and indices of school effectiveness (Anderson, 1982).

Review Summary

This chapter presents a review of pertinent perspectives contained in the literatures on schools as organizations, instructional supervision, and school effectiveness. The perspectives highlighted in this chapter call attention to the complexity of school organizational culture and the inherent multidimensional nature of the school climate construct. These conditions in the literature suggest a strong need for a more focused conceptualization and operationalization of the school climate construct. The present study addresses this issue through the conceptualization of an organizational/supervisory (O/S) model that can serve as a useful framework for the practical operationalization and study of variables and variable relationships involving the school professional subculture and its effects. Through focusing specifically on the organizational structures and climate effects associated with the professional supervisory subculture within schools, this study seeks to provide some definitional clarity to the study of school organizational climate. The following chapter describes the research methodology and procedures employed in the study.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Chapter four describes the methodology and procedures used to collect and analyze data for the study. Included in this chapter are descriptions of the research designs employed, instrumentation used to collect data, definitions of school effectiveness variables, quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures, and data analyses completed for instrument development/refinement and to answer primary and supplemental research questions.

Research Design

This study contained multiple design elements. First, to empirically examine the structure of the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI), a series of factor analysis procedures were used along with a set of explicit decision rules designed to delete/retain items for the refined version of the OSCI. Secondly, to investigate proposed relationships among school O/S structure, O/S climate and school effectiveness variables posited in the O/S framework presented in Chapter Two, a combined set of quantitative and qualitative design elements and procedures was used. The quantitative methodology utilized an ex post facto research design described by Campbell and Stanley (1963) in which the study variables were assigned and not manipulated. The qualitative design elements of the study utilized a series of semi-structured interviews with administrators and teachers in selected outlier and comparison schools consistent with open-ended interview strategies outlined by Patton (1990) and telephone research methods described by Frey (1989). Within the overall study design and procedures, qualitative data were collected after the completion of quantitative data analyses.
Independent Variables

Independent variables in the study were six dimensions of the factored/refined version of the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) specifically developed for the study. These OSCI dimensions were: 1) Organizational Structure (OS); 2) Professional Autonomy (PA); 3) Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR); 4) District Supervisory Climate (DSC); 5) Self Reflection (SR); 6) Centralization (CEN).

Dependent Variables

Dependent variables in the study were three indices of effectiveness: 1) school effectiveness; 2) organizational effectiveness; and 3) school holding power. School effectiveness was operationalized by school mean normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores on the California Achievement Test (CAT) Total Battery Score (California Achievement Tests, 1987) administered during the spring of 1992. Organizational effectiveness of schools was operationalized by school mean scores on the Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE) (Miskel, Fevurly, & Stewart, 1979). School holding power was operationalized by school mean average daily attendance (ADA) figures for the 1991-1992 school year.

Sample

The initial sample for the study consisted of all administrators and professional staff in 194 elementary, middle/junior high, secondary and comprehensive schools in 13 school districts in southern Louisiana. Because participation was voluntary, some schools chose not to participate and usable data were received from 162 schools. Sample sizes for the study varied among the analyses completed depending upon factors such as the units of
analysis used, the particular research or supplemental questions examined, the completeness of various data sets, and quantitative and qualitative research concerns.

A separate sample of 60 teacher volunteers was used to examine the test-retest reliability (stability) of the revised OSCI-S subscales.

Following completion of quantitative data analyses, two sets of schools were identified for the qualitative phase of the study. A first set consisted of eight outlier schools (Question 6) from the total sample. These schools were identified with three quantitative results concerns in mind: 1) the statistical relationships between the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale scores and perceptions of school organizational effectiveness; 2) the highest and lowest IPOE scores in the total sample of schools; and 3) school profiles of the OSCI-S subscale scores. Visual inspection of these data identified two schools at each of three levels (elementary, middle/junior high, and secondary) and two additional schools (the highest and the lowest school organizational effectiveness scores in the complete school sample) as participants in this first qualitative phase of the study.

Subsequent to this analysis, a second set of 12 comparison pair schools (Question 5) was also utilized as the focus of an additional phase of qualitative analyses. School pairs constituting this set were identified through inspection of a total sample variable matrix consisting of independent variables (OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension school mean scores), dependent variables (IPOE-S and CAT school mean scores, ADA), OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation scores, and demographic variables (school SES level, student enrollment size and administrator/staff ratio). For this second qualitative phase, six pairs of schools in the total sample having similar demographic characteristics but exhibiting
differing relationships between effectiveness indices and O/S climate characteristics were selected for analysis.

Instrumentation and Measurement

Quantitative Measures

Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI)

The Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) was initially developed and refined in a series of pilot studies (Claudet & Ellett, 1990; Claudet, et al., 1991). An item pool of 95 items was developed and logically content classified by seven OSCI climate dimensions. Subsequently, a panel of five expert judges were used to verify the content classification of the OSCI items by each OSCI dimension. Then the OSCI was administered on a pilot basis to a small group (n=15) of teachers to examine administration time requirements, clarity of items and directions and to receive additional suggestions for item revisions. The content-verified and piloted pool of 95 items was then used in the initial data collection in this study. Two forms of the OSCI were used in data collection: one for school administrators (OSCI-A) and one for professional staff (teachers and other professional staff) (OSCI-S). The two forms of the OSCI tap personal perspectives of administrators and professional staff about the nature and quality of the O/S climate in the school. Copies of the 95-item forms of the OSCI for administrators and professional staff used in initial data collection are included in Appendix B.

Subsequently, a series of factor analyses were used to empirically establish/verify dimensions of the OSCI. Specific factor analytic procedures utilized are specified in greater detail in the ensuing Chapter Five which describes the results of the study. The results of these analyses and application of a set of explicit decision making rules served to reduce the
OSCI to a set of 58 items distributed across the following six O/S climate dimensions: 1) Organizational Structure (OS); 2) Professional Autonomy (PA); 3) Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR); 4) District Supervisory Climate (DSC); 5) Self Reflection (SR); and 6) Centralization (CEN). The revised OSCI used to examine primary research and supplemental research questions is included in Appendix D.

Response Format

The response format for each of the OSCI items was a four-point, forced choice scale consistent with attitude scaling techniques originally described by Likert (1932). The scale points for each OSCI item were: 1) Strongly Disagree; 2) Disagree; 3) Agree; 4) Strongly Agree.

Reliability

Internal consistency and test-retest reliability characteristics of the OSCI were examined using data from the large samples of school administrators and professional staff and data from a separate sample of 60 classroom teachers. Separate internal consistency coefficients were computed for the total samples of administrators and professional staff for each of the six factored subscales of the OSCI. Additionally, within-school internal consistency reliabilities were computed for each sample school for professional staff. Test-retest reliability (stability) coefficients for the OSCI-S form were computed for the separate sample of 60 classroom teachers. Pre and post OSCI-S administrations to this sample of teachers were completed approximately two weeks apart.

Validity

After initial data collection, construct validity characteristics (Messick, 1989) of the OSCI were statistically examined in two ways. First, a series of factor analyses were used
to empirically verify/refine the OSCI subscales (constructs). Secondly, the criterion-related validity of the refined OSCI subscales was explored by examining bivariate and multivariate relationships between the subscales and the various effectiveness measures used in the study.

**Scoring**

The revised/refined forms (A and S) of the OSCI used to examine research questions in this study yield separate scores for each of six subscales. These scores are computed by summing item scores operationalizing the various subscales. All items are stated in a positive direction and none needs to be reverse scored. The OSCI subscales, number of items comprising each subscale, and possible subscale score ranges (SR), respectively, are as follows:

1. Organizational Structure (OS) (26 items) (SR= 26 to 104)
2. Professional Autonomy (PA) (9 items) (SR= 9 to 36)
3. Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) (8 items) (SR= 8 to 32)
4. District Supervisory Climate (DSC) (7 items) (SR= 7 to 28)
5. Self Reflection (SR) (4 items) (SR= 4 to 16)
6. Centralization (CEN) (4 items) (SR= 4 to 16)

Since the six subscales of the revised version of the OSCI were identified through orthogonal factor analysis solutions, the OSCI subscales are considered sub-constructs of the overall O/S climate in schools and a total instrument score is not considered conceptually meaningful.

**Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE)**

The *Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness* (IPOE) (Miskel, Fevurly & Stewart, 1979) is a modification of an original instrument, the *Index of Organizational
Effectiveness (IOE), designed by Mott (1972) to measure members' perceptions of the overall effectiveness of their work organization. As in the original measure, the school version of the IPOE requests respondents to rate the overall effectiveness of the school organization along four dimensions: 1) quantity and quality of product; 2) efficiency; 3) adaptability; and 4) flexibility. The IPOE consists of eight items, with two items designed to reflect each of the four dimensions. Copies of the IPOE used in this study can be found as page seven of the OSCI-S and OSCI-A instrument packets included in Appendix B.

Response Format

Respondents use a five-point, forced choice scale in making decisions about each IPOE item. These scales are designed to reflect degrees of perceived effectiveness of the school as an organization ranging from relatively ineffective to highly effective. However, the particular content of each of the five scale points varies from one item to the next based upon the organizational characteristic being considered and the effectiveness perspective measured.

Reliability

Miskel, Fevurly, and Stewart (1979) reported a Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of .89 for the school version of the IPOE. Similarly, Hoy and Ferguson (1985) reported an IPOE Alpha coefficient of .87. More recently, Logan (1990) reported an IPOE internal consistency coefficient for a sample of 73 schools of .88. In this study, internal consistency reliability coefficients were computed for the IPOE for the total sample of school administrators and for the total sample of professional staff. In addition, alpha reliabilities were computed using professional staff as the units of analysis within each sample school.
Validity

Validity of the Index of Organizational Effectiveness (IOE) was established by Mott (1972) in ten hospital studies and in a study of the organizational effectiveness of twelve organizational divisions within the Office of Administration at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The wording of the eight items contained in the original IOE was later modified by Miskel, Fevurly and Stewart (1979) to reflect an educational setting rather than an industrial situation (e.g., "school" was substituted for "division"). In both contexts, items on the IOE/IPOE were found to meaningfully correlate with subjective measures of organizational effectiveness. Factor analysis from the NASA data provided support for the initial construct validity of the IOE, and identified three sub-constructs of effectiveness: productivity, adaptability, and flexibility.

The criterion-related validity of the IPOE has also been supported more recently by Logan (1989) in a study in which the IPOE was shown to be meaningfully correlated with a comprehensive measure of school coupling structure (range of correlations was from .35 to .86). Also, in this study the IPOE was shown to be correlated with school achievement (r=.60) using a sample of 73 schools.

Scoring

The IPOE consists of eight items each of which yields a score ranging from one to five. Item scores are summed to yield a total IPOE score ranging from eight to 40. All items are stated in a positive direction and none has to be reverse scored.

School Achievement

School effectiveness was measured by school mean normal curve equivalent (NCE) total battery scores for the California Achievement Test (CAT) (California Achievement
Tests, 1987). The CAT is a nationally normed, basic skills achievement test that is given during the late spring of each school year to students in grades 4, 6 and 9 by the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) as part of a statewide testing program. The CAT scores used in the study were made available by the LDE during the summer of 1992. These scores were used to operationalize the dependent variable of school effectiveness.

**School Attendance**

School average daily attendance (ADA) data for students were made available through school district central office personnel for participating schools. The ADA index was constructed as a mean percentage of student ADA for each reporting period for the 1991-1992 school year. The ADA index was used as a proxy measure to operationalize the dependent variable of school holding power.

**Qualitative Measures**

A semi-structured interview protocol was specifically developed for the study to assist in the collection of telephone interview data from identified selected administrator(s) and teachers in outlier and comparison schools of interest identified through the results of quantitative analyses. This protocol framework reflected the following data collection concerns: (1) perceptions/explanations of O/S climate/organizational effectiveness relationships; (2) perceptions/explanations of levels of overall school organizational effectiveness; (3) descriptions of historical events that might influence study participants’ perspectives of school organizational effectiveness; and 4) content specific issues pertaining to the results of quantitative analyses of the various OSCI subscales. Information collected with this protocol was used to develop thematic descriptions of outlier and comparison schools to assist in explaining wide variation in within school relationships observed among
selected variables in the quantitative results of the study. A copy of the semi-structured interview protocol is included in Appendix E.

Demographic Information

Demographic information forms (administrator and professional staff) were used in the study to collect extensive information from study participants regarding three major classes of variables: (1) personal characteristics (e.g., sex, age, ethnicity, etc.); (2) professional characteristics (e.g., subject area specialty, years experience as an educator, etc.); and (3) information regarding supervisory activities in the school. The demographic information requested from administrators was slightly different than that requested from professional staff. Copies of these forms can be found as pages one and two of the OSCI-A and OSCI-S instrument sets included in Appendix B.

Data Collection Procedures

Administration and collection of quantitative survey measures constituted the first phase of data collection. Individual instrument packets containing a demographic information form, the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) (A or S Form), and the Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE) were prepared and distributed to all administrators and teachers in 194 schools in the spring of 1992. A cover letter accompanying the individual survey packets explained the nature and purpose of the survey to participants and requested their cooperation. The principal of each school was requested to designate an individual within the school (e.g., librarian or guidance counselor) to assist in the distribution and collection of the completed survey packets. Respondents were requested to return their completed demographic and survey forms to the individual designated by the principal to assist in the study within five (5) work days. Individual
schools were then instructed to return all completed survey forms to the district central office where they could be collected and returned for data processing and analysis.

Subsequent to completion of the quantitative data analyses for the study, visual inspection was made of quantitative results to identify sets of outlier and comparison schools for further qualitative study. Eight outlier and 12 comparison schools were identified for further collection of qualitative data. The school principal and two teachers in each outlier and comparison school were interviewed via telephone using the semi-structured interview protocol described above. The principal in each outlier and comparison school was asked to select two teachers to participate in the staff interviews. The cooperation of principals was requested in identifying teachers for interviews who were veteran (tenured teachers), and who were highly familiar and knowledgeable of school cultural norms, values, beliefs and collective perspectives of other teachers. Interview data were collected from interviewees in each outlier and comparison school for each of the five protocol questions (Appendix D). Sixty qualitative interviews were completed in the study. The average time for each interview was approximately 50 minutes.

Data Analyses Procedures

Quantitative Analyses

A variety of quantitative data analyses were completed in this study (SAS Institute, 1985; SPSS, 1985). These included computation of descriptive statistics for all demographic, independent and dependent variables. In addition, selected descriptive statistics were computed for sub-samples used in various analyses examining the factor structure, validity and reliability characteristics of the OSCI, and the primary and supplemental research questions. A series of oblique and orthogonal factor analyses
extracting from one to 10 factors was completed to examine the empirical structure of the OSCI and to refine/realign the initial, OSCI 95-item pool used in data collection with empirically derived dimensions. Subsequently, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients were computed for each revised OSCI subscale for the total sample of administrators (OSCI-A) and the total sample of professional staff (OSCI-S). School means were used for the OSCI-A reliability analyses in schools in which more than one administrator responded. Teachers were used as the units of analysis for the total sample OSCI-S reliability estimates. Additionally, Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the six OSCI-S subscales were computed within each sample school using individual teachers as the units of analysis.

Test-retest reliability (stability) coefficients (Pearson product-moment correlations) were also computed for the separate sample of 60 teachers for each of the six OSCI subscales.

To examine primary research and supplemental research questions, a series of bivariate and multivariate correlations was computed between the various independent (OSCI-S subscales) and the effectiveness/dependent variables (IPOE, CAT and ADA). These analyses included: 1) simple Pearson product-moment correlations among the independent variables and the various dependent variables; 2) a series of stepwise regression analyses with forward inclusion procedures regressing each of the dependent variables on mean and standard deviation scores for subscales of the OSCI-S; 3) similar, supplemental regression analyses using the OSCI-S subscales and SES and School Size as a set of independent variables; 4) canonical correlation analyses using the OSCI-S variables as one variable set and the three effectiveness indices (IPOE, CAT and ADA) as a second
variable set; and 5) a series of partial correlations examining relationships between the
OSCI-S subscales and the dependent variables (IPOE, CAT and ADA) while statistically
controlling for SES and School Size.

It should be recognized here, that the sample sizes for the various research and
supplemental analyses varied from one analysis to the next because all dependent variable
data were not available for all schools in the school sample. For example, CAT scores were
not available for secondary schools with only grades 10 through 12 because the CAT is not
administered at these grade levels. In addition, depending upon the particular analysis
completed, the unit of analysis changed (e.g., factor analyses used teachers as the units of
analysis and analyses examining the relationships among the independent and dependent
variables typically used school means as the units of analysis). Furthermore, analyses
examining the relationships between the independent (OSCI-S subscales) and dependent
variables (IPOE, CAT and ADA) were completed for only those schools in which 40% or
more of the school population of teachers responded. Schools in which fewer than 40% of
teachers responded were eliminated from these analyses because of concerns about the
representativeness of school means.

Qualitative Analyses

Interview information collected with the semi-structured interview protocol and
discussions via telephone with the school principal and selected teachers in the outlier
schools was qualitatively analyzed. At issue were several data analysis concerns: (1) the
identification of thematic perspectives related to the explanation of quantitative results in
each school; (2) identifying educator perspectives that might assist in explaining within and
between school differences observed in the quantitative results; and (3) identifying
organizational factors, events, conditions and issues beyond those directly measured by the OSCI that might be useful in explaining quantitative results of the study and in further developing/explicating variables in the OS climate model used to conceptualize and organize variables explored in the total study.

An interpretive analysis procedure described by Erickson (1986) was utilized to develop and make sense of "common themes" emerging in the interview data. This interpretive analysis procedure was selected to guide qualitative analyses in this study because of its simplicity and applicability to the type of interview data generated, and because it complemented rather well the theory-building focus of this study. The Erickson (1986) analysis procedure emphasizes the inductive construction of theory-based contextual assertions through the iterative analysis of qualitative interview data. The qualitative assertions generated in this study were then used as the basis for the construction of a few tenable propositions or research hypotheses to further inform O/S model refinement efforts.

Principal and teacher interview data from each school were analyzed for the presence of important thematic elements and noteworthy organizational and interactive structures, events, conditions, etc. that were emphasized by interviewees as important contextual characteristics of individual schools. These data comprised the primary interactive data from which initial Level One assertions were generated. These Level One assertions were included as summary profile proposition statements at the conclusion of each individual school O/S Climate Profile (Appendices F and G). These initial Level One assertions represented fairly specific information provided by the interviewees, and involved very little inferencing. The series of initial Level One assertions generated from the interpretive field data were then grouped into categories and further analyzed for possible emerging, common
themes. General summary statements exemplifying these common themes then formed the basis for higher, **Level Two** assertions. Finally, these higher Level Two assertions resulted in the emergence of a few theory-based, **Level Three** assertions from the entire data set. Level Two and Level Three assertions derived through this inductive analysis procedure are presented in the concluding section of the Qualitative Results (Supplemental Question 9) in Chapter Five.

Various quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures are specified in greater detail as appropriate in Chapter Five which includes the results of the study.

**Summary**

Chapter Four presents a description of the methodology and procedures used in the study. The chapter begins with a discussion of the research design and identification of study variables and sample(s). Information is then provided regarding the development, structure and psychometric properties of the survey measures used and the various effectiveness indices. A description of both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures is also included.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of the study. The results are presented in the following sections: 1) descriptive statistics for the sample, 2) factor analyses for the OSCI-S, 3) descriptive statistics for the independent and dependent variables, 4) reliability analyses, 5) intercorrelations of the OSCI-S subscales, 6) analyses pertinent to the research questions, 7) analyses of supplemental research questions, and 8) additional analyses. Independent variables are the six dimensions/subscales of the factor analyzed OSCI-S: 1) Organizational Structure, 2) Professional Autonomy, 3) Collaborative Sharing/Rapport, 4) District Supervisory Climate, 5) Self Reflection, and 6) Centralization. The dependent variables are the three selected measures of school effectiveness: 1) school productivity (standardized achievement test scores), 2) organizational effectiveness (IPOE), and school holding power (student average daily attendance).

Summaries of descriptive statistics for demographic variables, OSCI and IPOE items presented in this chapter can be cross-referenced for item content with the instrument packets administered to professional staff and administrators included in Appendix B.

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Sample Schools and Participants

School Sample

One hundred ninety-four schools comprising fourteen school districts in a southern state were invited to participate in the study. Usable data were received from 162 schools. Table 1 provides a profile of participating schools for the total sample of schools and by school level. Of the 162 participating schools, elementary schools (grades K-6) comprised 56.17 percent of the total sample, middle/junior high schools (grades 6-9), 23.46 percent,
Table 1
Profile of Sample of Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>El</th>
<th>M/Jr</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools Responding</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Sample</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56.17%</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>17.28%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff Surveyed</td>
<td>4848</td>
<td>2666</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Prof. Staff Surveys</td>
<td>3074</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Staff Return Rate</td>
<td>63.41%</td>
<td>64.33%</td>
<td>61.73%</td>
<td>65.13%</td>
<td>48.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Usable Prof. Staff Surveys (n=3074)</td>
<td>55.79%</td>
<td>20.88%</td>
<td>20.72%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Surveyed</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Admin. Surveys</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Return Rate</td>
<td>78.29%</td>
<td>86.58%</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td>71.64%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Usable Administrator Surveys (n=238)</td>
<td>54.20%</td>
<td>23.95%</td>
<td>20.17%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean School Professional Staff Size</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>27.37</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean School Administrator Size</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean School Student Size</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All = All Schools
  El = Elementary
  M/Jr = Middle/Junior High
  Sec = Secondary
  Comp = Comprehensive
secondary schools (grades 9-12), 17.28 percent, and comprehensive schools (grades K-12), 3.09 percent. There were a number of schools in the sample having some grade level variations and these schools were assigned to the most logical grade level category reflecting each school's overall level (e.g., several situations involved schools housing grades 6-8, 7-9, and 6-9, and these schools were all assigned to the middle/junior high school category). The percentage of schools within each grade level category (elementary, middle/junior high, secondary, and comprehensive) was reasonably comparable to the statewide distribution of schools during the school year this study was completed (1991-92): 57 percent elementary, 15 percent middle schools, 17 percent secondary schools and 11 percent comprehensive schools. These comparative percentages indicate reasonable representativeness of the study sample in terms of statewide school level distributions.

School Level Characteristics

Size

School size was measured by the total number of full-time professional staff employed at each school and by the total number of students enrolled at each school. A summary of school sizes for the total sample and by school levels is provided in Table 1 (p. 86, last three rows). The mean size using professional staff as the unit of analysis was 30 for the total sample of schools, 29.30 for elementary schools, 27.37 for middle/junior high schools, 34.93 for secondary schools, and 32.8 for comprehensive schools. Using students as the unit of analysis, the mean size for the total sample was 484, 476 for elementary schools, 451 for middle/junior high schools, 541 for secondary schools, and 569 for comprehensive schools.
Student Achievement

Student achievement was measured by normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores for core battery composite total scores on the California Achievement Test (CAT) (CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1987). Student achievement data were analyzed using schools as the units of analysis. Normal curve equivalent scores were selected for use in the analyses as their equal-interval scaling allowed for meaningful comparisons of different grade mean scores across schools (California Achievement Tests: Guide to Test Interpretation, 1991, p. 2). The core battery composite NCE score based on national norms for the CAT was used as the index of student achievement in all correlational and regression analyses. Composite school mean scores were computed by averaging core battery composite scores for multiple grade levels within schools.

The CAT is administered each spring in Louisiana public schools in grades four, six and nine. Spring, 1992 CAT results for participating schools in the study were obtained from the Bureau of Student Accountability, Louisiana Stated Department of Education (LDOE) in June, 1992. Table 2 presents a summary of means and standard deviations for the CAT for the total sample and by school level. The mean California Achievement Test NCE score for the total sample of schools (n=115) was 50.31. The NCE scores ranged from a low of 33.69 to a high of 73.00.

Average Daily Attendance

The percentage of average daily attendance (ADA) for each school was computed over all reporting periods for the 1991-92 school year. Table 2 presents a summary of means and standard deviations for all reporting periods for the total sample and by school level. The mean ADA for the total sample of schools (n=153) was 94.71%. The mean
Table 2

Summary of School Achievement, Attendance and Socioeconomic Characteristics for the Total School Sample and by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>El</td>
<td>M/Jr</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>51.76</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>49.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>94.71</td>
<td>95.48</td>
<td>94.61</td>
<td>92.32</td>
<td>93.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>60.81</td>
<td>65.69</td>
<td>56.89</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>51.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a CAT = Total battery normal curve equivalent score for Spring, 1992 California Achievement Test

*b ADA = Student average daily attendance for all reporting periods for the 1991-92 school year

*c SES = School socioeconomic status based upon the percentage of students receiving free or reduced cost lunches
ADA for elementary schools for the year was 95.48%, 94.61% for middle/junior high schools, 92.32 for secondary schools, and 93.71 for comprehensive schools.

**Socioeconomic Status**

The socioeconomic status (SES) for each school was measured by the percentage of students at each school receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches. Table 2 provides a summary of means and standard deviations for the total sample and by school level. The higher the SES score, the greater the number of students in the school receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches. The mean SES for the total sample of schools (n=140) was 60.81%, and the range was from 1.00% to 99.48%. The mean SES by individual school level was: elementary schools, 65.69%, middle/junior high schools, 56.89%, secondary schools, 50.13%, and comprehensive schools, 51.35%.

**Survey Return Rates**

Table 1 provides a profile of the sample of participating schools. A total of 4848 professional staff and 320 administrators were surveyed. In all, 3,312 usable instruments were returned. Of these total usable returns, 3,074 were usable OSCI-S (professional staff) instrument sets; 238 were usable OSCI-A (administrator) instrument sets. The professional staff return rate for the total sample was 61.35 percent. The professional staff return rate for elementary schools was 64.70 percent, for middle/junior high schools 61.73 percent, for secondary schools, 65.13 percent, and for comprehensive schools, 48.78 percent. In the sample (n=162) of participating schools 40 percent or more of professional staff responded in 82.1 percent of the schools (n=133). The administrator return rate for the total sample was 72.37 percent. The administrator return rate for elementary schools was 74.50 percent,
for middle/junior high schools, 73.08 percent, for secondary schools, 71.64 percent, and for comprehensive schools, 40.00 percent.

**Characteristics of Nonresponding Schools**

Of the original 194 schools whose cooperation were solicited, 162 schools chose to participate in the study. The 32 schools that chose not to participate in the study were all from one school district. The distribution of elementary, middle/junior high, secondary schools and comprehensive schools in the nonresponding sample was roughly equivalent to those schools that did respond. 43.75 percent of the nonresponding schools were elementary schools, 37.5 percent were middle/junior high schools, 18.75 percent were secondary schools, and 0 percent were comprehensive schools. Of those schools participating in the study, 56.17 percent were elementary schools, 23.46 percent were middle/junior high schools, 17.28 percent were secondary schools, and 3.09 percent were comprehensive schools.

School means were computed for the characteristics of school size, SES, and school achievement for the nonresponding sample. The mean school size (using students as the index) for nonresponding schools was 640, compared to 484 for responding schools. The mean SES for the nonresponding schools was 34.88 percent, compared to 60.81 percent for the responding schools. The mean NCE score for school achievement was 53.49 percent for the nonresponding schools, compared to 50.31 percent for the responding schools. The relatively large differences in school sizes and SES levels between responding and nonresponding school groups are due to the fact that the nonresponding schools were all situated in a large and comparatively wealthy school district in the state. The student
achievement mean NCE score for the nonresponding group was slightly higher than that of the responding group.

**Participant Sample**

**Participant Characteristics**

Participants surveyed in the study included all certificated professional staff (i.e., classroom teachers, federal and special education program teachers, guidance counselors, librarians, speech therapists, etc.) in each participating school, and all building-level administrators (principal and assistants).

**Professional Staff**

Tables 3 and 4 present summaries of personal and professional characteristics of the professional staff sample. The typical respondent in this sample was a white, tenured elementary level classroom teacher. Male professional staff comprised 15.97 percent of the total sample. Minorities constituted 26.5 percent of the sample, with blacks being the predominant minority group (25.4%). Of the total number of professional staff respondents, 69.11 percent were classroom teachers, 12.36 percent were special education teachers, 4.62 percent were federal program teachers, 2.72 percent were speech therapists, 2.81 percent were guidance counselors, 3.10 percent were librarians, and 5.29 percent reported other school professional work activity. Professional staff having six or more years of experience in their present school comprised 51.1% of the total sample. The largest percentage of teachers (40.07%) in the professional staff sample reported general elementary as their subject area specialty, with the lowest percentage of teachers (1.89%) indicating foreign language as their subject area.
Table 3

Summary of Demographics of Personal Characteristics of Professional Staff for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>15.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>84.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2124</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 70</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of Total Group Responding to Item
Table 4

Summary of Demographics of Professional Characteristics of Professional Staff for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in Present School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 25</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years' Experience as Professional Educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>51.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>24.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters/+30</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>69.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Program Teacher</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level(s) Presently Teaching/Professionally Involved With</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 3</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>37.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>27.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>18.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>17.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area Specialty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Elementary</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>40.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of Total Group Responding to Item
Administrators

Tables 5 and 6 contain summaries of personal and professional characteristics of the administrator sample. The typical administrator in the sample was a white, male administrator with a masters degree plus thirty additional graduate hours. In terms of ethnicity, 72.7 percent of the administrators in the sample were white, while the remaining 27.3 percent were black. Unlike the professional staff sample, there were no other minority groups represented in the administrator sample.

As shown in Table 6, 78.7 percent of administrators had four or more years total experience as an administrator, with 46.9 percent having six or more years experience in their present school. A majority of the administrators (73.30%) reported that they had been classroom teachers prior to becoming administrators. In the sample, the largest percentage (33.81%) of administrators had taught at the middle/junior high level (grades 7-9), 26.08 percent had taught at the senior high level (grades 10-12), while 40.11 percent had taught at the elementary level (K-6 grade) prior to becoming an administrator. Administrator subject area specialties in prior teaching/professional experience obtained percentages roughly comparable to those of professional staff, with percentage differences noted for the subject area categories of Physical Education (Administrators - 15.86%, Professional Staff - 5.65%) and Social Sciences (Administrators - 16.51%, Professional Staff - 6.31%).

Table 2 (p. 124) summarizes school achievement, attendance and socioeconomic characteristics (sample sizes, means\(^2\) and standard deviations) for the total sample of schools and by each school level. For the total sample of schools, the mean NCE California Achievement Test score was 50.31. CAT scores for the total sample ranged from a low of

\(^2\) M is used in tables throughout this study to refer to the arithmetic mean.
Table 5
Summary of Demographics of Personal Characteristics of Administrators for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 70</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of Total Group Responding to Item
Table 6

Summary of Demographics of Professional Characteristics of Administrators for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years as Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Present School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years' Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters/+30</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Activity Prior to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>73.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Program Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Years' Experience in Prior Work Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 25</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level(s) Taught/Professionally Involved With Prior To Becoming Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>23.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>33.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area Specialty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Elementary</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of Total Group Responding to Item
38.38 to a high of 73.00. The mean percentage of student average daily attendance (ADA) for the total sample of schools was 94.71%. The minimum ADA was 77.46%, and the maximum ADA was 99.48%. The mean SES index (percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches) for the total sample of schools was 60.81%. The minimum SES was 1.00%, and the maximum SES was 99.40%. In comparing CAT mean NCE scores by school level, the results in Table 2 show a somewhat lower mean score for the sample of secondary schools than for other school levels. A similar trend is evident for mean percentage ADA by school level. For the school mean SES by level, the highest percentage of free and/or reduced cost lunches was for the elementary school sample.

Factor Analyses

In an attempt to verify the original conceptual dimensions/subscales of the OSCI-S and to statistically explore the factor structure of the instrument, OSCI-S data were submitted to a variety of exploratory factor analyses. Inspection of the OSCI dataset revealed only a small amount of missing data across respondents (less than 1%). Therefore, item grand means were substituted for missing item scores for individual respondents to maximize the number of usable cases for the various factor analyses completed. Following this substitution procedure, exploratory factor analyses were conducted, extracting from one to twelve factors using oblique and orthogonal rotation procedures (SAS Institute, 1985). Based on the simplicity of the factor structure, the conceptual fit of items comprising each factor, and the amount of variance explained by each solution, a six-factor solution was retained for use in subsequent analyses. The six-factor solution was further suggested as the seven-factor solution did not generate an additional clearly identifiable factor.
Table 7 summarizes item/factor loadings for a one-factor and a six-factor solution of the OSCI-S data and includes the amount of variance in the solution explained by each factor extracted. The factor loadings are factor structure coefficients and, since the solution is orthogonal, can be interpreted as Pearson product-moment correlations. The higher an individual loading, the stronger the relationship between a particular OSCI-S item and an OSCI-S factor.

For the one-factor solution, 87 of the 95 items loaded on a single OSCI-S factor. Factor loading coefficients ranged from .30 to .75, with 60 of the 95 items (63.16%) loading at or exceeding .50. This one-factor solution accounted for 31.17% of the total OSCI-S variance. The factor loadings for each OSCI-S item for the six-factor solution are also presented in Table 7. Varimax rotation procedures were used to identify a set of orthogonal factors in the solution. Item loadings for the various factors identified were guided by the following set of decision rules: 1) the minimum value for retaining an item on a factor was .30; 2) an item was retained only if it loaded primarily on one factor; 3) an item was retained on the factor on which its loading was greatest; and 4) if an item loaded on more than one factor, the item was retained only on a factor if the difference between the two highest loadings was .20 or greater. Application of these decision rules resulted in the retention of 58 OSCI-S items to operationalize the six factors as shown in Table 7.

The first factor (Organizational Structure) consisted of 26 items and accounted for 16.99 percent of the variance in the solution. The second factor (Professional Autonomy) accounted for 9.64 percent of the variance and consisted of 9 items. The third factor (Collaborative Sharing/Rapport), consisting of 8 items, accounted for 7.21 percent of the variance. Factor four (District Supervisory Climate) explained 5.81 percent of the variance.
### Table 7

Summary of Factor Pattern Loadings* for the OSCI-S One-Factor and Six-Factor Solutions (n=2974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Item</th>
<th>1-Factor Solution</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Item</th>
<th>1-Factor Solution</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Item</th>
<th>1-Factor Solution</th>
<th>6-Factor Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Item</th>
<th>1-Factor Solution</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Explained 16.99 9.64 7.21 5.81 3.23 2.80
Total Variance Explained 31.17 45.68

* factor structure coefficients in this table are Pearson coefficients
in the solution and consisted of 7 items. Self Reflection (factor five) consisted of 4 items and accounted for 3.23 percent of the variance in the solution. Finally, the sixth factor (Centralization), was comprised of 4 items and accounted for 2.80 percent of the variance in the solution.

The six-factor solution accounted for 45.68 percent of the total OSCI-S variance. A total of 58 items with factor structure loadings ranging from .40 to .77 were retained in the revised version of the OSCI-S. This six-factor revised version of the OSCI-S was used in subsequent analyses to examine the research questions. An item location index for the six-factor solution of the OSCI-S which shows item numbers comprising each subscale is provided in Table 8.

Descriptive Statistics for Instruments

OSCI Descriptive Statistics

OSCI-S

Item descriptive statistics for the original 95-item OSCI-S were computed for the total sample of schools (n=133). Results reported in tables for descriptive statistics are for those schools in which 40 percent or more of professional staff responded. These schools were used in analyses pertinent to the research questions of the study. The sample sizes for the three school levels (elementary, middle/junior high, and secondary) shown in various tables do not sum to the total sample of schools because the total sample includes comprehensive (K-12) schools as well. Table C-1 (Appendix C) presents means and standard deviations for each OSCI-S item. Item numbers in Table C-1 can be cross-referenced with item numbers in Appendix D to examine OSCI-S item content. For the OSCI-S, the higher the item mean the more positive respondents' perceptions of the
Table 8

Item Location Index for the Six-Factor Solution of the OSCI-S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Organizational Structure (26)*</td>
<td>2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 37, 38, 39, 41, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>51, 59, 68, 71, 72, 75, 77, 84, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>42, 60, 62, 67, 79, 80, 83, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>5, 8, 9, 21, 34, 35, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>16, 43, 65, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Centralization (4)</td>
<td>27, 40, 73, 88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of items per factor
organizational/supervisory climate of the school. The item means ranged from 2.08 (item 62, "My weekly schedule includes observations of the classroom/professional activities of other staff members") to 3.26 (item 84, "I can request that my administrator(s) visit my class"). There were only six items with item means at or below the midpoint (2.50). However, only 33 items (34.7%) were at or exceeded a mean of 3.0. The standard deviations for the items ranged from .94 (item 85, "I have adequate time in my weekly work schedule to plan instructional activities") to .51 (item 75, "My ideas and suggestions about supervising instruction are respected by other professionals"). The 58 items retained in the six-factor solution of the OSCI-S are identified with asterisks in Table C-1.

Tables 9 and 10 present summaries of descriptive statistics for each subscale of the revised 58-item OSCI-S for all schools and by school level. The tables include means and standard deviations for each OSCI-S subscale, and also provide maximum possible scores and mean scores expressed as a percentage of the maximum possible score for each OSCI-S subscale. For the total sample of schools (n=133), percentages of maximum possible scores for subscales ranged from 58.5% (Collaborative Sharing/Rapport) to 75.69% (Self Reflection).

**OSCI-A**

Item descriptive statistics for the 95-item OSCI-A were computed for the total sample of schools (n=133). Table C-2 (Appendix C) presents means and standard deviations for each OSCI-A item. The item means ranged from 2.37 (items 38, "the administrator(s) solicit(s) staff input concerning instructional goals"); and 91, "I can freely discuss my own instructional concerns/problems with the administrator(s)") to 3.79 (item 92, "I agree with district office instructional goals and/or priorities"). Only two item means were below the
Table 9

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Each Subscale of the Six-Factor Solution of the OSCI-S for the Total Sample of Schools (n=133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Max Possible Score</th>
<th>M%Max^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (26)^b</td>
<td>28-104</td>
<td>74.67</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>71.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>16-36</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>3-32</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>6-28</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization (4)</td>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a M% Max = Subscale M score/Max possible score
^b Number of items on subscale
Table 10
Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Each Subscale of the Six-Factor Solution of the OSCI-S by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>El M</th>
<th>M/Jr M</th>
<th>Sec M</th>
<th>El S.D.</th>
<th>M/Jr S.D.</th>
<th>Sec S.D.</th>
<th>Max Possible Score</th>
<th>El M% Max</th>
<th>M/Jr M% Max</th>
<th>Sec M% Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (26)</td>
<td>76.21</td>
<td>75.44</td>
<td>70.19</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>73.28</td>
<td>72.54</td>
<td>67.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>75.64</td>
<td>73.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58.84</td>
<td>58.44</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.43</td>
<td>67.21</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.63</td>
<td>75.06</td>
<td>73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization (4)</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.75</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>67.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  M% Max = Subscale M Score/Max Possible Score
b  Number of items on subscale
n = 79 El
n = 27 M/Jr
n = 21 Sec
scale midpoint (2.5). However, 60 item means (63.2%) were at or exceeded 3.00. The standard deviations for the items ranged from a low of .38 (item 72, "I am encouraged by the administrator(s) to assess my own classroom classroom teaching/professional activities") to a high of .91 (item 81, "I clearly understand the school's overall instructional goals"). Tables 11 and 12 present summaries of descriptive statistics for each subscale of the OSCI-A for all schools and by school level. The tables include means and standard deviations for each OSCI-A subscale, and also provide maximum possible scores and mean scores expressed as a percentage of the maximum possible score for each OSCI-A subscale. For the total sample of schools (n=133), percentages of maximum possible scores for subscales ranged from 66.25% (Collaborative Sharing/Rapport) to 79.29% (Organizational Structure).

**IPOE Descriptive Statistics**

**IPOE-S**

A summary of descriptive statistics for each IPOE item and the total instrument for professional staff for the total sample of schools and by school level is presented in Table 13. A high score on the 8-item IPOE denotes a high degree of organizational effectiveness as perceived by professional staff or administrator respondents. The score range for the IPOE is 8 to 40. Item means for the IPOE-S for the total school sample varied from 3.25 to 4.04. The IPOE-S total score for all schools was 29.56 (73.90 %Max). The percentage of the maximum possible scores by school level were: elementary schools, 75.50; middle/junior high schools, 74.50; secondary, 69.75.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Max Possible Score</th>
<th>M% Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (26)c</td>
<td>61.00-103.00</td>
<td>82.46</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>79.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>21.00-35.50</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>12.00-30.50</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>8.00-26.50</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>6.00-16.00</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization (4)</td>
<td>7.00-16.00</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Subscale descriptive statistics are based upon the final structure of the OSCI-S six-factor solution.

b M% Max = Subscale M score/Max possible score

c Number of items on subscale
Table 12

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Each Subscale of the OSCI-A by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>El (n=78)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=29)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sec (n=21)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Max Possible Score</th>
<th>M% Max</th>
<th>El M/Jr</th>
<th>Sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (26)°</td>
<td>83.62</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.61</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>77.51</td>
<td>77.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78.58</td>
<td>77.22</td>
<td>75.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67.13</td>
<td>63.97</td>
<td>66.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.71</td>
<td>71.21</td>
<td>69.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>68.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization (4)</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.56</td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td>67.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscale descriptive statistics are based upon the final structure of the OSCI-S six-factor solution.

M% Max = Subscale M Score/Max Possible Score

Number of items on subscale
Table 13

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Each Item and Total Instrument for the IPOE-S for All Schools and by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All (n=133)</th>
<th>El (n=79)</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=27)</th>
<th>Sec (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>27.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %MAX</td>
<td>73.90</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>74.50</td>
<td>69.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Total IPOE score expressed as a percentage of maximum possible score
IPOE-A

Table 14 includes a summary of descriptive statistics for each IPOE item and the total instrument for school administrators for the total sample and by each school level. Item means for the IPOE-A for the total school sample varied from 3.29 to 4.10. The IPOE-A total score for all schools was 29.51; the total IPOE-A score expressed as a percentage of the maximum possible total IPOE score was 73.78%. The percentage of the maximum possible scores by school level were: elementary schools, 74.25%; middle/junior high schools, 74.38%; secondary, 71.93%.

Reliability Analyses

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients were computed for subscales of the OSCI and the IPOE total instrument for professional staff and administrators. Alpha coefficients were computed for total samples and for samples of professional staff within each school as well. In addition, test-retest (stability) coefficients were computed for a separate sample of 60 professional staff over a two- to three-week period. The sections that follow describe the results of these reliability analyses.

OSCI Reliability Analyses

OSCI-S

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients were computed for each of the six OSCI-S subscales for the total school sample using school means as the units of analysis. In addition, Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the six OSCI-S subscales were computed for each school in the sample using teachers as the units of analysis. For the total sample of schools (n=133), reliability coefficients for the OSCI-S subscales were as follows: Organizational Structure (r=.96), Professional Autonomy (r=.75), Collaborative
Table 14
Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Each Item and Total Instrument for the IPOE-A for All Schools and by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All (n=216)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>El (n=111)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=55)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sec (n=46)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%MAX</td>
<td>73.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total IPOE score expressed as a percentage of maximum possible score
Sharing/Rapport ($r=.81$), District Supervisory Climate ($r=.85$), Self Reflection ($r=.81$), and Centralization ($r=.63$). The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for the six subscales for all schools ranged from .63 (Centralization) to .96 (Organizational Structure). Table 15 presents a summary of the distribution of schools within Cronbach Alpha coefficient ranges for each OSCI-S subscale for the total school sample (n=133).

Stability coefficients (test-retest reliability) were computed between two complete OSCI-S instrument sets involving 60 professional staff respondents during Time 1 and Time 2 administrations (the second administration followed approximately two weeks after the first). Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between scores for each OSCI subscale from the first administration and the second administration. The stability coefficients for the OSCI-S subscales were as follows: Organizational Structure ($r=.95$); Professional Autonomy ($r=.87$); Collaborative Sharing/Rapport ($r=.97$); District Supervisory Climate ($r=.88$); Self Reflection ($r=.88$); and Centralization ($r=.75$). All of these reliability coefficients were statistically significant ($p<.0001$) and positive in direction.

**OSCI-A**

For the total sample of administrator respondents, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each of the OSCI-A subscales. In schools where more than one administrator responded to the OSCI-A, school means were used as the units of analysis. The sample size for the alpha reliabilities was n=155. Alpha coefficients for the OSCI-A subscales were as follows: OS ($r=.94$), PA ($r=.72$), CSR ($r=.74$), DSC ($r=.87$), SR ($r=.79$), CEN ($r=.69$).
Table 15

Summary of Number of Schools Distributed Within Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient Ranges for OSCI-S Subscales
(n = 133 schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alpha Range</th>
<th>Organizational Structure (26)*</th>
<th>Professional Autonomy (9)</th>
<th>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</th>
<th>District Supervisory Climate (7)</th>
<th>Self Reflection (4)</th>
<th>Centralization (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.90 - 1.00</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80 - .89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 - .79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60 - .69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 - .59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40 - .49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 - .39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20 - .29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 - .19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of items per subscale
IPOE Reliability Analyses

IPOE-S

Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach Alpha) coefficients were computed for the IPOE-S for the total sample of professional staff and for samples of professional staff within each school. The alpha reliability for the total professional staff sample was \( r = .90 \) (n=2479). The distribution of the percentage of IPOE alpha coefficients within various coefficient ranges was as follows: .99 - .90 (31.31%); .89 - .80 (49.49%); .79 - .70 (15.15%); .69 - .60 (.01%); .59 - .50 (.02%); .49 - .40 (0%); .39 - .30 (0%); .29 - .20 (0%); .19 - .10 (1.01%).

Using the same professional staff sample described above for the OSCI-S (n=60), a stability (test-retest reliability) coefficient was computed for the IPOE-S. This coefficient was .97 (p<.0001).

IPOE-A

The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the IPOE total instrument score for administrator respondents was \( r = .85 \). The sample size for this analysis was n=185, because school means were used as the units of analysis for schools in which more than one administrator responded to the IPOE-A.

Intercorrelations of OSCI-S Subscales

Table 16 presents a summary of the intercorrelations among the six OSCI-S subscales for the total sample of schools (n=133). Pearson product-moment correlations among the subscales ranged from .02 to .75. The OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Organization Structure (OS) positively and strongly correlated with both the Professional Autonomy (PA) (.75) and the Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) (.71) subscales/dimensions. The correlations between the subscale of Organizational Structure (OS) and the
Table 16

Summary of Intercorrelations Among OSCI-S Subscales for the Total Sample of Schools (n=133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05
subscales of District Supervisory Climate (DSC) (.55, p<.0001) and Self Reflection (SR) (.41, p<.0001) were positive in direction and moderate in magnitude. Positive and moderately strong correlations were found between the subscale/dimensions of Professional Autonomy (PA) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) (.51, p<.0001), District Supervisory Climate (DSC) (.42, p<.0001), and Self Reflection (SR) (.41, p<.0001). Additionally, positive and moderately strong correlations are shown in Table 16 for the subscales/dimensions of Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) and District Supervisory Climate (DSC) (.54, p<.0001), and Collaborative Rapport/Sharing and Self Reflection (SR) (.37, p<.0001). A positive, somewhat moderate relationship is also shown between District Supervisory Climate (DSC) and Centralization (.40, p<.0001). Somewhat weaker relationships were evident for District Supervisory Climate and Self Reflection (.22, p<.0001), and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport and Centralization (.21, p<.0001).

Table 17 presents a summary of intercorrelations among the six OSCI-S subscales by school level (elementary, middle/junior high, and secondary). For the table, a total of 26 of 45 correlations (58%) were statistically significant (p<.05) and positive in direction. For elementary schools, correlations ranged from .81 (PA/OS) to -.07 (CEN/OS). For middle/junior high schools correlations ranged from .68 (DSC/CSR) to .09 (SR/CSR). For secondary schools, correlations ranged from .76 (CSR/OS) to .13 (SR/OS).

Table 18 contains a summary of the intercorrelations among the OSCI-A subscales for the total sample of schools. With only two exceptions (DSC/CEN, r=.17; SR/CEN, r=.24) all correlations in the table exceeded the .01 level of statistical significance. All significant correlations were positive in direction and ranged in magnitude from .62 (OS/PA, p<.0001) to .24 (SR/CEN, p<.006).
Table 17

Summary of Intercorrelations Among OSCI-S Subscales by School Level (Elementary (n=79), Middle/Junior High (n=27), and Secondary (n=21))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Organizational Structure (OS)</th>
<th>Professional Autonomy (PA)</th>
<th>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR)</th>
<th>District Supervisory Climate (DSC)</th>
<th>Self Reflection (SR)</th>
<th>Centralization (CEN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El</td>
<td>M/Jr</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>El</td>
<td>M/Jr</td>
<td>Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > .05
### Table 18
Summary of Intercorrelations Among OSCI-A Subscales for the Total Sample of Schools (n=131)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05
Table 19 shows a summary of intercorrelations among OSCI-A subscales by school level. Fifty-three percent of the correlations (24 of 45) were statistically significant (p<.05). The correlations ranges from .70 (OS/PA, elementary schools) to -.13 (DSC/CEN, secondary schools). Ten of fifteen correlations for the middle/junior high and secondary school samples were not statistically significant (p>.05). For the elementary school sample, 14 of 15 correlations were statistically significant (p<.05), given the relatively large sample size (n=78).

Analyses Pertinent to Research Questions

Six primary research questions and eight supplemental research questions were formulated to guide the analyses in this study. The first four research questions focused on the exploration of quantitative relationships among the various organizational/supervisory climate dimensions, as identified in the refined OSCI, and the school outcome measures of student achievement, student attendance and perceived overall school effectiveness. The fifth research question was addressed through inspection and comparison of descriptive statistical results for independent, dependent and demographic variables for a subsample of contrasting schools. The sixth question was addressed through analysis of qualitative data derived from semi-structured interviews with the principal and selected teachers in each of eight outlier schools. Analyses results for each primary research question are presented below.
Table 19

Summary of Intercorrelations Among OSCI-A Subscales by School Level (Elementary (n=78), Middle/Junior High (n=29), and Secondary (n=21))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Organizational Structure (OS)</th>
<th>Professional Autonomy (PA)</th>
<th>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR)</th>
<th>District Supervisory Climate (DSC)</th>
<th>Self Reflection (SR)</th>
<th>Centralization (CEN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El</td>
<td>M/Jr</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>El</td>
<td>M/Jr</td>
<td>Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > .05
Primary Analyses

Analysis of Research Question 1: Are there bivariate relationships between the various O/S climate dimensions and the various school effectiveness indices?

The first research question was explored by computing Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between subscales of the six-factor solution of the OSCI-S, scores on the IPOE-S, standardized student achievement scores, and average daily attendance (ADA). Table 20 shows intercorrelations between scores on the OSCI-S subscales and the IPOE-S for the total school sample and by school level. These correlations ranged from .82 (OS/IPOE, secondary schools) to -.06 (DSC/IPOE, middle/junior high schools). The OS/IPOE and PA/IPOE correlations showed greater significance than the other OSCI/IPOE relationships. For the secondary school sample, five of six OSCI-S subscales/IPOE-S correlations were statistically significant (p<.05), positive in direction, and rather strong in magnitude.

Table 21 provides a summary of the intercorrelations between OSCI-S subscale scores and mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) standardized achievement test scores for all schools and by school level. Correlations between student achievement for all schools and the OSCI-S subscales of Organizational Structure (r = .20, p<.05) and Professional Autonomy (r = .29, p<.004) were statistically significant but rather moderate in magnitude. Additionally, the correlation between student achievement for elementary schools and the OSCI-S subscale of Professional Autonomy was also positive, statistically significant and moderate in magnitude (r = .35, p<.005). The sample of secondary schools in this analysis is rather small because the California Achievement Test was only administered in the
Table 20

Summary of Intercorrelations Between Scores on the OSCI-S Subscales and the IPOE-S for All Schools and by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S</th>
<th>All (n=133)</th>
<th>El (n=79)</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=27)</th>
<th>Sec (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (26)</td>
<td>.73****</td>
<td>.73****</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.82****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>.61****</td>
<td>.69****</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>.37****</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization (4)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Number of items per subscale

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
**** p<.0001
Table 21
Summary of Intercorrelations Between Scores on the OSCI-S Subscales and Student Achievement Scores for All Schools and by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S</th>
<th>All (n=98)</th>
<th>EL (n=61)</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=22)</th>
<th>Sec (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (26)*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization (4)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of items per subscale

* p<.05

** p<.01
schools in this study in grades four, six and nine, and no data are available for grades ten through twelve.

Intercorrelations between the OSCI-S subscales and average daily attendance for all schools and by school level are shown in Table 22. For the table total, only 4 of 24 correlations were statistically significant (p<.05). For the total school sample, Self Reflection (SR) was positively, though rather moderately associated with ADA (r = .19, p<.05). For the elementary school sample, only one significant correlation was found between the Collaborative Sharing/Rapport OSCI-S subscale and ADA (r = .22, p<.05). This same subscale, however, was rather strongly but negatively correlated with ADA for the sample of middle/junior high schools (r = -.60, p<.01). For this school level, a moderately strong, negative correlation is also shown in Table 22 for Organizational Structure and ADA (r = -.48, p<.05).

Analysis of Research Sub-Question 1a. If question one is affirmed, are these relationships statistically independent of school socioeconomic status?

To answer this research question, a series of partial correlation coefficients were computed between subscales of the OSCI-S and the IPOE-S controlling for socioeconomic status (SES) using the total sample of schools. Table 23 shows Pearson and partial correlation coefficients between the OSCI-S subscales and the IPOE-S. Statistically controlling for the effects of SES did little to alter the primary relationship between the OSCI-S and the IPOE-S variables. Three of these correlations slightly increased in magnitude while the other three remained essentially unchanged.

A similar partial correlation analysis was completed for the relationships between the OSCI-S subscales and the school effectiveness indices of achievement and ADA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S</th>
<th>All (n=123)</th>
<th>El (n=77)</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=23)</th>
<th>Sec (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (26)*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Autonomy (9)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (8)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.60**</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Supervisory Climate (7)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reflection (4)</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization (4)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of items per subscale

* p<.05
** p<.01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (n=133)</th>
<th>Partial* Correlation (n=115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Partial correlations computed by statistically controlling for percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches

* p>.05
Results of these analyses are shown in Table 24. As can be seen in the table, statistically controlling for SES with the partial correlation procedure did little to alter the primary relationships (Pearson correlations) between the OSCI-S subscales and these effectiveness variables.

Analysis of Research Question 2: Are there multivariate relationships among the set of O/S climate dimensions (independent variables) and the various school effectiveness measures (dependent variables)?

Sub-Question 2a: Which dimensions and what combination of OSCI dimensions account for/explain the most variance in the various school effectiveness measures?

Sub-Question 2b: Is there a significant multivariate relationship between the set of school effectiveness variables and the set of OSCI variables when analyzed collectively?

Analysis of Research Sub-Question 2a. Which dimensions and what combination of OSCI dimensions account for/explain the most variance in the various school effectiveness measures?

To address this research question, a series of stepwise multiple regression analyses with forward inclusion of variables (SAS Institute, 1985) were completed for each school effectiveness measure (dependent variables) by regressing each school effectiveness variable on each dimension/subscale of the OSCI-S. A total of three regression analyses were computed, one for each dependent variable. School means were used as the units of analysis in all regression procedures. Results of these regression analyses included in the tables that follow contain the multiple correlation, the squared multiple correlation, the change in the squared multiple correlation at each step in the analysis, and the F and p value for each significant variable in the regression equation.
Table 24
Summary of Pearson and Partial Correlation Coefficients Between Subscales of the OSCI-S, Standardized Achievement Test Scores and ADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>Achievement Pearson (n=98)</th>
<th>Partial* (n=89)</th>
<th>ADA Pearson (n=98)</th>
<th>Partial (n=110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Partial correlations computed by statistically controlling for the percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches

* p<.05
** p<.01
School Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE): A first multiple regression analysis was completed for the independent variable set (OSCI dimensions) using the IPOE as the dependent variable. Results of this regression analysis are summarized in Table 25. The first variable to enter the regression equation (highest single correlate with the dependent variable) was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Organizational Structure (OS). This OSCI-S dimension accounted for 53.30 percent of the total variation among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness. The second variable to enter the regression equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR). In combination, these two variables accounted for 57.80 percent of the total variance among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness. The third variable to enter the regression equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension District Supervisory Climate (DSC). Collectively, these three variables accounted for 59.30 percent of the total variance among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness ($R=.77$). These results indicate that, of the six OSCI-S subscales/dimensions, Organizational Structure (OS), Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) and District Supervisory Climate (DSC) were the three most important variables explaining/accounting for variation in perceived organizational effectiveness across all schools. Additionally, the results indicate that the OSCI-S subscale Organizational Structure (OS) accounted for most of the total variance among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness.

Student Achievement: The second regression analysis completed for the set of independent variables (OSCI dimensions) used student achievement mean normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores for the California Achievement Test as the dependent variable for the total school sample. Results of this second regression analysis are presented in
Table 25
Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of the IPOE on Subscales of the OSCI-S (n=132 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>ΔR^2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td></td>
<td>148.70</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.0388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26. The first variable to enter the regression equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Professional Autonomy (PA). This OSCI-S dimension accounted for 8.20 percent of the total variation among schools in student achievement. The second variable to enter the regression equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR). In combination, these two variables accounted for 13.10 percent of the total variance among schools in student achievement. These results indicate that Professional Autonomy (PA) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) were the two most important OSCI-S variables accounting for variation in student achievement across all schools (R=.36).

ADA: A third multiple regression analysis was completed for the independent variable set (OSCI dimensions) using ADA as the dependent variable. The results of this third regression analysis are summarized in Table 27. The first variable to enter the regression equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Self Reflection (SR). This OSCI-S variable accounted for 3.60 percent of the total variation in ADA. The second OSCI-S subscale/dimension to enter the equation was Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR). Collectively, these two variables accounted for 7.10 percent of the total variation among schools in ADA (R=.27). The results of this regression analysis indicate that the dependent variable of student average daily attendance (ADA) shared more common variance with professional staff perceptions of Self Reflection (SR) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) than with the other OSCI-S dimensions of Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA), District Supervisory Climate (DSC), and Centralization (CEN).
Table 26
Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of CAT NCE Scores on Subscales of the OSCI-S (n=95 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27
Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of School ADA on Subscales of the OSCI-S (n=129 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>AR²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.0312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>.0019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Research Sub-Question 2b. Is there a significant multivariate relationship between the set of school effectiveness variables and the set of OSCI variables when analyzed collectively?

A canonical correlation analysis (SAS Institute, 1985) was completed to examine possible multivariate relationships between the independent and dependent variable sets. The independent variable set consisted of the six OSCI-S subscales: Organizational Structure, Professional Autonomy, Collaborative Sharing/Rapport, District Supervisory Climate, Self Reflection, and Centralization. The dependent variable set consisted of the three school effectiveness measures: student achievement, student attendance and perceived school organizational effectiveness.

The results of this analysis yielded one significant multivariate relationship between the two sets of variables ($r_c = .795, p < .0001$). Table 28 presents the results of the canonical variate analysis. The first column shows correlations of each variable with the canonical variate of the same variable set. These correlations show that the canonical variate for the OSCI-S subscales is most importantly defined by the subscales of Organizational Structure ($r = .919$) and Professional Autonomy ($r = .740$). Similarly, the IPOE is the main contributor to the canonical variate of the school effectiveness variable set ($r = .990$). The second column in Table 28 shows Pearson correlations of each variable with the canonical variable of the opposite variable set. These results show that the canonical correlation between the variable sets ($R_c = .795, p < .0001$) is primarily accounted for by the contributions of the OS and PA subscales of the OSCI-S ($r = .731, r = .588$) and the IPOE ($r = .787$).
Table 28

Summary of Canonical Variate Analysis Results for Subscales of the OSCI-S and the Set of School Effectiveness Variables (n=94 Schools; $R_c=.795$, $p<.0001$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>Within Variate Correlations$^a$</th>
<th>Between Variate Correlations$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Effectiveness Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Within Variate Correlations$^a$</th>
<th>Between Variate Correlations$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPOE</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Correlations are Pearson product-moment correlations between each variable and the canonical variate of the same variable set.

$^b$ Correlations are Pearson product-moment correlations between each variable and the canonical variate of the opposite variable set.
Analysis of Research Question 3: Does within-school variance on various O/S climate dimensions explain/account for significant amounts of variation among the school effectiveness indices?

A series of stepwise regression analyses were computed for the school effectiveness dependent variables (perceived organizational effectiveness, student achievement and student attendance) with the OSCI-S subscale standard deviations as the independent variable set. A separate regression analysis was completed for each of the three dependent variables.

**IPOE.** The first stepwise regression analysis completed for the set of OSCI-S independent variables used perceived organizational effectiveness as the dependent variable and OSCI-S subscale standard deviation scores as the independent variable set. This analysis generated a multiple correlation (R) of .38 (F=21.99, p<.0001). The variable entered at the first step in the analysis was the standard deviation for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale.

**Student Achievement.** The second regression analysis completed for the set of OSCI-S independent variables used student achievement as the dependent variable and OSCI-S subscale standard deviation scores as the independent variable set. The results of this second regression analysis yielded a multiple correlation (R) of .27 (F=7.34, p<.008). The variable entered at the first step was the standard deviation for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale.

**Student Attendance.** A third regression analysis was completed using student attendance as the dependent variable and OSCI-S subscale standard deviation scores as the independent variable set. Results of this analysis yielded a multiple correlation (R) of .26
The variable entered at the first step in this regression analysis was the standard deviation for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale.

**Analysis of Research Question 4:** What relationship exists between administrator and professional staff perceptions of O/S climate dimension levels among schools?

To answer this research question, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between the OSCI-A and the OSCI-S subscales for the total sample of schools and by school level. Table 29 summarizes intercorrelations among these subscales for the total school sample. For the table total, 13 of 36 correlations (36%) were statistically significant (p<.05). These correlations were all positive in direction with one exception (Professional Autonomy for administrators and Centralization for professional staff, r=-.19), and they ranged from .32 (District Supervisory Climate for administrators and District Supervisory Climate for professional staff) to .18 (Collaborative Sharing/Rapport for administrators and Organizational Structure for professional staff, and Centralization for administrators and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport for professional staff). Four of the six OSCI subscales were positively and significantly correlated (though of rather moderate magnitude). Exceptions were the OSCI subscales of SR and CEN. Interestingly, the CSR subscale for the OSCI-S was significantly and positively correlated with all six of the OSCI-A subscales (r=.29 to r=.18).

Table 30 presents similar results for the sample of elementary schools. Seven of 36 (19.4%) correlations were statistically significant (p<.05), and these ranged from .33 (Collaborative Sharing/Rapport for administrators and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport for professional staff) to -.28 (Professional Autonomy for administrators and Centralization for professional staff).
Table 29

Summary of Intercorrelations Between OSCI-S and OSCI-A Subscales for Total School Sample (n=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-A Subscales</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 30

Summary of Intercorrelations Between OSCI-S and OSCI-A Subscales for Elementary Schools (n=75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-A Subscales</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
For the sample of middle/junior high schools (n=25) only 4 of 36 OSCI-A/OSCI-S correlations were statistically significant (p<.05). These were as follows: Professional Autonomy for administrators/Professional Autonomy for professional staff (r=.39); Self Reflection for administrators/Centralization for professional staff (r=.47); Centralization for administrators/Collaborative Sharing/Rapport for professional staff (r=.39); and Centralization for administrators and District Supervisory Climate for professional staff (r=.39).

Table 31 summarizes intercorrelations between the OSCI-A and OSCI-S subscales for the sample of secondary schools (n=19). For the table total, 4 of 36 correlations were statistically significant (p<.05), though the magnitude of several correlations is worth noting given the rather small sample size. These correlations ranged from .57 (Organizational Structure for administrators/Professional Autonomy for professional staff) to .47 (District Supervisory Climate for administrators/District Supervisory Climate for professional staff). Three of the OSCI-A Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/OSCI-S subscale correlations exceeded .50 (Organizational Structure, Professional Autonomy, and District Supervisory Climate).

Analysis of Research Question 5: Are there schools with similar demographic characteristics (e.g., SES, grade level), but with differing relationships between effectiveness indices and O/S climate characteristics?

Table 32 presents summary profiles of independent, dependent and demographic variables and OS/IPOE-S intercorrelations for selected comparison schools from the total sample of schools having a 40 percent or higher professional staff response rate (n=133). A total school sample variable matrix consisting of independent variables (OSCI-S
### Table 31

Summary of Intercorrelations Between OSCI-S and OSCI-A Subscales for Secondary Schools (n=19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-A Subscales</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01
Table 32

Summary Profiles of Independent, Dependent and Demographic Variables and OS/IPOE-S Intercorrelations for Selected Comparison Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Schools</th>
<th>OS/IPOE-S*</th>
<th>OSb</th>
<th>IPOE-Sc</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>SESd</th>
<th>Size*</th>
<th>A/S ratiof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M%Max</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M%Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES Schools8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. high school (10-12)</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>63.92</td>
<td>61.46%</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>67.45%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. high school (10-12)</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>85.80</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>85.83%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>98.03</td>
<td>25.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. high school (9-12)</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>62.06</td>
<td>59.67%</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>60.33%</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>89.89</td>
<td>22.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. high school (9-12)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>65.16%</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>59.70%</td>
<td>53.74</td>
<td>92.08</td>
<td>23.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle SES Schoolsb

| Pair No. 3         |            |       |         |      |     |      |       |            |
| 3a. elem. school (K-4) | .32      | 78.29 | 75.28%  | 31.32 | 78.30% | 52.95 | 95.26 | 56.85 | 628  | 1/32 |
| 3b. elem. school (K-4) | .76      | 70.86 | 68.13%  | 30.14 | 75.35% | 55.29 | 94.60 | 55.67 | 320  | 1/21 |

| Pair No. 4         |            |       |         |      |     |      |       |            |
| 4a. elem. school (K-6) | .59      | 84.86 | 81.60%  | 32.14 | 80.35% | 54.92 | 93.70 | 53.77 | 198  | 1/16 |
| 4b. elem. school (K-6) | .75      | 78.69 | 75.66%  | 28.29 | 70.73% | 48.11 | 94.24 | 51.42 | 258  | 1/18 |

(table continues)
Table 32 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Schools</th>
<th>OS/IPOE-S M M%Max</th>
<th>OS M M%Max</th>
<th>IPOE-S M M%Max</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>A/S ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low SES Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair No. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. elem. school (K-6)</td>
<td>.62 81.79 78.64%</td>
<td>31.07 77.68%</td>
<td>42.05 95.07 98.21 354 1/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. elem. school (K-6)</td>
<td>-.04 75.87 72.95%</td>
<td>29.09 72.73%</td>
<td>43.48 96.57 98.16 415 2/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair No. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. elem. school (K-6)</td>
<td>.71 80.38 77.29%</td>
<td>31.50 78.75%</td>
<td>43.81 95.14 98.51 413 1/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. elem. school (K-6)</td>
<td>.26 74.93 72.05%</td>
<td>26.86 67.15%</td>
<td>44.12 93.64 98.52 386 1/23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pearson product-moment correlation between OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) and IPOE-S
* School mean and mean percentage of maximum possible scores for Organizational Structure (OS) subscale
* School mean and mean percentage of maximum possible scores for IPOE-S
* Percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches
* School student enrollment (1991-92)
* School administrator/staff ratio
* Percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is less than 30%
* Percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is 45-60%
* Percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is greater than 95%
subscale/dimension Organizational Structure (OS) school mean scores), dependent variables (IPOE-S and CAT school mean scores, ADA), Organizational Structure (OS)/IPOE-S intercorrelation scores, and demographic variables (school SES level, student enrollment size and administrator/staff ratio) for all schools in the sample was used to identify pairs of schools with similar demographic levels, but exhibiting differing relationships between effectiveness indices and O/S climate characteristics. The OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) was selected from among the set of six OSCI-S subscales/dimensions as the independent variable to compare schools, as well as the variable of choice for identification of individual school O/S climate/IPOE-S intercorrelation scores. This subscale/dimension was chosen because previous analyses showed it explained/accounted for the largest amount of variance in O/S climate across schools in the sample. Thus, it was thought to be best representative of the overall O/S climate construct. Schools in the matrix were organized into three SES category levels (High SES - percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is less than 30%; Middle SES - percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is between 45 and 60%; and Low SES - percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is greater than 95%). Table 32 presents summary profiles for selected pairs of comparison schools for each SES school level category.

Table 32 contains summary profiles for two pairs of schools falling within the High SES level category (Pair Nos. 1 and 2). Pair No. 1 consists of two senior high schools (grades 10-12), both with large enrollments, similar administrator/staff ratios and comparable SES levels (school 1a - SES=26.94%; school 1b - SES=25.84%). While comparatively similar in demographic characteristics, these two schools displayed moderate variability in
student average daily attendance (ADA) as well as a relatively large difference in school mean scores for organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) (school 1a - ADA=94.92%, IPOE-S=26.98 (M%Max= 67.45%); school 1b - ADA=98.03, IPOE-S=34.33 (M%Max= 85.83%)). No student achievement (CAT) data were available for these schools, as they are both 10-12th grade settings. The independent variable summary for this comparison set indicates that the two schools demonstrated substantial variability in O/S climate (school 1a - OS=63.92 (M%Max=61.46%); school 1b - OS=85.80 (M%Max 82.50%)), with only a slight difference in OS/IPOE-S correlations (school 1a - OS/IPOE-S, r=.45; school 1b - OS/IPOE-S, r=.49).

The summary profiles for the second comparison set of schools (Pair No. 2) indicated that these two 9-12th grade high schools had similar SES levels, but were distinguished by substantially different student enrollment levels (school 2a - Size=950; school 2b - Size=339). These two schools form a rather unique comparison set in that they both had comparatively low student average daily attendance (ADA) levels, low organizational effectiveness and O/S climate school mean scores, but with a substantial difference in their OS/IPOE-S correlations (school 2a - OS/IPOE-S, r=.36; school 2b - OS/IPOE-S, r=.15).

Two sets of schools are profiled in Table 32 in the Middle SES category (Pair Nos. 3 and 4). Pair No. 3 consists of two K-4 elementary schools that had comparable SES levels and administrator/staff ratios, but were substantially different in student enrollments (school 3a having nearly twice the enrollment of school 3b). The effectiveness indices of ADA and CAT for these two schools were fairly similar, with school 3b having a slightly higher CAT score (school 3a - ADA=95.26%, CAT=52.95; school 3b - ADA=94.60,
School 3a evidenced a slightly higher IPOE-S score than school 3b (school 3a - IPOE-S=31.32 (M%Max=78.30%); school 3b - IPOE-S=30.14 (M%Max=75.35%)). The profiles for these two schools, however, indicated a moderately large difference in O/S climate as reflected in school mean scores for the Organizational Structure (OS) OSCI-S variable (school 3a - OS=78.29 (M%Max=75.28%); school 3b - OS=70.86 (M%Max=68.13%)). Additionally, the two schools evidenced a substantial difference in OS/IPOE-S correlations (school 3a - OS/IPOE-S, r=.32; school 3b - OS/IPOE-S, r=.76).

Pair No. 4 consists of two K-6 elementary schools that were comparable in SES levels, with both schools having small student enrollments and similar administrator/staff ratios (school 4a - Size=198, A/S ratio=1/16; school 4b - Size=258, A/S ratio=1/18). As indicated by the schools’ profile summaries for dependent and independent variable scores in Table 32, the two schools had similar student average daily attendance (ADA) percentages, but showed a matching pattern of moderately large differences in student achievement (CAT), organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S), and O/S climate scores (school 4a - CAT=54.92, IPOE-S=32.14 (M%Max=80.35%), OS=84.86 (M%Max=81.60%); school 4b - CAT=48.11, IPOE-S=28.29 (M%Max=70.73%), OS=78.69 (M%Max=75.66%)). Additionally, the two schools evidenced a moderately large difference in OS/IPOE-S correlations (school 4a - OS/IPOE-S, r=.59; school 4b - OS/IPOE-S, r=.75).

The third Low SES category in Table 32 contains two sets of schools (Pair Nos. 5 and 6). Pair No. 5 consists of two K-6 elementary schools with similar student enrollments, although different administrator/staff ratios (school 5a - Size=354, A/S ratio=1/26; school 5b - Size=415, A/S ratio=2/30). The summary profile for this pair of schools indicates that they had almost identical SES levels. The effectiveness indices of student achievement
(CAT) and student average daily attendance (ADA) were also similar for the two schools with a rather moderate difference observed in organizational effectiveness scores (school 5a - 31.07 (M%Max=77.68%); school 5b - 29.09 (M%Max=72.73%)). In terms of the independent variable profile, these two low SES schools demonstrated a moderate difference in O/S climate (school 5a - OS=81.79 (M%Max=78.64%); school 5b - OS=75.87 (M%Max=72.95%)). These two low SES schools, however, evidenced a considerably large difference in the relationship between staff perceptions of supervisory climate and organizational effectiveness (school 5a - OS/IPOE-S, r=.62; school 5b - OS/IPOE-S, r=-.04).

The second comparison set (Pair No. 6) in this Low SES category was also very similar in SES level, with school 6b having a similar student enrollment than school 6a (school 6a - Size=413; school 6b - Size=386), and comparable administrator/teacher ratios (school 6a - A/S ratio=1/28; school 6b - A/S ratio=1/23). The student average daily attendance (ADA) and student achievement (CAT) scores were also similar. Pair No. 6, reflected a pattern of IPOE-S and OS scores similar to Pair No. 5 (school 6a - OS=80.38 (M%Max=77.29%), IPOE-S=31.50 (M%Max=78.75%); school 6b - OS=74.93 (M%Max=72.05%), IPOE-S=26.86 (M%Max=67.15%)). Additionally, the summary profiles for these two low SES schools indicated a substantial contrast in their OS/IPOE-S correlations (school 6a - OS/IPOE-S, r=.71; school 6b - OS/IPOE-S, r=.26).

In collectively reviewing the school summary profile results across SES categories, school mean scores on the independent variable of O/S climate (Organizational Structure - OS) were found to vary considerably across schools and school SES categories. For this sample of comparison schools, school mean scores for the O/S climate subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) ranged from 62.06 (school 2a) to 85.80 (school 1b).
Comparatively lower O/S climate scores were found for the sample school comparison sets in the High SES category level than in the Middle SES and Low SES category levels.

In summary, Table 32 shows four pairs of schools (Pair Nos. 1, 3, 5 and 6) with summary profiles reflecting close similarity in SES levels, and relative similarity in student average daily attendance (ADA) and student achievement (CAT). These pairs, however, demonstrated some matched pattern variability in organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) and O/S climate (Organizational Structure - OS) as well as moderate to rather moderately large variability in OS/IPOE-S correlations.

Of additional interest in the comparative analyses were results for two additional pairs of schools (Pair Nos. 2 and 4). Pair No. 2 was rather unique in that these two schools both had comparatively low IPOE-S and O/S climate scores, but evidenced substantially large differences in student enrollment, student achievement (CAT) and OS/IPOE-S correlation scores. Pair No. 4 also displayed a moderately large difference in student achievement (CAT) scores, while evidencing moderately large differences in O/S climate, organizational effectiveness (IPOE) and OS/IPOE-S correlations.

**Analysis of Research Question 6:** Are there qualitative differences between schools that are the most extreme in the relationship between O/S climate dimensions and organizational effectiveness, and in levels of organizational effectiveness?

Research data used to answer this question were obtained from semi-structured telephone interviews completed with the principal and selected teachers in identified outlier schools. These schools were selected based upon inspection of the total school sample variable matrix described in Question 5. Of interest in this outlier analysis was the identification of schools in the total sample with: (1) the most extreme correlation scores
between O/S climate and organizational effectiveness (Organizational Structure (OS)/IPOE-S), and (2) the most extreme levels of overall organizational effectiveness. Included in the sample of identified outlier schools were two schools from each of the three school levels (elementary, middle/junior high, and secondary) addressed in study analyses, and two additional schools with the highest and lowest organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) scores in the total school sample (n=133). Comparisons of the magnitude of the standard deviations for the OS and the IPOE-S variables for schools in the outlier analysis suggested that the OS/IPOE-S correlations were not statistical artifacts. These standard deviations were highly similar for each school. Table 33 provides summary profiles for independent, dependent and demographic variables and OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation scores for each of the identified outlier schools. The following section presents information describing the design and focus of the qualitative interview protocol used in the outlier school telephone interviews.

**O/S Climate Qualitative Interview Protocol**

The list of semi-structured interview questions used to guide telephone interviews with principals and staff in the outlier schools is provided in Appendix E. The questions were designed as semi-structured open-ended questions (Patton, 1990), formulated to elicit as much context-specific information from respondents as possible. Specifically, the questions comprising the interview protocol were designed to: (1) obtain additional contextual information and perspectives from principals and school staff regarding their perceptions of the meaning of relationships among school level independent and dependent variable data emerging from the quantitative analyses; (2) inquire about any occurrences historically in the school and/or district relating to important organizational restructuring
Table 33
Summary Profiles of Independent, Dependent and Demographic Variables and OS/IPOE-S Intercorrelations for Identified Outlier Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Schools</th>
<th>OS/IPOE-S&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>OS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>IPOE-S&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>SES&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Size&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>A/S ratio&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M%Max</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M%Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OS/IPOE-S Outlier Schools (By Grade Level)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A (K-3)</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>78.01</td>
<td>75.01%</td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>78.53%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>78.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B (K-4)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>74.67%</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>80.50%</td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td>95.20</td>
<td>65.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle/Junior High Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C (5-7)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>75.55</td>
<td>72.64%</td>
<td>33.43</td>
<td>83.58%</td>
<td>58.69</td>
<td>93.63</td>
<td>51.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D (5-8)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>76.05</td>
<td>73.13%</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>91.93</td>
<td>64.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E (9-12)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>79.28%</td>
<td>29.99</td>
<td>74.98%</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>92.91</td>
<td>55.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F (9-12)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>73.05</td>
<td>70.24%</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>73.95%</td>
<td>49.20</td>
<td>93.90</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPOE-S Outlier Schools (Total Sample)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G (K-6)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>73.53</td>
<td>70.70%</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>57.75%</td>
<td>43.85</td>
<td>96.52</td>
<td>96.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H (K-5)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>90.05%</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>92.25%</td>
<td>54.44</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>35.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Pearson product-moment correlation between OS/IPOE-S subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) and IPOE-S

<sup>b</sup> School mean and mean percentage of maximum possible scores for Organizational Structure (OS) subscale

<sup>c</sup> School mean and mean percentage of maximum possible scores for IPOE-S

<sup>d</sup> Percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches

<sup>e</sup> School student enrollment (1991-92)

<sup>f</sup> School administrator/staff ratio
and/or changes in supervisory practices; and (3) obtain from respondents their perceptions
of the underlying meaning of their school's various O/S climate (OSCI-S) dimension scores
and how they might make sense of these scores from their perspectives as role participants
in the everyday organizational/supervisory life of their school.

Interview data from each outlier school were reviewed for response content and the
presence of discernible organizational and supervisory themes. Also of interest in the
analyses were the identification of similar/contrasting relationships among thematic elements
contained in principal and staff member responses to protocol questions. As a way of
organizing qualitative analysis results, an O/S Climate Profile was compiled for each of the
eight outlier schools. Each school O/S Climate Profile contains: (1) a quantitative data
summary of OSCI-S survey results for the school; (2) interview background information
highlighting pertinent demographic information and key independent/dependent variable
relationships obtained for the school; (3) written summary results of qualitative interviews
with the principal and two teachers in each school; and (4) a final O/S climate profile
summary synthesizing results of qualitative data analyses. The O/S Climate Profiles for the
eight outlier schools in the sample are presented in Appendix F. The reader is referred to
this appendix for complete outlier school interview results. A discussion of findings and
conclusions derived from these outlier school qualitative analyses is presented in the final
chapter. The following section provides a brief synthesis of collective results of outlier
school interviews.

Synthesis of Qualitative Interview Results

Results of qualitative data analyses completed for the outlier school sample yielded
some interesting, contrasting features for schools with very weak or inverse OS/IPOE-S
correlations (low OS/IPOE-S correlation outliers), and schools with very strong, positive OS-IPOE relationships (high OS/IPOE-S correlation outliers). High OS/IPOE-S correlation outlier schools exhibited very similar characteristics in terms of principal and teacher attitudes. Principals in these outlier schools evidenced a strong emphasis on providing a supervisory structure allowing time for teacher planning and sharing, and participation in supervisory decisionmaking. Similarly, teachers in these schools considered the principal’s encouragement and provision of opportunities for teacher input into instructional and supervisory decisionmaking important elements contributing to their positive view of the principal as an effective supervisory leader. Additionally, teachers in the most organizationally effective outlier school (School H) evidenced a strong sense of shared ownership and responsibility with the principal for the school’s instructional and supervisory programs.

A predominant feature of low OS/IPOE-S outlier schools was that principals and teachers in these schools appeared to share a passive attitude toward professional supervision. This passive attitude was characterized by a view of supervision as primarily involving participation in and compliance with district- and/or state-mandated programs. Additionally, both teachers and the principal in the least organizationally effective (elementary) school (School G) viewed daily time and scheduling constraints as a major factor limiting supervisory activities. This, interestingly, is in contrast to another elementary (high OS/IPOE-S) outlier school (School B), where the principal and teachers were found to use limited available time creatively for within-day professional planning and sharing.

Finally, no systematic relationship was found to exist between OS/IPOE-S correlations and Organizational Structure (OS) mean score levels. Although, it should be
noted that the two organizational effectiveness outliers - Schools G and H - also evidenced consistently low and high Organizational Structure (OS) and OS/IPOE-S correlations respectively.

These outlier school qualitative interview results provided interpretive documentation for the quantitative relationships between OS and IPOE-S variables previously identified. These results also suggested the need to conduct additional, more indepth qualitative probes of other schools in the sample. Results of these additional qualitative interviews are presented in response to Supplemental Question 9 beginning on page 216.

**Supplemental Analyses**

A variety of supplemental analyses were completed in addition to those pertinent to the study’s primary research questions. The results of these analyses are presented below.

**Supplemental Question 1.** What is the variation in within-school relationships between the OSCI-S and the IPOE-S?

To examine common method variance concerns and variation in relationships between the OSCI-S subscales and the IPOE-S a large number (780) of within school correlations were computed using professional staff as the units of analysis. A summary of these correlations can be found in Table H-1, Appendix H. In viewing the results in Table H-1, it is obvious that a considerable range in magnitude and direction between the OSCI-S subscales and the IPOE-S exists. For example, correlations between the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale and the IPOE-S ranged from .88 to -.94.\(^3\) Similarly, correlations for the OSCI-S Professional Autonomy (PA) subscale and the IPOE-S ranged

---

\(^3\) It should be noted that the strong negative correlation \((r=-.94)\) was for a small vocational education school \((n=4)\) and that this correlation is not considered stable. Negative correlations were not frequently occurring and typically were less than \(r=-.11\).
from .91 to -.82. These correlations show considerable differences in the direction and magnitude of the relationship between these variables within various schools, and the patterning of relationships from one school to the next is also quite varied. The frequency of inverse relationships between the OSCI-S subscales and the IPOE-S is the greatest for Self Reflection (SR) and Centralization (CEN) subscales for the OSCI-S. The wide variation in direction and magnitude of the correlations in Table H-1 somewhat negate common method variance concerns in the data collection methods in the study.

**Supplemental Question 2.** Are there bivariate relationships between the various OSCI-S subscales/dimensions and SES?

This supplemental question was explored by computing Pearson product-moment correlations between subscales of the OSCI-S and school SES level as measured by percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches. Table 34 shows intercorrelations between scores on the OSCI-S subscales and SES for the total school sample and by school level. These correlations ranged from .34 (OS/SES, secondary schools) to -.23 (PA/SES, secondary schools). The only significant relationship emerging in this analysis was the rather moderate, positive correlation of the OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Centralization (CEN) and SES (r=.26, p<.05).

**Supplemental Question 3.** Are there bivariate relationships between the various OSCI-A subscales/dimensions and the various effectiveness indices (IPOE-A, CAT, and ADA) and SES?

This supplemental question was explored by computing Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between subscales of the OSCI-A, scores on the IPOE-A, standardized achievement scores (CAT), student average daily attendance (ADA), and school
Table 34
Summary of Intercorrelations Between Scores on the OSCI-S Subscales and SES for All Schools and by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>Total (n=118)</th>
<th>EI (n=72)</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=25)</th>
<th>Sec (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
SES level (measured by percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches). Table 35 shows intercorrelations between scores on the OSCI-A subscales and the IPOE-A for the total sample of schools and by school level. These correlations ranged from .72 (OS/IPOE-A, middle/junior high schools) to -.11 (SR/IPOE-A, elementary schools). The OS/IPOE-A and PA/IPOE-A correlations showed greater significance than the other OSCI-A/IPOE-A relationships. For the middle/junior high school sample, the OS/IPOE-A correlation was statistically significant (p < .001), positive in direction, and rather strong in magnitude. Additionally, two of the OSCI-A/IPOE-A correlations in this middle/junior high school sample were statistically significant (p < .05 level), positive in direction, and moderate in magnitude (PA/IPOE-A, DSC/IPOE-A). In the secondary school sample, the PA/IPOE-A correlation was statistically significant (p < .01), positive in direction, and rather strong in magnitude. Two additional correlations in this secondary sample (CSR/IPOE-A, SR/IPOE-A) were statistically significant (p < .05), positive in direction, and moderate in magnitude.

Intercorrelations between the OSCI-A subscales/dimensions and CAT standardized achievement scores resulted in only one statistically significant correlation. The correlation between the OSCI-A subscale/dimension of Collaborative Sharing/Rapport and CAT scores for the secondary school sample was statistically significant (p < .01), positive in direction, and rather strong in magnitude.

Table 36 provides a summary of the intercorrelations between OSCI-A subscale scores and SES levels for all schools and by school level. These correlations ranged from .47 (CSR/SES, middle/junior high schools) to -.49 (PA/SES, secondary schools). The correlations between SES for all schools and the OSCI-A subscale/dimension of Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) was statistically significant (p < .01), positive in
Table 35
Correlations Between OSCI-A Subscales as an Independent Variable Set and the IPOE-A as a Dependent Variable Set for the Total Sample and by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-A Subscales</th>
<th>Total (n=131)</th>
<th>El (n=78)</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=29)</th>
<th>Sec (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001  
**** p<.0001
Table 36
Correlations Between OSCI-A Subscales as an Independent Variable Set and SES as a Dependent Variable for the Total Sample and by School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-A Subscales</th>
<th>Total (n=119)</th>
<th>El (n=73)</th>
<th>M/Jr (n=27)</th>
<th>Sec (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
direction, but rather moderate in magnitude. For the sample of middle/junior high schools, the correlation between SES and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) was statistically significant (p<.05), positive in direction, and moderately strong in magnitude. For the secondary school sample, the correlation between SES and the OSCI-A subscale/dimension of Professional Autonomy (PA) was statistically significant (p<.05), negative in direction, and moderately strong in magnitude.

Intercorrelations between the OSCI-A subscales/dimensions and student average daily attendance (ADA) for all schools and by school level are shown in Table 37. For the total school sample, Self Reflection (SR) was positively, though rather moderately associated with ADA (r=.28, p<.01). For the elementary school sample, significant correlations were found between Self Reflection and ADA (r=.25, p<.05) and Centralization (CEN) and ADA (r=.27, p<.05). For the sample of middle/junior high schools, the correlation between Organizational Structure (OS) and ADA was statistically significant, negative in direction, and rather moderate (r=-.43, p<.05). For the sample of secondary schools, three of the six correlations between the OSCI-A subscales/dimensions and ADA were statistically significant and rather strong in magnitude (OS/ADA, r=.47, p<.05; DSC/ADA, r=.70, p<.001; SR/ADA, r=.59, p<.01).  

**Supplemental Question 4.** What are the relationships among the various effective indices of IPOE, student achievement and attendance?  

This supplemental question was explored by examining intercorrelations between organizational effectiveness (IPOE), student achievement (CAT) and attendance (ADA) in both professional staff and administrator data for all schools and by level.
Table 37  
Correlations Between OSCI-A Subscales as an Independent Variable Set and ADA as a Dependent Variable for the Total Sample and by School Level  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI-A Subscales</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n=122)</td>
<td>El (n=76)</td>
<td>M/Jr (n=25)</td>
<td>Sec (n=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
Intercorrelations Between the IPOE-S and Student Achievement and ADA for All Schools and by Level.

The correlation between the IPOE-S and student achievement for all schools (n = 98) was .52 (p<.0001). The correlation between the IPOE and student achievement for the sample of elementary schools (n = 61) was .59 (p<.0001); for the sample of middle/junior high schools (n = 22), .47 (p<.03); and, for the sample of secondary schools (n = 13), -0.09 (p<.76).

The correlations between the IPOE-S and ADA were -.007 (p<.94) for all schools in the sample (n = 130), -.05 (p<.67) for elementary schools (n = 79), -.01 (p<.96) for middle/junior high schools (n = 27), and .02 (p<.94) for secondary schools (n = 21).

The correlations between student achievement and ADA were .09 (p<.39) for the total sample of schools (n = 105), .18 (p<.15) for elementary schools (n = 64), .04 (p<.83) for middle/junior high schools (n = 26), and .21 (p<.49) for secondary schools (n = 13).

Intercorrelations Between the IPOE-A and Student Achievement and ADA for All Schools and by Level.

The correlation between the IPOE-A and student achievement for all schools in the sample (n = 100) was .29 (p<.003). The correlation between the IPOE-A and student achievement was .29 (p<.019) for the sample of elementary schools (n = 63); .22 (p<.29) for the sample of middle/junior high schools (n = 24); and, .21 (p<.51) for the sample of secondary schools (n = 12).

The correlations between the IPOE-A and ADA were .088 (p<.34) for all schools in the sample (n = 122), .09 (p<.44) for elementary schools (n = 76), -.25 (p<.24) for middle/junior high schools (n = 25), and .28 (p<.25) for secondary schools (n = 19).
The correlations between student achievement and ADA were .22 (p<.03) for the total sample of schools (n = 100), .16 (p<.22) for elementary schools (n = 62), .14 (p<.52) for middle/junior high schools (n = 23), and .21 (p<.49) for secondary schools (n = 13).

**Intercorrelations between the IPOE-S and IPOE-A.**

The correlation between the IPOE-S and IPOE-A for all schools in the sample (n=131) was .36 (p<.0001). The correlation between the IPOE-S and IPOE-A was .33 (p<.004) for the sample of elementary schools (n=79); .37 (p<.05) for the sample of middle/junior high schools (n=25); and .41 (p<.05) for the sample of secondary schools (n=19).

**Supplemental Question 5.** Do school size and socioeconomic status (SES) variables account for significant amounts of school effectiveness variance beyond the variance accounted for by the OSCI-S subscales?

Two separate multiple regression analyses were completed for the independent variable set (OSCI-S subscales/dimensions, teacher size, and SES) using the IPOE and CAT respectively as the dependent variable. Results of these regression analyses are summarized in Table 38. For the first regression analysis (using IPOE as the dependent variable), the first variable to enter the regression equation (highest single correlate with the dependent variable) was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Organizational Structure (OS). This OSCI-S dimension accounted for 46.90 percent of the total variation among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness. The second variable to enter the regression equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR). In combination, these two variables accounted for 51.70 percent of the total variance among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness. The third variable to enter the regression equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension District Supervisory Climate (DSC). Collectively, these three
Table 38
Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of IPOE and CAT on Subscales of the OSCI-S, Teacher Size, and SES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DV$^b$ = IPOE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DV = CAT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Results are shown for IPOE and CAT. No variables met the p<.05 level of significance for entry in the model for ADA.

$^b$ DV = Dependent Variable
variables accounted for 54.60 percent of the total variance among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness (R=.74). These results indicate that, of the six OSCI-S subscales/dimensions, Organizational Structure (OS), Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) and District Supervisory Climate (DSC) were the three most important variables explaining/accounting for variation in perceived organizational effectiveness across all schools. Additionally, the results indicate that the OSCI-S subscale Organizational Structure (OS) accounted for most of the total variance among schools in perceived organizational effectiveness.

The second regression analysis used CAT as the dependent variable. The results of this analysis are also summarized in Table 38. For this analysis, the only variable to enter the equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Professional Autonomy (PA). This variable accounted for 11.40 percent of the total variance among schools in student achievement (R=.34).

In both the first and second regression analyses, teacher size and SES did not explain/account for any significant amount of variance among schools in either dependent variable when competed against the OSCI-S subscales (OS, CSR, and DSC). Additionally, for these sets of analyses, no variables met the p<.05 level of significance for entry into the regression model for ADA.

Supplemental Question 6. What portion of the variance in school size among schools in the sample can be accounted for by the various OSCI-S variables and SES?

Two separate multiple regression analyses were completed for the independent variable set (OSCI-S subscales/dimensions and SES) using teacher size and student size respectively as the dependent variable. Results of these regression analyses are summarized
in Table 39. For the first regression analysis (using teacher size as the dependent variable), the first variable to enter the regression equation (highest single correlate with the dependent variable) was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Organizational Structure (OS). This OSCI-S dimension accounted for 9.40 percent of the total variation among schools in teacher size. The second variable to enter the regression equation was the independent variable SES. In combination, these two variables accounted for 14.50 percent of the total variance among schools in teacher size ($R=.38$). These results indicate that, of the variables comprising the independent variable set (the six OSCI-S subscales/dimensions and SES), the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Organizational Structure (OS) and SES were the two most important variables explaining/accounting for variation in teacher size across all schools. Additionally, the results indicate that the OSCI-S subscale Organizational Structure (OS) accounted for a large portion of the total variance among schools in teacher size.

The second regression analysis used student size as the dependent variable. The results of this analysis are also summarized in Table 39. For this analysis, the first variable to enter the equation was the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Organizational Structure (OS). This variable accounted for 10.40 percent of the total variance among schools in student size. The second variable to enter the regression equation was the independent variable SES. Collectively, these two variables accounted for 15.90 percent of the total variance among schools in student size ($R=.40$). These results indicate that, of the variables comprising the independent variable set (six OSCI-S subscales/dimensions and SES), the OSCI-S subscale/dimension Organizational Structure (OS) and SES were the two most important variables explaining/accounting for variation in student size across all schools. Additionally, the analysis results indicate that the OSCI-S subscale Organizational Structure
Table 39
Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of School Size Variables on Subscales of the OSCI-S and SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DVa = Teacher Sizeb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DV = Student Sizec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a DV = Dependent Variable
b Number of teachers in each school
c Number of students in each school
(OS) explained/accounted for a large portion of the total variance among schools in student size.

**Supplemental Question 7.** To what degree are reports by administrators and professional staff of the kinds and frequency of supervisory activities similar?

Table 40 provides a comparative summary of average responses of professional staff and administrators on OSCI instrument demographic items focusing on the kinds and frequency of school supervisory activities. The two forms of the OSCI instrument (OSCI-S and OSCI-A) contain cross-matched demographic item sets. The OSCI-S supervisory items ask professional staff for their individual perceptions of personal supervisory situations and/or their perceptions of general school supervisory conditions for all staff. The OSCI-A supervisory items focus on administrators’ perceptions of their average supervisory interactions with individual school staff and/or their perceptions of general school supervisory conditions for all staff. Table 40 lists the 12 cross-matched supervisory OSCI-S/OSCI-A items of interest in the comparative analysis. Overall average responses were computed for both the total usable sample of professional staff respondents (n=2970) and administrator respondents (n=207).

The overall average responses reported in Table 40 suggest somewhat differential perceptions by professional staff and administrators of the kinds and frequencies of specific school supervisory activities. A comparison of average responses of both groups to OSCI supervisory items 1 through 5 suggest that professional staff and administrators were in agreement regarding frequency reports about formal supervisory activities (i.e., formal classroom/professional work observations, formal supervisory conferences), but differed regarding perceptions of the amount of time spent in informal supervisory activities (i.e.,
### Table 40
Comparative Summary of Average Responses of Professional Staff and Administrators to OSCI Demographic Items About the Kinds and Frequency of School Supervisory Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI Demographic Item</th>
<th>Professional Staff&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (n=2970)</th>
<th>Administrators&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (n=207)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of formal observations by administrator(s) during school year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of informal observations by administrator(s) during school year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of formal conferences with administrator(s) during school year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Amount of time staff spend (during typical school week) in informal supervisory discussions with administrator(s)</td>
<td>.66 hrs.</td>
<td>1.25 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Amount of time (during typical school week) staff spend in informal supervisory discussions with other staff</td>
<td>1.3 hrs.</td>
<td>2.0 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do(es) staff member weekly work schedule(s) include professional planning time?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Amount of scheduled planning time per week (on average) for individual staff</td>
<td>1.0 hrs.</td>
<td>1.2 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 40 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSCI Demographic Item</th>
<th>Professional Staff (n=2970)</th>
<th>Administrators (n=207)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Amount of time per week (on average) individual staff spend on instructional planning</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does school have established instructional planning group?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How often does school instructional planning group meet per year?</td>
<td>8 times/yr.</td>
<td>18 times/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Does school have established planning group for schoolwide staff development needs?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How often does school staff development planning group meet per year?</td>
<td>6 times/yr.</td>
<td>9 times/yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Professional Staff responses to these items reflect individual staff perceptions of personal supervisory situations and/or general school supervisory conditions for all staff

* Administrator responses to these items reflect administrator perceptions of average supervisory interactions with individual school staff and/or general school supervisory conditions for all staff
informal observations, informal supervisory discussions with administrators and/or other staff). Administrators' average responses to these informal supervisory activity items indicated that: 1) administrators perceived themselves as engaging in higher levels of informal staff supervisory observations than did staff; and 2) administrators' average perceptions of the amount of time spent in informal supervisory discussions (either administrator-staff, or staff-staff) was nearly twice that of professional staff average perceptions.

Supervisory items 7 through 12 also depict contrasting average response patterns for administrators and professional staff. Notably, administrators registered considerably higher frequency reports than staff regarding number of school instructional planning group meetings per year (item 10) (administrators - 18 times/yr., staff - 8 times/yr.), and number of school staff development planning group meetings per year (item 12) (administrators - 9 times/yr., staff - 6 times/yr.). Additionally, administrators' overall average response to item 8 indicated that administrators perceived their staff as spending half the time (on average) per week in instructional planning (2 hours per week) as compared with instructional planning time reports by professional staff (4 hours per week).

**Supplemental Question 8:** Is there a relationship between administrator and professional staff reports of kinds and frequency of supervisory activities and scores on OSCI subscales and the IPOE?

Table 41 provides a comparative summary of intercorrelations between professional staff and administrator reports of kinds and frequency of specific supervisory activities and scores on OSCI subscales and the IPOE. The table reports Pearson product-moment correlations between OSCI instrument demographic items focusing on professional staff and
Table 41

Comparative Summary of Intercorrelations Between Professional Staff and Administrator Reports of Kinds and Frequency of Specific Supervisory Activities and Scores on OSCI Subscales and IPOE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Activity</th>
<th>OS_S</th>
<th>OS_A</th>
<th>PA_S</th>
<th>PA_A</th>
<th>CSR_S</th>
<th>CSR_A</th>
<th>DSC_S</th>
<th>DSC_A</th>
<th>SR_S</th>
<th>SR_A</th>
<th>CEN_S</th>
<th>CEN_A</th>
<th>IPOE_S</th>
<th>IPOE_A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of formal observations by administrator(s) during school year</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of informal observations by administrator(s) during school year</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of formal conferences with administrator(s) during school year</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 41 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Activity</th>
<th>OSCI-S</th>
<th>OSCI-A</th>
<th>PA_S</th>
<th>PA_A</th>
<th>OSCI-S/OSCI-A Subscales and IPOE-S/IPOE-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSR_S</td>
<td>CSR_A</td>
<td>DSC_S</td>
<td>DSC_A</td>
<td>SR_S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Amount of time</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff spend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(during typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school week) in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrator(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Amount of time</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff spend in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do staff member</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.36****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weekly work schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 41 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Activity</th>
<th>OŚs</th>
<th>OŚa</th>
<th>PAś</th>
<th>PAa</th>
<th>OŚCI-S/OSCI-A Subscales and IPOE-S/IPOE-A Subscales</th>
<th>CSRś</th>
<th>CSRa</th>
<th>DŚś</th>
<th>DŚa</th>
<th>SRś</th>
<th>SRa</th>
<th>CENś</th>
<th>CENa</th>
<th>IPOEś</th>
<th>IPOEa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Amount of scheduled planning time per week (on average) for individual staff</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amount of time per week (on average) individual staff spend on instructional planning</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does school have established instructional planning group?</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.54***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.40****</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.26***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How often does school instructional planning group meet per year?</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.34****</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
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Table 41 (continued)

| Supervisory Activity | OS<sub>s</sub> | OS<sub>a</sub> | PA<sub>s</sub> | PA<sub>a</sub> | OSCI-S/OSCI-A Subscales and IPOE-S/IPOE-A | CSR<sub>s</sub> | CSR<sub>a</sub> | DSC<sub>s</sub> | DSC<sub>a</sub> | SR<sub>s</sub> | SR<sub>a</sub> | CEN<sub>s</sub> | CEN<sub>a</sub> | IPOE<sub>s</sub> | IPOE<sub>a</sub> |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 11. Does school have established planning group for schoolwide staff development needs? | -.47<sup>****</sup> | -.01<sup>****</sup> | -.41<sup>****</sup> | -.02<sup>****</sup> | -.45<sup>****</sup> | .01<sup>****</sup> | -.46<sup>****</sup> | .02<sup>****</sup> | -.19<sup>*</sup> | -.11<sup>****</sup> | -.15<sup>****</sup> | -.11<sup>****</sup> | -.30<sup>***</sup> | -.05<sup>****</sup> |
| 12. How often does school staff development planning group meet per year? | .28<sup>***</sup> | .02<sup>****</sup> | .21<sup>***</sup> | -.12<sup>****</sup> | .27<sup>****</sup> | .12<sup>****</sup> | .17<sup>****</sup> | .04<sup>****</sup> | .22<sup>****</sup> | .13<sup>****</sup> | .01<sup>****</sup> | .16<sup>****</sup> | .21<sup>****</sup> | .03<sup>****</sup> |

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001  
**** p<.0001
administrator perceptions about specific school supervisory activities and subscales/dimensions of the OSCI-S and OSCI-A. The twelve supervisory items listed in Table 41 are cross-matched items on the OSCI-S and OSCI-A instruments.

The significant correlations for the professional staff sample ranged from .41 (CSR/item #3 - "Number of formal conferences with administrator(s) during school year") to -.54 (CSR/item #9 - "Does school have established instructional planning group?"). The correlations for the administrator sample ranged from .25 (OS/item #4 - "Amount of time staff spend (during typical school week) in informal supervisory discussions with administrator(s)) to -.24 (CSR/item #6 - "Do staff member weekly work schedules include professional planning time?").

For the professional staff sample, all six of the OSCI-S subscales/dimensions were found to have statistically significant relationships with a large number of supervisory items. Five of the six OSCI-S dimensions as well as the IPOE-S registered six or more significant correlations with supervisory activity items (CSR - 9 items, PA - 8 items, DSC - 8 items, OS - 7 items, IPOE-S - 6 items). Thus, the professional staff sample reflected rather strong associations of kinds and frequency of school supervisory activities with their perceptions of collaborative sharing/rapport, professional autonomy, district supervisory climate, school organizational structure, and school organizational effectiveness. The two OSCI-S subscales of Self Reflection (SR) and Centralization (CEN) registered five and three significant correlations with supervisory items respectively. A total of 46 statistically significant correlations between supervisory activity items and OSCI-S subscales/dimensions were found in the total professional staff matrix.
For the administrator sample, there were only six statistically significant correlations in the complete matrix between individual supervisory items and OSCI-A subscales/dimensions. Three of the OSCI-A subscales/dimensions (OS, CSR, and DSC) and the IPOE-A each registered one significant correlation with individual supervisory items (OS/item #4 - "Amount of time staff spend (during typical school week) in informal supervisory discussions with administrators, r=.25, p<.01; CSR/item #6 - "Do staff member weekly work schedules include professional planning time?", r=.24, p<.01; DSC/item #7 - "Amount of scheduled planning time per week (on average) for individual staff", r=-.21, p<.05; IPOE-A/item #8 - "Amount of time per week (on average) individual staff spend on instructional planning", r=.20, p<.05). The OSCI-A subscale dimension of Centralization (CEN) registered two significant correlations with individual supervisory activity items (CEN/item #3 - "Number of formal conferences with administrator(s) during school year", r=.19, p<.05; CEN/item #7 - "Amount of scheduled planning time per week (on average) for individual staff", r=.19, p<.05). The OSCI-A subscales/dimensions of Professional Autonomy (PA) and Self Reflection (SR) did not register any significant correlations with supervisory activity items.

**Supplemental Question 9:** Are there qualitative differences between those schools identified in primary analyses (Research Question 5) as being similar in demographic (e.g., SES, grade level) characteristics, but different in effectiveness and O/S climate variables?

To address this supplemental question, qualitative interviews were conducted with administrative and staff personnel in each of the twelve comparison schools identified in Primary Question 5 (Table 32, pp. 182-183). These additional qualitative data collection and analysis procedures were completed because the apparent usefulness of qualitative analyses
completed for the set of outlier schools in Primary Question 6 suggested similar qualitative probes of the comparison school pairs might prove fruitful in providing additional analytic perspectives on variations in independent and dependent variable relationships identified in the primary analyses.

Similar telephone interview data collection procedures were followed for the comparison schools as used for the outlier school sample. Additionally, as in the outlier analyses, O/S Climate Profiles were compiled for each of the twelve comparison schools. The O/S Climate Profiles for the set of twelve comparison schools are presented in Appendix G. Each comparison school O/S Climate Profile contains: (1) a quantitative data summary of OSCI-S survey results for the school; (2) interview background information; (3) written summary results of qualitative interviews with the principal and two teachers in each school; and (4) a final O/S climate profile summary synthesizing interview results. The reader is referred to Appendix G for complete qualitative interview results pertinent to each comparison school. An indepth discussion of findings and conclusions derived from results of qualitative analyses completed for both sets of comparison and outlier schools is presented in Chapter Six. A brief synthesis of collective results of comparison school qualitative interviews is presented below.

Synthesis of Comparison School Interview Results

Results of qualitative data analyses completed for the school comparison pair sample generated some contrasting features of high versus low O/S climate comparison schools. In high O/S climate comparison schools, principals were found to actively encourage and support teacher involvement in group planning and sharing activities, and to structure opportunities for teachers to become involved in instructional and supervisory
decisionmaking. Principals in high O/S climate schools evidenced a desire to facilitate teacher involvement in collaborative activities by creating within-day meeting structures to accommodate teacher collaborative planning/sharing and participation in supervisory meetings. Likewise, teachers in these high O/S climate schools expressed a positive perception of the principal as encouraging and supportive of their instructional and supervisory efforts, and regarded the principal as an effective supervisory leader.

These results contrast with those of low O/S climate comparison schools in which principals primarily evidenced self-perceptions as facilitators and implementors of external, packaged district and state supervisory programs. Additionally, teachers in low O/S climate comparison schools expressed rather negative views of principals' abilities to structure meaningful teacher collaborative planning/sharing and decisionmaking opportunities. Because of these negative perceptions, teachers in these schools often spoke of the principal as being an ineffective supervisory leader.

Additionally, teachers and principals in high O/S climate comparison schools were found to exhibit a more school-wide focus in their instructional and supervisory activities. This supervisory emphasis extended to administrative and teacher group planning of instructional programs both within and across grade levels, focusing on the curricular needs of the school as a whole. This school-wide focus contrasted with the view of principals and teachers in low O/S climate schools, who perceived teachers' individual classroom responsibilities and duties as time-consuming constraints inhibiting efforts at more extensive school supervisory efforts.

Finally, high and low O/S climate comparison schools were found to differ also in principal and staff perceptions of the quality and relevance of district supervisory programs.
Principals and teachers in high O/S climate comparison schools expressed positive views of district supervisory efforts as generally purposeful and supportive of individual school contextual needs. Principals and teachers, however, in low O/S climate comparison schools tended to view district supervisory programs as unresponsive to individual building-level needs. As this contrast in perceptions regarding district supervisory programs was generally found to be a differentiating feature in high and low comparison schools, it is important to point out that a negative perception of district supervisory programs was not confined exclusively to principal and staff in low O/S climate schools. Comparison schools 4a and 5b demonstrated this anomaly. Interestingly, the principal and teachers in comparison school 5b (low O/S climate) viewed district supervisory programs as being rather unresponsive to their school contextual needs, and cited this as one reason for their school’s low O/S climate scores. By contrast, the principal and teachers in school 4a (high O/S climate) also expressed strong, negative sentiments regarding the contextual relevance of their district’s supervisory programs, although their school evidenced rather high O/S climate scores.

**Synthesis of Collective School Outlier and Comparison Pair Inductive Analyses Results**

This final section presents results of inductive analyses completed for the combined school outlier and comparison pair sets. A synthesis of summary results of qualitative analyses completed for school outlier and comparison pair sets is presented in Table 42. Collectively, the summary analysis statements regarding High and Low OS/IPOE-S Correlation and IPOE-S Outlier Schools and High and Low O/S Climate Comparison Schools presented in this table represent mid-level generalizations (Level Two assertions)
### Table 42

Synthesis of School Outlier and Comparison Pair Qualitative Interview Results (Level Two Assertions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYNTHEISIS OF OUTLIER SCHOOL RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High OS/IPOE-S Correlation and IPOE-S Outliers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Principals evidence a strong emphasis on providing a supervisory structure allowing time for teacher planning and sharing, and participation in supervisory decisionmaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers consider the principal’s encouragement and provision of opportunities for teacher input into instructional and supervisory decisionmaking important elements contributing to their positive view of the principal as an effective supervisory leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers and principal in the most organizationally effective outlier school evidence a strong sense of shared ownership and responsibility for the school’s instructional and supervisory programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low OS/IPOE-S Correlation and IPOE-S Outliers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Principals and teachers view professional supervision as primarily involving participation in and compliance with district- and/or state-mandated programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers and principal in the least organizationally effective outlier school view daily time and scheduling constraints as a major factor limiting supervisory activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 42 (continued)

SYNTHESIS OF COMPARISON SCHOOL RESULTS

High O/S Climate Comparison Schools

- Principals view teachers' involvement in collegial planning/sharing and teachers' involvement in supervisory decisionmaking as two important elements of teachers' professional work roles.
- Structured times for teacher planning/sharing and professional development are part of teachers' work schedules.
- Teachers view principal as positive, encouraging and supportive of their instructional and supervisory efforts.
- Teachers and principal adopt a school-wide focus on instructional and supervisory planning/sharing.
- Teachers and principal share a perception that district supervisory efforts are purposeful and supportive of school's contextual needs.

Low O/S Climate Comparison Schools

- Principals evidence self-perceptions as facilitators or implementors of packaged district/state supervisory programs.
- Teachers view principals as ineffective in structuring collaborative planning/sharing and decisionmaking opportunities for them.
- Teachers and principal emphasize individual classroom responsibilities/duties as constraints on school supervisory involvement.
- Principal and teachers view district supervisory programs as unresponsive to school-level contextual needs.
from review of collective O/S climate summary statements (Level One Assertions) concluding each individual school O/S Climate Profile.

These Level Two assertions provided the conceptual frame for the formulation of a few theory-based statements (Level Three assertions) about the nature of O/S climate variation within individual schools. These Level Three assertions collectively reflect an additional set of school-level contextual variables found in analyses to mediate professional staff and administrator perceptions of school O/S climate quality and school organizational effectiveness. Level Three assertions and their corresponding context variables are presented in Table 43. As depicted in this table, collective inductive analyses resulted in the emergence of five school-level context variables found to most generally impact individual school O/S climate quality (viz., Principal Supervisory Leadership Style, Decisionmaking Structure, Organizational/Supervisory Focus, Supervisory Stance, and District-School Supervisory Relationship). Two of these variables - Decisionmaking Structure and District-School Supervisory Relationship - constituted two school-level characteristics emerging in the analyses that simply provided additional qualitative support for the primary foci of two quantitatively identified OSCI subscales/dimensions (Organizational Structure and District Supervisory Climate). The three variables of Principal Supervisory Leadership Style, Organizational/Supervisory Focus, and Supervisory Stance were found to be additional within-school contextual variables mediating individual school staff and administrator perceptions of school O/S climate quality and school organizational effectiveness.

As a final phase of the inductive analysis process, these Level Three assertions and derived context variables were employed as the basis for the construction of the following
Table 43

Level Three Assertions and Corresponding Context Variables Derived from Collective School Outlier and Comparison Pair Inductive Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL THREE ASSERTIONS</th>
<th>CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High O/S Climate Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>High O/S Climate Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals cultivate a supervisory leader style emphasizing teacher involvement in group planning/sharing and decision-making.</td>
<td>PRINCIPAL SUPERVISORY LEADERSHIP STYLE - collaborative, inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers feel they have real opportunities for participation in instructional and supervisory decisionmaking.</td>
<td>DECISIONMAKING STRUCTURE - organizationally strong, collegial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and teacher focus is on school-wide instructional and supervisory concerns.</td>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL/SUPERVISORY FOCUS - school-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals and teachers view supervision as primarily involving active response to school instructional/supervisory needs.</td>
<td>SUPERVISORY STANCE - proactive, contextually focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals and teachers view district-school instructional and supervisory programs as relevant to school needs.</td>
<td>DISTRICT-SCHOOL SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP - strong, school-focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 43 (continued)

LEVEL THREE ASSERTIONS

Low O/S Climate Schools

Principals cultivate a supervisory leader style emphasizing implementation of external district/state supervisory programs.

Teachers and principals view individual instructional responsibilities/duties as time-consuming, inhibiting teachers' involvement in broader school supervisory efforts.

Principal and teacher focus is on individual classroom instructional and supervisory concerns.

Principals and teachers view supervision as primarily involving passive response to external mandates.

Principals and teachers view district-school instructional and supervisory programs as invasive and not relevant to school needs.

CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES

Low O/S Climate Schools

PRINCIPAL SUPERVISORY LEADERSHIP STYLE - passive, laissez faire

DECISIONMAKING STRUCTURE - organizationally weak, loosely-defined

ORGANIZATIONAL/SUPERVISORY FOCUS - classroom-oriented

SUPERVISORY STANCE - reactive, diffused

DISTRICT-SCHOOL SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP - weak, unfocused
sample set of tenable statements\textsuperscript{4} regarding linkages between school O/S climate and organizational effectiveness:

- Principal supervisory leadership style is an important context variable mediating linkages between individual school O/S climate quality and organizational effectiveness.

- There is a link between administrator and staff perceptions of school O/S climate quality and their normative supervisory values and beliefs.

- The district-school supervisory relationship is an important broader organizational phenomenon affecting administrator and staff perceptions of linkages between building-level O/S climate and organizational effectiveness.

These tenable statements are presented as final, theory-relevant results obtained through the process of inductive data analysis completed in the qualitative component of this study. These statements (and emerging context variables) are further discussed in Chapter Six in terms of their potential usefulness for informing continued O/S model refinement efforts and their viability as reasonable, empirically-derived parameters for guiding further, more comprehensive qualitative research efforts regarding the nature of school O/S climate.

Summary

Chapter Five presents a summary of results of analyses completed to address the six primary research questions delineated in the study. Results of data analyses completed for a series of nine supplemental research questions are also included. The following chapter contains a presentation and discussion of the findings and conclusions of the study.

\textsuperscript{4} The term \textit{statement} is used here and throughout rather than more formal descriptions of relationships among variables such as research questions, researchable propositions, research hypotheses, etc.
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CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Chapter Six begins with a recapitulation of the overall structure and purpose of the study. Major findings and conclusions of the study are delineated. A discussion, organized in three parts, is then presented: 1) conceptual validity of the Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Model of Instructional Supervision and Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) instrument construct validity, 2) major findings and conclusions pertinent to research questions, and 3) research methodology and design concerns. The concluding section of the chapter examines potential directions for continued school O/S climate research and addresses the usefulness of the O/S framework for yielding further testable research hypotheses.

Overview of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to explore instructional supervision in schools as an organizational phenomenon. This organizational perspective on instructional supervision is developed in contrast to more traditional views of instructional supervision present in the literature focusing on the individual and clinical nature of supervisory interactions among administrators and teachers. This study emerged in direct response to a perceived lack of definitional clarity in the organizational effectiveness and school climate constructs as presented in the school effectiveness, school organization and supervision literatures.

The study consisted of two major parts. The first part of the study involved the development and refinement of an instrument designed to measure professional staff and administrator perceptions of the quality of school instructional supervision from an
organizational perspective. The OSCI instrument was grounded in a conceptual model of instructional supervision that considers the supervisory behaviors and professional learning activities of administrators, teachers and peer professionals as comprising an important supervisory subculture within schools. The O/S model developed in this study presented a framework for synthesizing relevant perspectives from organization theory, instructional supervision and school climate and effectiveness research, and provided a means for considering the structure and dynamics of professional supervisory behaviors of administrators and teachers in schools as distinctively organizational in nature, rather than simply isolated, individual phenomena.

The second part of the study focused on formulating and exploring specific research questions derived from the O/S model. The Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) developed in this study served to operationally define the O/S climate construct and provided a means for empirically exploring relationships among O/S climate dimensions and school effectiveness indices posited in the model.

**Model/Instrument Development and Refinement**

Part One of this study involved the development of a conceptual model of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) structure of instructional supervision. The O/S model posited multiple, reciprocal relationships among identified O/S climate variables and selected school effectiveness indices. The O/S model served as the basis for the development of the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory - Professional Staff (OSCI-S) and Administrator (OSCI-A) forms. The sections below provide a brief recapitulation of development and refinement work associated with the O/S model and OSCI instrument completed in this study.
O/S Model Development

The Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Model of Instructional Supervision presented in Chapter Two defined O/S structure as consisting of sets of macro- and micro-communicative elements. These macro- and micro-elements were conceptualized in the O/S model as comprising two broad interactive levels of school personnel supervisory actions and behaviors. This macro- and micro-communicative structure was further defined through a set of six O/S climate dimensions or variables informing each communicative level. These six climate variables were: centralization, vertical communication, professional autonomy, rapport, communicative depth, and goal consensus (see O/S Model Figure 1, Chapter Two, p. 27). An additional dimension/variable - metaphoric role perception - was also identified in the model as potentially contributing to school members' formations and perceptions of O/S climate.

These O/S variables were conceptualized in the model framework as multi-dimensional facets of school personnel supervisory behavior that contribute collectively to the formation of a distinctive school O/S climate. The O/S model depicted the professional learning environment in a school as emanating from the interrelated matrix of macro- and micro-structural elements and O/S climate variables. Organizationally, the O/S model suggested that the professional learning environment constructed and sustained by staff members and administrators in a school contributes to the shape and definition of the school's unique supervisory subculture - viewed as an important subunit of school organizational culture.
**OSCI Instrument Development and Refinement**

**Initial Development of OSCI Instrument Forms**

Two forms of the *Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory* (OSCI) were developed, the professional staff form (OSCI-S) and a complimentary administrator form (OSCI-A). An item pool of possible OSCI demographic and climate dimension items was developed to operationalize the six O/S climate dimensions/variables identified from pilot studies as potential facets of school personnel supervisory behavior. The additional seventh dimension/variable of metaphoric role perception, included in the original O/S model as a potentially useful variable construct, was not operationalized as part of OSCI development efforts in this study. From this original item pool, refined working lists of item sets addressing each O/S climate dimension as well as an item set addressing salient demographic characteristics related to school personnel/supervisory activities were iteratively constructed. Initial face validity of the OSCI instrument forms (OSCI-S and OSCI-A demographic and variable item sets) was checked by five expert judges, with suggested revisions and further refinement recommendations incorporated into final item lists. The O/S items comprising the final pilot versions of the OSCI professional staff and administrator forms were judged to have reasonable face validity in terms of addressing typical supervisory activities and behaviors of school personnel, and given the exploratory nature of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) construct and its development within a school effectiveness model design.
Major Findings and Conclusions

Part One: Model/Instrument Development and Refinement

This section presents major findings and conclusions relating to the construct validity of the O/S model and OSCI instrument. The section is organized into two parts: (1) construct validity of the OSCI instrument; and (2) construct validity of the refined O/S model.

Construct Validity of OSCI Instrument

Factor Analyses

Exploratory factor analyses of the OSCI-S data set resulted in six identified factors or OSCI dimensions: Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA), Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR), District Supervisory Climate (DSC), Self Reflection (SR), and Centralization (CEN). Results of these analyses supported the construct validity of the OSCI as an inventory of these six dimensions of organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate. Five major findings emerged from factor analyses results: (1) the exploratory factor analyses of the OSCI suggested that the OSCI instrument is a multidimensional inventory of school organizational climate; (2) the first OSCI subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) demonstrated the largest number of item loadings; (3) the six-factor solution generated factors that were only partly consistent with the original O/S model dimensions; (4) the macro- and micro-communicative structural dimensions posited in the O/S model were not confirmed in the factor analyses; and (5) a relatively strong District Supervisory Climate (DSC) factor was retained in the six-factor solution that was not posited in the original set of seven O/S climate dimensions.
These findings of the OSCI exploratory factor analyses support the following conclusions: (1) it is possible to measure with a paper and pencil test meaningful dimensions of organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate; (2) from the number and content of item loadings in the analyses, it can be concluded that the first strong OSCI subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) was able to contribute the most to a clear articulation and explanation of the overall organizational/supervisory (O/S) construct; (3) given the fact that the six-factor solution generated factors that were only partly consistent with original O/S model dimensions, there is a need for further development and possible expansion of the OSCI instrument, or perhaps the use of the OSCI in future studies in combination with other measures; and (4) it might prove useful, in view of factor analytic findings to reexamine the O/S model in general and the relationships among the six subscales/dimensions retained in the factor analyses procedures.

**Reliability of OSCI Instrument**

Investigations were conducted to examine both the internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha) and stability (test-retest) of the OSCI instrument. Major findings of reliability and stability analyses are presented below.

**Internal Consistency**

Results of internal consistency analyses completed for the OSCI-S instrument yielded the following findings: (1) five OSCI-S subscales (OS, PA, CSR, DSC, and SR) obtained strong reliability coefficients, ranging from .75 to .96, and (2) the OSCI-S subscale of Centralization (CEN) obtained a moderately strong reliability coefficient ($r=.63$).
These internal consistency findings support the conclusion that the items comprising the various OSCI-S subscales are homogeneous and can be considered reasonable samples of the subscales they represent.

**Stability**

Results of stability (test-retest reliability) analyses completed on the OSCI-S instrument supported the following two findings: (1) the first five OSCI-S subscales demonstrated strong stability with coefficients ranging from .87 to .95, and (2) a more moderate stability coefficient was obtained for the Centralization (CEN) subscale (r=.75).

These findings suggest the conclusion that five of the six OSCI-S subscales (i.e., OS, PA, CSR, DSC, and SR) demonstrated strong stability over a two-to-three week period, while the Centralization (CEN) subscale demonstrated more moderate stability.

**Criterion-Related Validity of OSCI Instrument**

Exploration of the criterion-related validity of the various dimensions of the OSCI-S constituted another important aspect of instrument development work. The criterion-related validity of OSCI-S dimensions was investigated by examining relationships among independent and dependent variables using school means as the units of analysis. Overall results of correlation analyses completed in this study to investigate bivariate and multivariate relationships among the OSCI-S subscales/dimensions and indices of school effectiveness support the following findings: (1) strong positive to moderate relationships exist between the OSCI-S subscales of Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) and the dependent variable of organizational effectiveness (IPOE); (2) considering all of the criterion-related validity
coefficients generated, the greatest support for the validity of the OSCI instrument was evidenced by the Organizational Structure (OS) and Professional Autonomy (PA) subscales.

These findings lead to the following conclusions: (1) the measurement of professional staff perceptions is a valid means of examining the overall organizational/supervisory structure in schools; (2) understanding the validity of staff perceptions of O/S climate depends upon the particular conceptualization of effectiveness used; and (3) the criterion validity evidence, when combined with other validity evidence (e.g., results of factor analyses and face validity analyses), support the overall construct validity of the OSCI-S.

Construct Validity of Refined O/S Model

Results of bivariate and multivariate analyses completed using the OSCI-S data set in this study generally provided rather strong support for the multidimensionality of the O/S construct and its connection to dimensions of organizational effectiveness posited in the model. Results provided evidence supporting the reasonableness of conceptualizing multiple dimensions of school supervisory climate as organizational dimensions of the adult professional learning environment and as being most closely linked to personnel members’ perceptions of the effectiveness of schools as organizations. Results of exploratory factor analyses of the OSCI-S data set resulted in six identified factors or O/S climate dimensions: Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA), Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR), District Supervisory Climate (DSC), Self Reflection (SR), and Centralization (CEN). These six factor analyzed OSCI-S subscales/dimensions became the basis for the development of a revised version of the O/S model (Figure 2, p. 234). Conceptual
Figure 2: Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) model of the organizational structure and dynamics of instructional supervisory practices within the school supervisory subculture.
definitions of these six factor analyzed OSCI subscales/dimensions are presented in Appendix I.

**Part One Synthesis of Major Findings and Conclusions**

Major findings and conclusions of Part One of this study provide evidence suggesting that it may indeed make sense to conceptualize school instructional supervision as a multidimensional, organizational phenomenon. Results of factor analyses and criterion-related validity investigations completed in the study generally provided support for the Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) model as a viable conceptual framework for examining multiple relationships existing among supervisory structure, interactive climate dimensions and indices of school effectiveness defining the school supervisory subculture. Additionally, results of these investigations suggested that it is possible to define multiple organizational dimensions of supervisory climate in schools, and that these climate dimensions could be related to meaningful indices of school effectiveness.

The rather strong emergence of a District Supervisory Climate (DSC) OSCI dimension in factor analyses results suggested the importance of this broader, organizational dimension for continued O/S model and OSCI instrument refinement efforts. The lack of factor analytic support for the original macro- and micro-communicative structures posited in the O/S model suggested the need for revisiting of this model component, and perhaps the expansion of the macro- and micro-structure notion to encompass the within-school and district-school supervisory environment. Finally, findings from factor analyses, criterion-related validity and reliability analyses completed in Part One of this study provided initial evidence supporting the construct validity of the Organizational/Supervisory Climate
Inventory (OSCI) as a reasonably valid and reliable measure of school organizational/supervisory climate.

**Part Two: Research Questions**

Part Two of this study focused on the analysis of specific research questions derived from the O/S model concerning the relationship between O/S climate and school effectiveness. The series of primary and supplemental research questions that guided the analyses are reviewed below followed by statements of major findings and conclusions pertaining to each research question. The presentation of major findings and conclusions is organized in three major sections: (1) major quantitative findings and conclusions (research questions 1 through 5); (2) major qualitative findings and conclusions (primary question 6 and supplemental question 9); and (3) supplemental findings and conclusions.

**Primary Research Questions**

Six primary research questions were formulated in this study. These research questions were designed to explore relationships among organizational/supervisory (O/S) dimensions and school effectiveness indices posited in the O/S model. Questions 1 through 5 involved quantitative analyses completed to explore bivariate and multivariate variable relationships posited in the O/S model. Question six involved analyses completed to explore qualitative differences among identified outlier schools. This qualitative investigation was supplemented by additional qualitative analyses completed in supplemental question 9. Major findings and conclusions derived from analyses completed for these six primary research questions are presented below.

**Research Question 1.** Are there bivariate relationships between the various O/S climate dimensions (and/or individual O/S variables within these dimensions) and the various school effectiveness indices?
Sub-Question 1a: If question one is affirmed, are these relationships statistically independent of school socioeconomic status?

Results of correlation analyses completed to investigate this first research question produced five major findings. First, considering all the school effectiveness indices, the pattern of correlations for the OSCI and IPOE were stronger and more frequently occurring than for the OSCI and other effectiveness variables (i.e., student achievement (CAT) and school holding power (ADA)). This general relationship held by school levels as well. Secondly, the first three OSCI subscales/dimensions of Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) demonstrated the strongest and most consistent relationships with the IPOE effectiveness variable across the various school levels. Stated another way, these three subscales/dimensions demonstrated the greatest validity when the IPOE was used as a criterion variable.

A third finding is that, with the exception of the Professional Autonomy (PA) subscale/dimension, little relationship was found between the OSCI and student achievement. A fourth finding is that the relationship between the OSCI-S and the school holding power index used (ADA) appears to be different for middle/junior high schools than for elementary and secondary schools in both magnitude and direction. A final, fifth finding is that relationships between O/S climate variables and school effectiveness indices are independent of school socioeconomic status.

The following conclusions are derived from these findings: (1) the O/S climate construct, as an organizational variable, appears to relate most strongly to process variables such as overall organizational effectiveness, rather than to other school effectiveness variables such as student achievement and holding power (viewed as product variables); (2)
apparently there are context variables that serve to mediate the relationship between
organizational/supervisory climate and indices of school effectiveness/productivity; and (3)
school socioeconomic status (SES) is not a viable school context variable mediating linkages
between O/S climate and school effectiveness/productivity.

**Research Question 2:** Are there multivariate relationships among the set of O/S
climate dimensions (independent variables) and the various school effectiveness measures
(dependent variables)?

**Sub-Question 2a.** Which dimensions and what combination of OSCI dimensions
account for/explain the most variance in the various school effectiveness measures?

**Sub-Question 2b.** Is there a significant multivariate relationship between the set of
school effectiveness variables and the set of OSCI variables when analyzed collectively?

Five major findings were derived from results of the set of stepwise regression and
canonical correlation analyses conducted to address this research question. **First,** a rather
large portion of the variance in organizational effectiveness of schools (as measured by the
IPOE) was accounted for by a combination of selected subscales of the OSCI-S. Of the
three OSCI-S variables emerging in the regression analyses -- Organizational Structure (OS),
Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) and District Supervisory Climate (DSC) --
Organizational Structure (OS) was found to be the most important O/S climate variable in
terms of explaining/accounting for variation in perceived organizational effectiveness across
all schools.

**A second finding** is that only moderate multivariate relationships were found to exist
between OSCI-S variables and the school productivity variable (CAT) and the school
holding power variable (ADA). **A third** somewhat related finding is that different OSCI
variables were found to explain different amounts of variance in different school effectiveness indices. A fourth finding is that the OSCI subscales/dimensions, from a psychometric perspective, do have incremental, criterion-related validity with all three of the effectiveness indices (IPOE, CAT and ADA variables). However, the strongest explanatory relationship involved the IPOE variable, and to a much lesser extent the student achievement and student average daily attendance variables. A fifth finding is that there is a strong multivariate relationship between the set of climate variables and the set of effectiveness variables, and that this relationship is primarily explained by the contributions of the OSCI subscales/dimensions of Organizational Structure (OS) and Professional Autonomy (PA) and the dependent variable of overall organizational effectiveness (IPOE).

The above findings suggest the following conclusions: (1) the O/S climate construct can be best understood as a mediating variable that is conceptually linked to a greater extent to the overall effectiveness of the school as an organization than to what the school produces in terms of educational outcomes (e.g., school achievement); (2) the construct of school effectiveness does not have any simple relationship with school organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate, and different definitions of school effectiveness (i.e., organizational effectiveness, achievement and holding power) may be best understood in terms of their differential linkages to specific climate variables or dimensions of school climate; (3) organizational elements of school effectiveness rather than other elements of school effectiveness (e.g., school achievement or school holding power) are most strongly linked to elements of school O/S climate; and (4) variation among schools in their organizational effectiveness is primarily explained by Organizational Structure (OS) and Professional Autonomy (PA) rather than other dimensions of O/S climate.
Research Question 3: Does within-school variance on various O/S climate dimensions explain/account for significant amounts of variation among the school effectiveness indices?

A series of stepwise regression analyses, using school means and standard deviation scores for the OSCI-S subscales as independent variables and the various effectiveness indices as dependent variables were completed to address this research question. Two major findings resulted from these analyses. First, Organizational Structure (OS) was the only OSCI-S subscale/dimension that accounted for significant amounts of variation in the three indices of effectiveness with substantially more variation accounted for with the school effectiveness variable of perceived organizational effectiveness (IPOE) than achievement and attendance. Secondly, the OSCI-S dimension standard deviations (within-school variance index) did not account for significant amounts of variation among the school effectiveness indices.

The single major conclusion from these findings is that variation in organizational effectiveness among schools is primarily explained by differences in absolute subscale scores (their school means) rather than differences between within-school variations for these same variables. Said another way, the overall strength of O/S climate characteristics explains differences in the organizational effectiveness of schools to a much greater degree than indices of cohesiveness (standard deviations of O/S climate subscales) among respondents.

Research Question 4: What relationship exists between administrator and professional staff perceptions of O/S climate dimension levels among schools?

Three major findings were derived from results of correlational analyses conducted to address this fourth research question. First, the first four OSCI-S and OSCI-A subscales
of Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA), Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR), and District Supervisory Climate (DSC) were found to be positively and significantly correlated, though rather moderately. Second, all six OSCI-A subscales were found to be significantly and positively, though moderately, correlated with the OSCI-S Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) subscale. Third, in the OSCI-S/OSCI-A correlations by school level, the most consistent and noteworthy pattern of relationship between OSCI-S and OSCI-A subscales/dimensions was obtained for the secondary sample, with three of the OSCI-S/OSCI-A Organizational Structure (OS) subscale correlations exceeding .50 (viz., OSCI-S Organizational Structure, Professional Autonomy, and District Supervisory Climate).

These findings suggest the following conclusions: (1) for the most part, teachers and administrators perceive the O/S climate of schools from different perspectives; and (2) secondary principals' and teachers' perceptions of O/S climate dimensions are more congruent than the O/S climate perceptions of principals and teachers in elementary and middle/junior high schools.

Research Question 5: Are there schools that are similar in demographic characteristics (e.g., SES, grade level) and equally effective, but substantially different in their O/S climate characteristics?

Results of comparative analyses completed to address this fifth research question yielded five major findings. First, pairs of schools were identified in the variable matrix with very similar demographic characteristics (e.g., SES, student enrollment, and administrator/staff ratio), but with substantial differences in O/S climate levels (i.e., Organizational Structure (OS)) and in OS/IPOE-S correlations. Second, no systematic pattern of relationships was found to exist between student achievement and attendance
(ADA) and the variables of organizational effectiveness and O/S climate in the schools compared. Third, the O/S climate (Organizational Structure (OS)) construct was found to have some relationship with organizational effectiveness (IPOE). Fourth, moderate differences in O/S climate (Organizational Structure (OS)) and IPOE-S scores, as well as moderate to substantial differences in the relationship among these variables were evident between schools in identified comparison pairs across all SES categories. Fifth, the OS/IPOE-S correlations were substantially different from one individual comparison school to the next.

These findings suggest the following conclusions: (1) school size and socioeconomic level are not important school context variables mediating staff perceptions of the level and quality of organizational effectiveness and O/S climate; and (2) the O/S climate construct may have some value as a contextual barometer of organizational conditions existing in individual schools and of the strong impact of these organizational constraints on faculty perceptions of supervisory quality.

Research Question 6: Are there qualitative differences between schools that are the most extreme in the relationship between O/S climate dimensions and organizational effectiveness, and in levels of organizational effectiveness?

Question 6 of this study focused on the completion of qualitative data collection and analyses procedures to determine if there exists identifiable within-school differences or contextual variables further differentiating schools identified as extreme outlier schools in the total sample. Results from this initial qualitative probe of school outliers in the sample data provided the impetus for continuation of a more extensive qualitative probe of school comparison pairs selected in question 5. Supplemental question 9 was formulated to guide
this additional qualitative inquiry (Supplemental Question 9: Are there qualitative
differences between those schools identified in primary analyses (Research Question 5) as
being similar in demographic (e.g., SES, grade level) characteristics, but different in
effectiveness and O/S climate variables?). Collectively, the sets of qualitative analyses
completed for outlier and comparison pair schools constituted the qualitative component of
this study. For organizational purposes, and because the inductive analyses procedures
completed culminated in a final synthesis and analysis of the combined data sets, collective
major findings and conclusions from results of the sets of qualitative analyses completed for
both outlier and comparison pair schools will be presented here.

The inductive analyses completed for outlier and comparison pair schools resulted
in the generation of a final set of theory-based assertions about the nature of personnel
perceptual variation in high and low O/S climate schools regarding the quality of school
organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate and organizational effectiveness. These empirically
derived propositional statements, in turn, were found to reflect a number of school-level
contextual variables differentiating personnel supervisory perceptions within individual
schools. Five contextual variables further mediating administrator and staff perceptions of
O/S climate quality and organizational effectiveness at the school level were identified (viz.,
Principal Supervisory Leadership Style, Decisionmaking Structure, Organizational/
Supervisory Focus, Supervisory Stance, and District-School Supervisory Relationship). The
combined set of theory-based assertions and contextual variables generated through the
inductive analysis process represent the collective results of the qualitative component of this
study. The mediating influence of these five contextual variables in further defining
the relationship between personnel perceptions of O/S climate (Organizational Structure (OS)) and organizational effectiveness is graphically presented in Appendix J.

Results obtained from qualitative analyses completed in the study yielded three major findings. First, the qualitative probes of outlier and comparison pair schools provided evidence indicating that there are additional within-school contextual variables that can further account for/explain variation in personnel perceptions of school O/S climate quality and organizational effectiveness at the individual school level. Second, two of the five contextual variables identified (Decisionmaking Structure and District-School Supervisory Relationship) were found to be strong, contextual dimensions emerging in the analyses that simply provided additional qualitative support for the two factor analyzed OSCI subscales/dimensions of Organizational Structure (OS) and District Supervisory Climate (DSC). Third, the three context variables of Principal Supervisory Leader Style, Organizational/Supervisory Focus and Supervisory Stance were found to be additional, distinct context variables affecting personnel perceptions of O/S climate quality at the school level.

These qualitative findings suggest the following conclusions: (1) the O/S climate construct appears to be a much more complex variable when isolated and examined at the individual school level using teachers as the units of analysis; (2) the finding that the perceived quality of the district-school supervisory relationship is a strong contextual variable mediating personnel perceptions of the quality of building level O/S climate provides further qualitative evidence supporting the importance of this broader, organizational dimension as a structural component of the O/S model; and (3) the collective findings of the qualitative component of this study provide additional strong support for the conceptualization of O/S climate as a multidimensional, organizational construct.
**Supplemental Research Questions**

In addition to primary research questions, a variety of supplemental questions were also addressed as they emerged from results of primary data analyses. Results of these supplemental analyses have already been reported in Chapter Five. Considered collectively, results of supplemental analyses yielded findings consistent with those of primary quantitative analyses. These supplemental findings are summarized as follows:  **First**, a wide range and magnitude of within-school variation was found between OSCI-S subscales and the IPOE-S for schools in the total sample, negating common methods variance concerns.  **Second**, no systematic relationship was found to exist between OSCI-S and OSCI-A subscales/dimensions and SES.  **Third**, the only consistent bivariate relationship between the OSCI-A and the various independent variables was that between the OSCI-A and the IPOE, with Organizational Structure (OS) and Professional Autonomy (PA) bearing the strongest relationship to the IPOE-A.

A **fourth** finding was that rather strong relationships were evident between various OSCI-A subscales/dimensions and the IPOE-A for the middle/junior high (OS, PA, DSC) and secondary (PA, CSR, SR) school samples.  **Fifth**, the OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) was found to account for most of the total variance in organizational effectiveness across schools, with no meaningful contributions made by school size and SES. Additionally, the Organizational Structure (OS) subscale dimension was also found to account for a large portion of the total variance among schools in student size.  **Sixth**, differences between administrator and staff perceptions of the kinds and extent of individual school supervisory activities were evident in the total sample.  **Seventh**, strong associations were evident in the total sample between professional staff reports of kinds and
extent of school supervisory activities and all six OSCI-S dimensions/subscales and the IPOE-S. This strong relationship pattern was not reflected in the administrator sample.

These supplemental findings, in turn, provided further support for a number of conclusions consistent with those derived from primary research findings: (1) considerable within-school variation exists between organizational/supervisory climate and organizational effectiveness across individual schools; (2) the OSCI subscales/dimensions are independent measures of the O/S climate construct that do not systematically covary with individual indices of effectiveness (e.g., CAT, ADA) and SES; (3) O/S climate variables and O/S climate/organizational effectiveness relationships may be differentially defined within individual school levels (e.g., middle/junior high, secondary schools); (4) findings of supplemental analyses corroborate the importance of the Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension in defining the overall O/S climate construct; and (5) staff perceive their presence and participation in individual school supervisory structures and O/S climate more strongly than do school administrators.

**Part Two Synthesis of Major Findings and Conclusions**

Major findings and conclusions of Part Two of this study provided additional quantitative and qualitative support for the viability of conceptualizing school instructional supervision as a multidimensional, organizational phenomenon. Collective findings and conclusions derived from results of quantitative and qualitative analyses completed strongly suggested that the O/S climate construct is a multidimensional variable that is most directly tied to personnel perceptions of the school as an organization. Findings and conclusions from bivariate and multivariate analyses completed also suggested that O/S climate may be best understood as an organizational variable that is most directly explained by personnel
perceptions of supervisory structure and professional supervisory autonomy. Furthermore, the findings and conclusions of qualitative analyses completed provided additional within-school evidence supporting the multidimensional nature of the O/S climate construct. Through generating a series of school-level contextual variables found to further mediate personnel perceptions of school O/S climate quality, results of qualitative probes completed in the study provided further evidence supporting the complex, multidimensional nature of the O/S climate construct as a school organizational variable.

Discussion

This section presents a discussion of conclusions reached based on findings from analyses completed in the study. The discussion is organized in five parts. The first part of the discussion focuses on conceptualization, refinement and construct validity issues associated with model and empirical instrument development. Parts two and three provide discussions of conclusions derived from analyses results of primary and supplemental research questions completed in the study. The fourth part presents a discussion of conclusions derived from analyses results of qualitative interviews completed in identified outlier and comparison schools. The final part of the discussion addresses issues related to research methodology and design.

Conceptualization, Refinement and Construct Validity of O/S Model and OSCI Instrument

The research impetus for this study centered on a perceived need for the conceptualization and development of a theoretical model of school supervision. A special feature of the study was its emphasis on specifically examining organizational structures and personnel interactive behaviors peculiar to schools and conceptualizing a model that directly
addresses schools as unique organizations. This focus is based on a view of the limited usefulness of borrowing traditional models of organization from the social sciences and applying them to schools. This view underscores a strong perception, supported by organizational theorists in educational administration (Allison, 1983; Willower, 1975, 1988), that schools are organizationally unique and, therefore, require their own explanatory models.

Presently within educational administration, there exists general agreement among researchers on the need for further theory-based research examining the nature and complexity of school organizational culture (Willower, 1988). Additionally, as researchers in educational administration have become more cognizant of the multidimensional characteristics of school organizations, increased recognition has also emerged of the usefulness of identifying individual school subcultures as the foci of systematic research (Firestone & Corbett, 1988; Willower, 1986).

The Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Model of Instructional Supervision developed in this study has focused on an examination of one important dimension of school organizational culture - the school supervisory subculture. The O/S model was developed to provide a framework for exploring the nature and effects of the adult professional learning environment in schools and the organizational/ supervisory climate that shapes and infuses this environment.

O/S Model

The Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) model developed emphasizes instructional supervision in schools as being an essentially organizational phenomenon. An important feature of the model is that, rather than being causal in design, the O/S model is
conceptualized as a *processual* and *interactive* framework for examining school organizational/supervisory behavior. The multiple relationships posited in the O/S model among supervisory structure, O/S climate dimensions and the various effectiveness indices represent an initial attempt to conceptualize school instructional supervision as a multidimensional, organizational phenomenon. Given the exploratory nature of the model framework, the three school effectiveness indices of organizational effectiveness, school productivity and school holding power included in the model framework were deemed to be reasonable dependent measures to guide explorations of possible relationships among O/S climate and school effectiveness in this initial investigation. Of particular interest in this study was exploring the O/S climate construct as an organizational variable and determining the nature and extent of its relationship to these various measures of school effectiveness.

Quantitative findings derived in this study strongly supported the link or connectedness between dimensions of organizational/supervisory climate posited in the model and personnel perceptions of the effectiveness of schools as organizations. The fact that the dependent variable of perceived organizational effectiveness (IPOE) emerged in quantitative analyses as the variable most strongly linked to dimensions of O/S climate provides rather strong support for the organizational focus of the O/S model and the six factor analyzed O/S climate subscales as organizational dimensions of school supervisory behavior.

The final six-factor solution retained in the exploratory factor analyses generated factors that were only partly consistent with the original O/S model dimensions. The final identified factors or OSCI dimensions emerging in the six-factor solution included: Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA), Collaborative Sharing/Rapport
(CSR), District Supervisory Climate (DSC), Self Reflection (SR), and Centralization (CEN). This factor analyzed, six-dimensional OSCI subscale structure was subsequently incorporated into the revised O/S model configuration (Figure 2, p. 234).

The original dimensions of Centralization, Professional Autonomy, and Rapport were supported and retained in the final, six-factor solution. The other original model dimensions of Vertical Communication, Communicative Depth, and Goal Consensus, though, were not supported in this solution. However, conceptual elements of these constructs were retained in the final six dimensions that emerged. The additional original dimension of metaphoric role perception was not operationalized in this study. This dimension, nonetheless, is considered to be a variable worthy of exploration in subsequent research employing a more specific, qualitative focus.

The factor-analyzed OSCI-S subscales of Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) were found to be most clearly linked with personnel perceptions of school organizational effectiveness (IPOE). Additionally, the emergence in factor analyses results of a rather strong District Supervisory Climate (DSC) subscale provided support for the importance of this district-school organizational dimension of the O/S model.

Results of the factor analyses did not support the macro- and micro-communicative structural dimensions posited in the original O/S model. The O/S subscales/dimensions emerging in the six-factor solution did not conceptually support the original model framework positing a "nesting" of micro-communicative supervisory elements within larger macro-communicative elements contributing to the overall structure of a school's professional learning environment. The fact that the factor analyses did not confirm these
macro- and micro-communicative elements as defining an overall within school organizational/supervisory (O/S) structure suggests the need for a revisiting of this O/S structure construct, its possible relationship to other model variables, and its general usefulness as a variable contributing to a conceptual understanding of the organizational nature of school instructional supervisory behavior. Additionally, the specific content of item loadings on individual OSCI-S subscale factors also suggests that school personnel responding to the OSCI-S (in its present form) did not differentiate between micro- and macro-supervisory structures in registering their perceptions of the quality of instructional supervisory behaviors and interactions occurring in their schools.

Given that the dual communicative structure dimensions of the O/S model were not supported by factor analyses results, a number of further speculative suggestions emerge: (1) the macro- and micro-communicative "nested" structure as presently articulated in the O/S model is not a viable organizational representation of the actual structural configuration of instructional supervision in schools; (2) the nested communicative O/S structure subconstruct suggested in the O/S model could perhaps be better conceived as more of a masked, latent variable and as such warrants further scrutiny in future model refinement work; and (3) the nested O/S structure subconstruct should perhaps be further explored and reconceptualized as a somewhat broader organizational variable framing both intra-organizational structures (within-school professional learning environment) and extra-organizational structures (the larger school-district professional learning environment).

The second and third suggestions seem plausible given the fact that a considerable number of items from both the original macro-communicative and micro-communicative sections of the OSCI-S instrument loaded on the final six subscales/dimensions.
Additionally, the retention in the six-factor solution of the relatively strong District Supervisory Climate (DSC) subscale/dimension lends credence to the third suggestion and indicates the need for further consideration of this broader notion of structural nesting and its potential for clarifying school personnel members' perceptions of important organizational structural elements and element relationships impacting school O/S climate and effectiveness. These speculations suggest the need for continued conceptual development and refinement of the O/S structure sub-construct as a potential viable component of the O/S model.

Of particular interest is the potential usefulness of this multidimensional structure component as a substantive variable in the O/S model framework, given that the model seeks to define critical elements and variable relationships involving school supervisory structure, climate and effectiveness. Factor analysis findings indicating the importance of district-school supervisory climate as a potentially strong component affecting school staff perceptions of overall school O/S climate quality suggest the need for a broader conceptualization of micro- and macro-communicative O/S structure that reflects this larger district-school supervisory climate notion. In light of these findings, further examination of relationships among O/S variables employing this broader O/S communicative structure perspective seems warranted and appears to hold promise as a purposeful direction for continued O/S model refinement.

**OSCI Instrument**

Results of exploratory factor analyses completed in this study provide positive evidence affirming the OSCI instrument as a multidimensional inventory of school organizational climate. The six-factor solution retained in the factor analyses procedures
was clearly distinguishable over other solutions in terms of the amount of variance explained, the conceptual fit of items comprising each factor, and the solution's overall simplicity of factor structure. Results of these analyses supported the construct validity of the OSCI as an inventory of these six identified dimensions of organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate (Figure 2, p. 234). The fact that the first OSCI subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) demonstrated the largest number of factor loadings suggests the need to revisit the other five subscales/dimensions of the OSCI instrument. These subscales/dimensions might possibly be further developed and refined in subsequent studies.

Finally, findings and conclusions from the set of criterion-related validity and reliability analyses, when considered collectively with factor analytic results, provided rather strong support for the OSCI instrument as a reasonably valid and reliable measure of school organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate.

Discussion of Major Findings and Conclusions

Pertinent to Quantitative Research Questions

This section presents a discussion of major findings and conclusions derived from analyses completed for the primary quantitative research questions guiding the study. The discussion is organized into subsections dealing with: (1) quantitative findings and conclusions relating to specific bivariate and multivariate variable relationships addressed in the various research questions; (2) relationships between administrator and professional staff perceptions of O/S climate dimension levels among schools; and (3) relationships between O/S climate variables and effectiveness indices in schools with similar demographic characteristics. A discussion of findings and conclusions derived from qualitative analysis
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results of outlier schools (research question 6) is included as part of the general discussion of qualitative findings and conclusions of the study presented in part four of this discussion.

**Bivariate Relationships Between OSCI Climate Variables and School Effectiveness Indices**

Results of correlation analyses completed to investigate bivariate relationships between the various OSCI climate dimensions and the various school effectiveness indices provided evidence supporting the positive relationship among these O/S climate dimensions and school personnel perceptions of the school as an effective organization, and generally supported the organizational focus of the OSCI subscales/dimensions.

In attempting to understand Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Climate as a school organizational variable, results of correlational analyses suggest that the O/S construct most relates to variables of organizational effectiveness, where organizational effectiveness is seen as a **process** and not a school **product** variable. The subscales/dimensions of Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) were found to have the strongest and most consistent relationships with the IPOE across school levels and these dimensions of organizational climate appear to be the best overall process measures of the effectiveness of the school as an organization. Further, socioeconomic status (SES) did not appreciably alter the relationships found among these O/S climate variables and the IPOE. These findings suggest it makes sense to conceptualize linkages in schools between school organizational effectiveness and O/S climate in terms of degrees or levels of organizational structure, professional autonomy, and collaborative sharing/rapport.

Additionally, since causal modeling was not part of the analysis, it would appear that whatever linkages exist between OSCI subscales/dimensions and school productivity (i.e.,
student achievement and ADA) are most likely mediated by organizational effectiveness and that the links between O/S climate in schools and student achievement and attendance are largely indirect. One exception to this conclusion may be the findings for the relationship between the OSCI subscales of Organizational Structure (OS) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) and attendance for middle/junior high schools. For the sample of middle/junior high schools (n=23), a moderately strong, negative correlation was found between Organizational Structure (OS) and ADA (r = -.48, p<.05), and a rather strong, negative correlation was obtained between Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) and ADA (r = -.60, p<.01).

This finding contrasts with findings for the elementary and secondary school samples, and suggests that the organizational culture of middle schools may be somewhat unique. One might speculate that, in middle schools, administrators’ and teachers’ daily activities are somewhat constrained due to the presence of a rather strong organizational press for maintaining student order and discipline both within individual classrooms and throughout the school. Additionally, this organizational press may perhaps extend as well to a strong need for active monitoring of student academic and social activities. This conjecture regarding the nature of middle school organizations suggests that middle school organizational culture may be more transitional in nature - characterized by more dynamic flux and uncertainty. In junior high and middle schools, administrators’ and teachers’ daily professional activities may be oriented more to managing contingency events rather than focusing on instructional and supervisory planning/sharing.

This view seems supported by Daniel and Scott (1993) who found that middle school teachers tended to have more cohesive beliefs about appropriate roles, relationships and
behaviors of persons in their schools (social element), but were more fragmented in their conceptions of the leadership style of the principal, goal setting strategies, and open sharing of ideas (school environment) and in their beliefs about decisionmaking strategies, inservice strategies, and uniqueness of staff development opportunities (the organization's structural realities). Additionally, the junior high/middle school findings of this study are consistent with general notions of a distinctive and idealized middle school organizational culture that have been proposed by various sources over the past decade (e.g., Daniel, 1990; Daniel, 1991; George, 1983; Lake, 1991; NASSP Council on Middle Level Education, 1985; Shockley, Holt, & Meichtry, 1985; Sklarz, 1986).

Multivariate Relationships Among Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Climate Variables and School Effectiveness Indices

Results of multivariate analyses completed in this study generally provide additional support for the multidimensionality of the O/S climate construct and its relationship to indices of school effectiveness. The finding that the OSCI-S subscales/dimensions do possess some incremental, criterion-related validity with the school effectiveness indices suggests that the general notion of school effectiveness and its connection to school climate cannot be explained unidimensionally.

There appears to be a quality of "additiveness" associated with the various O/S variables in being able to explain/account for variation in perceptions of school organizational effectiveness. Thus, in attempting to understand the notion of school effectiveness from an organizational-supervisory climate perspective, it appears important to first identify the specific definition of effectiveness (e.g., student achievement, ADA, etc.) that is being considered.
Finally, the O/S climate of schools appears to be best understood as a school organizational culture and professional learning environment construct that is primarily linked to the effectiveness of the school as an organization, not to what the school generates in terms of an organizational product (i.e., student achievement scores). This conclusion provides some support for the O/S model that suggests that O/S climate is first linked to the overall effectiveness of the school as an organization -- an organization that is comprised, in part, of a perceptible supervisory subculture with its own unique organizational/supervisory structure. The relationships between O/S climate and student achievement and ADA are probably mediated by perceptions and subsequent behaviors of school members regarding the organizational effectiveness of the school. Additionally, linkages between O/S climate and organizational effectiveness appear to be further mediated by context variables such as those identified in the qualitative component of the study (i.e., principal supervisory leadership style, decisionmaking structure, supervisory focus and stance, and district-school relationship).

Relationships Between Administrator and Professional Staff Perceptions of O/S Climate Dimension Levels Among Schools

The notably strong correlations in the secondary school sample (not found in the elementary or middle/junior high samples) between administrator perceptions of Organizational Structure (OS) and staff perceptions of Organizational Structure (OS), Professional Autonomy (PA) and District Supervisory Climate (DSC) provide support for the notion that the professional supervisory environment (i.e., O/S climate) of secondary and elementary schools may be quite different. For example, in the elementary school sample, OSCI-A/OSCI-S correlations were explained primarily by staff perceptions regarding the
extent of Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) among personnel in these schools. It may be that elementary teachers and administrators, because of the relatively uncomplicated instructional delivery structure (viz., self-contained classrooms) commonly found in elementary schools, are able to develop a fairly integrated, collaborative sense regarding instructional and supervisory decisionmaking in their schools. However, the organizational/supervisory (O/S) structure of secondary schools (viz., a larger number and variety of relatively autonomous curricular departments, with more complicated supervisory "linkages" existing between various administrative/supervisory and staff personnel) tends to make administrator and teacher supervisory relations in these schools more complicated and program-specific than in elementary schools (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Secondary teachers may view the complexity of "in situ" instructional and supervisory decisionmaking structures in their schools, and their relationship to these structures, as professionally important and more directly affecting their overall perceptions of school O/S climate quality.

Relationships Between Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) Climate Variables and Effectiveness Indices in Schools with Similar Demographic Characteristics

Findings from results of comparative analyses completed for Research Question 5 provide rather strong evidence suggesting that individual schools can be markedly similar in demographic characteristics, but have clear differences in overall staff perceptions of the level and quality of supervisory climate and organizational effectiveness. Individual schools in comparison pairs were found to vary considerably in terms of staff perceptions of the relationship, or connectedness, between supervisory climate (OS) and organizational effectiveness/productivity (OS/IPOE-S). Further, school staff perceptions of level/quality
of organizational effectiveness and O/S climate appear not to be related in any systematic way to school size and socioeconomic status (SES).

Discussion of Major Findings and Conclusions

Pertinent to Supplemental Research Questions

The series of nine quantitative and qualitative supplemental analyses completed in this study collectively provided additional evidence supporting the multidimensional nature of the O/S construct, and further defined O/S climate as a school-level organizational variable. Findings and conclusions from supplemental analyses results generally corroborated those obtained from primary analyses, and provided additional insights into the nature of the O/S climate construct as a school-level perceptual phenomenon.

Within-school relationships between OSCI-S subscales and the IPOE-S for all schools affirmed the O/S climate construct as a distinct school-level variable. Additionally, findings from supplemental bivariate analyses suggested that the OSCI subscales/dimensions are indeed independent organizational/supervisory variables. These additional findings support the O/S climate as an independent construct that does not systematically covary with SES, and that is most directly related to perceptions of organizational effectiveness, rather than other effectiveness/productivity measures.

The findings regarding differences in administrator and staff reports of extent of supervisory activities are interesting and suggest a number of possible explanations. For example, administrator and staff perceptions of instructional and staff development structures in individual schools might vary because staff may not be fully informed about instructional planning/decisionmaking structures in place. Additionally, it is conceivable that a large number of staff members in individual schools may simply not participate in these kinds of
supervisory planning groups do to individual work constraints and/or the existing organizational structures in the school.

Collectively, the findings and conclusions from supplemental analyses completed generally provided further support for the O/S climate construct as a multidimensional, school-level climate variable, and the OSCI as an inventory of organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate. The following section presents an in-depth discussion of major findings and conclusions pertinent to qualitative analyses completed for Primary Question 6 and Supplemental Question 9.

Discussion of Major Findings and Conclusions

Pertinent to Qualitative Research Questions

This section presents a discussion of findings and conclusions derived from the sets of qualitative analyses completed for selected school comparison sets (primary question 5 and supplemental question 9) and identified outlier schools (primary question 6). In this study, qualitative interviews were first completed in the outlier schools identified in the total sample. Results from these outlier analyses provided the impetus for continued qualitative exploration of sets of comparison schools identified in research question 5. Collectively, the sets of analyses completed for the school outlier and comparison pair sets comprised the qualitative component of the study.

The five contextual variables (viz., Principal Supervisory Leadership Style, Decisionmaking Structure, Organizational/Supervisory Focus, Supervisory Stance, and District-School Supervisory Relationship) emerging in the inductive analyses constitute qualitative evidence corroborating the complex nature of the linkages between the O/S climate construct and organizational effectiveness at the individual school level and
demonstrate the importance of examining within-school differences. These within-school contextual aspects of organizational/supervisory behavior surfacing in the analyses provide important insights into the nature of O/S climate at the school level and its linkage to organizational effectiveness.

The five contextual variables identified provide support for the O/S climate construct as reflecting a dynamic and complex set of organizational structures and interactive processes within which school personnel collectively negotiate instructional and supervisory quality. The notion of organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate (and the school supervisory subculture) as dynamic and processual is consistent with current discussions in the literature on complex organizations that reflect a growing interest in viewing organizations as comprised of dynamic and fluid structures, populated by members who interact and negotiate through a variety of organizational processes to shape and, in some instances, transform the organization's culture (Czarniawska-Joerges, 1992). Interestingly, this more recent view of organizations as dynamic and processual contrasts sharply with previous, traditional notions of organizations that focused on organizational structures as static, bureaucratic and functionalist (Etzioni, 1961; Parsons, 1949; Weber, 1922).

**Contextual Themes**

Collectively, the five within-school variables emerging from inductive analyses (Table 43, pp. 223-224) suggest three broad contextual themes that appear to further mediate personnel perceptions of O/S climate quality at the individual school level and linkages between O/S climate characteristics and school organizational effectiveness. These school level contextual themes include: (1) principal supervisory leadership, (2) the normative values and beliefs of personnel regarding supervision, and (3) the development and
maintenance of meaningful within-school and district-school organizational-supervisory structures. A review of the O/S climate interview profiles constructed for each school in the qualitative sample (Appendices F and G) provides a sense of the manner in which these various themes are interwoven by school personnel throughout the organizational fabric of their supervisory activities and interactions and the ways in which these contextual variables help to thematically define the nature of each school's professional learning environment.

**Principal Supervisory Leadership**

The set of sixty individual interviews with teachers and principals completed in this study provide strong and consistent support for the importance of the principal's role as supervisory leader in affecting personnel perceptions of school organizational-supervisory climate and organizational effectiveness. Specifically, in high O/S climate schools in the sample data, principals' supervisory leader styles were found to be characterized by three distinguishing features: (1) active encouragement and support of teacher instructional and supervisory efforts; (2) an open, participative view regarding supervisory decisionmaking; and (3) a decided emphasis on creating structured opportunities for teacher involvement in group planning and sharing and in supervisory decisionmaking. Thus, the contextual variable of decisionmaking structure was found to be directly related to the kind of supervisory leader style evidenced by principals. This emphasis on structuring and supporting teacher collegial sharing and input into decisionmaking evidenced by high O/S climate school principals, coupled with the fact that teachers in both high and low O/S climate schools noted principal ability to provide collegial sharing and decisionmaking opportunities as primary criteria guiding their own assessments of principal supervisory leader effectiveness, suggests that this aspect of principal supervisory leadership is an
important contextual dimension affecting personnel perceptions of school O/S climate quality.

Interestingly, in low O/S climate schools principals were found to practice supervisory leader styles that focused more on implementing external program services rather than on cultivating internal collegial structures. This contrast between reactive and proactive leader styles of low and high O/S climate principals found in sample data is congruent with the "transactional" versus "transformative" leadership distinction delineated by Burns (1978). In this leadership differentiation, transactional leaders are characterized as focusing primarily on providing and satisfying extrinsic needs, while transformative leaders focus primarily on higher-order, more intrinsic needs. Transactional leaders direct their energies at providing and implementing professional services to personnel, while transformative leadership involves principals and teachers in the mutual development of shared covenants that "transform" their work activities through cultivating a moral commitment to the organization. A related notion implicit in this transformative leader relationship between principal and teachers is the ability of the principal to provide teachers with support and encouragement, and to build teachers' sense of importance as professionals (Gross & Herriott, 1965; McPherson, 1979).

The literature on the principalship is replete with discussions of the importance of the principal's instructional leadership role in affecting school organizational performance (e.g., Barth, 1989; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Rossow, 1990; Smith & Andrews, 1989). From among these numerous perspectives, of particular relevance to the collegial dimension of effective supervisory leader behavior emerging in this study's interview analyses is the notion of "leadership density" posited by Sergiovanni (1989). The concept of leadership
density essentially reflects the view that complex organizations such as schools function best when principals act not as sole leaders, but as lead members of "collegial teams" of teachers. This view emphasizes that principals, as transformative leaders, operate primarily as leaders among school leader colleagues, and that as a "collegial team" leader, the principal encourages teachers to become active players in shared leadership responsibilities and decisionmaking. Notably, a positive link between administrator/staff collegial team building and school success has been reported by Little (1982), who found that personnel in successful schools displayed a greater tendency toward cultivating strong collegial norms and engaging in a range of professional interactions. It is this sense of collegial teaming and shared leadership behavior that emerged as a strong contextual feature of successful principal leader styles in high O/S climate schools in the sample data.

Implicit also in the notion of supervisory leadership as collegial is the ability of school principals to create and communicate a compelling vision of organizational goals and expectations. The importance to a successful transformative leadership style of articulating an organizational vision has, in fact, been emphasized by Bennis (1984), who suggests that principal effort at cultivating and sharing such a vision with personnel "...clarifies the current situation and induces commitment to the future" (Bennis, p. 66).

Collectively, these complementary strands of collegiality and vision-building were found to be thematically interwoven through principal and teacher interview responses in the sample data, and they emerged as primary characteristics articulating the principal supervisory leader contextual theme. These contextual features of high O/S climate principal supervisory leader behavior are strongly supported in the literature on principal collegial decisionmaking and organizational planning.
Supervisory Norms and Beliefs

Personnel organizational/supervisory focus and supervisory stance emerged in the interview analyses as two additional contextual variables affecting organizational/supervisory climates of high and low O/S climate schools. These two contextual variables were found to be important psychosocial, organizational elements contributing to and distinguishing the supervisory subculture of individual schools in the qualitative sample. Rather clear differences were found between low and high O/S climate schools in the kinds of professional activities and supervisory interactions emphasized and in the ways in which respondents articulated school-level normative values and beliefs about organizational/supervisory practice.

In low O/S climate schools, the organizational/supervisory focus of personnel was found to be classroom-oriented, with principals and teachers emphasizing duties and responsibilities associated with teachers' individual work activities and individual classroom needs. This focus on classroom-level instructional and supervisory concerns was coupled with a supervisory stance that was primarily reactive in nature. The supervisory stance of low O/S climate school personnel was primarily characterized by passive compliance with external supervisory directives, and acceptance of imposed organizational standards. Personnel in low O/S climate schools often expressed negative sentiments about the purposefulness of some imposed instructional and/or supervisory programs; however, their stance typically centered on adopting and coping with program directives and fulfilling mandated requirements. Perhaps, in schools characterized by low O/S climate, norms and values are grounded in a "work ethic" of supervision rather than one consistent with a professional ethic and learning environment.
By contrast, principals and teachers in high O/S climate schools, while emphasizing classroom-level quality, also exhibited strong concern for the ways in which various instructional and supervisory programs were integrated within the school, and a desire to focus collaborative planning efforts across grade levels and through the curriculum. This broader, school-wide organizational/supervisory focus was found to be coupled with a complementary supervisory stance characterized by active identification of and responsiveness to school-level learning needs. Principals and teachers in these high O/S climate schools, in expressing concern for the contextual needs of the school as a whole, evidenced a strong collaborative orientation toward initiating within-school supervisory efforts directed at improving their overall school student and professional learning environments.

Thus, low and high O/S climate schools were typified by a set of contrasting normative personnel patterns that centered around divergent supervisory values and beliefs regarding organizational/supervisory purpose. These contrasting attitudes were found to be grounded in normative beliefs about school supervisory practice that were alternately adoptive versus adaptive, reactive versus proactive, external versus internal, diffusive versus contextual, and professional versus managerial. In low and high O/S climate schools, personnel appeared to define themselves somewhat differently as professionals, constructing different collective professional orientations regarding appropriate organizational/supervisory activities and behaviors. These contrasting professional orientations were found to emerge from different shared assumptions by personnel members of the nature and purposes of supervisory activity in the organizational life of the school. As the professional orientations of principals and teachers in these individual schools were found to influence daily
interactive behaviors and determine supervisory activities, these orientations contributed to shaping the character of the supervisory culture infusing each school's professional learning environment.

Definitions of organizational culture appearing in the literature on complex organizations consistently address the notion of shared meaning construction by organization members (e.g., Louis, 1985; Ouchi, 1981; Rosaldo, 1984; Trice & Beyer, 1985). Recently, Schein (1991) has provided a formal definition of culture that is consistent with other earlier definitions, and that offers important insights into the processes by which school personnel may construct school-level supervisory culture. In Schein's view, culture is "...a pattern of shared basic assumptions, invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration" (p. 247).

Applying Schein's definition of culture to the school supervisory subculture, principals and teachers in individual schools may best be able to negotiate shared meanings about useful supervisory practice and construct meaningful student and adult learning environments when their negotiations and constructions rest on a foundation of positive organizational/supervisory assumptions and beliefs. These positive cultural assumptions and beliefs are ones that enable school personnel not simply to adopt, but to adapt to external organizational constraints (e.g., state/district supervisory mandates, etc.), and that cause them to not diffuse their organizational energies, but to focus purposefully on developing supervisory activities and programs that address the contextual needs of both student and adult learners in their schools. As Corbett and Rossman (1988) suggest, it is through cultivating a shared belief system that principals and teachers can affect and enhance school quality.
Organizational/Supervisory Structures

The within-school contextual variables surfacing in inductive analyses reflect a third contextual theme - organizational/supervisory structures - that appears interwoven, along with supervisory leader style and cultural norms and beliefs, through personnel perceptions of O/S climate in schools in the qualitative sample. Quantitative findings of this study strongly supported both the internal supervisory structure of the school organization (Organizational Structure (OS)) and the broader district-school supervisory structure (District Supervisory Climate (DSC)) as two important elements or organizational dimensions contributing to personnel perceptions of school-level O/S climate quality. Findings of qualitative analyses confirmed the importance of these quantitative variables and provided additional insights into their school-level complexity and contextual nature.

In the sample data, differences were found between low and high O/S climate schools in both the extent and focus of within-school and district-school supervisory structures. Principals and teachers in low O/S climate schools viewed classroom responsibilities and duties as time-consuming, and indicated that individual instructional obligations to a large extent prevented them from organizing and engaging in structured group supervisory activities. Low O/S climate principals and teachers often spoke of time constraints as a primary inhibiting factor, and indicated they felt professionally burdened and overwhelmed with the sheer number of state/district instructional and supervisory programs with which they were forced to comply. Further, principals in these schools appeared to feel an organizational press for implementing external programs and services and, thus, cultivated leader roles as facilitators and implementors of state/district supervisory mandates. Additionally, principals and teachers in low O/S climate schools often described district
supervisory programs as rather diffuse and ill-focused, and not clearly linked to the contextual needs of individual schools within the district.

Interestingly, principals and teachers in high O/S climate schools, while affected by the same external mandates, did not emphasize these mandates in interview remarks. Principals of these schools stressed the importance they placed on their teachers being involved in ongoing group planning and decisionmaking, and elaborated upon the rather creative meeting structures they had developed to facilitate teachers’ collegial interactions. Likewise, teachers in high O/S climate schools expressed praise for their principals’ effectiveness in organizing and maintaining these internal group meeting structures. Notably, both principals and teachers in high O/S climate schools indicated a substantial portion of their supervisory efforts during structured meetings were directed toward school-wide organizational planning and effectiveness, and were not limited solely to individual classroom or grade-level concerns.

Principals and teachers in some high O/S climate schools spoke highly of the superintendent and other district office personnel, indicating that they viewed district supervisory programs, and the efforts of district office administrators in coordinating these programs, as having a positive impact on the quality of instruction and supervision in their own schools. Teacher and principal respondents in high O/S climate schools in the qualitative sample were found to vary somewhat in their perceptions of district supervisory quality, though all respondents were found to have generally positive views regarding district-school structures. Respondents in some high O/S climate schools viewed their district-school supervisory structures as adequate and satisfactory, while others expressed high praise for the quality and usefulness of their district’s supervisory programs. In schools
where principals and teachers viewed district-school supervisory programs as highly relevant and effective, this strong, positive district-supervisory structure was found to be a significant element contributing to personnel perceptions of school-level O/S climate quality.

In general, qualitative findings of this study concerning school-level organizational/supervisory structures suggest that staff perceptions of school-level O/S climate quality are strongly grounded in teacher views regarding the kinds and quality of supervisory structures in place in individual schools. Additionally, teachers were found to consistently view the principal as the primary motivating agent in developing and encouraging teacher participation in these structures. Thus, there appears to be a strong link between this third organizational/supervisory structure theme and the first theme of principal supervisory leadership style (in much the same manner as the second theme of supervisory norms and beliefs was found to be connected to principal leader style as well).

This finding of the importance of school-level organizational/supervisory structures and their connection to principal leadership style in affecting teacher perceptions of O/S climate quality is generally consistent with earlier research in educational administration concerning supervisory structure and leader behavior (e.g., Bowers & Seashore, 1966; Halpin, 1966; Hemphill, 1967; Vroom, 1976). This traditional body of research on organizational structures and administrative behavior in schools however, while important, primarily served to underscore the connection between organizational task and consideration structures and school administrative leader behavior without attempting to define the nature of supervisory (e.g., principal-teacher, teacher-teacher) relationships in organizational (i.e., organizational/supervisory) terms.
Thus, of particular interest in this study are more recent findings from empirical research focusing on the connection between organizational structures, principal leadership and teacher environmental perceptions. For example, Blase (1983) noted the importance of supervisory activity and decisionmaking structures on teacher perceptions of work environment quality as part of research on the relationship between task-structure and consideration behaviors of principals and teacher stress. Specifically, Blase reported "lack of follow-through" as one of eight principal behaviors defined by teachers as violating task-structure criteria, and "lack of opportunities for input" as one of four principal behaviors found to violate consideration criteria as defined by teachers. Task-structure and consideration criteria were determined from negative principal behaviors identified by teachers as influencing their work stress. Principal failure to provide and structure "essential supervisory activities" and programs, and their inability to "...develop viable channels through which teachers may express their thoughts on program- and policy-related issues" were found by Blase to contribute, along with other dimensional facets of task-structure and consideration, to teacher feelings of stress, manipulation, helplessness and impotence (Blase, pp. 172-73).

The importance of principal development and cultivation of strong school-level supervisory and decisionmaking structures noted by Blase was supported by findings of this study. However, whereas Blase's findings focused specifically on principal failure in providing essential supervisory and decisionmaking structures as "micropolitical" contributing factors affecting teacher perceptions of environmental work stress (considered here as one artifact of O/S climate), qualitative findings of this study are viewed as providing evidence framing supervisory structures and principal structure-affirming behaviors
as key contextual variables affecting school personnel supervisory interactions and school-level climate in a larger, organizational sense. Supervisory structures and principal supervisory influence in creating and sustaining these structures emerged in this study as primary organizational themes affecting personnel perceptions of school-level O/S climate and as strong thematic components contributing to the nature and quality of the adult organizational/supervisory (O/S) environment in individual schools.

Evidence emerging from interview analyses suggesting that a strong district supervisory program can act as a powerful district-school organizational/supervisory structure affecting building personnel perceptions of school-level O/S climate also provided further support for the importance of the quantitative dimension of District Supervisory Climate (DSC) in the O/S model. Specific evidence obtained from analyses of interview data in the qualitative sample (e.g., Outlier School D, Appendix F) further suggests that superintendents can be powerful organizational catalysts in affecting district-school supervisory program change and improvement, and that superintendent supervisory leadership can act as a strong mediating influence in shaping personnel perceptions of school-level O/S climate.

Principal and teacher perceptions of outstanding district-level supervisory program leadership was not evidenced in all high O/S climate schools in the qualitative sample, although positive views of district-school supervisory program quality were consistently obtained from high O/S climate school interview respondents. In instances, though, where a strong, positive district-school organizational/supervisory climate was evident in the sample, two features were found to distinguish this high quality district-school supervisory climate: (1) the formulation by the superintendent of a clear organizational focus for district-
wide supervisory programs; and (2) frequent communication between district office and individual schools about district-wide supervisory goals and objectives, and available instructional and supervisory programs.

These findings concerning the potential influence of superintendents’ supervisory leadership in affecting district-school supervisory change and improvement are congruent with recent research on the superintendency affirming the positive impact of superintendents’ communication and influence pattern characteristics on their districts (Pitner & Ogawa, 1981), as well as the importance of superintendent "vision" in delineating and restructuring district-wide goals (Cuban, 1989). More specifically, these findings are also supported by recent research on instructionally effective school districts, in which superintendents were often found to assume active roles in district-wide instructional and supervisory program development and management (Murphy & Hallinger, 1988, 1986).

As qualitative findings of this study regarding district-school supervisory programs appear to be consistent with earlier research on district-level program improvement efforts and superintendent supervisory leadership (Floden, et al., 1988; Pitner & Ogawa, 1981), the findings are also unique in terms of the insights they offer for gaining a deeper understanding of the nature of supervisory climate at the individual school level. In the context of O/S model-building efforts initiated in this study, these qualitative findings regarding the district-school supervisory relationship are important in providing further contextual evidence supporting the notion that school instructional supervision is indeed a multidimensional, organizational phenomenon, and that its organizational nature may include both within-school and district-school organizational/supervisory facets. Specifically, these findings suggest that district supervisory leadership and a strong, positive district-school
organizational/supervisory structure may act as additional mediating influences on building staff perceptions of school-level supervisory climate.

**Differences Among Schools in the Qualitative Sample Across Various School Levels and Socioeconomic Status (SES) Categories**

The limitations imposed by the number and kind of qualitative interviews (three telephone interviews per school) completed for each school in the qualitative sample in this study preclude the formulation of broad, definitive statements regarding the nature of possible differences in the organizational/supervisory climate of schools across levels and SES categories. However, analyses completed in this initial qualitative probe suggest the possibility of contextual differences existing in organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate focus across level and SES categories. These differences could extend to the manner in which administrators and teachers in schools in differing contexts establish instructional and supervisory priorities (Teddlie, Kirby & Stringfield, 1989), as well as to perceivable differences in the organizational press and goal-setting behaviors of personnel in middle/junior high and secondary schools as opposed to elementary schools (e.g., Daniel & Scott, 1993; Firestone & Wilson, 1989; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Smith & Andrews, 1989). Such differences are not readily apparent in quantitative analyses such as those completed in this study controlling for SES. Results of this initial qualitative probe of O/S climate in targeted schools suggest the strong need for designing studies involving selected schools in the sample to further investigate the extent of contextual differences in O/S climate within various school categories.
Integrating Contextual Themes and Variables Into a Unified Conception of School O/S Climate

The principal leadership, supervisory norms and beliefs and organizational/supervisory structure themes discerned in qualitative analyses collectively provide additional contextual evidence supporting the main thesis of this study that supervision in schools may best be viewed as an organizational phenomenon. The contextual themes and school-level variables emerging in the qualitative analyses are addressed separately in various ways in the literature on organizations and school administrative leadership. However, the contextual themes and variables in this study are unique in representing an interrelated set of school-level facets of professional supervisory behavior that collectively help further define and clarify the nature of the organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate construct. In particular, these contextual facets further articulate O/S climate as a personnel perceptual variable, providing deeper insights into the manner in which O/S climate perceptions influence and shape the overall quality of the adult supervisory learning environment at the school level.

Findings from qualitative analyses completed suggest that the O/S climate construct may have some usefulness by way of providing an additional "organizational lens" with which to view the complexity of supervisory life in schools. The strong interrelationships found among the three contextual themes emerging in the analyses add further credence to the notion that contextual climate dimensions and supervisory variables may be interwoven organizationally into a larger, integrated pattern of supervisory structures and professional interactions at the school level. These findings further suggest that considerations of the level and quality of instructional supervision from a decidedly organizational perspective
may have some "value addedness" in terms of understanding the overall nature and complexity of schools as organizations.

Research Methodology and Design Concerns

A primary focus of this study was the initial development and refinement of a theoretical model of organizational/supervisory processes in schools. The organizational/supervisory (O/S) model developed in this study was devised as a conceptual framework designed to explain school instructional supervision as a complex organizational phenomenon, consisting of school personnel engaging in a range of supervisory behaviors and professionally interacting within a variety of organizational structures and contexts.

Willower (1962), in discussing various criteria of good theory-building in educational administration, emphasizes that a good theory must have sufficient scope - that is, it must be able to explain reality in many different contexts. For a theory to be useful, it must be able to explain phenomena as they occur at a broad, general level and also be able to explain individual contextual differences in isolated instances. The notion of sufficient theoretical scope implies that a good conceptual framework must be able to explain phenomena at multiple levels and be conceptually valid when employing different units of analysis. Thus, the extent to which the O/S model developed and refined in this study is able to explain personnel supervisory behavior in schools both generally and within specific varying contexts is an important issue. Related to this notion of model explanatory power is the importance of unit of analysis considerations in research methodology and design.

Findings and conclusions from results of quantitative and qualitative analyses completed in this study provide strong evidence that the unit of analysis issue is a very real and important one in the study of schools as organizations. For example, when conducting
quantitative analyses using large samples, variable comparisons across school means may mask important within-school individual differences in study variables. The set of qualitative analyses completed for the school outlier and comparison pair samples in this study illustrates this point. Qualitative interview analyses identified important additional contextual variables mediating supervisory personnel behavior in outlier and comparison pair schools, as well as idiosyncrasies among various school O/S variables and O/S variable/organizational effectiveness relationships within individual schools that were not apparent in between-school analyses.

This issue of multiple units of analysis and the apparent "value addedness" of combining analyses of between-school and within-school differences suggest the complementarity of these two research foci for collectively deepening the total research process. The findings and conclusions of the quantitative and qualitative components of this study provide clear evidence of the complementary nature of these two methodologies in addressing these two research tiers or unit of analysis concerns. On the school level, quantitative findings supported the school organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate construct as a multidimensional variable across a large sampling of schools. On the individual teacher level, the complexity and multidimensionality of the construct was further defined and clarified using qualitative methods in individual schools. In particular, this study demonstrated that the quantitative component was only able to demonstrate statistical linkages between organizational/supervisory climate variables and effectiveness, while the qualitative component was able to highlight more subtle, cultural linkages apparently existing between these same variables.
What seems suggested by the results of this study is a two-stage, two-level data collection and analysis process. In undertaking theory-based research on organizational characteristics of schools, a first stage involves aggregating and analyzing data using school means as the units of analysis for examining general relationships among variables using variation among schools. Quantitatively, this stage can also be enhanced by using organizational members as the units of analysis (e.g., teachers) within individual schools. The second stage is focused on within-school concerns using qualitative methodology, because the first stage quantitative analysis (using schools as the units of analysis) masks important differences between the relationships of variables within individual schools.

This difference in analytical intent and complexity concerning within-school and between-school methodologies has implications for theory-building as well. The methodological issues of unit of analysis selection and analytical complexity suggest the related notion that a good theory, to have useful explanatory power, must in fact be two-tiered - that is, a good theory must be able to predict and explain within-school variance as well as account for more general relationships among variables across schools.

This notion of complementarity of research methods is not a new notion, but one that has a long tradition in the social sciences. Cronbach (1957) elegantly expressed this natural complementarity of experimental (between-groups) and correlational (within-groups) methods and noted that both methods are integral to aiding construct development and the strengthening of nomological networks (p. 682). This primary connection between selection of research methods and underlying theoretical rationale has more recently been elucidated by Shulman (1988). For Shulman, selection of research method must not simply be a technical question but must be intrinsically connected to the underlying theoretical or
The results of this study suggest a number of important implications that need to be considered in future studies of schools as organizations. First, those seeking to study the organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate of schools can take note that professional staff and administrator perceptions of organizational/supervisory climate can be measured validly and reliably. Second, school effectiveness researchers, when attempting to relate indices of effectiveness to school organizational variables, must be conceptually and operationally clear
about definitions of variables; otherwise, differing results and assumptions about relationships between school organizational climate and school effectiveness indices will obtain. A third implication of this study is that there is a need to further explicate at a conceptual and operational level what is really meant by a professional learning environment in schools. Fourth, quantitative analyses using schools as the units of analysis alone may paint a somewhat misleading picture of relationships among school organizational and school effectiveness variables. A fifth implication is that deductive methods appear quite useful for focusing and developing quantitative, psychometrically sound measures to examine organizational variables like those employed in this study. A sixth implication from the study is that understanding the richness of schools is clearly enhanced by using multilevel units of analysis (e.g., school means versus individual teachers) and using quantitative and qualitative design methodologies. A final, seventh implication of the study might be that educational practitioners might gain from engaging in reflective practice efforts (Schön, 1983, 1991) focusing more directly on organizational process concerns - that is, on cultivating and maintaining effective organizational/ supervisory (O/S) climate as one important link to school effectiveness, and not just primarily on school effectiveness/productivity (viz., student achievement).

**Conceptualizing O/S Climate as a School Context Variable**

This study utilized both quantitative and qualitative research strategies to explore the organizational nature of instructional supervision in schools. As the findings of this exploratory study provide some initial evidence supporting the utility of conceptualizing school instructional supervision as a multidimensional, organizational phenomenon, the findings and conclusions derived from the study's quantitative and qualitative components
collectively highlight an interesting aspect of the multidimensional nature of the O/S climate construct. Quantitative findings from analyses of sample data suggest the O/S climate variable to be a conceptually focused construct that does not systematically covary with the selected school effectiveness indices of organizational effectiveness, school productivity and school holding power using school means as the units of analysis. These findings focus on the nature of between-school differences regarding the O/S climate construct as an organizational variable. The study's quantitative findings and conclusions speak to one level of complexity through examining personnel perceptions of O/S climate quality and organizational effectiveness across large samples of schools.

Qualitative analyses completed, however, reveal the O/S climate construct to be much more complex at the individual school level using teachers as the units of analysis. In exploring the O/S climate construct further in the qualitative component of the study, a number of additional school contextual variables were found to further mediate administrator and staff perceptions of school O/S climate quality and organizational effectiveness. The qualitative evidence provided rather strong support for the view that the O/S climate construct may be best understood as a complex school contextual variable influencing personnel supervisory behavior differentially at the individual school level. As such, the O/S climate variable may be useful as a contextually sensitive barometer for assessing the quality of the adult supervisory environment within individual schools.

**Implications for Theory-Building in Educational Administration**

Findings of this study emphasized the importance of unit of analysis and data collection methodological concerns in conducting empirical research on schools as organizations. These methodological concerns, though, also have important implications for
viewing the process of theory-building and the construction of knowledge in educational administration as a multistage/multilevel enterprise. In particular, the research design and model-building efforts of this study centered on a two-stage/two-level process that involved the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods (stages), and multiple units of analysis (levels) within each stage.

The O/S model development and refinement efforts involved in the study’s quantitative dimension (i.e., factor analyses, criterion-related validity and reliability) represented the first stage of this process. This quantitative first stage consisted of two separate analysis levels. Quantitative findings using schools as the analytic units constituted one level of analysis through highlighting differences among study variables across schools and identifying general relationships among variables. A second analysis level (using teachers as analytic units) then served to identify anomalies not represented in the first level. These two levels together represented a normative, deductive focus - moving first from broad, general strokes across the data, to identifying more specific differences within individual schools. Collectively, findings from this first stage of inquiry were then used to make initial modifications and refinements in the organizational/supervisory (O/S) model.

The second stage of inquiry centered on the use of qualitative methods to further explore variable relationships. During this second stage, qualitative methods were useful in further examining identified anomalies in the data and in identifying contextual features that were not possible in the first stage. This second-stage, inductive process was conducted through employing two levels of analysis as well. In the first analytic level, teachers and administrators in individual school cases were isolated and examined to explore contextual differences within schools. The continued examination of specific school cases, through a
process of iterative, inductive assertion-building, resulted in the identification of an additional set of school-level contextual variables not apparent in first-stage analyses. This constituted the second level of analysis in the qualitative stage. These context variables were useful in making further, more precise, refinements in the conceptual definitions of O/S climate and O/S climate sub-constructs, and represented culturally-based, thematic categories useful in further understanding the nature of linkages identified in stage one (quantitative) analyses between O/S climate variables and organizational effectiveness. These school-level variables did not surface in the first-level stage, remaining only as masked, latent variables in the quantitative analyses. These two analysis levels defining this second (qualitative) stage together represented a cultural, inductive focus - moving first from close-up, qualitative probing of individual school cases to inductive generation of broad, contextual themes. As such, these analysis levels were useful in identifying contextual features of specific school cases important in explaining individual differences in linkages between O/S climate variables and organizational effectiveness. Together, both stage one (quantitative inquiry) and stage two (qualitative inquiry) of this study served as important complementary facets of a comprehensive two-stage/two-level integrated theory-building/research methodology design.

Thus, collective findings from the quantitative and qualitative components of this study seem to have important implications in terms of conceptualizing a broader notion of complementarity or linkage existing between multiple stages and levels within an integrated process of grounded theory-building. Clearly, if only the first (quantitative-based) stage had been completed, then a much more limited view of organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate would have emerged, because knowledge would not have surfaced regarding within-school
contextual differences. However, the linking of quantitative methods with contextually-sensitive qualitative inquiry led to the identification of important context variables that further explicated the nature of individual differences among schools. These second stage variables were useful in further clarifying and refining the O/S climate construct on a cultural level and, consequently, in further strengthening the O/S model.

Therefore, results of this study suggest the desirability of conceptualizing and designing grounded empirical research on school organizations as a multistage, multilevel process. This process involves engaging in theory-building as a two-stage/two-level enterprise that combines use of multiple research methods with multiple, iterative levels of model-building and construct refinement. This multistage/multilevel inquiry process is graphically presented in Appendix K. This study is one example of how this two-stage/two-level research process can be useful in developing more comprehensive understandings of linkages between O/S climate variables and organizational effectiveness and, ultimately, in generating more refined conceptual definitions of organizational variables such as school O/S climate.

Willower (1962) has identified six criteria found in the literature for judging the theoretical adequacy and utility of theories and conceptual models in educational administration. As Willower notes, a theoretical framework must, when scrutinized, be found to be conceptually adequate in terms of six criteria: (1) testability - a theory should lead to deductions which can be credited or discredited by empirical test; (2) consistency - a theory should be free from internal contradiction and not be logically inconsistent; (3) scope - a theory should account for a relatively wide range of data; (4) predictive power - a theory should provide a basis for successful prediction; (5) fruitfulness - a theory should
generate a variety of new hypotheses; and (6) parsimony - other things being equal, a simpler theory is preferable to a more complicated one (Willower, 1962, p. 211).

Findings from this study suggest the advisability of including a seventh criterion - integration. The notion of integration here refers to the ability of a theory, through employing both deductive and inductive methods and using multiple levels of analysis, to generate more refined and comprehensive statements regarding theory construct variables and variable relationships. In this sense, a primary characteristic of a good theory is that it develops and evolves through an integrated, two-stage/two-level process employing multiple levels of analysis within each stage. The six criteria of theoretical adequacy highlighted by Willower have traditionally been employed in assessing model-building adequacy within either stage one or stage two forms of research inquiry. It may be (as the design and results of this study suggest) that the theoretical adequacy of model-building efforts may hinge ultimately, not simply on a one-stage interface between methods and concepts (whether within quantitative or qualitative inquiry), but on the degree to which a higher-order complementarity or integration exists in the use of multiple research methods within a multistage process of iterative construct and model refinement.

Directions for Future Research

The findings and conclusions of this study suggest a number of other potential directions for further research involving the O/S climate construct. This initial study employed conceptual model-building, paper and pencil test survey methods and qualitative interviewing techniques as its primary methodologies. A number of intriguing possibilities can be envisioned for future studies of school O/S climate. First, in terms of the measurement element of organizational/ supervisory (O/S) climate of schools, this study
utilized administrator/staff self-reported perceptions of school climate. Thus, one direction for future research might be to introduce multiple methods at getting at organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate. Secondly, future studies could be directed at refining paper and pencil measures to better elicit personnel perceptions of macro- and micro-organizational elements - perhaps through employing direct observation, interviews, or document analysis methods. Thirdly, as the O/S climate construct was found to relate most directly to the effectiveness of schools as organizations, the refined OSCI instrument developed in this study might be combined with other paper and pencil measures of organizational effectiveness like the IPOE.

Additionally, findings and conclusions derived from qualitative analyses completed in this study highlight the school-specific, contextual nature of the O/S climate variable and suggest the advisability of conducting further studies addressing this contextuality. Findings from the set of analyses of outlier and comparison schools completed represent only an initial first-level qualitative probe of contextual differences in individual schools. Results of this initial qualitative work suggest a strong need for more comprehensive second-level qualitative investigations of within-school contextual variation in O/S climate. The contextual variables and sample set of tenable statements emerging from the qualitative inductive analyses completed suggest the usefulness of designing more comprehensive qualitative studies to further probe the nature and function of these contextual variables and to specifically address these empirically derived hypotheses. The sample set of tenable statements generated in this study can be considered viable parameters for guiding continued second-level qualitative research efforts on the nature of O/S climate in schools. A variety of qualitative methodologies (e.g., focus group interviews, direct observations, school case
studies, etc.) might be employed, either individually or in tandem, to guide these further O/S climate research efforts.

Given the first-level qualitative findings of this study, a number of possible directions for further qualitative O/S climate studies are suggested. For example, an indepth case study approach could be utilized to further explore the impact of the district-school supervisory relationship on building-level O/S climate in schools in the qualitative sample. Additionally, schools in the sample could be qualitatively compared in terms of O/S climate differences between "high" and "average" quality O/S climate schools to gain further knowledge concerning how organizational/supervisory climate may possibly be contextually manipulated and improved by individual school personnel. And, in yet another possible set of qualitative studies, school case research could be conducted focusing on specific school level O/S climate characteristics, particularly involving middle/junior high and secondary schools.

To further probe school level O/S climate characteristics, a set of case studies could be designed to investigate the nature and effects of personnel supervisory roles and "role complexity" on collective personnel perceptions of school O/S climate quality. As suggested in this study, the kinds of social meanings and interactive metaphors teachers and administrators ascribe to their supervisory roles and the ways in which personnel negotiate, construct and legitimate (Anderson, 1988) supervisory behavior in schools may be an important component affecting the overall shape of a school’s professional supervisory environment. The nature of supervisory role definitions and role interactions could be explored in individual school cases through investigating the epistemologies and processes
by which school personnel construct and maintain various supervisory roles, and the effects of these role constructions on school-level O/S climate quality.

In a broad methodological sense, then, results of this study strongly support the use of complementary methodologies in studies of schools as organizations. Study findings indicated that qualitative methodologies can enrich quantitative results and highlight contextual differences in individual schools. Thus, one clear direction for future research emerging from this study is to continue to use combinations of quantitative and qualitative methods to obtain a comprehensive picture of schools as organizations.

One interesting, possible direction for further O/S climate research is the development of an instructional climate instrument that focuses on organizational/supervisory teaching and learning processes at the classroom level. It may be that O/S climate might also be construed in the ways teachers organizationally define the learning environment in individual classrooms, in the messages teachers convey to students about learning and learning interactions, and in teachers' and students' perceptions of classroom teaching and learning quality. This conceptualization of O/S climate at the classroom level could conceivably involve investigations of classroom level O/S climate both between and within individual classrooms.

Another possibility for future O/S climate studies might involve continued refinement in the selection and/or definition of various indices of effectiveness included in the O/S model, and the exploration of the relationship of these refined effectiveness measures to school-level O/S climate. For example, in this exploratory study, school holding power was operationalized by student average daily attendance (ADA). Study findings suggested that dimensions of organizational/supervisory climate have little relationship to school holding
power as measured by student attendance. It may be that holding power from the student attendance perspective has very little to do with what the OSCI measures, and that the professional learning climate of schools may have more positive valence where school holding power for teachers is concerned (e.g., teacher absenteeism).

In a larger sense, the notion of holding power itself implies a broader set of ideas involving a conceptualization of holding power as a more holistic organizational variable. Holding power may, in fact, be better viewed as a combination of certain normative aspects of a school's culture that increase the overall positive valence of holding power for the clientele it serves (Morris, 1986). Through conceptualizing holding power in this way, further studies of school O/S climate, incorporating the holding power variable and using other operational definitions (e.g., teacher attendance), might be conducted to probe potential links between organizational/supervisory climate and the normative, cultural holding power of school organizations. Additionally, as the district-school supervisory climate was found in this study to be a rather strong dimension affecting both school-level and district-school O/S climate quality, the conceptualization of holding power might be further expanded to include the organizational/supervisory holding power characteristics of school districts. This broader district-school holding power notion relates to the quality and effectiveness of the kinds of supervisory programs afforded teachers by school districts, and how teacher perceptions of these programs may affect the ability of individual districts to attract and retain teachers. Thus, like other school organizational variables, holding power might also be conceptualized at various levels throughout the school organization (e.g., classroom, school, and district levels).
Finally, precise measurement of variables has not traditionally been a strong emphasis in empirical research in educational administration. Thus, one notable feature of this study was its efforts at tackling a complex set of organizational/supervisory notions and attempting to measure the variables with some degree of sophistication. Based on study findings, the continued use in future studies of complementary research methods addressing both between-school and within-school differences appears to hold promise for obtaining more refined understandings of the O/S climate construct as a multidimensional, organizational phenomenon.

Summary

The purpose and scope of this study was twofold. First, the study was grounded in the development of an organizational/supervisory (O/S) model of instructional supervision that seeks to view the supervisory subculture of schools as an important school organizational phenomenon, comprised of a variety of intervening variables mediating supervisory behavior, decision making and school effectiveness. The O/S model framework enabled the positing of a more focused conceptualization of school learning climate (i.e., school organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate) than is presently in the literature - and further allowed for the construction of hypotheses regarding possible relationships of this O/S climate to measures of school effectiveness.

Second, the O/S model provided the conceptual framework for the development and empirical testing of a new supervisory climate instrument - the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) (Claudet & Ellett, 1992). The OSCI was designed and developed to reflect broad macro- and micro-communicative dimensions of supervisory behavior typifying school organizations. This study served as an initial exploration of the possible
multiple relationships among O/S climate dimensions and selected indices of school effectiveness. The study obtained initial empirical evidence supporting the utility of conceptualizing about organizational-supervisory climate in schools and the relationship of this O/S climate construct to the school supervisory subculture. The study additionally allowed for an initial investigation of the reliability and criterion-related validity of the OSCI instrument within an organizational climate/school effectiveness design.

The independent variables in the study were six dimensions/subscales of the organizational-supervisory climate construct: 1) Organizational Structure, 2) Professional Autonomy, 3) Collaborative Sharing/Rapport, 4) District Supervisory Climate, 5) Self Reflection, and 6) Centralization. Dependent variables in the study were three selected measures of school effectiveness: 1) school productivity (standardized achievement), 2) organizational effectiveness, and 3) holding power.

Two primary instruments were used for data collection: 1) the Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory (OSCI) (Claudet & Ellett, 1992), Professional Staff Form (OSCI-S) and Administrator Form (OSCI-A), and 2) the Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE) (Miskel, Fevurly, and Stewart, 1979). School productivity (student standardized achievement) was measured by normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores from total battery scores for the California Achievement Test (CAT). The percentage of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) for each school for the 1991-92 school year was used as the measure of school holding power.

The study used both quantitative and qualitative methods, using a variety of research methods to analyze the data. Major findings of the study included: First, the OSCI instrument was found to be a reasonably valid and reliable quantitative means for obtaining
personnel perceptions of the quality of the organizational/supervisory climate of schools. Second, the Organizational/Supervisory (O/S) climate variable demonstrated the greatest correlation with a process measure of school organizational effectiveness (the IPOE), rather than with other school effectiveness/productivity measures (CAT and ADA). Third, the qualitative component of the study delineated five additional contextual variables further mediating linkages between school organizational/supervisory climate and organizational effectiveness. Finally, the implications section of the chapter discussed a variety of issues and concerns for model/instrument development and refinement and for theory-building, and for conducting future meaningful studies of the nature and influence of organizational/supervisory (O/S) climate within the context of schools as complex organizations.
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APPENDIX A: EXISTING FRAMEWORKS
Figure A-1:

Hoy/Ferguson Model of School Effectiveness
### Hoy/Ferguson Model of School Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Time Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal attainment</td>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latency</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A-1: The Hoy/Ferguson model of school effectiveness based on a Parsonian framework (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985, p. 123)
Figure A-2:

Brookover et al. Mediated Model of School Effectiveness
Figure A-2: Brookover, et al. Mediated Model of School Effectiveness depicting the relationships among School Social Inputs (SI), School Social Structure (SS), School Social Climate (SC), and Student Outcomes (SO) (Brookover, et al., 1979)
Figure A-3:

Anderson Interactive, Causal Model
Anderson Interactive, Causal Model

Figure A-3: Anderson interactive, causal model depicting multiple, reciprocal relationships among school organizational dimensions (taxonomy), school climate, and student outcomes (Anderson, 1982)
Figure A-4:

A Comparison of Two Frameworks
A Comparison of Two Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parsonian Dimensions</th>
<th>Tagiurian Climate Taxonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptation</strong> - involves the problem of acquiring sufficient resources and accommodating to the reality demands of the environment</td>
<td><strong>ecology</strong> - the physical and material aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal attainment</strong> - reflects the problem of defining and implementing goals</td>
<td><strong>milieu</strong> - the social dimension concerned with the presence of persons and groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration</strong> - incorporates the problem of maintaining solidarity and unity among the members of the system</td>
<td><strong>social system</strong> - the social dimension concerned with the patterned relationships of persons and groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latency</strong> - consists of the problem of maintaining and renewing the motivational and cultural patterns of the system</td>
<td><strong>culture</strong> - the social dimension concerned with belief systems, values, cognitive structures, and meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A-4: A comparison of the conceptual similarity of dimensions comprising Parsons’ Social Functions Typology of Organizations and Tagiuri’s Climate Taxonomy (Parsons, 1960, pp. 16-58; Tagiuri, 1968)
Figure A-5:

Conceptual Mapping of O/S Model Dimensions With Existing Frameworks
## Conceptual Mapping of O/S Model Dimensions with Existing Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Effectiveness (Parsonian social functions typology)</th>
<th>Hoy/Ferguson operational indicators</th>
<th>O/S model dimensions</th>
<th>Tagiurian climate taxonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>innovation</td>
<td>centralization</td>
<td>ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal attainment</td>
<td>academic achievement</td>
<td>teacher professional autonomy</td>
<td>milieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>cohesiveness</td>
<td>rapport</td>
<td>social system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latency</td>
<td>organizational commitment</td>
<td>goal consensus</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metaphoric role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A-5: A conceptual mapping of proposed organizational/supervisory (O/S) model dimensions in relation to existing conceptual frameworks discussed.
APPENDIX B: SURVEY INSTRUMENT SETS
USED IN DATA COLLECTION
Appendix B.1:

Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory
Professional Staff Form (OSCI-S)
**PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

Instructions: Please complete this DEMOGRAPHIC section by filling in the appropriate bubble(s) for each item listed. When completed, please proceed to the Professional Staff Opinion Survey (PART B).

**SCHOOL NAME:** __________________________________________________

**Sex:** ☐ Male ☐ Female

**Ethnic Group:** ☐ Black ☐ White ☐ Hispanic ☐ Asian ☐ Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of years in present school:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of years' experience as a professional educator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Level (please check only one):**

- ☐ Bachelor's
- ☐ Specialist
- ☐ Masters
- ☐ Doctorate
- ☐ Masters/EdD
- ☐ Other

**Your professional work activity in your school is as (please mark as many as apply):**

- ☐ Classroom teacher
- ☐ Special education teacher
- ☐ Federal program teacher
- ☐ Speech therapist
- ☐ Guidance counselor
- ☐ Librarian
- ☐ Other

**Grade Level(s) you presently teach/are professionally involved with:**

- ☐ K-3
- ☐ 4-6
- ☐ 7-9
- ☐ 10-12

**Subject Area specialty:**

- ☐ General Elementary
- ☐ Fine Arts
- ☐ Math
- ☐ Biological/Physical Sciences
- ☐ Social Sciences
- ☐ Special Education
- ☐ Vocational Education
- ☐ Other

**How many times during the school year does your principal (or equivalent administrative supervisor) formally observe your classroom teaching or other professional work activities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How many times during the school year does your principal (or equivalent administrative supervisor) informally observe your classroom teaching or other professional work activities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How many times during the school year is your classroom teaching or other professional work activity observed by a peer professional (e.g., master teacher, department head, peer teacher)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How many times during the school year do you have formal conferences regarding your classroom teaching or other professional work activity with your principal or administrative supervisor?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How many times during the school year do you have conversations with a district office supervisor regarding your classroom teaching or other work activity needs?

- Tens: [ ]
- Ones: [ ]

Do you have access to one or more of the following district office personnel during the school year for assistance with your instructional needs?

- Curriculum specialist
- Special education supervisor
- Federally funded program supervisor
- Other

During a typical school week, how much time would you estimate you spend in informal supervisory discussions/conversations with your principal about instructional concerns?

- Hours: [ ]
- Minutes: [ ]

During a typical school week, how much time would you estimate you spend in informal supervisory discussions/conversations with other staff members about instructional concerns?

- Hours: [ ]
- Minutes: [ ]

Does your weekly work schedule include professional planning time?

- Yes: [ ]
- No: [ ]

How much scheduled professional planning time per week do you have?

- Hours: [ ]
- Minutes: [ ]

During a typical school week, how much time would you estimate you spend in instructional planning?

- Hours: [ ]
- Minutes: [ ]

Does your school have an established planning group (e.g., task force, school committee, etc.) for school instructional needs?

- Yes: [ ]
- No: [ ]

How often does this instructional planning group meet per year?

- Tens: [ ]
- Ones: [ ]

Does your school have an established planning group for school-wide staff development needs?

- Yes: [ ]
- No: [ ]

How often does this staff development planning group meet per year?

- Tens: [ ]
- Ones: [ ]

Please indicate if you participate in one or more of the following school supervisory activities:

- School goal setting/planning
- Instructional planning
- Staff development planning
- Staff inservice planning, preparation, and/or coordination
- Other
PART B: PROFESSIONAL STAFF OPINION SURVEY (SECTIONS ONE & TWO)

Please respond to each of the following statements. There are four response categories: SD = Strongly Disagree (1); D = Disagree (2); A = Agree (3); and SA = Strongly Agree (4). Please mark only one response for each of the statements below. For each statement, please mark the response point that best reflects your opinion of the accuracy of the statement in describing your school.

SECTION ONE

The items in this section focus on your interactions with other staff members (e.g., teachers, school librarians, guidance counselors, etc.) and administrators in your school regarding the school's INSTRUCTIONAL and SUPERVISORY PROGRAMS. Typically, a wide variety of instructional meetings occur with other staff members and/or administrators in schools. The term Instructional meetings is used here to refer to both general faculty meetings and smaller group meetings (e.g., departmental, grade-level, committee, etc.). The items in this section ask for your opinions about the focus and quality of your professional interactions with other school staff members and administrators in discussing your school's instructional and supervisory programs.

Statements

IN MY SCHOOL:

I feel comfortable in providing suggestions to other staff about improving instruction

Staff members respect ideas and perspectives of the administrator(s) about instruction

Staff members and administrator(s) agree on short-term instructional goals

Open discussion of important instructional problems/issues is encouraged during staff meetings

The district office solicits building administrator input concerning school instructional goals

Staff members have primary responsibility for evaluating existing curricular programs

The administrator(s) respect(s) ideas and perspectives of staff members about instruction

Policies set by the district office are helpful to staff in accomplishing school instructional goals

Instructional guidelines from the district office are in agreement with staff perceptions of school needs

Staff members and administrator(s) display a sense of professional trust toward each other

Instructional meetings make staff members assess the current quality of instruction

I feel comfortable in providing suggestions to the administrator(s) about improving instruction

Staff members are expected to participate fully in instructional meetings

Instructional meetings include discussion of school instructional goals

Instructional meetings are scheduled so that all involved can attend

I spend a lot of time during the regular school day thinking about ways to improve instruction

Instructional meetings are scheduled at times indicating they are important professional activities

Administrator(s) and staff together produce plans for action during instructional meetings
Decisions regarding important instructional matters are made jointly by both staff and administrator(s).

Staff members are heavily involved in planning and coordinating various instructional meetings.
The district office solicits building staff input concerning school instructional goals.

Activities in instructional meetings are of high quality.

Staff members have significant input in determining the agendas for instructional meetings.

Staff members determine the adoption of new instructional programs.

Staff members often serve as presenters during staff inservices.

Instructional meetings address current school instructional needs.

The administrator(s) (as opposed to staff) determine(s) the kinds of instructional supervisory activities that involve staff.

Staff members and administrator(s) work cooperatively to design/develop instructional programs.

The administrator(s) often participate(s) in small group instructional meetings with staff.

Administrator(s) and staff clearly communicate to each other the kind of school they want.

Instructional meetings are carried out in a collaborative, professional manner.

Staff members have primary responsibility for planning inservice instructional workshops.

Staff members and administrator(s) regularly exchange ideas concerning instructional matters.

Inservices mandated by the district office are consistent with instructional goals valued by staff.

Instructional priorities and goals set by the district office are clear to staff.

Other staff members openly share ideas about improving instruction with me.

The administrator(s) openly share(s) ideas about improving instruction with me.

The administrator(s) solicit(s) staff input concerning instructional goals.

Administrator(s) and staff focus on instructional problem-solving during meetings.

The administrator(s) (as opposed to staff) determine(s) the extent to which staff must be involved in instructional supervisory activities.

Staff members are expected to attend regular instructional meetings.

One or more staff members (as opposed to the administrator(s)) determine the nature of instructional supervisory activities.

I spend a lot of time outside of school thinking about ways to improve instruction.

Staff members and administrator(s) agree on long-term instructional goals.

Staff members and administrator(s) agree on instructional needs.

Staff members respect ideas and perspectives of other staff members about instruction.
SECTION TWO

The items in this section refer to your interactions with professionals in your school about INDIVIDUAL WORK ACTIVITIES (either your own or those of other staff). Please respond to these items based on your personal experiences in the school in which you are currently employed.

Statements

IN MY SCHOOL:

I have confidence in suggestions made by the administrator(s) about improving my work performance

Observations of my classroom/professional activities are scheduled at times that indicate these observations are important events

Professional supervisory activities involving me and the administrator(s) are usually formalized and documented

I routinely have informal discussions with other staff about my progress toward instructional goals

I am allowed to use my own self-evaluations as a basis for my professional development

I am allowed to include my self-evaluations as part of my final annual evaluation

I have input in structuring the kinds of individual professional development activities that are available

The district office solicits building administrator input concerning staff members' individual professional development goals

My administrator(s) and I agree on my short-term professional development goals

I view the preparation of written lesson plans as an important activity

The principal (or other administrator) has major responsibility for prescribing activities for my professional growth

I clearly understand instructional goals and/or priorities mandated by the district office and/or school board

I am allowed to choose the kinds of professional development activities in which I participate

My weekly work schedule includes conferences/discussions with other staff members about their work activities

Supervisory decisions concerning my professional work activities are jointly made by me and the administrator(s)

My weekly schedule includes observations of the classroom/professional activities of other staff members

The administrator(s) regularly provide(s) informal comments to me about my classroom teaching/professional activities

My supervisory conferences/discussions with the administrator(s) and/or other staff are beneficial

I spend a lot of time during the regular school day thinking about ways to improve my own instructional activities

My administrator(s) and I agree on my long-term professional development goals

If money is available for staff participation in professional activities outside of school (e.g., conferences, workshops, etc.), I can spend it in the way I choose

I have the freedom to choose how I use my planning time
The administrator(s) solicit(s) staff input concerning individual professional development goals
I agree with the school's overall instructional goals
I am allowed to be creative and innovative in the submission of lesson plans
I am encouraged by the administrator(s) to assess my own classroom teaching/professional activities
The administrator(s) (as opposed to me) determine(s) the extent to which I must be involved in individual professional supervisory activities
My informal discussions with administrator(s) often focus on my instructional concerns
My ideas and suggestions about improving instruction are respected by other professionals
I share common understanding with the administrator(s) regarding the purposes of individual professional development activities
I can freely discuss my own instructional concerns/problems with other staff members
I spend a lot of time outside of school thinking about ways to improve my own instructional activities
It is expected that other staff members will informally visit my classroom
The administrator(s) provide(s) me with regular feedback about the quality of my lesson plans
I clearly understand the school's overall instructional goals
The district office solicits building staff input concerning individual professional development goals
I regularly discuss with my administrator(s) my role in accomplishing school instructional goals
I can request that my administrator(s) visit my classroom
I have adequate time in my weekly work schedule to plan instructional activities
I primarily use planning time for instructionally-related matters
My formal conferences with the administrator(s) focus on issues directly related to instructional quality
The administrator(s) (as opposed to me) determine(s) my individual professional supervisory activities
My individual conferences/discussions with the administrator(s) are conducted in a collaborative, professional manner
I view the submission of written lesson plans to the administrator(s) as an important activity
I can freely discuss my own instructional concerns/problems with the administrator(s)
I agree with district office instructional goals and/or priorities
I have confidence in suggestions made by other staff about improving my work performance
I am free to choose the professional development activities within my school in which I participate
I regularly engage in observations and assessments of other staff members' classroom teaching/professional activities
Professional Staff Opinion Survey (Section Three)

These final eight questions are about your perceptions of your school’s overall effectiveness. Every educator produces something during work. It may be a “product” or a “service”. The following list of products and services are just a few things that result from schools:

Lesson Plans  Student Learning  Athletic Achievements  New Curricula
Community Projects  Teacher-Parent Meetings  Art and Music Programs  Instruction

Please indicate your responses by filling in the appropriate bubble. Use a #2 Pencil!

Of the various things produced by the people you know in your school, how much are they producing?
- Low Production
- Fairly Low
- Moderate
- High
- Very High Production

How good is the quality of the products or services produced by the people you know in your school?
- Poor Quality
- Low Quality
- Fair Quality
- Good Quality
- Excellent Quality

Do the people in your school get maximum output from the available resources (money, people, equipment, etc.)? That is, how efficiently do they do their work?
- Not Efficiently
- Fairly Efficiently
- Very Efficiently
- Extremely Efficiently

How good a job is done by the people in your school in anticipating problems and preventing them from occurring or minimizing their effects?
- A Poor Job
- An Adequate Job
- A Fair Job
- A Very Good Job
- An Excellent Job

How informed are the people in your school about innovations that could affect the way they do their work?
- Uninformed
- Somewhat Informed
- Moderately Informed
- Informed
- Very Informed

When changes are made in the methods, routines, or equipment, how quickly do the people in your school accept and adjust to the changes?
- Very Slowly
- Rather Slowly
- Fairly Rapidly
- Rapidly
- Immediately

How many of the people in your school readily accept and adjust to the changes?
- Few, If Any
- Less Than Half
- About Half
- Many More Than Half
- Almost Everyone

How good a job do the people in your school do in coping with emergencies and disruptions?
- A Poor Job
- An Adequate Job
- A Fair Job
- A Good Job
- An Excellent Job
Appendix B.2:

Organizational/Supervisory Climate Inventory
Administrator Form (OSCI-A)
**PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

Instructions: Please complete this DEMOGRAPHIC section by filling in the appropriate bubble(s) for each item listed. When completed, please proceed to the Administrator Opinion Survey (PART B).

**SCHOOL NAME:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group:</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age: Tens</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years as administrator in present school: Tens</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of years of administrative experience: Tens</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level (please mark only one): Bachelors</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters/+30</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your professional work activity prior to becoming an administrator was as: (please mark as many as apply): classroom teacher</th>
<th>special education teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>special program teacher</td>
<td>guidance counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech therapist</td>
<td>librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of years' experience in this prior professional work activity: Tens</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level(s) you have taught (or were professionally involved with) prior to becoming an administrator: K-3</th>
<th>1-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area specialty: General Elementary</th>
<th>English/Language Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times during the school year do you formally observe the classroom teaching or other professional work activities of individual staff in your school (normally)? Tens</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times during the school year do you informally observe the classroom teaching or other professional work activities of individual staff in your school (normally)? Tens</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times during the school year do you engage in formal conferences with individual staff members (normally) regarding their professional work (i.e., classroom teaching and/or other professional activities)? Tens</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do staff members have access to one or more of the following district office personnel during the school year for assistance with their instructional needs?

- Curriculum specialist
- Special education supervisor
- Federally funded program supervisor
- Other

During a typical school week, how much time would you estimate you spend in informal supervisory discussions/conversations with individual staff members (on average) about instructional concerns?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During a typical school week, how much time would you estimate individual members of your staff spend in informal supervisory discussions/conversations with other staff members about school instructional concerns?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do staff members' weekly work schedules include professional planning time?

- Yes
- No

How much scheduled professional planning time per week (on average) do staff members have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much time (on average) would you estimate individuals on your staff spend on instructional planning per week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does your school have an established planning group (e.g., task force, school committee, etc.) for school instructional needs?

- Yes
- No

How often does this instructional planning group meet per year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does your school have an established planning group for school-wide staff development needs?

- Yes
- No

How often does this staff development planning group meet per year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tens</th>
<th>Ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate if you participate in one or more of the following school supervisory activities:

- School goal setting/planning
- Instructional planning
- Staff development planning
- Staff in-service planning, preparation, and/or coordination
- Other
PART B: ADMINISTRATOR OPINION SURVEY (SECTIONS ONE & TWO)

Please respond to each of the following statements. There are four response categories: SD = Strongly Disagree (1); D = Disagree (2); A = Agree (3); and SA = Strongly Agree (4). Please mark only one response for each of the statements below. For each statement please mark the response point that best reflects your opinion of the accuracy of the statement in describing your school.

SECTION ONE

The items in this section focus on your interactions with staff members (e.g., teachers, school librarians, guidance counselors, etc.) and other administrators in your school regarding the school's INSTRUCTIONAL AND SUPERVISORY PROGRAMS. Typically, a wide variety of instructional meetings occur with other staff members and/or administrators in schools. The term instructional meetings is used here to refer to BOTH general faculty meetings and smaller group meetings (e.g., departmental, grade-level, committee, etc.). The items in this section ask for your opinions about the focus and quality of your professional interactions with other school staff members and administrators in discussing your school's instructional and supervisory programs.

Statements:

IN MY SCHOOL:

SD D A SA

- Staff members feel comfortable in providing suggestions to each other about improving instruction
- Staff members have respect for ideas and perspectives of the administrator(s) about instruction
- Administrator(s) and staff members agree on short-term instructional goals
- Open discussion of important instructional problems/issues is encouraged during staff meetings
- The district office solicits building administrator input concerning school instructional goals
- Staff members have primary responsibility for evaluating existing curricular programs
- I have respect for ideas and perspectives of staff members about instruction
- Policies set by the district office are helpful to staff in accomplishing school instructional goals
- Instructional guidelines from the district office are in agreement with staff perceptions of school needs
- Administrator(s) and staff members display a sense of professional trust toward each other
- Instructional meetings make staff members assess the current quality of instruction
- Staff members feel comfortable in providing suggestions to me about improving instruction
- Staff members are expected to participate fully in instructional meetings
- Instructional meetings include discussion of school instructional goals
- Instructional meetings are scheduled so that all involved can attend
- I spend a lot of time during the regular school day thinking about ways to improve instruction
- Instructional meetings are scheduled at times indicating that they are important professional activities
- Administrator(s) and staff together produce plans for action during instructional meetings


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions regarding important instructional matters are made jointly by both staff and administrator(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are heavily involved in planning and coordinating various instructional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The district office solicits building staff input concerning school instructional goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities in instructional meetings are of high quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members have significant input in determining the agendas for instructional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members determine the adoption of new instructional programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members often serve as presenters during staff inservices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional meetings address current school instructional needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrator(s) (as opposed to staff) determine(s) the kinds of instructional supervisory activities that involve staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator(s) and staff members work cooperatively to design/develop instructional programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often participate in small group instructional meetings with staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and administrator(s) clearly communicate to each other the kind of school they want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional meetings are carried out in a collaborative, professional manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members have primary responsibility for planning inservice instructional workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly exchange ideas concerning instructional matters with staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice mandated by the district office are consistent with instructional goals valued by staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional priorities and goals set by the district office are clear to staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members openly share ideas about improving instruction with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I openly share ideas about improving instruction with staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrator(s) solicit(s) staff input concerning instructional goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator(s) and staff focus on instructional problem-solving during meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrator(s) (as opposed to staff) determine(s) the extent to which staff must be involved in instructional supervisory activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are expected to attend regular instructional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more staff members (as opposed to the administrator(s)) determine the nature of instructional supervisory activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend a lot of time outside of school thinking about ways to improve instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator(s) and staff members agree on long-term instructional goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator(s) and staff members agree on instructional needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members respect ideas and perspectives of other staff about instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO

In this section, keep in mind that these items focus on your interactions with individual staff members in your school regarding their own INDIVIDUAL WORK PERFORMANCE. These items pertain to the staff member as an individual. It is understood that interactions with individual staff may vary. Please respond to these items based on your typical instructional supervisory experiences with individual staff members in the school in which you are presently working.

IN MY SCHOOL:

Individual staff members have confidence in my suggestions on ways for improving their work performance

I schedule observations of classroom/professional activities of individual staff at times that indicate these observations are important events

Professional supervisory activities involving staff members and me are usually formalised and documented

Staff members routinely have informal discussions with each other about their progress in achieving their instructional goals

I allow staff members to use their own self-evaluations as a basis for their professional development

I allow staff members to include their self-evaluations as part of their final annual evaluation

Staff members have input in structuring the kinds of individual professional development activities that are available

The district office solicits my input concerning staff members' individual professional development goals

Individual staff members and I agree on their short-term professional development goals

Staff view the preparation of written lesson plans as an important activity

I have major responsibility for prescribing activities for individual staff members' professional growth

Staff members clearly understand instructional goals and/or priorities mandated by the district office and/or school board

I allow staff members to choose the kinds of professional development activities in which they participate

A major part of my weekly work schedule involves conferences/discussions with individual staff about their work activities

Supervisory decisions concerning an individual staff member's professional work activities are jointly made by the individual and me

A major part of my weekly work schedule involves observations of the classroom/professional activities of individual staff

I regularly provide informal comments to individual staff members about their classroom teaching/professional activities

My supervisory conferences/discussions with individual staff members are beneficial to them

I spend a lot of time during the regular school day thinking about ways to help individual staff members improve their instructional activities

Individual staff members and I agree on their long-term professional development goals

If money is available for staff participation in professional activities outside of school (e.g., conferences, workshops, etc.), they can spend it in the way they choose

Staff members have the freedom to choose how they use their planning time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I solicit staff input concerning individual professional development goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff members agree with the school's overall instructional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I allow staff to be creative and innovative in the submission of lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I encourage individual staff members to assess their own classroom teaching/professional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I determine the extent to which staff must be involved in individual professional supervisory activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My informal discussions with individual staff members often focus on their instructional concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My ideas and suggestions about improving instruction are respected by other professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I share common understandings with staff members regarding the purposes of individual professional development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Individual staff members can freely discuss their own instructional concerns/problems with other staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I spend a lot of time outside of school thinking about ways to help individual staff members improve their instructional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I expect staff members to informally visit each other's classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I provide staff members with regular feedback about the quality of their lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Staff members clearly understand the school's overall instructional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The district office solicits building staff input concerning individual professional development goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I regularly discuss with staff members their roles in accomplishing school instructional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A teacher can request that I visit his/her class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Staff members have adequate time during their weekly work schedule to plan instructional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Staff members primarily use planning time for instructionally-related matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My formal conferences with staff members focus on issues directly related to instructional quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I determine the individual professional supervisory activities of my staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My individual conferences/discussions with staff members are conducted in a collaborative, professional manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Staff view the submission of written lesson plans to the administrator(s) as an important activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Individual staff members can freely discuss their own instructional concerns/problems with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Staff members agree with district office instructional goals and/or priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Individual staff members have confidence in other staff members' suggestions on ways for improving their work performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Staff members are free to choose the professional development activities within the school in which they participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Staff members regularly engage in observations and assessments of each other's classroom teaching/professional activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrator Opinion Survey (Section Three)

These final eight questions are about your perceptions of your school's overall effectiveness. Every educator produces something during work. It may be a 'product' or a 'service'. The following list of products and services are just a few things that result from schools:

- Lesson Plans
- Student Learning
- Community Projects
- Teacher-Parent Meetings
- Athletic Achievements
- Art and Music Programs
- Instruction
- New Curricula

Please indicate your responses by filling in the appropriate bubble. Use a #2 Pencil!

Of the various things produced by the people you know in your school, how much are they producing?
- Low Production
- Fairly Low
- Moderate
- High
- Very High Production

How good is the quality of the products or services produced by the people you know in your school?
- Poor Quality
- Low Quality
- Fair Quality
- Good Quality
- Excellent Quality

Do the people in your school get maximum output from the available resources (money, people, equipment, etc.)? That is, how efficiently do they do their work?
- Not Efficiently
- Not Very Efficiently
- Fairly Efficiently
- Very Efficiently
- Extremely Efficiently

How good a job is done by the people in your school in anticipating problems and preventing them from occurring or minimizing their effects?
- Poor Job
- An Adequate Job
- A Fair Job
- A Very Good Job
- An Excellent Job

How informed are the people in your school about innovations that could affect the way they do their work?
- Uninformed
- Somewhat Informed
- Moderately Informed
- Informed
- Very Informed

When changes are made in the methods, routines, or equipment, how quickly do the people in your school accept and adjust to the changes?
- Very Slowly
- Rather Slowly
- Fairly Rapidly
- Rapidly
- Immediately

How many of the people in your school readily accept and adjust to the changes?
- Few, if any
- Less Than Half
- About Half
- Many More Than Half
- Almost Everyone

How good a job do the people in your school do in coping with emergencies and disruptions?
- Poor Job
- An Adequate Job
- A Fair Job
- A Good Job
- An Excellent Job
Table C-1
Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Each Item of the OSCI-S (n=2974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20*</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21*</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25*</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26*</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28*</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29*</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
### Table C-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33*</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35*</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37*</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38*</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39*</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40*</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41*</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42*</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43*</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45*</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59*</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60*</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62*</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table C-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65*</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67*</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68*</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71*</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72*</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73*</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75*</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77*</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78*</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79*</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80*</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83*</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84*</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88*</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93*</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95*</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items loading on the final OSCI-S 58-item, six-factor solution.
Table C-2
Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Each Item of the OSCI-A (n=133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table C-2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table C-2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: ITEM CONTENT LISTING
OF FACTORED OSCI-S
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FACTOR 1 -- ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE (OS):

2 - staff members respect ideas and perspectives of the administrator(s) about instruction
4 - open discussion of important instructional problems/issues is encouraged during staff meetings
7 - the administrator(s) respect(s) ideas and perspectives of staff members about instruction
10 - staff members and administrator(s) display a sense of professional trust toward each other
11 - instructional meetings make staff members assess the current quality of instruction
12 - I feel comfortable in providing suggestions to the administrator(s) about improving instruction
13 - staff members are expected to participate fully in instructional meetings
14 - instructional meetings include discussion of school instructional goals
15 - instructional meetings are scheduled so that all involved can attend
17 - instructional meetings are scheduled at times indicating that they are important professional activities
18 - administrator(s) and staff together produce plans for action during instructional meetings
19 - decisions regarding important instructional matters are made jointly by both staff and administrator(s)
20 - staff members are heavily involved in planning and coordinating various instructional meetings
22 - activities in instructional meetings are of high quality
25 - staff members often serve as presenters during staff inservices
26 - instructional meetings address current school instructional needs
28 - staff and administrator(s) work cooperatively to design/develop instructional programs
29 - the administrator(s) often participate(s) in small group instructional meetings with staff
30 - administrator(s) and staff clearly communicate to each other the kind of school they want
31 - instructional meetings are carried out in a collaborative, professional manner
33 - staff members and administrator(s) regularly exchange ideas concerning instructional matters
37 - the administrator(s) openly share(s) ideas about improving instruction with me
38 - the administrator(s) solicit(s) staff input concerning instructional goals
39 - administrator(s) and staff focus on instructional problem-solving during meetings
41 - staff members are expected to attend regular instructional meetings
45 - staff members and administrator(s) agree on instructional needs

FACTOR 2 -- PROFESSIONAL AUTONOMY (PA):

51 - I am allowed to use my own self-evaluations as a basis for my professional development
59 - I am allowed to choose the kinds of professional development activities in which I participate
68 - I have the freedom to choose how I use my planning time
71 - I am allowed to be creative and innovative in the submission of lesson plans
72 - I am encouraged by the administrator(s) to assess my own classroom teaching/professional activities
75 - my ideas and suggestions about improving instruction are respected by other professionals
77 - I can freely discuss my own instructional concerns/problems with other staff members
84 - I can request that my administrator(s) visit my class
93 - I have confidence in suggestions made by other staff about improving my work performance

FACTOR 3 -- COLLABORATIVE SHARING/RAPPORT (CSR):

42 - one or more staff members (as opposed to the administrator(s)) determine the nature of instructional supervisory activities
60 - my weekly work schedule includes conferences/discussions with other staff members about their work activities
62 - my weekly schedule includes observations of the classroom/professional activities of other staff members
67 - if money is available for staff participation in professional activities outside of school (e.g., conferences, workshops, etc.), I can spend it in the way I choose
79 - it is expected that other staff members will informally visit my classroom
80 - the administrator(s) provide me with regular feedback about the quality of my lesson plans
83 - I regularly discuss with my administrator(s) my role in accomplishing school instructional goals
95 - I regularly engage in observations and assessments of other staff members’ classroom teaching/professional activities

FACTOR 4 -- DISTRICT SUPERVISORY CLIMATE (DSC):

5 - the district office solicits building administrator input concerning school instructional goals
8 - policies set by the district office are helpful to staff in accomplishing school instructional goals
9 - instructional guidelines from the district office are in agreement with staff perceptions of school needs
21 - the district office solicits building staff input concerning school instructional goals
34 - inservices mandated by the district office are consistent with instructional goals valued by staff
35 - instructional priorities and goals set by the district central office are clear to staff
92 - I agree with district office instructional goals and/or priorities

FACTOR 5 -- SELF REFLECTION (SR):

16 - I spend a lot of time during the regular school day thinking about ways to improve instruction
43 - I spend a lot of time outside of school thinking about ways to improve instruction
65 - I spend a lot of time during the regular school day thinking about ways to improve my own instructional activities
78 - I spend a lot of time outside of school thinking about ways to improve my own instructional activities

FACTOR 6 -- CENTRALIZATION (CEN):

27 - the administrator(s) (as opposed to staff) determine(s) the kinds of instructional supervisory activities that involve staff
40 - the administrator(s) (as opposed to staff) determine(s) the extent to which staff must be involved in instructional supervisory activities
73 - the administrator(s) (as opposed to me) determine(s) the extent to which I must be involved in individual professional supervisory activities
88 - the administrator(s) (as opposed to me) determine(s) my individual professional supervisory activities
APPENDIX E: ORGANIZATIONAL/SUPERVISORY (O/S)
CLIMATE QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL QUESTIONS

To initiate each telephone interview, each interviewee was informed that as a followup to the survey administration several schools participating in the study were being contacted. Educators in contacted schools were told that schools identified for followup interviews were selected because they displayed some very interesting relationships among study variables. Individual school OSCI-S quantitative profile scores were shared with interviewees at the outset of each interview. School interviewees were informed that the variable relationships (e.g., very high or very low) obtained for the school did not mean their school was either "good" or "bad" in terms of supervisory climate, but that the researcher was interested in asking a sample of educators in their school the following questions in order to better understand the nature of these relationships and what they might mean in the context of their own school.

1. What does it mean to you that most of the teachers in your school felt that there was a STRONG POSITIVE (OR, a STRONG INVERSE) relationship between supervisory climate in the school and school organizational effectiveness?

2. When you think about the school as an organization moving forward and adapting to goals, accomplish goals/objectives, etc., here is what your general score was (____, high, average, or low). Why do feel that teachers in your school felt this way? What is it that goes on in your school that would lead teachers in your school to have this view?

3. Is there anything historically that has happened in your school (e.g., new principal, a heavy teacher turnover, heavy external pressure from central office, any big reorganization of school, change in funding, new programs interfering with the school's ability to accomplish its goals, etc.) to lead teachers to respond this way?

4. The interviewees are then posed some specific questions relative to the individual OSCI variables for their school that obtained the most interesting scores. This set of specific OSCI-S sub-questions focused on individual items within these subscales. The purpose of these sub-questions is to get at "content-specific" issues/concerns that interviewees and fellow teachers might have to specific content associated with particular item concerns; and then tying this content-specific focus to the context in which the educators work.

5. Finally, representative items from each subscale are selected and paraphrased to give interviewees a general flavor of the perspective of each subscale. Interviewees are then asked to talk about what each overall subscale means in their school - how does the subscale play out in their school?
O/S Climate Profiles for Identified Outlier Schools

O/S Climate Profiles for each of the eight outlier schools identified in Research Question 6 (Table 33, p. 190) are presented in this appendix. Each school O/S Climate Profile contains: (1) a quantitative data summary of OSCI-S survey results for the school; (2) interview background information highlighting pertinent demographic information and key independent/dependent variable relationships obtained for the school; (3) written summary results of qualitative interviews with the principal and two teachers in each school; and (4) a final O/S climate profile summary section synthesizing results of qualitative data analyses.
OS/IPOE-S OUTLIER SCHOOLS (BY SCHOOL LEVEL)
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OUTLIERS
(SCHOOLS A AND B)
SCHOOL A
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>74.67%</td>
<td>75.92%</td>
<td>58.81%</td>
<td>65.32%</td>
<td>74.56%</td>
<td>63.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This K-3 elementary school obtained the lowest OS/IPOE-S correlation (r=-.20, n=17) of schools in the elementary school sample (n=84). For the 1991-92 school year, this K-3 school had a student enrollment of 374, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/20. The percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches (SES level) was 78.96%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 92.50%. As California Achievement Test (CAT) data were available for grades four, six and nine for schools in this study, no standardized student achievement (CAT) data were obtained for this school.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 85.00%. This school obtained an OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 78.01 (M%Max OS=75.01%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 31.41 (M%Max IPOE-S=78.53%).

The principal and two members of the school faculty were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this elementary school for ten years. Two teachers on the school staff were interviewed. One of the teachers interviewed is a second grade teacher who has taught at this school for five years. The other interviewee is a first grade teacher who has been on the school staff for eight years.
Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

At the outset of the interview, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to reflect on his school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to him that survey results indicated no relationship existed between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, the principal expressed his belief that the professional supervisory climate in the school is "...very supportive of faculty." As the principal explained, "...around here we cultivate a lot of respect and caring for [the] people on our staff". In his view, the faculty at this school over the past few years has undergone a real transformation from a rather dispersed, non-cohesive group to one that is "...much closer and interactive." As the principal related:

...the faculty is much closer and interactive now than before. In the ten years I’ve been here I’ve watched this get better...this is something you just have to work on from year to year. Professional respect and caring is something we stress a lot. All of us here - teachers and myself - we all try to show respect for each other, and treat each other as professionals. There’s a strong caring attitude shared by everyone...because of this caring, teachers are able to easily share and work together.

The principal did note that historically some divisiveness has existed among faculty regarding instructional and supervisory issues, but that this has lessened as teacher openness and collaboration has increased:

...several years ago - I’d say about five or six years ago - the faculty was much more divided on instructional and supervisory issues, but I think that we’re gradually mending some of this division...but, I’ve been encouraging teachers to work together and share their concerns...I think part of the reason teachers are more comfortable now is that we’re more open and interactive than we used to be.
Commenting on survey results indicating teachers’ lack of association between school supervisory structure and effectiveness, the principal expressed his surprise at this result. The principal indicated he believed his teachers are given ample opportunities for participation in supervisory activities, particularly in the area of supervisory decision making. The principal explained that several years ago he established a school site principal’s advisory committee composed of teacher representatives from the faculty. According to the principal, teachers are selected each year by their peers and approved by him for membership on this advisory committee. The principal indicated the purpose of this committee is to give teachers the opportunity to offer their expertise and advice to the principal on important instructional concerns, as well as to make recommendations to him regarding selected policy decisions. In the principal’s view, this advisory committee provides teachers with opportunities for inclusion in administrative and supervisory decision making. As the principal related:

...well, I can tell you that teachers here do have input into the process...they have input into decisions. Some time ago - several years ago - I instituted a ‘principal’s advisory committee’ here...this is before site-based management and all the talk about site-based decision making had even begun. The intent of this [advisory committee] is to give teachers a voice...so they can have input into administrative decisions.

Teacher Interviews

As a preface to the teacher interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with each teacher. Teachers were first asked to reflect on their school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to them that survey results indicated no relationship existed between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, both
teachers expressed congruent views (consistent with the principal's) that the faculty has become more interactive in recent years. In one teacher's words, "...we have become more cohesive over the last two to three years." They indicated that this increase in faculty feeling of cohesiveness has generated some increased feelings of closeness and esprit d'corps between faculty and the principal. One teacher expressed her view that "...in the last few years we've become almost like a family - we definitely have a family atmosphere here."

Both of the teachers expressed their belief that the principal advisory committee may partly contribute to the overall feeling of greater faculty interaction that now seems evident in the school. They both indicated further, however, that although the advisory committee structure did result in the generation of more discussion among teachers and the principal about instructional and supervisory concerns, they felt that the locus of actual instructional and supervisory decision making still predominantly remained with the principal. Their view of the advisory committee was that, although it did allow faculty input into decision making processes, in many instances its function extended only to "advisement", and that teachers' views and concerns had relatively little effect on the actual decisions made.

One teacher, in elaborating on the operation of the principal advisory committee, expressed her view that the committee in many respects was ritualistic in nature:

...we have site committee - it works okay, but it doesn't really operate like it should. It's not as effective as we would want. For example, things we requested last year are not really enforced. Last year we talked about the behavior of the children - the need for all teachers to be consistent, using assertive discipline. But this has not happened. some teachers still don't man their duty stations correctly. The principal listens, we do have a chance for input...sometimes we decide that we have to poll the teachers to get more input from everyone. Mr. [principal] takes notes during our meetings...he writes down everything we say during each meeting (we meet
once a month). But, this is really as far it goes. After this, the principal doesn’t really do anything with our input.

The other teacher, while noting the improvement the advisory committee represented in providing at least some structure for teacher input, corroborated the other teacher’s view of the ineffectiveness of the school’s advisory committee in facilitating meaningful teacher input into decisions:

...teachers used to complain so much before because we never used to have any input at all. So, in that sense I guess the advisory committee is some progress. But, it is viewed by teachers here as not very effective in terms of getting things done...because the principal doesn’t enforce what the advisory committee advises, our recommendations are put on paper and that’s where it stays.

Concerning the larger faculty meeting structure existing in the school, one of the teachers commented regarding the extent and focus of the full faculty meetings that are held:

...we have faculty meetings once a month. These are full faculty meetings that are mandatory...they’re generally more informative than dealing with instructional things. Meetings focus a lot on things like school safety - that type of thing. Our meetings are very short...they usually last about fifteen minutes. The principal does most of the talking...again, it’s mostly information-giving on the part of the principal.

Finally, this same teacher articulated her overall appraisal of the decision making structure in the school as follows:

We don’t really make any decisions...he [principal] takes our recommendations...but they end up being token input, because he doesn’t really use our suggestions.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:
The principal has crafted a supervisory decision making structure that is viewed by teachers as largely ritualistic in nature.

Administrator and teacher roles in the school appear to be differentially defined, with policy and administrative decision making authority strongly associated with the principal's role, with teachers primarily assuming an advisory and confirmatory function.
SCHOOL B
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>74.67%</td>
<td>75.92%</td>
<td>58.81%</td>
<td>65.32%</td>
<td>74.56%</td>
<td>63.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This K-4 elementary school evidenced the highest OS/IPOE-S correlation (r=.81, n=15) of schools in the elementary school sample (n=84). For the 1991-92 school year, the school had a student enrollment of 562, with an administrator/staff ratio of 1/30. The percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches (SES level) was 65.50%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 95.20%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for fourth grade students for this school was 49.79. The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 50.00%.

The principal and two teachers at this school were interviewed. The 1991-92 school year marked the principal’s third year as administrator of this school, with this individual having a total of ten years of administrative experience. Of the teachers interviewed, one is a kindergarten teacher with eleven years’ experience at the school; the other is a third grade teacher who has been on the school staff for five years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

To initiate the interview, OSCI-S summary profile scores for the school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to reflect on her school’s organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) and Organizational Structure (OS) OSCI-S subscale/dimension staff
mean scores, and to comment on what it meant to her that teachers in her school saw a very strong, positive relationship between their perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, the principal emphasized that she felt teachers are able to see a strong connection between school supervisory structure and effectiveness because she and her teachers are highly involved in school supervisory activities. The principal indicated that, in her role as instructional leader, she strives to maintain an active presence and visibility as an observer and monitor of teaching and learning quality in the school. In the principal’s words:

...many teachers around here feel that I observe them 180 days a year. I feel that this is really appreciated by the teachers. I try to get into the classroom a lot. I am very, very visible in the school.

The principal’s sentiments about her own strong supervisory presence in the school extended to her perceptions of school staff supervisory involvement as well. She portrayed teachers in the school as being very actively involved in a variety of instructional programs designed to motivate students’ learning potential and improve their self-esteem:

...we are all very, very positive with kids, and the teachers are involved in many positive programs for the children. An example of this is ‘Project Charlie’...a self-concept program designed to increase kid’s self-esteem and drug awareness. We have a good deal of community-supported funding for a variety of self-esteem reward type programs, ...[an example being] our ‘A/B Conduct Treat’...[in this program] any student who makes an A or B on [his/her] report card gets a special treat.

The principal further emphasized that professional development is a frequent agenda item for monthly faculty meetings, with teachers being encouraged to share professional knowledge obtained from outside workshops/conferences, etc. with colleagues. The principal indicated that one of her top priorities as the school administrator is to continually work to obtain necessary travel funds for teachers to attend professional workshops and
other events that have the potential for fostering teachers’ professional growth. As the principal explained:

This year, for example, we asked our parent club to earmark $2,100.00 for teachers for staff development to attend whole-language workshops in New Orleans. Or, if a teacher brings something she is very interested in, I try to get the money for this...and, an important staff development rule we have among our faculty is that whoever is picked to go to a conference, they must come back and share the information that they have learned with the faculty. Also, the school’s MCOP teacher (our school’s MCOP teacher’s plan for last year as well as this year is staff development) - she brings many professional development ideas to our faculty meetings.

The principal stressed that scheduling time for teacher professional development activities is difficult given the amount of time that teachers are engaged with students in their own classrooms. As the principal stated, "...we would like to have much more time for teachers to engage in professional development activities, but regular staff development time is difficult to put into the schedule." But, she mentioned that she and her teachers have experimented with ways to utilize available time more effectively in this regard:

We have tried, however, to be creative about this as best we can. We do have what we call 'recess reviews'. These ‘recess reviews’ are sort of like mini-professional development times that we schedule frequently each month during the regular school lunch recess time. During this regular recess time, the teachers can bring their lunch and come voluntarily and there is some special staff development activity for them...these recess reviews are very well attended by faculty.

In addition to these frequent mini-professional development activities, teachers in the school participate in grade-level meetings that are scheduled each report card session during the school year.

The principal explained that each teacher in the school each year is required to sign up for one or more school committees (such as school site committee, instructional planning committees, etc.). The principal added that this process spreads the tasks that have to be
done for the year across a number of different teachers in the school, with all teachers being able to make their own decisions as to what committee they want to serve on. An important aspect of this "pick and choose" process, according to the principal, was the fact that the teachers, in self-selecting their own assignments, also develop a strong sense of ownership and responsibility in the endeavor:

Everybody has to buy into the process. This gives [teachers] a sense of commitment. Our philosophy behind this is ‘the more you put into it the more you get out of it’. Also, as [teachers] sign up for and participate as members of various committees, this activity lets them see more of the process of how the school works. It also helps to tap into the good creative points of all teachers.

Regarding the school’s ability to retain teachers, the principal mentioned that the teacher turnover rate for the school is very low - in the principal’s words, "..we almost never lose a teacher." The principal attributed this low turnover rate in large part to the very supportive relationship the school enjoys with the community. The school, according to the principal, has "...outstanding parent-teacher club participation."

Finally, this principal re-emphasized her belief that teachers in the school are encouraged to engage in frequent professional collegial exchange, including peer observations both within and across grade levels, as well as within and outside the school. When asked to elaborate on specific kinds of peer supervisory activities teachers engage in at the school, the principal responded:

We put out an ‘all call’ each year for teachers to feel welcome to observe teachers right here within our own school, or go observe other teachers in other schools...to observe other programs going on in the parish. For example, last year there were several pilot programs in the parish. I, along with my teachers, make a conscious effort to make site visitations to other schools to observe these programs. We really focus on this as being sort of an extra parameter to our total staff development activities. Our teachers here perceive this as really an extra professional development opportunity for them.
Teacher Interviews

As a preface to the interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. The teachers were first asked to review their school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to them that survey results for the school indicated a very strong, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding to this question, both teachers confirmed that they believed survey results reflected teachers’ true perceptions in that, as one teacher commented, 
"...teachers at the school are continually able to see strong connections between what they do in supervisory activities and how these efforts impact the school." Elaborating on this statement, this teacher described the active role her principal plays in providing strong, supervisory leadership to school faculty as being a significant factor affecting teachers’ perceptions of the quality of the school’s supervisory climate. According to this teacher, an important aspect of the principal’s successful leadership efforts at the school is her ability to provide opportunities for teachers to have meaningful input into instructional and supervisory decision making:

...we feel that our principal is a very strong leader. She is very thorough and completely organized...and she let’s us have input into the run of the school. We have a site-based committee and grade level meetings. The best thing about our principal is that she supports us in the things that we want to do...we have a great rapport with her.

The other teacher also expressed praise for the principal’s ability to provide teachers with ongoing support and encouragement. As this teacher explained, the principal’s
motivation is especially noteworthy in encouraging teachers to assume supervisory initiative in experimenting with and implementing innovative instructional strategies:

...our principal encourages us to kind of 'get the ball rolling' when we express an interest in some instructional innovation or new teaching strategy, technique or whatever, and just go ahead and do that particular thing. Additionally, the principal encourages us to attend workshops and come back and share the information we learn with other faculty members back at the school. She lets us take the initiative in our professional work.

Elaborating further on the principal's supervisory leadership style, this teacher expressed her view that the principal's willingness to afford teachers a substantial degree of supervisory independence is based on her strong professional trust of the teachers on her staff:

If we do have an idea, and we want to do something about it, our principal will give us encouragement and support to go out on our own and try things. The big point I want to make is that she really trusts us...and, because of the trust she has for each of us, this then encourages all of us to have trust for each other. Our principal is a very positive person.

In addition to teacher perceptions of the principal as an effective supervisory leader, a sense of strong parental and community involvement in the school was also cited by one of the teachers as another reason contributing to teachers' feelings of having an effective supervisory climate at the school. In the teacher's words:

...our school gets a lot of backup from the parents and from the whole community. We also get a lot of financial support from our community. The community is very actively involved in our school.

In discussing the level of effectiveness of the school's site-based committee, one teacher indicated that she feels a strong contributing factor to the effectiveness of the school's site-based committee is the fact that there is strong teacher representation on the committee. This teacher explained that committee membership includes a site-based teacher representative from each grade in the school, as well as representatives of the school's professional support personnel. As the teacher related:
...through site-based management we are able to get any new ideas to our principal through our site-based representatives. The site-based committee at our school holds a meeting every six weeks. There is a representative from each grade level on the site-based committee, also auxiliary and special services personnel representatives. If the committee feels they have received a good recommendation from a committee member and [the recommendation] is feasible, then they usually go ahead and adopt it.

This teacher further explained that the committee is interested in considering the concerns of all faculty members, and that a process is available for obtaining regular teacher input:

...another thing about the site-based meetings - about a week before the meetings every faculty member gets a form they can fill out about any concerns they may have...any complaints or suggestions they might have about instructional or supervisory matters. They can fill this form out and then give it to their grade level representative on the site-based committee.

In discussing the supervisory meeting structure at the school, both teachers indicated that the school has the traditional daily scheduling constraints typical of most elementary schools. One teacher explained that teachers’ daily schedules at the school require that they be with their students essentially all day long, with only two ten-minute recess breaks. This scheduling format provides very little, if any, time during the day when teachers can meet to engage in collaborative sharing and instructional planning. This teacher indicated that teachers at the school do manage, nonetheless, to hold grade level meetings after school. According to the teacher, teachers consider it important to schedule these after-school grade level meetings on their own because they value these opportunities for collaborative discussion:

We do hold grade level meetings. For example, all of the kindergarten teachers get together and meet once a month in the afternoons after school, simply because we are very interested in meeting together to discuss our grade level concerns.

The other teacher described the staff’s supervisory meeting structure in the same way, adding that recess breaks are also used as possible faculty meeting times:
...whenever we have grade level meetings, we will hold them after school. Sometimes, though, we'll also have short ones during recess - because we have no homeroom periods in our school.

Both teachers also spoke of the sense of pride that faculty members have in the school. One teacher talked about recognition the school has achieved in the last few years, and how this has been a source to the faculty of both feelings of pride and increased motivation to strive to maintain their school's reputation:

...we also have a lot of pride in our school - our self-esteem is very high. This school is the only elementary school in the parish [district] last year [1991-92] to receive the ‘excellence in education’ award - a national award from the U.S. Dept. of Education. Also, we were the only parish school to get drug-free recognition from the state department of education. As a faculty, we have a lot of pride in what we do...especially now, because we want to maintain that image and reputation as an outstanding school that we've worked so hard to achieve.

This teacher explained further that the school's growing reputation has only come about through the result of much hard work over the years on the part of the faculty and principal. The teacher recounted that, historically, the school did not always have a good reputation in the district, with many teachers - especially new teachers - looking upon the school as a less than desirable professional assignment. As the teacher related, this negative image of their school has gradually changed:

In past years, this was the last school that many new teachers wanted to come to, especially because we are so far out at the extreme end of the parish. But now, because the school is starting to be recognized more and more on a state as well as national level, more teachers are asking to be assigned to our school.

Finally, the teachers commented on the nature of the supervisory relationship teachers at the school have with the district office. The overall feeling of both teachers was that, while interactions with district personnel are adequate, district workshops and other inservices provided for teachers during the year are limited in terms of being directly useful
to teachers in their own school. One teacher indicated that she felt this was due more to the diverse nature of the schools within the district, and of the overwhelming task the district has in attempting to provide meaningful district-level supervisory activities to teachers and administrators working in several different kinds of school situations. The views of both teachers can be summarized by this teacher’s concluding comment:

...what I see happening in this district is that we have 47 schools, and many of them are very different in nature. For example, in the parish we have some large urban schools with 1500 and more students...but, then, some of the other schools like our own are very rural, out on the outskirts of the parish, and have only a very small number of kids. This makes it very difficult for the district to plan inservices that are going to meet all of the different kinds of needs these schools are going to have.

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- Principal and teachers participate in a variety of professional development activities that focus directly on instructional improvement.

- Available time is creatively used by principal and teachers for ‘within-day’ professional planning and sharing.

- The principal’s encouragement and provision of opportunities for teacher participation in supervisory decision making is an important element contributing to teachers’ positive view of the principal as an effective supervisory leader.

- The school site committee is viewed by teachers as an effective means for collaborative decision making.
MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL OUTLIERS
(SCHOOLS C AND D)
SCHOOL C
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>75.55</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>11.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>72.64%</td>
<td>78.36%</td>
<td>56.56%</td>
<td>66.07%</td>
<td>70.31%</td>
<td>72.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This 5-7 grade middle school obtained the lowest OS/IPOE-S correlation (r=.06, n=15) of schools in the middle/junior high school sample (n=29). The school’s 1991-92 administrator/staff ratio was 1/17, with a student enrollment of 283. The percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches (SES) for 1991-92 was 51.69%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 93.63%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for seventh grade students for this school was 58.69. The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 88.24%.

The principal and two teachers at this school were interviewed. The 1991-92 school year marked this principal’s eighth year as administrator of this school. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is a fifth grade teacher with thirteen years’ experience at the school; the other is a seventh grade teacher who has been at the school for six years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

To initiate the interview, the OSCI-S staff mean scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was asked to reflect on the school’s organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) and Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension mean scores, and to comment on why teachers in the school did not perceive any connection between the
professional supervisory activities they engage in and the school’s overall effectiveness. In responding, this principal emphasized his feeling that his teachers are working under a very high level of frustration. This principal expressed his feeling that all of the state legislative mandates that are being required of his teachers have contributed significantly to raising his teachers’ frustration level, and that this may be the explanation of why his school’s OS/OPOE-S correlation score is so low. The principal explained that in the last five to ten years there have been a number of mandated requirements that have impacted teachers, including career education, new math, SPUR (Special Program to Upgrade Reading), and LaTIP/LaTEP (Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Programs). These state-mandated programs, according to the principal, have caused teachers to develop increasing feelings of bewilderment. The principal indicated that he understood why the accumulation of all of these mandates would cause teachers to develop anxiety and confusion about the purpose and value of professional development. As the principal stated:

Teachers [here] have feelings of utter confusion. Their feeling, basically, is - "what’s going to be thrown at us next?" I can easily see how this would make them very disillusioned and confused. They have so many things thrown at them that after a while they are unable to see the connection between the kinds and quantity of the things that they are forced to do and how those things might help improve the school. I don’t blame them.

The principal expressed his concern that many of these mandated requirements have drastically increased the amount of additional paper work that teachers must complete. He indicated that this has forced teachers to stay after school, oftentimes to complete required paper work that only involves a very few students (e.g., the dyslexia rule). The principal further expressed his concern about his teachers’ growing frustration level and how teachers fail to see any connection between the supervisory activities they are required to do and actual professional development:
Because teachers feel that they are so overwhelmed with mandated requirements and extra paperwork, they don't necessarily connect what they are required to do in terms of supervision with positively affecting or improving the organizational quality and effectiveness of the school. They just complete the requirements and the mandates and do their job in spite of this mandated supervisory work. They don't connect all of this work with actual professional development or professional supervision. They are feeling that this actually gets in the way of their professional development.

In light of these preceding remarks, the principal was then asked to comment on the kinds of supervisory activities that he and his teachers do concentrate on in their school that he feels teachers value, and that he and his teachers feel actually contribute to professional development and professional learning. The principal's remarks focused on the fact that he and his teachers are working on student management concerns, "...making sure that student discipline and student management are operating well in our school." As the principal indicated:

Teachers [here] get everything and teachers have a chance to give feedback. The faculty makes the decisions and figures out what we're going to do. We work heavily on the attendance of our students. Teachers are called at first period every day. We call parents every morning and ask why their children aren't at school. Teachers in this school are greatly involved in affecting organizational effectiveness.

Additionally, the principal mentioned that the teachers participate each year in "...five or six staff improvement workshops after school that are mandated by the district" during the school year. During the 1991-92 school year the principal said that the focus of these workshops was on providing information to teachers on learning styles and cooperative learning.

In elaborating on the kinds of supervisory activities he considered important, the principal, although feeling that the improvement workshops "...did provide teachers with some useful information," emphasized that his overall impression of his teachers is that
"...basically the teachers are saying - ‘let me do what I’m supposed to be doing, and leave me alone’." The principal further explicated his views on teacher participation in professional supervisory activities in his school by way of stating his "guiding philosophy" about professional supervision:

My operative personal guideline or guiding philosophy that I use to work with teachers supervisorily in this school can be summarized by: ‘All I try to do is stay out [of] the way of my teachers’. Extra supervisory activities just create extra work for teachers. And, they don’t need any extra work.

Teacher Interviews

To initiate the interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. The teachers were first asked to review their school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to them that survey results for the school indicated no relationship between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, both teachers confirmed the principal’s negative sentiments regarding teacher frustration over state-mandated programs and the added time and paperwork responsibilities these external supervisory initiatives impose on teachers. The increase in teacher professional time and work demands resulting from new state-mandated programs was offered by the teachers interviewed as a primary factor, in their view, of why teachers at the school would view virtually no connection between their perceptions of the supervisory activities they engage in within the school and the school’s overall effectiveness. As one teacher stated:

A good example of the extra work we are required to do is the new dyslexia program. This is a state mandated law affecting only about 3% of the population of the entire state. It’s important to help these children, but we have to do all of this paperwork and [attend] extra committee meetings....
The biggest problem in this state is that they mandate programs for two years, then they kick out the programs.

In addition to the frustration teachers voiced concerning "extra work", the teachers interviewed also expressed reservations about the usefulness of some of these mandated programs in meeting teachers' professional needs. As one teacher commented, these programs fail to meet their specific school-based contextual needs:

You know, we are a rural school. The people in the state who plan these mandated programs don't understand our needs or the kinds of students and problems we are working to overcome. These kinds of programs do not help teachers grow professionally.

This sentiment was also echoed by the other teacher who indicated that she believed developers of state supervisory programs are "...out of touch with the needs of classroom teachers." In her view, compliance with all of these required programs presents teachers with an onerous amount of extra work that may not necessarily be related to improving their teaching effectiveness. As this teacher related:

...most teachers here feel overwhelmed by the sheer number of programs we have to keep up with. One example I'm thinking about is Bulletin 741...we had to memorize all of these policies and the philosophy of our school, get our gradebooks ready for review...and all of this was just very stressful. Another example was the LaTTP/LaTEP program...we had to do all this work and use all of our inservices to get ready...go through all of that material, and then the program is put on hold. Many of us really question whether these kinds of mandates and programs really help improve our teaching.

The teachers interviewed also indicated that they feel their faculty's perception of the school as being organizationally effective is probably attributable to the fact that the school is a small, rural community school with a small professional staff (n=17) and strong, collegial relationships existing among teachers. Teachers' comments about everyday staff interactions suggest they view faculty closeness and an easygoing professional comraderie as hallmarks of teachers' collaborative style at the school. As one teacher remarked:
We all work together here - this is a little country school. Teachers here work hand in hand daily with no little cliques...[there is] no bonding by little teacher groups. We all work together hand in hand here - teachers simply working together.

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- The principal questions the value of self-initiated staff development activity, viewing this as extra work for his teachers who are already victimized and frustrated from external supervisory demands. The principal cultivates a laissez faire supervisory leadership style based on avoidance.

- A shared principal and teacher attitude of coping and defensiveness regarding externally imposed mandates - perceived as negative realities of teachers’ professional work - is a prevailing characteristic of the school’s supervisory environment.

- Principal and teachers assume a reactive, compliant stance regarding professional learning and staff development, viewing themselves primarily as receptors of mandated, packaged programs rather than as initiators and designers of their own professional learning.
SCHOOL D
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>76.05</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>73.13%</td>
<td>75.89%</td>
<td>64.16%</td>
<td>75.86%</td>
<td>75.25%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

Of the schools in the middle/junior high school sample (n=29), this 5-8 grade middle school obtained the highest OS/IPOE-S correlation (r=.88, n=26). For the 1991-92 school year, the school had a student enrollment of 479, and an administrator/staff ratio of 2/31. The percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches (SES) at the school during 1991-92 was 64.17%. The student average daily attendance (ADA) figure for the same year was 91.93%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for seventh grade students for this school was 39.24. The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 83.87%.

The principal and two teachers at this school were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this school for six years. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is a fifth grade/math teacher who has been at the school for 14 years; the other is a seventh/eighth grade english teacher with 19 years’ teaching experience at this school.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

To initiate the interview, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to reflect on her school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to her that survey results indicated a very strong, positive
relationship (OS/IPOE-S, r=.88) between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their view of the school's overall level of effectiveness as an organization. The principal was asked to share her reflections on this, particularly in light of the fact that her school obtained a comparatively low organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) score (MIPOE-S=24.60, M%MaxIPOE-S=61.50%).

In responding, the principal indicated that, in her opinion, "...the most important aspect of [school] supervisory climate is the ability of teachers to have input into the supervisory process." The principal expressed her feeling that teachers have substantial input into decision making regarding the kinds of supervisory activities that are structured in their school, and have numerous opportunities in faculty meetings, department and grade level meetings to offer their input concerning their perceptions of the quality of those activities and suggestions for improving them. The principal emphasized that she feels teachers at her school know their input into instructional and supervisory decision making is valued, and believes teachers can see a link between supervisory efforts and their impact on instructional and supervisory quality. According to the principal, the fact that teachers perceive themselves as having a central role in supervisory decision making might be a reason why they sense a strong relationship between what they do in supervisory activities and how these actions affect the school. In the principal's words:

Teachers have input into what they want to see as the kinds of supervisory activities we have here and what they want to see done in these activities. In the faculty meetings they can voice their opinions and each one is heard. These meetings bring us together both professionally and socially. My teachers and I discuss both the high and the low points of the quality of instruction and supervision going on in our school...we do this in faculty as well as grade level meetings. During these meetings we discuss the quality of what we are doing. Teachers have a great deal of input and ownership in this ongoing evaluation process - and, along with this input comes responsibility as well.
In commenting on reasons that might explain why her teachers perceived the school's overall effectiveness as an organization as relatively low (IPOE M%Max=61.50%), the principal indicated that, because of depressed salaries and the generally poor area economy, the school has a high teacher turnover rate. As the principal stated, "...because of the poor economy here, we lose teachers to the other parishes [districts] around us". The principal emphasized, however, that she and her teachers work diligently to assist new teachers who do move to the area and join the school faculty. She stated that she and her teachers work with new teachers to facilitate their transition and acculturation into the community. The principal indicated she and veteran teachers focus their efforts on helping new teachers understand the socioeconomic factors and learning difficulties characterizing the school's student/parent clientele and cope with the unique challenges they will face in the school and in the larger community. The principal did not use terms presently in the literature such as "teacher coaching" or "mentoring", but spoke enthusiastically about the ways in which her veteran teachers each year naturally "partner-up" with newly arriving teachers, facilitating their efforts at becoming fully functioning members of the school's professional staff:

We have to spend a lot of time with the new teachers coming in. Our veteran teachers partner-up with new teachers who are just coming into the school situation. By the way, this is really not something that we plan in great detail. But, all of the teachers who have been here a while know how difficult it was for them to get used to the kinds of learning problems and difficulties many of our kids have, so they naturally feel a desire to help new teachers coming in to understand some of the challenges that they will face. This teacher partner system is something that goes on throughout the year and beyond - and this system has really worked well for us. Sometimes, the new teachers feel like we're not giving them enough, but we do the best we can.
The principal described the school staff's supervisory activities as numerous and varied. According to the principal, the teachers in this school are involved in a number of supervisory activities that focus both on working directly with students and on facilitating teachers' professional development. In the principal's words:

...our teachers here have opportunities to participate in a number of different kinds of supervisory activities including grade level meetings, department meetings, beta club, student council, and so on. These activities not only involve just our teachers but also extend to community members - for example, our building level committee.

The efforts that the district's superintendent and central office staff have made in the past two years in developing customized school improvement plans and programs for schools in the district were highlighted by the principal as a primary contributor, in her opinion, to the progress she and her teachers have made at the school. The principal was especially complimentary of the middle schools improvement plan implemented by the district. The principal expressed her belief that the district's effort to provide release time for teachers in the district to attend district-wide workshops and inservices was commendable, and that these supervisory activities were being customized in a way that addressed the specific needs of teachers working in the district's schools. According to the principal:

The superintendent has worked very closely with the middle schools improvement plan. The central office works very closely with the schools in the parish [district]. The faculty involved in this work very heavily on developing their school's individual campus level plan, and then they turn this plan in to the central office. The parish provides each school with six days release time that includes workshops and inservices to help teachers and administrators first develop, then implement their plan in their school. I think that the workshops provided by the parish have been extremely helpful - they have greatly improved the professional development and supervisory life of teachers here.
The principal indicated that when teachers from her school attend these district workshops and inservices, they make a point to return to the school and share what they have learned with the rest of the faculty.

Additionally, the principal indicated that she works very hard at keeping lines of communication open between teachers and herself, as well as between teachers and the district. When she receives communications from the district office, such as board meeting minutes or other information, she explained that she makes sure her teachers are informed of this. The principal said that teachers in the school express a high interest in this information.

Maintaining open lines of communication among school staff about problems and concerns existing within the school was also emphasized by this principal as an important priority. According to the principal, she and her teachers are continuing to work on having all teachers become "...more involved and interested in whole school supervisory concerns". As an example of how they are approaching this, the principal explained that teacher leaders from each grade level meet periodically during the school year and bring together teachers' concerns and questions about instructional and supervisory quality issues affecting the whole school. After meeting and discussing various issues, the teachers then make presentations regarding their concerns to the school's building-level committee. This committee, comprised of teachers and parents in the community, listens to teacher input and then considers possible options and ways to address teachers' concerns. As the principal emphasized:

...this open communication between teachers, administrators and parents has been a tremendous help to us in keeping everyone informed -- not only about what's going on in our school, but also about the quality of what we are doing here.
Teacher Interviews

At the outset of the two teacher interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with each teacher. Teachers were asked to reflect on the school's staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to him/her that survey results indicated a very strong, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their view of the school's overall level of organizational effectiveness. Teachers were asked to note the school's relatively low organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) staff mean score, and to comment on this, in view of their school's strong, positive supervisory structure/effectiveness relationship.

In responding to this question, both teachers expressed a similar view that teachers at the school are given regular opportunities for professional sharing. According to one teacher, this professional sharing involves meeting weekly as a faculty, as well as meeting in smaller grade level groups to discuss instructional concerns. This teacher emphasized that she felt a distinguishing feature of these faculty meetings is the openness with which faculty are able to share their individual, professional views:

...we have faculty meetings once per week. We meet very regularly...faculty have opportunities to share their own feelings. No one is overlooked ...everyone gets a chance to share their opinions openly. We have subject area departmental meetings and we meet by grade levels. We take our recess time and use this...to discuss any instructional problems we may be having.

This teacher further described teachers' supervisory activities at the school as including interactions about instructional matters among teachers across grade levels. These interactions also involve peer observations, both within- and across-grades:
...teachers share things that work in their fifth grade classrooms with the sixth grade teachers. Also, teachers observe in each others’ classrooms...both in the same grade and in different grades.

The other teacher also spoke of the ad hoc nature of the school’s instructional and supervisory meetings. According to him, faculty meetings are characterized by collaborative discussion and a sense of purpose:

...when there is something pressing we have a meeting. We gather information and discuss suggestions that different teachers bring up. Our meetings always have a real purpose.

In commenting on the school’s relatively low organizational effectiveness staff mean score, one teacher summed up the sentiments of both teachers, in stating:

Well, I think teachers here are always feeling like we’re not doing as well as we can. We feel a need to improve our standardized test scores...we feel a general need for improvement in all areas.

Both teachers during the interviews commented on a historical change in district leadership that, in their view, has dramatically affected teachers’ perceptions of the nature and quality of their faculty interactions with supervisory personnel as well as the general school-district supervisory climate. In describing this change, both teachers cited the leadership of their new superintendent, who assumed administration of the district two years ago (1990-91), as an important turning point for the district in terms of district-school supervisory climate. As one teacher explained:

...this is the first minority superintendent for the parish. We have a school board that is composed mostly of minority members. Our school board members are very concerned and supportive of the schools in the parish [district]. We all perceive a profound difference in the parish administration with the new superintendent. Now everything - information about supervision, teacher workshops, development opportunities - is given to you, and you know exactly what is expected of you.
The other teacher echoed this view, relating how opportunities to attend district-sponsored supervisory inservices during the day are now provided to teachers in the district:

The superintendent has made himself a part of every school setting and pulled the parish [district] together. A lot of workshops and training sessions are now given, where none were given before...and these workshops are now done during the regular school day - during school time. Teachers throughout the parish are allowed to attend the workshops during the day.

In addition, this teacher explained that district office personnel are now working much more closely with individual schools, particularly in the area of school improvement planning:

Also, each school now has to develop an individual school improvement plan. We have a new supervisor in the parish - another innovation by the superintendent - who works with our school to help us develop and implement this plan.

Finally, both teachers expressed their belief that, as a result of their new superintendent’s leadership, the district has now become an important part of the supervisory life of teachers in their own school and in the schools throughout the district.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- The principal considers teacher input into instructional and supervisory decision making as the most important component of an effective supervisory climate.
- Teachers and principal view the school’s supervisory meeting structure as effective in providing teachers with meaningful opportunities for professional sharing.
- District supervisory programs and personnel focusing on individual school improvement needs are viewed by both principal and teachers as important, positive agents affecting the school’s supervisory climate.
SECONDARY SCHOOL OUTLIERS
(SCHOOLS E AND F)
SCHOOL E
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>79.28%</td>
<td>78.22%</td>
<td>61.09%</td>
<td>70.93%</td>
<td>73.19%</td>
<td>66.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This 9-12 grade high school obtained the lowest OS/IPOE-S correlation (r=-.11, n=21) of the schools comprising the secondary school sample (n=18). The school had a student enrollment of 483, and an administrator/staff ratio of 3/35 for the 1991-92 school year. For this school year, the percentage of students at the school receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches was 55.76%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 92.91%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for ninth grade students for this school was 42.86. The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 60.00%.

The principal and two teachers from this school were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this school for seven years. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is a ninth/tenth grade english teacher with thirteen years’ experience at the school, while the other is a science teacher who has been at this school for eight years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

To initiate the interview, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to reflect on his school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to him that survey results indicated no relationship
between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their view of the school's overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In discussing possible reasons for the lack of relationship between his staff's perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and its organizational effectiveness, the principal explained that he used to be the person who coordinated all of the faculty meetings, planning all the meeting agendas and "...standing up in front of the teachers and more or less controlling the meetings." In the principal's words, this resulted in many faculty meetings that were "...rather dull and not very interesting to faculty."

The principal further explained that two years ago (1990-91 school year) he instituted a new policy whereby individual curricular departments in the school would take the responsibility for planning the faculty meetings themselves, with each curricular department "taking their turn". The principal indicated that he felt that this new policy has significantly increased faculty participation in instructional and supervisory activities and allowed them to assume more responsibility in instructional and supervisory decision making. The principal commented during the interview that "...my teachers like the faculty meetings much more now...they don't have be bored with me anymore...they do the faculty meetings themselves." He stated further that:

...perhaps teachers here are still getting used to the new way we are structuring our meetings now. I know that teachers sometimes complain a little that this is more work for them, but I think that most of the teachers appreciate the meetings more now that they are the ones who are actually preparing them. It makes it a lot easier on me, and the teachers become a lot more involved...[this new structure] gives them more responsibility and encourages them to participate a lot more.

During the interview, the principal emphasized and praised what he referred to as "...a strong structure of supervision that is in place in our district". He explained that his
staff is required to participate in four release-time inservices during the school year - two per semester. His professional staff also participate in six additional full faculty meetings after school per semester (the faculty meetings described above). The principal related that these after-school faculty meetings are required for all faculty members.

Teacher Interviews

As a preface to the teacher interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with each teacher. Teachers were first asked to reflect on their school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to them that survey results indicated no relationship between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of organizational effectiveness. In responding, both teachers expressed a similar perception that the structure of supervision in their school is well-organized and very predictable. As one teacher put it, "...supervision here is very organized and firmly set in place...we have specific meetings that are scheduled throughout the year, and we all have to attend these meetings." Elaborating on the specific nature of their school’s meeting structure, the other teacher related:

...well, you know, we have to attend several faculty meetings after school each semester - twelve in the whole year. These faculty meetings are mandated by the parish [district]...all teachers have to be there.

In describing their view of the usefulness of these after-school meetings and the kinds of supervisory activities involved, teachers interviewed indicated that teachers at the school perceive these meetings as time consuming and sometimes requiring considerable extra work. As one teacher explained:

...these after-school meetings are all on our calendars, and we all know we have to attend. But, frankly, at many of these meetings we really don't
accomplish very much. Before, Mr. _________ used to run the meetings, and we basically just sat and listened to him talk. Now, teachers are required to prepare inservice presentations for the faculty. Let me say that I really think this is a good idea...because it forces teachers to become more involved and to share with the faculty. But, most of us simply do not have the time to devote to a lot of additional preparation...and many of us find it hard to do this extra work.

The other teacher shared a similar view:

...working on plans and preparations for the faculty inservices is quite a lot of work...especially since it's something extra we have to do over and above our regular classroom preparation work.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school's O/S climate:

• Principal and teachers view professional supervision in the school as synonymous with participation in the district inservice meeting structure.

• Teachers and principal share a passive attitude toward staff development based on compliance with district directives.
Interview Background Information

This 9-12 high school obtained the highest OS/IPOE-S correlation ($r = .69, n=31$) of schools in the secondary school sample ($n=18$). For the 1991-92 school year, the school had a student enrollment of 910, and an administrator/staff ratio of 3/54. For this same school year, the percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches was 64.00%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 93.90%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for ninth grade students for this school was 49.20. The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 57.41%.

The principal and two teachers at this school were interviewed. The principal has been administrator of this school for seven years. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is an English teacher with ten years' experience at the school; the other is a math teacher who has been teaching at this school for six years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

The principal emphasized during the interview that the school faculty are "...included a lot in decision making about instructional and supervisory matters." A predominant theme emerging during this interview was the principal's interest in communicating his thoughts regarding the importance of supervisory leadership in his school.
and his strong views regarding encouraging and supporting teachers. The principal, when questioned regarding the school's high positive correlation between staff perceptions of supervisory structure and organizational effectiveness, used this question as an impetus to relate what he felt to be his "philosophy" regarding school supervisory leadership.

According to this principal, effective supervision has two important dimensions. The principal explained that he considers a first supervisory dimension to involve providing a "variety of supervisory activities" that school staff can become involved in. A second dimension involves reinforcing teachers' genuine decision making authority in these activities by encouraging teacher participation and offering teachers "...consistent administrative support in their endeavors." The principal emphasized that these two primary dimensions are interrelated and ongoing in nature. As the principal explained:

I feel there are probably two things that may contribute to the staff's perceptions on this. First, we have a variety of opportunities for teachers here to become involved in supervisory and instructional activities, including a very active faculty advisory committee, as well as regular department meetings. In addition, we all meet together in a general faculty meeting at least once a month. Secondly, and probably more importantly, I consistently encourage teachers here to become actively involved in these activities and support them in every way I can.

The principal further emphasized that he felt his efforts within the second dimension of supervisory leadership was what his teachers appreciated the most from him. For this principal, encouraging teachers to become involved in collegial sharing activities and fostering an overall supervisory environment based on professional support was a predominant concern:

We encourage teachers to get together and discuss relevant instructional problems and to work together on ways to improve the quality of their inservices and other staff development efforts. When they come up with well-thought out and reasonable proposals, I always try to support them. I really think this is what the teachers appreciate the most.
Teacher Interviews

To initiate the teacher interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. The teachers were asked to review their school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to them that survey results for the school evidenced a very strong, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization.

During these interviews, both teachers expressed praise for their school’s faculty advisory committee and commented on its perceived effectiveness by teachers in the school. The success of the faculty advisory committee was emphasized by both teachers during the two interviews and served as a predominant focus for each teacher’s remarks. An important aspect of the school’s faculty advisory committee, according to the teachers, was their belief that it is a genuine means for teachers in the school to express their views about instructional issues and to "...have a voice in instructional decision making." As one teacher explained:

...one thing that really stands out about our faculty committee is that teachers here see it as a chance for us to have a real voice in the school - it's not just a token group. Our teachers take it seriously. We regularly make recommendations to the principal about important instructional concerns that we have...not just about our individual classrooms, but about things related to instruction throughout the whole school.

This view was shared by the other teacher, who emphasized that teachers in the school share a common perception of the principal as a good listener. According to this teacher, the principal’s ongoing efforts at soliciting and encouraging teacher participation in this committee, and then genuinely listening to their concerns and recommendations, are
two major factors influencing teachers' high regard for the committee. This teacher emphasized that the principal's supervisory leader style of "active listening" to teacher input is viewed by teachers as contributing significantly to the success of the advisory committee:

The principal is good about really listening to our concerns. He doesn't just hear what we have to say, then let's it stop there. He takes our concerns and our suggestions seriously....If there's one thing I would say that stands out about our principal, it's that he takes what we say seriously. In this sense, our faculty advisory committee is genuinely perceived by teachers here to be very effective in our school.

Finally, both teachers interviewed expressed congruent views that the faculty advisory committee is an important supervisory structure distinguishing their school's ongoing supervisory environment. According to these teachers, the faculty's general perception of the strong effectiveness of this advisory committee is primarily due to the positive efforts of the principal in encouraging teacher ongoing participation in this collaborative advisory structure, and in taking teachers' concerns and recommendations seriously.

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school's O/S climate:

- The principal structures opportunities for teachers to engage in collaborative sharing and supervisory decision making and encourages them in these activities.
- Teachers view the principal's efforts at providing opportunities for meaningful staff input into instructional and supervisory decision making - and responding to their input - as important, positive features of his supervisory leader style.
IPOE-S OUTLIER SCHOOLS (TOTAL SAMPLE)
O/S Variable: OS PA CSR DSC SR CEN
Staff Mean Score: 73.53 27.47 20.39 18.53 12.40 11.47
Staff Mean %Max: 70.70% 76.31% 63.72% 66.18% 77.50% 71.69%

Interview Background Information

This K-6 elementary school obtained the lowest IPOE-S score (MIPOE-S=23.10; M%MaxIPOE-S=57.75%) of all schools in the total school sample (n=131). The OS/IPOE-S correlation for this school was .27 (n=15). The school had a student enrollment of 342 and an administrator/staff ratio of 2/22 for the 1991-92 school year. The percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches in 1991-92 was 96.20%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 96.52%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for fourth grade students for this school was 43.85. The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 68.18%.

The principal and two teachers at this school were interviewed. The principal has been administrator of this school for 19 years, and an administrator in the district for 23 years. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is a second grade teacher who has been at the school for seven years; the other is a fifth grade teacher with nine years’ teaching experience at this school.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

To initiate the interview, OSCI-S staff mean scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was asked to reflect on the school’s Organizational Structure
(OS) subscale/dimension mean score, and to comment on why teachers at the school would have such a low perception of the school’s overall effectiveness as an organization. Additionally, the principal was asked to also comment on survey results indicating teachers at the school perceived only a slight connection between the supervisory activities they engage in and the school’s overall effectiveness. In responding, the principal first emphasized that, in terms of effectiveness, his teachers are working daily with students who are from a low socioeconomic area. According to the principal, "...this weighs heavily on teachers in terms of being able to see the results of their instructional efforts." Concerning the relationship between supervision and effectiveness, the principal noted that, in his view, a probable reason why teachers would see very little connection between their supervisory activities and the school’s organizational effectiveness is because they are victims of time and scheduling constraints. According to the principal, teachers’ daily class schedules and the responsibilities of their own classrooms prevent them from engaging in the kinds of supervisory activities they would like to be involved in. As the principal explained:

...well, frankly, I feel teachers are just trapped by their own schedules. We’re not like junior high or senior high schools where, where teachers really only teach a five and a half hour day. One of the biggest administrative problems that we have here in terms of supervision is just the way time is set up...we have very little time for supervision - and, all elementary schools have this same problem.

During the interview, the principal related that his school has been designated a targeted area school for federal funding because of the high percentage of at-risk students it serves. As a result of this, the principal explained that his school has begun participation in a new program managed by the district designed to empower teachers to be able to make instructional decisions at the classroom level to most benefit their students:
We're considered a target area school...we're in a low socioeconomic area, and because of this we qualify for federal funds. As a result of this, we're in a new program called the 'accelerated schools' program. This is our second year - we began it in 1991-92. The first year we spent our time more or less getting familiar with the concept of what an accelerated school is all about. Normally, people think about this as a magnet-type school situation, but this not correct. An accelerated school is really designed for kids who are at-risk - and, by at-risk I mean those students who for whatever reasons seem to have difficulty achieving academically when they get to school.

The principal went on to describe the manner in which the accelerated schools program seeks to alter traditional supervisory roles and empower teachers regarding instructional decision making:

...one of the tenets of the accelerated schools concept is that the teachers are self-empowered to make instructional decisions. In this program, rather than thinking of myself as a traditional-type principal, I basically take on the role of a facilitator. The only thing I do is monitor to be sure that the program is being followed. Teachers have free reign about doing their own thing...the only thing is that they are held accountable for their decisions. Teachers like being able to make more decisions about their classroom teaching...and, we've all become much more supervision conscious in the last two years since the initiation of this program, especially in terms of focusing on instruction.

The principal indicated that his school's involvement in this program has changed the way in which he and his teachers approach instructional supervision. According to the principal, teachers in the program are able to assume more decision making responsibility regarding their own teaching and function more professionally:

...since we have been involved in this program, my teachers are being allowed to take control of their own teaching. Teachers here working in the accelerated schools concept are now working more as professionals...they are now able to make decisions as to what types of teaching strategies and techniques they can use in their classrooms - as opposed to me telling them what kinds of strategies they can use.

The principal elaborated on the way the program is affecting teachers in their classrooms, citing how teachers are able to operationalize the accelerated schools concept of teacher-
empowered instructional decision making. The principal related the following example:

...[in this program] teachers can decide how they can assign a number of minutes to their academic areas in their own classrooms. For example, let's say that in a second grade classroom, the students are knocking the top off of math, but are not doing well in reading. Under the accelerated schools concept our teachers can decide to teach math for only 45 minutes (even though it's mandated for 55 minutes from the state) and spend more time in reading...and, they are freely able to do this using their own professional judgment and are not penalized for this decision.

Finally, commenting on the kinds of professional planning and sharing activities that teachers at the school engage in, the principal again emphasized the time restriction elementary scheduling imposes on teachers:

...well, teachers actually do have some planning time - during their library period...but I'd have to say that's hardly adequate for what they really need, and teachers don't all have the same library periods. Again, the one thing that limits teachers here in terms of meeting together is the time factor during the day. The teachers do engage in some peer observations, though, and they're free to do as much of this as they want.

Teacher Interviews

As a preface to the teacher interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with each teacher. Teachers were first asked to reflect on their school's staff mean score for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension, and to comment on why teachers at the school would have such a low perception of the school's overall effectiveness as an organization. Additionally, teachers were asked to comment on what it meant to them that survey results indicated teachers saw only a slight connection between the school's supervisory structure and its organizational effectiveness. In responding, both teachers expressed their view that many students coming to the school have special needs because of disadvantaged home conditions, and that these needs pose additional challenges to teachers at the school. As one teacher related:
...many of our kids just come to school with less of an advantage. It's not that they are not capable, but their home conditions often puts them at a disadvantage, particularly in terms of their self-esteem. As teachers, we have to work with these kids and where they are academically, and many of them are already at-risk.

The other teacher confirmed this view, and noted that the accelerated schools program the school is participating in is viewed positively by teachers:

...well, we know we still have a ways to go with improvements, but the accelerated schools program is helping us. The accelerated program gives us free reign to work with our kids in the way we want to.

In discussing opportunities for collaborative planning and sharing at the school, the teachers interviewed indicated that, while planning time is incorporated into teachers’ daily schedules, time and scheduling constraints prevent teachers from conducting any purposeful group meetings. As one teacher explained:

We actually do have a daily planning period - during library time, but teachers don’t have their planning period at the same time...so, it’s still impossible, say, for the second grade teachers to meet together during the day.

The other teacher, however, noted that teachers at the school feel free to conduct informal meetings whenever they feel the need, sometimes calling impromptu meetings outside classroom doors during recess:

Teachers here can call a meeting whenever they feel they need one...teachers can do that during the day if they can find someone to watch their class. Sometimes, we’ll just hold meetings right in the hall at recess while on duty watching the kids.

Finally, commenting on the quality of professional interactions among teachers and administrators at the school, the teachers interviewed indicated that staff interactions are characterized by, as one teacher remarked, "...strong feelings of family-like closeness and togetherness." The views of the two teachers regarding the overall collaborative atmosphere
at the school can be summarized by one teacher’s final interview comment:

...we have a very strong family-type atmosphere. Our classrooms are also very close together, so we just meet informally whenever we want to discuss instructional matters. For example, teachers here freely chat in the halls about everything. We’re naturally very sharing and collaborative...we’re just a very close-knit group.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

• Principal and teachers consider daily time and scheduling constraints as a major factor limiting their supervisory activities.

• Principal and teachers view professional supervision in the school as primarily involving participation in and compliance with external programs.

• Professional collaboration is loosely interpreted by teachers to include informal fraternizing.
SCHOOL H
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>32.31</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>90.05%</td>
<td>89.75%</td>
<td>78.03%</td>
<td>66.11%</td>
<td>88.31%</td>
<td>62.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This K-5 elementary school obtained the highest IPOE-S score (MIPOE-S=36.90, M%Max=92.25%) of all schools in the total school sample (n=131). This school also had the highest Organizational Structure (OS) OSCI-S subscale/dimension score (OS=93.65, M%Max=90.05%) of all schools in the total variable matrix. The OS/IPOE-S correlation for this school was .70 (n=41).

For the 1991-92 school year, the school had a student enrollment of 644 and an administrator/staff ratio of 2/42. The percentage of students receiving free and/or reduced cost lunches was 35.87%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 97.30%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for fourth grade students for this school was 54.44. The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 97.62%.

The principal and two members of the school faculty were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of the school for fourteen years. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is a first grade teacher with ten year’s teaching experience at the school; the other is a fifth grade teacher who has been at the school for four years.
Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

To initiate the interview, OSCI-S summary profile scores for the school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to comment on her school’s high organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) and Organizational Structure (OS) OSCI-S subscale/dimension staff mean scores, and to also explain what it meant to her that teachers in her school saw a strong, positive relationship between their perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, the principal emphasized that she believes she and her faculty have developed and maintain a very unique and open supervisory culture in their school. In the principal’s view, this culture focuses on "...meeting and satisfying the professional and ‘person needs’ of the faculty." Towards this end, the principal related that she and her teachers are very interested in working together to "...continually meet the supervisory needs of the faculty."

The principal described the school’s "supervisory culture" as one that focuses on "people helping each other", and one in which both administrators and staff "...place high value in the importance of monitoring and supervising instructional quality." She attributed this culture she and her staff "...work very hard to sustain", as a primary reason why the school evidenced a high, positive relationship between staff perceptions of school supervisory structure and organizational effectiveness.

A second reason offered by the principal was her belief that she and her staff have developed a high level of "professional trust" toward each other. The principal explained that this professional trust extends to affording teachers considerable input and decision making authority in a variety of instructional and supervisory concerns, as well as in
administrative matters. Elaborating on the school’s decision making structure, the principal emphasized she viewed herself as:

...just one of the many supervisory personnel in the school, as many of the teachers assume full instructional supervisory roles as mentor teachers and as ‘decision making team’ group leaders.

The principal related that she actively involves faculty members in critical supervisory decisions. The example she shared involved the fact that teachers, both within and across grade levels, actually become involved in the screening and selection of new faculty to fill grade-level vacancies.

The principal related during the interview that the teachers over the years have devised a school supervisory motto that has a rather unique history to it. The motto the principal said she and her teachers live by at the school is "failure is the fertilizer for our success". According to the principal, this motto was developed following an occurrence five years back, when a number of teachers had collaborated in writing a grant proposal for the design and implementation of a new, experimental reading program in the school. The teachers had put a considerable amount of time and effort into the development of this grant proposal, and were quite disappointed on learning that the proposal was rejected. Still excited about the potential of the project for professional learning, and rather than simply shelving the entire proposal, the principal recounted that she and her teachers decided to proceed with the project anyway. The result of this decision was the inauguration of a one-day professional development workshop for area educators that subsequently has mushroomed into an annual professional development, public relations and fund-raising event for the school.
This one-day professional development workshop is now called "Super Saturday". This annual event is completely planned and coordinated by the school’s faculty, with the teachers themselves serving as the workshop’s featured presenters. The "Super Saturday" event, in its fourth year in 1991-92, involves an array of inservice presentations, all by school faculty members, in curriculum areas such as reading, hands-on science, computer technology, whole language, etc. The principal stated all area teachers, parents and community members are invited to attend.

The principal stressed that the most important aspect of this "Super Saturday" event is the fact that it represents a very focused and high-level professional learning opportunity for all of her teachers. As the principal explained:

...because teachers have to prepare all of the presentations, they really have to think about what is so interesting and worthwhile about the kinds of teaching strategies and techniques they’re using in their classroom, and why are these things worth talking about and sharing with others.

The principal emphasized that her teachers plan for this one-day workshop all year long. It was the principal’s view that her teachers perhaps learn and grow more professionally through staging this event than through anything else they do and participate in during the year.

The principal also discussed what she viewed as the school’s relative autonomy from the central office in terms of supervisory activities. As the principal related:

...the staff in the school probably feel somewhat ‘out of touch’ with the district supervisory structure and don’t feel any connection with central office personnel from the district...this is so because the school has chosen to plan and conduct its own in-building supervisory activities and not rely on the district office for activities and/or personnel.

Teachers’ sense of having relative autonomy in developing and implementing their own supervisory and instructional programs at the school is, in the principal’s estimation, a
The principal further stated that other schools in the district, as well as personnel in the central office, have over the years come to value many of the staff development and instructional improvement projects that teachers at their school have developed. According to the principal, the district now often calls upon members of the school staff to pilot their newly developed ideas and programs at other district school sites.

**Teacher Interviews**

To initiate the teacher interviews, O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. Teachers were asked to comment on their school's high staff mean scores for the IPOE-S and the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension, and to also explain what it meant to them that survey results indicated a high, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school's overall effectiveness as an organization. In responding, both teachers expressed congruent views (consistent with the principal's) that their school possesses a "uniquely open culture" that focuses on "...sustaining a high esprit d'corps among teachers" and developing a "...high quality atmosphere of trust for each other". One teacher commented that she felt a distinguishing characteristic of the school's professional culture is a decided focus on "...people helping each other".

The teachers also expressed the view that the overall professional climate in the school is one that places high value on the importance of supervising instructional quality. In speculating on what might be possible explanations for the relatively high correlation in their school between staff perceptions of professional supervisory structure and overall organizational effectiveness, these two faculty members voiced similar beliefs about the
supervisory structure in their school. One teacher indicated she believes teachers' feelings of a strong connection between the school's supervisory structure and its effectiveness comes from the level of involvement in decision making teachers feel they have at the school. As this teacher explained:

...I think a big reason teachers see a connection here is because decisions are not made separately from teachers. As teachers, we make a lot of the important decisions affecting the quality of instruction in our classrooms. But, our decision making doesn't stop there...we are involved in making decisions in a number of areas that involve our own staff development programs, the kinds of professional planning and sharing we want to do, etc. Our principal encourages us in this...and we feel we do all this together with her.

The other teacher commented that school staff members are given "...lots of opportunities to become involved in decision making." Offering examples of the kinds of activities that teachers in the school are encouraged to assume decision making authority in, this teacher stated:

...one example that comes to mind is textbook selection...this decision always comes from our teachers. In addition, we have a number of programs that teachers are directly involved in. One such program is the first-grade reading recovery program focusing on at-risk first graders. In other areas, some of our teachers here, in numerous instances, have researched, compiled literature reviews and presented proposals for curricular materials and programs to the principal, and she has agreed to let us go ahead with these. She [principal] encourages us to assume meaningful leadership roles in both instructional and supervisory areas.

One of the teachers interviewees stated she felt teachers' perceptions of the school as organizationally effective was unquestionably linked to their perception of the principal as an effective instructional and supervisory leader. In further elaborating on why she felt the principal was an effective leader, this teacher stated:

...I think that our teachers really perceive Mrs. _____ as an extremely knowledgeable principal and an effective leader. And, leadership is very important to the organizational effectiveness of a school. This principal has
a clear instructional and supervisory leadership vision, and shares that vision
readily with staff. In this school, our principal functions as a catalyst for
change and is a real risk-taker.

And finally, in regards to school staff members’ supervisory relationships with the
central office, both teachers interviewed felt that the teachers at the school have "...really
progressed to the point where they are designing and implementing their own professional
development programs." The teachers did not have any particular negative perceptions of
the central office, but expressed the belief that their faculty had simply developed
professional needs and interests that have matured beyond the ability of the district to
provide meaningful assistance to them.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the
following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

• There is a lack of clear delineation and separation of principal and staff roles in
  supervisory and administrative functions. Decision making in instructional,
  supervisory and administrative matters is a product of shared leadership.

• Principal and teachers interact in an atmosphere of mutual professional caring and
  trust, and share a strong sense of ownership in and responsibility for the school’s
  instructional and supervisory programs.

• Teachers feel empowered by the principal to assume active, shared leadership roles
  in the school and, because of this, view the principal as an effective supervisory
  leader.
O/S Climate Profiles for Selected Comparison Schools

O/S Climate Profiles for each of the twelve comparison schools identified in Research Question 5 (Table 32, pp. 182-183) are presented in this appendix. Each school O/S Climate Profile contains: (1) a quantitative data summary of OSCI-S survey results for the school; (2) interview background information highlighting pertinent demographic information and key independent/dependent variable relationships obtained for the school; (3) written summary results of qualitative interviews with the principal and two teachers in each school; and (4) a final O/S climate profile summary section synthesizing results of qualitative data analyses.
HIGH SES CATEGORY
(COMPARISON PAIR NOS. 1 & 2)
COMPARISON PAIR NO. 1

COMPARISON SCHOOL 1a
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

O/S Variable:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.92</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.46%</td>
<td>71.06%</td>
<td>51.63%</td>
<td>66.18%</td>
<td>70.13%</td>
<td>67.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This 10-12 grade senior high school is one of a pair of senior high schools (Comparison Pair No. 1, High SES Category, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample as having similar demographic characteristics (i.e., school size, SES, administrator/staff ratio) but differing independent and dependent variable features. For the 1991-92 school year, Comparison School 1a had a student enrollment of 1,083, and an administrator staff ratio of 3/63. The percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches (SES level) was 26.94%, and the student yearly average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 94.92%. As California Achievement Test (CAT) data were available for grades four, six and nine for schools in this study, no standardized student achievement (CAT) data were obtained for this pair of senior high schools.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 77.78%. This school obtained an Organizational Structure OSCI-S subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 63.92 (M%Max OS=61.46%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 26.98 (M%Max IPOE-S=67.45%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .45 (n=49).

The principal and two members of the school faculty were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this senior high school for twelve years. Two
teachers in the school were interviewed. One teacher is a math teacher with six years' experience at the school. The other teacher is an English teacher who has been at this school for eight years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

At the outset of the telephone interview, the principal was given the OSCI-S survey profile scores for his school. The principal was asked to comment on what it meant to him that teachers in the school felt there was a moderate relationship between the school’s professional supervisory climate and its overall organizational effectiveness. In answering this question, the principal emphasized that he feels he is responsive to the needs of his teachers, and is interested in seeing his teachers participate in supervisory activities that will improve the quality of the school. As the principal explained:

...I feel I give my teachers some real opportunities to help create the kinds of professional development activities that they really want and need, and that they can see some benefit from and how [through participating in these activities] they can eventually impact the quality of our school.

This principal then went on to describe an example of how he has provided an organizational structure in the school through which teachers have opportunities to request specific supervisory activities they feel they need:

I can share with you a real good example of what I mean on this. A few years ago we instituted the effective schools program in my school. I instituted a steering committee; the teachers were able to give their input as to what they wanted to do. I considered this to be a real way of giving the teachers some real input into telling me the kinds of things that they wanted to be involved in and the kinds of things that they would consider helpful to their professional development. We still have this steering committee. The effective schools thing is still going on, as well as the steering committee. We go to our people and find out what they are doing and what they actually need. We started this about four or five years ago here.
The principal stressed that he felt himself to be a "good listener" to teachers. In elaborating on his self-description as an administrator who listens and is responsive to supervisory requests and needs of his teachers, he discussed the criteria he employs in assessing the merits of teacher supervisory requests, and what he means when he speaks of teacher ownership in supervisory decision making:

I tell my teachers that I will listen to anything. They have got to come up with a concrete problem first, they have to present something to me that makes sense and seems like a logical need. Then, if they can do that, then I will listen to what they have to say. I would say in this sense that I give my staff a lot of ownership - I'm not afraid of that term - I wouldn't want it to get out of hand, though. It depends on the people you have on your faculty in any given year. You just have to play this ownership thing by ear. Giving teachers ownership is good - if they know what to do with it, and can handle it. Some teachers can, and some can't - you know what I mean.

Additionally, the principal was specifically asked to share his thoughts regarding his school's relatively low Organizational Structure (OS) OSCI-S mean score (OS=63.92; M%Max=61.46%), and low Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) OSCI-S mean score (CSR=16.52; M%Max=51.63%). In regard to the school's supervisory structure, the principal again cited his teachers' involvement in the school's steering committee as an example of a supervisory activity in the school that encourages active teacher participation in decision making regarding their own professional development.

In addition to teacher involvement in drafting steering committee recommendations, the principal noted that teachers at the school have substantial ownership in other school professional supervisory activities as well, especially in regards to the professional classroom observation/assessment process. In this regard, the principal related how the parish had reviewed and modified an earlier state-devised classroom assessment form (the state Teacher
Internship and Evaluation (LaTIP/LaTEP) form), and how this form was being utilized by the administrators and teachers in his school. As the principal related:

Well, again, I actually think that we do give our teachers a lot of input into decision making. For example, they have a good deal of ownership in their own classroom assessment and professional instructional development plans. We use the LaTIP/LaTEP form in our accountability plan - parish-wide. We modified this document to fit our needs in the school. We now have 42 assessment indicators that we use in the modified LaTIP/LaTEP assessment form for the parish. That’s how we do it -- we had a parish-wide committee that we formed to modify the state assessment system - some of our own teachers served on this committee, and we broke it down to what we really needed in our school, and made it fit the needs of our students and classrooms.

The principal indicated that the state-devised classroom assessment form he was referring to had been originally mandated by the state legislature, but implementation efforts for this assessment system were postponed in 1991, then subsequently abandoned. Districts within the state were then allowed to individually modify the state system to meet their own perceived school needs. As the principal remarked:

We liked [the state system] in its original form pretty much. But, we felt that all of the time-consuming part about the documentation of the conferences and all the other kinds of paperwork documentation was a little too much, but the indicators that were in the [state] form were good. We still use them around here, but in our modified form.

The principal was asked to elaborate further on the specific kinds of supervisory activities related to classroom assessment that he (and the assistant administrators) and his teachers participate in, and to explain in more detail how these activities promote the kind of teacher "ownership" in professional supervisory activities (in particular, the classroom assessment process) that he spoke of earlier. In response to this question, the principal indicated that he and his assistant administrators always make a point of advising teachers when they will be visiting their classrooms, and encourage teachers to "...discuss aspects of
their teaching and teaching indicators on the assessment form that are of particular concern to them."

The principal’s comments concerning his school’s relatively low score on the OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) were more general. The principal stated that he was not opposed to teachers sharing professionally among themselves, but did not give any verbal indication that he considered this to be an important component of the school’s supervisory activities:

Well, I think that my teachers do have time to do some collaborative sharing. But if teachers would want to go visit with other teachers during their off hours, they could do that if they want to -- that’s fine with me. In fact, last year there was something on educational television that presented that kind of thing - the peer coaching idea - and I told my teachers that if they wanted to do that, then that’s fine.

Finally, when questioned about staff development activities and other professional staff supervisory services provided by the district and his teachers’ overall perceptions of the district-school supervisory climate, the principal indicated that the district traditionally has not provided elaborate supervisory and professional development programs for the district’s teachers and schools. Professional support programs, when provided by the district, are usually done so to provide additional information to personnel in conjunction with implementation of new state-mandated programs and/or new district policies:

Usually, as far as the district is concerned - if we are going to have an inservice by the district - it’s going to be on something that’s very important. They don’t have a regular series of workshops and inservices for our teachers, unless it is really something very important.

It was this principal’s view that his teachers did not consider the school’s overall supervisory climate as being very much affected by occasional interactions with personnel from the district office and/or the relatively infrequent district-planned inservice activities.
Teacher Interviews

To initiate the teacher interviews, the O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. The teachers were asked to first reflect on their school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to then comment on what it meant to him/her that survey results indicated a moderate, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall effectiveness level as an organization. In responding to this question, both teacher interviewees emphasized that teachers at the school really do not have a structured time during the day to hold departmental and/or grade level meetings. As one teacher explained, all teachers do have a conference period each day, but the master schedule does not allow for teachers within single departments to have coincident conference periods. Because of this scheduling limitation, this teacher indicated that individual department staff find it difficult to hold supervisory meetings. Describing the supervisory meeting structure at her school, the teacher stated:

We simply don’t have time during the day to meet by departments...we don’t have any time to share within departments easily. We all have our individual daily planning periods, but enough of us within a single department are not off at the same time to allow for meetings - we simply can’t do this.

This view was echoed by the other teacher, who indicated further that teacher sponsorship of extracurricular activities preclude teachers from conducting supervisory meetings after school as well:

...in our school, even though each individual teacher has a conference period, all the math teachers, for example, don’t have off at the same period. This is a big problem because we then can never meet as a department during the day to discuss instructional or supervisory matters ...our only option is to
meet after school - and, teachers at this school just don’t do that. There are just too many extracurricular activities going on every day after school that many of the teachers may be sponsors and cosponsors for. We just don’t have a structure in our schedule that allows for departments to meet during the school day.

One teacher further explained that at certain times during the year teachers at the school may engage in department meetings either during the day or after school. These typically occur, according to the teacher, in instances when the district schedules a mandatory inservice, and when release time is provided:

...whenever we have some type of inservice that is mandated by the parish, there is a certain amount of time allowed for department meetings. Usually, there is some type of release time from the school board for this purpose. Sometimes, we may holding meetings after school when we have parish inservice days. We have these parish inservices three or four times during the year.

In view of the comments the teachers expressed above concerning their school’s supervisory meeting structure and the lack of available time for planned instructional and supervisory interactions among teacher groups, one teacher commented further that she felt the scores for her school were "...probably a little high in all areas". This teacher explained that she also felt this was the case because, in her view, teachers at the school do not have any real input into supervisory decision making. The teacher indicated, however, that she believes that many teachers are simply unwilling to state their true opinions about such a professionally sensitive topic on a paper and pencil survey:

You know, we fill out a lot of surveys for the state department, LEAD, etc., and I can tell you that most of the teachers here are simply playing it safe and not really saying what they really think, especially in terms of the way supervisory decisions are made...because, we simply do not have the input into decision making here at this school that we really want to have. But, many teachers are not going to say this. This is just my personal opinion, but I’m sharing with you what I really think. I’d say that all of the scores for our school are too high.
Reviewing her school’s supervisory climate subscale scores, this same teacher expressed surprise at the relatively high mean scores in some areas. In particular, she indicated that she believed faculty members’ true perceptions of the extent of meaningful input they have into supervisory decision making at the school are, in fact, at odds with the school’s Professional Autonomy score results. This teacher cited the school’s ‘effective schools committee’ as an example in point:

...well, we do have the effective schools committee... but, this is a very small group of people, only a small number of our teachers are on this committee. So, I’m very surprised at these numbers, particularly the Professional Autonomy score...because the general perception of teachers here is that we have very little, if any, real input into decision making regarding supervisory matters.

This teacher elaborated further on this point, providing an example of how the principal, in her view, fails to include teachers in important supervisory decisions:

I feel that at this school - as compared with other schools I’ve worked at - the principal treats us in a very patronizing way. For example, we don’t have any input in helping to make up the master schedule...to help decide what courses we will be teaching the next year...deciding what periods and that type of thing. I feel that there are a lot of talents and strengths of many teachers here that go untapped because the principal doesn’t solicit our input in something as important as this.

In regards to supervision of professional work, both teachers expressed similar views that the principal and assistant administrators in their school are effective in their normal observations of teachers, and in providing feedback about classroom performance. As one teacher commented:

...our principals have two days - tuesdays and thursdays - to come and observe us. They come and talk to you before they come and visit, and they are pretty good at giving feedback afterwards.

The other teacher briefly described how the district revised the state classroom assessment form, and adopted this revised version for district-wide use:
We have a formal parish observation form that we follow. The parish revised the state evaluation form...our form doesn't have nearly as many indicators as the state form did, and this is what we use throughout the parish.

Finally, teachers commented on faculty perceptions of the district-school supervisory climate, and the nature and quality of the professional interactions teachers at the school have with district supervisory personnel. The teachers were in agreement in stating they believed that their school's District Supervisory Climate (DSC) score was a fairly accurate reflection of the limited number of interactions teachers have with district office personnel.

As one teacher explained:

I'd say that this score is probably about right. Our district supervisory staff is fairly small compared to other parishes. We do not have a lot of supervisory personnel working at the district office. For example, in ________ parish, they have a supervisory coordinator in every subject area - a math coordinator, science coordinator, etc. We don't have that...we just have two supervisors for the whole parish - an elementary and a secondary coordinator of instruction. That's the extent of our district supervisory staff.

This feeling was confirmed by the other teacher, who added:

...we just don't see many district personnel here very often. We do have the three or four scheduled district inservices throughout the year...but, that's the extent of formal district-sponsored activities.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school's O/S climate:

- The principal, while indicating an interest in providing teachers with opportunities for input into supervisory decision making, does not view teacher collaborative sharing as an important element of the school's professional supervisory structure.
• In contrast to the principal’s stated initiatives, teachers do not perceive that they are afforded any real input into school supervisory decision making or are provided with any structured opportunities for collaborative planning and sharing.

• District office supervisory programs and personnel are not viewed by principal and staff as significant elements affecting the school's overall supervisory structure.
COMPARISON SCHOOL 1b  
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE  

OSCI-S Data Summary  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>85.80</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>11.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>82.81%</td>
<td>68.81%</td>
<td>74.64%</td>
<td>74.75%</td>
<td>72.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information  

This 10-12 grade senior high school is the second of a pair of senior high schools (Comparison Pair No. 1, High SES Category, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample as similar demographically (i.e., school size, SES, administrator/staff ratio) but having contrasting independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, Comparison School 1b had a student enrollment of 843, and an administrator staff ratio of 3/53. The percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches (SES level) was 25.84%, and the 1991-92 student average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 98.03%. As with school 1a, no standardized student achievement (CAT) data were available for this senior high school.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 100%. The school registered an Organizational Structure OSCI-S subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 85.80 (M%Max OS=82.50%), and a professional staff mean IPOE-S score of 34.33 (M%Max IPOE-S=85.83%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .49 (n=53).

The principal and two members of the school faculty were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this senior high school for twelve years. Two teachers on the school faculty were interviewed. One of the teachers is an English teacher...
who has been on the professional staff for nine years; the other teacher is a math teacher with 16 years' teaching experience at this school.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

The school's OSCI-S summary profile scores were shared with the principal at the beginning of the telephone interview. The principal was asked what it meant to him that his school evidenced a positive and moderate relationship between staff perceptions of supervisory structure and overall organizational effectiveness, especially given the fact that the Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and IPOE-S professional staff mean scores for his school were both relatively high (MOS=85.80, M%MaxOS=82.50%; MIPOE-S=34.33, M%MaxIPOE-S=85.83%). The principal stated that he was not surprised by the relatively high supervisory structure and organizational effectiveness scores, because, according to this principal, "...we work very conscientiously here to create and maintain a positive and meaningful professional learning environment for our teachers." In reflecting on the moderate relationship found between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and level of effectiveness, the principal emphasized that he felt his teachers value the efforts they have made in improving the quality of the school's instructional and supervisory programs. But, he added that he felt his teachers tend to be realistic, and take the broader view that these improvements represent steps in a positive direction, although more improvements are still needed:

I think our teachers have a fairly realistic idea of where we are in our supervisory programs. They know that we take our staff development and professional inservice programs seriously, and that we try to give them many opportunities for real professional improvement. But, I think they also recognize that as they can see some improvement from year to year, things move slow[ly] - especially in a high school environment where things are so
diverse. Teachers are very specialized, their instructional needs vary, and professional growth needs may be different from one teacher to the next. I have to say, though, that I feel that we make teacher professional development a real focus of our efforts.

The principal related that they have a rather innovative daily schedule which he referred to as a "modified seven-period day". He indicated that this modified daily schedule allows teachers some additional professional planning time, as well as some available time during the school day to meet in small groups for instructional and supervisory planning. As the principal explained:

We are pretty organized in terms of time for teachers' professional planning. Teachers here work in a modified seven-period day. This means that most of the teachers on the faculty have both a planning period and a professional period each day. We try to schedule these periods so that, for example, most of the math people are free at one time. For teachers' professional period duties...before the start of the school year teachers come in and decide what professional duties and activities they want to participate in, and they then work on those activities during their professional period.

The principal explained further that the daily planning periods are utilized by teachers for a variety of professional planning needs. Teacher planning activities during these periods include individual classroom lesson preparation as well as small group meetings for curricular and departmental planning:

Also, teachers meet regularly in their department and curricular groups during their planning periods. Teachers really value this group planning time, especially as they are able to meet together during the school day. They are able to plan a great deal, and are able to meet as often as they like to discuss and revise their instructional plans.

In describing the kinds of supervisory activities in which the whole faculty participates, the principal explained that their faculty organizational meeting structure centers around monthly faculty inservices, during which teachers frequently make presentations:

We also have some professional activities for the whole faculty. We have monthly inservice meetings - sometimes we bring in guest speakers, but
many times we have our own faculty members make presentations, to share
with the rest of the faculty interesting and innovative things they are doing
in their own classrooms.

Concerning teachers’ individual growth needs, the principal described the school’s
classroom observation/assessment program as benefitting teachers’ professional development.
Their school, like other schools in the district, uses a modified version of the state-designed
classroom assessment system. The principal explained that some of his teachers, along with
other teachers in the district, were part of a district-wide committee - comprised of teachers
and instructional supervisors - who were charged (in 1991) with making modifications to
the state system and customizing it to the needs of the district’s schools. According to the
principal, teachers view the revised assessment system adopted by the district as very useful:

As far as [teacher] observations, evaluations, and followups are concerned -
that’s all mandated, and the parish has a set form that we have to use in our
[teacher] evaluation process. We still use the TIP/TEP assessment program.
The parish system is still using this because the teachers find it very
useful...a committee of supervisors and teachers from throughout the parish
devised the final, streamlined form for the parish.

In discussing teacher involvement in the classroom assessment process, the principal
indicated that the teachers value the observation and conference process at their school,
particularly since, because of their input into the revision process, they had acquired indepth
knowledge about specific indicators comprising the form. According to the principal,
because they are knowledgeable and feel comfortable with the program, teachers look
forward to the post-observation conferences as real opportunities for professional learning:

The process of evaluation is very well organized and pretty straightforward.
The teachers really like the conference setup. We are very organized
observation- and conference-wise. The teachers know the teaching points
we are looking for during observations, and have a real interest in discussing
these points later on during the conferences. Teachers really feel like they
are benefitting from them [conferences], because they had real input into the
final structure of the revised evaluation form.
Finally, in further elaborating on the structure of the teacher assessment program at the school, the principal explained that each of the school's three administrators "...has about 20 faculty members assigned to them...for example, the teachers I observe and assess are mostly in my own fields - math and science." The school's assessment program, in the principal's view, has complimented and even enhanced the "open door policy" that administrators and staff at the school subscribe to. Regarding the school's open door policy, the principal stated:

...we have good working relationships and a real sense of collaborative trust existing among our teachers and administrators. They know what is expected of them, and they have a lot of input into decision making. We have a working open door policy...for example, teachers ask me - as well as other teachers - to come into their classroom, and they ask for input into ways they can improve their instruction.

Commenting on the school's lower staff mean score for the OSCL-S subscale/dimension of Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (MCSR=22.02, M%MaxCSR=68.81%), this principal stated that he feels that his teachers already do a good deal of collaborative sharing among themselves both within and across grade levels. He added, however, that the master schedule does place some limitations on the amount of teacher sharing that's possible within the structured day. In the principal's words:

I do feel, however, that we have a lot of exchange among teachers both within and across grades. Our teacher planning and professional periods help a lot in this area. I just think teachers feel like there needs to be more of this. We encourage our teachers on this, and support their efforts at collaboration as much as possible.

In elaborating on teacher opportunities for input into curricular and supervisory decision making, the principal stated that when he designs the master schedule for the following school year, he asks teachers for their input concerning course offerings and scheduling:
...when I'm planning my master schedule for the following year I include the teachers in giving input into the curriculum - to make recommendations as to what they want to teach and how they want to teach it. Some teachers are encouraged to write up new courses and actually get approval for it from the state department.

The principal added that several teachers in the school have gone through the process of designing and submitting new courses to the state for approval, and have succeeded in getting these courses inserted into the school’s curriculum.

Finally, in commenting on the level of district supervisory support and the quality of the district-school supervisory climate, the principal indicated that he felt there is a good overall working supervisory relationship between the central office and schools within the district. Again, the principal referred to the recent district-school collaboration on refining the classroom assessment program as an example of the quality of the district-school supervisory relationship:

...workshops from the district are pretty good - they meet the needs of the teachers. For example, two years ago we inserviced the teachers on TIP/TEP [classroom assessment program]. We worked very closely with the teachers on this, [and] gave many inservices on this...we are still using this. The parish actually promoted this strongly...the parish also has some supervisory instructors that come by and observe teachers and provide feedback...observing teachers who ask for observation. We call this our prescriptive inservice program, where we, along with district office supervisors, work with both new and tenured teachers. Yes, I would say that we get quite a bit of support from the district.

Teacher Interviews

Telephone interviews were conducted with two teachers from this school. The teachers were asked to comment on what it meant to them that a positive and moderate relationship was found for their school between staff perceptions of school supervisory structure and overall organizational effectiveness. The teachers were additionally asked to share their reflections on their school’s moderate, positive correlation between these two
variables, given the school’s relatively high individual OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) and organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) professional staff mean scores. Teachers’ remarks generally confirmed the principal’s description of the school’s supervisory climate as encouraging and supporting strong teacher influence and input into curricular and supervisory activities. The teachers interviewed both felt that teachers at the school have many opportunities to become involved and work collaboratively:

...we feel that teachers here really become involved in school supervisory activities, and through participating in these activities teachers are very influential in affecting the overall quality of our school. The state mandated things - sometimes we find these totally ridiculous, particularly when somebody from outside the system just comes in and lectures to us. These kinds of lectures don’t really have any relevance for us. But, the activities we do in our school really do...we are very involved in deciding the kinds of activities and ways we are going to work together to improve our school.

One teacher indicated she felt the school staff is proactive in collaborating in curricular and supervisory activities as well as in implementing them:

Our teachers here work very closely together and we get things done. We’ve met with the central office, we’ve gone to numerous workshops. We know that innovations are out there and we try to bring them back to our school - and then we try to implement them.

This teacher went on to explain that two years ago (1990-91) they had created and implemented a modified seven-period schedule at the school "...in order to improve our supervisory structure." According to the teacher, this new schedule format allows teachers significantly more time during the school day to engage in instructional planning and to become involved in supervisory activities that increase their own professional learning:

For example two years ago we created and implemented a modified seven-period schedule in order to improve our supervisory structure. This rearrangement of the schedule has helped tremendously in giving us the time we need to plan and improve our teaching. There was, in fact, a school from up north looking at our modified seven-period day program because it’s kind of innovative. In the modified seven-period day plan most teachers
teach five periods, and have one period of professional work and one planning period. For their professional work period many teachers work on inservice development, staff development, accountability, and also engage in peer observations.

According to the teacher, obtaining permission from the central office to implement the modified master schedule required some effort. The teacher explained that teachers and administrators in the school worked diligently to develop the proposal for this modified schedule and presented it to the central office. The effort required strong commitment on the part of the teachers, and a "...steady determination that this was something that the teachers really believed in." As this teacher recounted:

...initially, getting this schedule was tough...we had to fight the central office tooth and nail to get this extra period and keep it. The central office was initially very hesitant to grant us this request, because they are very conscious of community relations and how the community would view teachers taking an extra period and not working with the students. But, gradually, the central office has come to see the value of us having this professional work and professional development time - where we actually have time to do some of the professional activities that really help make ourselves better teachers and the school a better quality school. It's taken a real long time to convince everybody, but it's working great now...now the central office understands how this is really a good thing and is very useful.

The other teacher described another pilot program that the teachers initiated during the 1991-92 school year. This program involved "...going to a two half-day and two full-day exam schedule." According to this teacher, this scheduling modification was suggested by the faculty and approved by the school administration, and resulted in "...giving students extra time to study, and providing faculty with additional time for interdepartmental meetings."

Both teachers emphasized repeatedly during the interviews that they consider their faculty to be a very active and highly participative group that "...wants to become involved
in decision making, especially decisions that affect our daily work." As one teacher explained:

We're a very vocal faculty - the teachers really like to be involved in everything. For example, we as a faculty made sure we were involved in the TIP/TEP [state assessment program] revision plans conducted in the parish. We had a lot of input in these revisions, and our principal and administrators supported us in this. We met with the central office people and gave a lot of input.

Both teachers agreed that the encouragement and support the teachers receive from the school's administrators is an important element of "...the supervisory atmosphere at the school." The teachers indicated the principal and assistant principals encourage teachers to discuss their own ideas about ways to improve supervisory quality and to make their ideas known to the administrators both at the school and at the central office:

We give our input to the central office - sometimes they don't solicit our input, but we give it to them anyway. They may not be receptive because of financial limitations, but we are very interested in participating, and our principal and assistant principals encourage us to make our professional opinions about instruction and supervisory activities known to everyone - at the school and at the central office.

The teachers indicated that one supervisory area they are working on at the school is increasing the amount of collaboration teachers do across departments. One teacher commented that she feels there is a good deal of interdepartmental collaboration already, but that teachers feel a need to increase this kind of professional sharing:

...we do a lot of interdepartmental stuff across the curriculum. Each nine weeks we come up with guidelines for content area - so we have been sharing across departments, but possibly not as much as we would want to. This is an area we are still working on.

Finally, both teachers related that the school enjoys excellent parental support. The teachers interviewed stated that parents are actively involved in many areas of school life, and participate regularly with teachers in school-related projects. As one teacher remarked,
"...we have great parental support...and an ‘Up With Teachers’ program here...parents are very much involved in our school."

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- The principal views teachers’ involvement in collaborative planning and supervisory decision making as important elements of their professional work roles.

- Structured times for both teacher planning/sharing and professional development are incorporated into teachers’ regular daily work schedules.

- Teachers are actively involved in a variety of instructional and supervisory activities, and feel encouraged and supported in these efforts by school administrators.

- A good working supervisory relationship exists between the school and district office.
COMPARISON PAIR NO. 2

COMPARISON SCHOOL 2a
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>62.06</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>59.67%</td>
<td>74.17%</td>
<td>51.25%</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>70.13%</td>
<td>66.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This secondary school is one of a pair of 9-12 grade high schools (Comparison Pair No. 2, High SES Category, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample. School 2a shares similar demographic features with school 2b, but the two schools differ in some independent and dependent variable characteristics. Comparison School 2a had a student enrollment of 950, and an administrator staff ratio of 3/55 for the 1991-92 school year. The school fell in the High SES category, having less than 30 percent of its students on free and/or reduced cost lunches (1991-92 SES level, 22.48%). The school’s 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 89.89%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for ninth grade students for this school was 39.68.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 87.27%. The school obtained an Organizational Structure OSCI-S subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 62.06 (M%Max OS=59.67%), and a professional staff mean IPOE-S score of 24.13 (M%Max IPOE-S=60.33%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .36 (n=48).

The principal and two members of the school faculty were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this high school for fifteen years. Of the teachers
interviewed, one is an English teacher, and English department chairman, who has been on the staff for thirteen years. The other is a librarian/social studies teacher who has been at the school for fifteen years, and who is the chairman of the school advisory committee.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

At the outset of the interview the principal was asked to share his thoughts on his school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) and organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S), and what it meant to him that his staff perceived only a slight to moderate relationship between their perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and the school’s level of organizational effectiveness. The principal responded that he felt there could be a number of reasons contributing to the way in which faculty members might perceive the school’s supervisory activities, but he strongly emphasized that teachers in his school have substantial input into decision making:

Well, there are a variety of reasons why teachers might think the way they do...one would be that faculty opinions can vary from year to year...but one thing that I can tell you is that teachers here know that they have a voice in decision making...teachers know that I’m not an autocrat...I’m big on decision making.

The principal stressed that the supervisory structure in his school is a very informal one. According to the principal, professional interactions among teachers, and between teachers and himself, are done on an informal basis - and he indicated that he actively encourages this interactive style:

...one of the things that I do here is communicate regularly with my teachers - informally - both in and out of the classrooms. Professional supervision around here is done informally, in informal situations when teachers are not feeling pressured. I’m a very informal person when it comes to being helpful...we have different titles, but we are all educators.
The principal related that some of his teachers are members of the school site committee. This is the site-based management committee for the school. Several faculty members serve on this committee, and the committee meets regularly to discuss and plan instructional and supervisory activities. As a followup to his remarks regarding the school’s site committee, the principal was asked to comment on his school’s relatively low Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) staff mean score (MCSR=16.40, M%MaxCSR=51.25%). The principal stated:

Well, I can tell you that we have a very active site committee...we even set aside some time during the school day to get departments together to share and plan. We have a great 13-member site committee...I’m just a member, I’m not the head of it. My teachers and I were into the site-based management idea long before a lot of other high schools, and we are much deeper into it now than other schools.

Concerning full staff faculty meetings, the principal related what he viewed as a recurring problem that he had been encountering at his school up until a few years ago with scheduling and conducting these meetings:

...let me tell you about one of the problems we used to have here with after-school faculty meetings - coaches were aggravated, teachers with bus duties were aggravated, doctors’ appointments were a problem, etc. People were just aggravated to start with.

The principal then elaborated on the way in which he has attempted to alleviate this scheduling problem, and how he has restructured these kinds of supervisory meetings at his school. In doing so, the principal shared his philosophy about faculty meetings and what he views as the most productive times for meeting and engaging in collaborative, supervisory activities with teachers:

I now hold faculty meetings only during planning periods...I’ve been doing this now for the past three years. I don’t have mass faculty meetings either before or after school. When we do have faculty meetings we actually have six different faculty meetings on a given day - with much smaller groups of
teachers. We went to having six faculty meetings during the day [because] this is a much better arrangement for the faculty. It actually makes it a lot harder on me - it really ties up my complete day - because I have to meet with six different sets of faculty members. But it really pays off, because we're meeting in much smaller groups, and we're getting much more accomplished, on a little bit more informal basis.

The principal stated that he felt that this scheduling format for faculty meetings was probably the most significant feature of the supervisory meeting structure at his school. In the principal's words, "...this format for holding faculty meetings is widely appreciated by the teachers, we get much more accomplished with this type of arrangement, and teachers feel less hassled."

Teacher Interviews

To initiate the two teacher interviews, each teacher was asked to comment on the school's relatively low professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) and organizational effectiveness (IPGE-S), and what it meant to him/her that school staff perceived only a slight to moderate relationship between their perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and the school's level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, both teachers expressed some surprise at their schools scores in these areas. In framing their remarks, these two teachers emphasized the positive nature of the school's supervisory structure and their perception that teachers do have input into supervisory decision making at the school. One of the teachers expressed her belief that, especially in the last three years following the initiation of school site committees on the district, attitudes about teacher input into decision making have changed at the school. As this teacher related:

We've changed our way of looking at things here. Now we have a site-committee...teachers have input into the site committee. We have about ten or so members - ten teachers - on the committee. Our teachers decided to
meet during after-school time. Also, we hold workshops at school. We do the workshops ourselves...different teachers put on the workshops, and the principal encourages us in this.

This same teacher also indicated that the site committee meetings have been useful in helping to identify supervisory problem areas in the school and in producing plans for initiating additional opportunities for teacher sharing:

...in site committee meetings, we came up with some problems in the departments and school. For example, some teachers are having problems with discipline...so we decided that sometimes in the afternoons teachers would get together and share their ideas and techniques. These afternoons are designed to allow teachers to share techniques with each other. Yesterday, for example, we determined the period where the least number of students would be affected, and teachers decided to have an English department meeting.

The other teacher reinforced this positive view of the site committee, and expressed his view that the committee has provided members with an increased understanding of school administrative functions. According to this teacher, a greater appreciation of the school's administrative processes has resulted from committee members assuming responsibility for administrative problem areas:

...we've really come to understand the nature of administrative problems by being on site committee. Before the site committee, teachers really didn't have a real appreciation of how the school works administratively. But now, because many of us serve on this committee, we now have to actually assume some of the responsibility for some of these problems...and it's really been an enlightening experience for us. We appreciate the administrative facets of the school much more now.

In commenting on the school's faculty meeting structure, one teacher indicated that teachers from various departments engage in informal meetings in the lounge during their planning periods. According to this teacher, this informal meeting structure facilitates interaction and sharing across curricular departments:
...whenever we wish, we have informal faculty meetings in the lounge where teachers can share. Usually we do not have large faculty meetings during individual planning periods during the day...these are not entire or almost-entire departments - just a cross-section of teachers. But, this is actually good, because the teachers can then pull ideas from different departments.

During one of the interviews, the teacher respondent emphasized that he felt teachers at the school are afforded opportunities by the school administration for sharing and decision making input. This teacher offered the professional sharing activities he and his colleagues engage in within his own department as an example of the kinds of supervisory sharing he believes school faculty engage in:

...basically, we’re given opportunities for input into decision making and participation from the administration. I think we also have the opportunity to share among ourselves during the school day. For example, I have my planning period right here at fifth hour - I’m the chairman of the english department - and there are at least four other english teachers in the department that also have off at this time. So, we actually do have time to share. I don’t really understand why our Collaborative Sharing score was quite so low...I think that teachers really do have time during their day to share among themselves and also within their departments.

This teacher added that he felt the site committee’s efforts have contributed to the effectiveness and quality of supervisory meetings. As this teacher explained:

...quality of our meetings has improved significantly because of our site committee. We are also able to now hold departmental meetings during the school day.

Finally, this same teacher indicated that - at least in terms of his own experience - the principal has always been encouraging and supportive of his own instructional and supervisory efforts and project proposals. As this teacher recounted:

We have absolute freedom in suggesting and carrying out all of our supervisory suggestions. I can tell you in the 13 years I’ve been here, I’ve never been denied a go-ahead from our principal...he’s given me encouragement and support for any instructional or supervisory project or suggestion that I had researched and brought before him. As long as I was
prepared and had a proposal that was feasible, the principal has always supported me in anything that I’ve tried to do.

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- The principal cultivates an informal leader style that sustains a loose supervisory meeting and decision making structure.
- The principal has established a multiple within-day structure for administrative meetings with teachers, and views the school site committee as a positive vehicle for teacher supervisory input.
- Teachers view the principal as an encouraging and supportive supervisory leader.
- The school site committee is perceived by teachers as an effective mechanism for teacher-administrator interaction and shared decision making.
COMPARISON SCHOOL 2b
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>65.16%</td>
<td>80.64%</td>
<td>51.41%</td>
<td>60.54%</td>
<td>72.88%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This comparison school is the other of a pair of 9-12 secondary schools (Comparison Pair No. 2, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample. Comparison schools 2a and 2b were identified as having similar demographic features, while registering differences in independent and dependent variable characteristics. Comparison school 2b fell within the High SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is less than 30 percent), having a 1991-92 SES level of 23.01%. For the 1991-92 school year, Comparison School 2b had a student enrollment of 339, and an administrator/staff ratio of 2/24. The school’s 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 92.08%. The 1992 average mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for the school (ninth grade) was 53.74.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this secondary school was 79.17%. The school registered an OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 67.77 (M%MaxOS=65.16%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 23.88 (M%MaxIPOE-S=59.70%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .15 (n=19).

The principal and two members of the school faculty participated in telephone interviews. The principal has been the administrator of this secondary school for 12 years. Two teachers on the school faculty were interviewed. One teacher is a math teacher who
has been on the school staff for nine years; the other teacher is an English teacher who has been at the school for five years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

As a preface to the interview, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was asked to reflect on his school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to him that survey results for his school evidenced only a slight association between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school’s overall level of organizational effectiveness.

In responding, this principal expressed some surprise at the relatively low mean scores for organizational structure and organizational effectiveness. The principal especially noted that he has gone to considerable lengths to provide teachers in the school with a comprehensive in-building staff development program, and that all teachers in the school participate in these monthly inservice professional development meetings:

...well, you know, the information you are sharing with me is valuable and we’ll certainly use it. But, in reality, we now have, and have been developing for the past three years, an extensive staff development program for our teachers. This professional development program is designed on a yearly basis, with a unique staff development theme for each year. For example, last year [1991-92] our staff development theme was ‘constructing a super vision for our school’; and this year [1992-93] we are expanding on this theme through ways to implement our ‘super vision’ within the school curriculum.

The principal indicated that the monthly staff development meetings he and his faculty participate in are mandated by the district and implemented in all schools district-
wide. According to the principal, these professional inservice days are scheduled each spring and placed on the calendar for the following school year. All principals and teachers in the district are informed of the inservice dates at the beginning of each year. The principal went on to describe the structure of committees and inservices projects that he and his teachers are involved in as part of this inservice program. The principal explained that committees are assigned to work on a number of supervisory activities, including school planning and communication, as well as a staff development committee. All teachers, according to the principal, are involved in several of these committees which meet periodically throughout the school term:

...as part of our monthly staff development meetings, faculty become involved in a number of collaborative activities and projects. For example, some teachers are involved as members of curriculum groups, staff development planning committees, etc. We have school-wide planning and communication committees that are prescribed by our district...some of our teachers are also members of our school staff development committee. Teachers serve on these committees and develop reports of our school’s activities for the district.

The principal also explained that his school is currently going through a regional accreditation process, and that several teachers on the staff are involved in committee activities associated with this process:

...we’re also going through our SACS [Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools] accreditation, so we have some teachers serving on this committee as well. This is a pretty involved process, so the teachers on this committee have been spending quite a bit of time completing all the work involved for this.

In discussing opportunities teachers in the school have for group planning, the principal indicated that he allows teachers a lot of autonomy in making decisions about when they will hold department meetings for curricular planning. According to the
principal, some time is provided during the scheduled monthly inservice days for teachers
to meet for departmental planning and sharing:

During each of our inservice days, we have some time built in for faculty
to meet by departments. For example, at our meeting this coming thursday,
teachers will be given some time after lunch to meet together in their
departments...also, teachers will meet in their committees to work on their
various activities.

Additionally, the principal also commented during the interview that he is "very
supportive" of his teachers and encourages them to meet regularly to engage in group
planning whenever they can. He stated that, as the staff is relatively small, a lot of
curricular planning can be done informally both before school and during breaks:

I encourage the teachers to use the time they do have to plan in the ways
they see fit. Our schedule does not allow teachers within departments to
have the same planning periods...but, teachers do take advantage of the time
they have before school and sometimes during lunch to work on their
planning together. We have a fairly small faculty, so teachers here know
each other very well. They understand what their needs are and what are the
needs of the students.

Finally, the principal was asked to comment on the quality of the district-school
climate, including the nature and quality of district supervisory programs as well as the
interactions that his staff may have with district office personnel. The principal indicated
that, for the most part, district personnel were helpful in making themselves accessible to
individual schools and in working with teachers on individual professional development.
However, he indicated that the mandated monthly inservice (staff development) program is
the only form of district-wide supervisory activity that he and his staff participate in that has
a district-school focus:

...in general, I think that the district supervisory staff are pretty good about
making themselves available to our teachers. Our teachers know who these
individuals are, and are able to contact them if they like for assistance on
curricular planning, obtaining instructional materials, and so on. As far as
district supervisory programs go...again, our monthly inservice programs are really the only type of supervisory activities that we do that is district-wide. We don't have other kinds of scheduled district-sponsored supervisory programs on a regular basis.

Teacher Interviews

To initiate the two teacher interviews, O/S climate profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. Consistent with other staff interviews, each teacher was asked to reflect on the professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to the teachers that survey results for the school evidenced only a slight association between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school's overall level of organizational effectiveness.

In responding, one teacher described the structure of faculty inservice meetings teachers in the school participate in, and the committees on which teachers are required to serve:

...we do have monthly inservices that we all are involved with - this is mostly committee work. This work is pretty time-consuming, though...and, since we only meet once a month, it's sometimes hard to keep up with this. Mr. _________ gives us our committee assignments and our tasks for the year, and we just work on these ourselves.

According to the other teacher, many teachers in the school view these committee assignments as a great deal of "extra work", and feel that their inservice time could be more productively used for planning for their own classroom instructional needs:

The committees that each of us are members of takes up a lot of our time...this is really a good bit of extra work for us. Besides, we don't have any regular times during the week to meet as departments during the school day, and with all the student-related activities that we're involved with, it's just very hard for individual departments to get together. Besides that, many teachers here feel that the committee activities are just not relevant to what we are doing instructionally. We would rather be focusing on devising staff
development activities that are directed at instructional needs in our own classrooms...these committees simply represent extra work that doesn’t really pay off for us in the classroom.

The other teacher indicated during his interview that department planning and sharing is generally done informally, since many teachers are involved in co-curricular activities and athletics both before and after school. According to this teacher, individual planning periods during the day are primarily used by teachers just to keep up with their own work:

...well, we do have a planning period each day. But, teachers within departments do not have their planning periods at the same time, so we actually can do very little during this time in terms of department planning. Besides, we need our planning period time mostly just to keep up with our classes, and to do our individual preparations.

Both teachers expressed the opinion that their school’s relatively low Collaborative Sharing/Rapport staff mean score was probably due to the fact that teachers have very little time to actually meet and engage in group planning and sharing about instructional concerns. As the teachers both emphasized, the only time that they do have for any structured group interaction is during their scheduled monthly inservices, and most or all of this time is generally taken up with committee activities and work towards completing committee reports, rather than with group instructional planning. One of the teachers summarized the sentiments of both interviewees in commenting:

...I can understand why teachers would feel this way about sharing. Despite the fact that we have our monthly inservices, there’s really no time for instructional sharing...because, we’re so busy completing committee assignments. It’s true that we’re working together on these committee projects, but we’re not working on instructional planning activities that are related to our own classrooms...we’re not really involved in the kinds of instructional planning activities that would really benefit us.
Finally, teachers were asked to comment on their perceptions of the district-school supervisory climate, and the quality of the interactions they have with district office personnel. The teachers interviewed expressed congruent beliefs that the supervisory programs from the district were rather marginal, and that there was not a very strong connection between individual school faculty and district personnel. As one teacher explained:

...we just don’t interact very much with district personnel. We are involved as a faculty in the monthly district-mandated staff development program and we work on preparing our individual committee reports...these are sent to the district, but in terms of interacting on a one-to-one basis with district office people, we just don’t do this. As far as district-sponsored activities are concerned, our inservice days are pretty much the only district-wide supervisory activities that we take part in.

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- A district-mandated monthly staff development inservice program serves as the focal point for supervisory activity in the school.
- Teachers view the school’s supervisory structure as ritualistic and extra work, and not applicable to their own supervisory and instructional needs.
MIDDLE SES CATEGORY
(COMPARISON PAIR NOS. 3 & 4)
COMPARISON PAIR NO. 3

COMPARISON SCHOOL 3a
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>78.29</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>75.28%</td>
<td>78.22%</td>
<td>60.88%</td>
<td>68.86%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>70.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This K-4 elementary school is one of a pair of elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 3, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample in the Middle SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is between 45 and 60 percent). Comparison schools 3a and 3b are similar demographically, while differing in their independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, School 3a registered an SES level of 56.85%. For this same school year, Comparison School 3a had a student enrollment of 628, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/32. The school’s 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 95.26%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for fourth grade students for this school was 52.95.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 81.25%. The school obtained an Organizational Structure OSCI-S subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 78.29 (M%MaxOS=75.28%), and a professional staff mean IPOE-S score of 31.32 (M%MaxIPOE-S=78.30%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .32 (n=26).

The principal and two members of the school faculty were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this elementary school for one year. Before
becoming principal, this individual had been a teacher at this school for nine years. One of the teachers interviewed is a first grade teacher with six years’ experience at the school; the other is a fourth grade teacher who has been at the school for seven years.

**Qualitative Interview Results**

**Principal Interview**

To initiate the interview, the O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to reflect on her school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to her that survey results indicated a slight to moderate, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, the principal indicated that in initiating her administration as the school’s new principal for the 1991-92 school year, she set as one of her top priorities to work to establish clear goals for the school, and to work collaboratively with faculty so that "...teachers are working towards the same goals I envision." Reflecting on her staff’s slight to moderate association of school supervisory structure and organizational effectiveness, this principal remarked:

> ...well, this is one of the main areas that I want to work on as principal. One of my main goals is to try to encourage teachers to become involved and find ways for them to participate more in decisions - decisions not only about their classrooms and instruction, but also about the kinds of group planning and staff development activities we want to do.

In commenting on the school’s relatively high organizational effectiveness staff mean score (MIPOE-S=31.32, M%MaxIPOE-S=78.30%), the principal indicated that she believes that the school was viewed by staff as an effective school before she became principal. She emphasized that, as the new principal, she has concentrated on examining areas within the
school, both organizationally and instructionally, reviewing and prioritizing needs and then
developing reasonable improvement plans. The principal expressed her belief that, because
she is working with teachers on a number of improvement areas, and has instituted some
innovative programs in the school during her first year, that teachers are "...aware of the
changes and are beginning to assess their effects in terms of real improvement." Elaborating
on specific areas targeted for improvement, the principal stated:

...we've initiated some changes in discipline procedures...a much more
structured plan that we use consistently. We've also added some programs
that teachers have asked for - for example, the Pre-K program...securing
that...and a new counseling program for students. We now have three
different programs involving counseling.

Reviewing her school's individual O/S climate subscale scores, the principal
commented that she felt teachers' perceptions of their relative involvement in supervisory
activities and the level of decision making input they have concerning instructional and
supervisory concerns has perhaps increased in a positive way due to some of the changes
she has instituted. Describing how she has modified the supervisory time structure at the
school, this principal related that she has increased the amount of release time for teachers.
The principal indicated she has provided her teachers with more structured time during the
school day to engage in various supervisory activities including grade level meetings as well
as work on individual professional development efforts. As the principal explained:

I have given the teachers more release time. In conjunction with this
teachers are being asked to take more time for self-reflection and self-
evaluation...to examine the methods they use in the classroom. Additionally,
I ask the teachers to use some of this release time to work on our school
improvement plans, especially in terms of where they see needs within their
own grade level.
Concerning the school's grade level meeting structure, the principal stated:

...each grade has a weekly grade level meeting. Each grade level is then asked to bring an idea to the faculty meeting - something unique or innovative - that they’d like to share with other teachers...ideas that other teachers could adapt and use in their own grade level.

The principal indicated that she and her teachers have found this meeting structure useful as a way of identifying and focusing on particular problem areas across the school curriculum:

One of the things we’re looking at in both grade level and faculty meetings is our content in social studies and science. We’ve been finding that often our teachers are teaching identical things in first, second and third grade...for example, we’re teaching the same thing in the ‘thanksgiving unit’ across grade levels. Differentiating our content across these grades is something we’re presently working on.

Finally, commenting on staff development opportunities at the school, this principal explained that she has expanded the kinds of release time activities available to teachers, incorporating opportunities for peer observations and feedback into teachers’ work schedules:

Also, we’ve arranged for every teacher to have the option of scheduling peer observations with other teachers...teachers can choose to do this once or twice a month if they like. As part of this observation process, teachers are able to give feedback to each other.

Additionally, the principal indicated she is setting aside funds when possible for teachers to attend instructional workshops:

...we are also funding release time activities...spending extra monies, when we can, on additional workshops that teachers normally would not have the opportunity to attend.

Teacher Interviews

The O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with the two teachers interviewed. Each teacher was asked to reflect on the school’s staff mean scores
for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to her that survey results indicated a slight to moderate, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their view of the school's overall level of organizational effectiveness. In responding, both teachers focused primarily on their belief that the school is considered effective by teachers and parents in the community largely because of the close, family atmosphere that is present among teachers as well as with the community as a whole:

...we have a small community, and because of this we have a lot of community feeling among teachers in the school itself. Families are very close in the community and everybody knows everybody else. The small area causes everyone to have a community feeling - a give-and-take family, not like a business. There is that freedom and closeness to input and exchange of ideas...we're not a rigid community. We have a good deal of parental involvement...the attitude that this is our community and our school...and so we work along with parents together.

This familial atmosphere was confirmed by the other teacher, who expressed her view that this atmosphere of closeness among teachers and community members fosters a feeling of mutual ownership in the school. As this teacher related, "...everyone associated with our school feels like the school belongs to all of us - this is our community school."

This same teacher indicated that teachers viewed two administrative changes, one at the district level and the other within their school, as having a positive impact on the supervisory climate in terms of bringing fresh perspectives regarding useful instructional and supervisory activities:

We had a change in elementary supervisors from the district...this gave us new perspectives and new ideas, and a bringing together of what we are going to do in all our schools. Also, the principal change last year has had some positive effects...our new principal is interested in meeting teachers' needs and is willing to try some new and useful things we haven't done before...for example, the peer observations we're now doing is something new for us.
Finally, regarding the group meeting structure at the school, both teachers expressed a common view that the new grade-level meeting structure has proved beneficial in terms of increasing record keeping efficiency as well as providing a useful means for teacher sharing. One teacher commented on the positive effects of this teacher sharing both within and across grade-level levels:

The grade-level meetings that we now have...this helps a lot with supervision. These meetings make it easier for record keeping as well as taking notes and documenting things grade-wise. In these meetings we also share ideas by grade levels, then in the faculty meetings we take these ideas and share them across the whole faculty. It’s not a rigid meeting structure, in that everyone doesn’t have to do the same thing. We can take back to our classrooms what we feel we can use.

Similarly, the other teacher related that the faculty meetings are a useful forum for sharing and discussing ideas from the various teacher groups in the school:

...in our monthly faculty meetings, grade levels and committees are able to share each other’s findings. Teachers are finding this very helpful, because we are now focusing a lot more on comparing what we all do in the different grades.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

• Teachers view recent changes in supervisory personnel (new elementary supervisor and principal) as positively affecting the school’s supervisory climate.

• Principal and teachers view the school’s multiple-level meeting structure as useful opportunities for teacher sharing.
COMPARISON SCHOOL 3b
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>70.86</td>
<td>27.07</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>10.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>68.13%</td>
<td>75.19%</td>
<td>53.63%</td>
<td>56.39%</td>
<td>74.13%</td>
<td>66.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This K-4 elementary school is one of a pair of elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 3, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample in the Middle SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is between 45 and 60 percent). While similar demographically to comparison school 3a, school 3b displayed differing independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, School 3b had an SES level of 55.67%, a student enrollment of 320, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/21. The school’s 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 94.60%. The 1992 mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for fourth grade students for this school was 55.29.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this school was 66.67%. The school obtained an Organizational Structure OSCI-S subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 70.86 (M%MaxOS=68.13%), and a professional staff mean IPOE-S score of 30.14 (M%MaxIPOE-S=75.35%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .76 (n=14).

The principal and two members of the school faculty were interviewed. The principal has been the administrator of this elementary school for one year. One of the staff members interviewed is a second grade teacher with six years’ experience at the school; the other is a first grade teacher who has been at the school for seven years.
Principal Interview

To initiate the interview, OSCI-S summary profile scores for the school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to reflect on his school’s relatively high Organizational Structure (OS) and organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) professional staff mean scores and moderately high OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation, and to comment on what it meant to him that teachers in his school saw a strong, positive relationship between their perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. In responding, the principal expressed his belief that the supervisory activities he and his teachers engage in within their school are probably not much different from those of other school staff.

I don’t think there’s anything particularly unique that’s done here. I wouldn’t say there’s anything - supervision-wise - that we do here that’s extraordinary. This is now my second year [1992-93] here...mostly, we just try to buckle down and do the things that we can do as well as possible.

The principal did emphasize that, in the time he has been administrator at the school, his attitude has been to respect teachers as professionals. In conjunction with this, the principal indicated that he has formed an administrative advisory committee that, in his view, provides teachers with direct input into the supervisory decision making process:

...in regard to teachers’ input into decision making, I made the comment when I first came here that I don’t believe in administration by ‘error detection’. I believe that people are professional...that’s one of the things that I did say to teachers when I came here. What I did do was set up a principal’s advisory committee. This committee meets weekly and is composed of several teachers nominated by the faculty. The purpose of this committee is to make faculty supervisory decisions at the lowest level possible - ruling out any legal issues - to get faculty members to feel more in control.

Noting the variation in his school’s OSCI-S mean scores across subscales, the principal added:
I think that perhaps when something like that is done, though, we might improve in one area, but we can go down in another area. For example, when you give teachers a lot of freedom and professional autonomy, then, they might not have the perception that the organizational structure is good, because, in giving them more autonomy, you may be working with them less.

During the interview, this principal emphasized that he finds it impossible to provide teachers with any meaningful group activities during the day. According to the principal, time constraints of teachers' daily work schedules and their classroom responsibilities prevent the development of any useful 'within-day' group meeting structure. As the principal explained:

...we pretty much have our hands tied in terms of providing time for teachers to meet during the school day. For example, at our school, teachers legally must spend so much time in the classroom teaching, and they only have two ten-minute recesses during the entire school day...they can barely drink a cup of coffee, much less try to meet among themselves. Because of this there's no way I can create any additional time for supervisory meetings without adding more time to the school day, and this I can't do - this would have to be done throughout the parish.

Elaborating further on this time factor, the principal expressed his view that elementary schools, because of their scheduling structure, are simply less able than middle and secondary schools to provide teachers with adequate group planning time:

I really believe elementary schools are somewhat at a disadvantage compared to middle and secondary schools, because in middle and secondary schools there's planning and meeting time built into the day's schedule, but in elementary schools we just can't do that.

Finally, in commenting on the usefulness and quality of district supervisory activities, the principal indicated that he did not feel that teachers view district workshops as "especially useful". However, the principal added that, personally, he feels "...the supervisory activities that the district provides are excellent."
Teacher Interviews

To initiate the teacher interviews, O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. Teachers were asked to reflect on the school’s staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to them that survey results indicated a high, positive relationship between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school’s overall effectiveness as an organization. In responding, both teachers expressed a similar view that the school’s small size contributes to a very personal, family-type environment. In their estimation, this small school atmosphere fosters an environment in which teachers and parents are able to work well together and communicate easily. As one teacher explained:

I think perhaps one reason teachers here might see a strong connection between our professional activities and their impact on the school’s effectiveness is because we are a small school in a small community. We’re a very close-knit family. We work well together because we’re not a large, impersonal environment...our personalities all gel together very well. Also, because the community is small, it’s easy to communicate with parents.

This "family atmosphere" feature of teacher/parent relationships at the school was also mentioned by the other teacher. In this teacher’s view, this family atmosphere makes it easier for both teachers and parents to be aware of and value teachers’ instructional efforts:

...our smallness is an asset here, because we are able to all work together as a family. We have an excellent rapport with our parents, and everyone can see and appreciate what we are doing here at the school.

In addressing the availability of time for group planning, one teacher noted that teachers’ rigid daily schedules allow very little time for the kinds of supervisory activities teachers would like to engage in:
I think our score here [Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR)] is lower because we’re structured with very little or almost no planning or preparation time. For example, teachers here just don’t have time to go into each other’s classrooms to do peer observations. As teachers, this is one activity that we talk about frequently as being something we’d really like to be able to do. But we can’t do this because our schedule locks us into our own classrooms for pretty much the entire day. We don’t even have time to do any real sharing within same grade levels.

The other teacher indicated that teachers are allowed some grade level planning time on scheduled district inservice days. But, as this teacher explained, these infrequent inservices provide teachers with only a few opportunities for collaboration:

...we do have some time to meet by grades or departments in the inservices that are mandated by the district a few times during the year, but that’s about it.

This teacher further explained that, when teachers find it necessary to hold grade level meetings, they usually must do so informally and under makeshift conditions:

When we do meet by grade, we have to do so informally, usually in small gatherings at small tables for a very short time. Because of this, we usually meet only when we absolutely have to, and because there’s just no time structured into the schedule for this.

Although both teacher interviewees expressed negative feelings regarding the lack of available time during the school day for teacher group activities, these teachers voiced contrasting, positive sentiments about what they view are other compensating elements of the school’s supervisory life. In particular, one teacher noted how the principal’s continuing, positive encouragement and support of teachers’ daily efforts is valued by teachers:

...as teachers, we often become discouraged when we think of the many things we just are not able to do together...the fact that our principal is so supportive of our efforts under these conditions really makes a difference for us.

For the other teacher, strong collegial ties forged among veteran teachers at the school have been beneficial in at least providing some compensating mechanism for collaborative action:
We have a few new teachers each year, but most of our teachers have been here awhile. We are able to work very well together...we know how each other thinks, and we have gotten to the point where we are very much team-oriented.

Finally, one teacher related how the principal provides teachers with opportunities for input into supervisory decision making:

...during one of our recent district-mandated inservice days, we had a faculty meeting to discuss our student handbook. This meeting came out of a request from teachers on the advisory committee to review policies in the school's student handbook. As a result of the request, the principal placed this activity on the agenda for the next faculty meeting. At this meeting we were able as a faculty to work with the principal in making revisions to the handbook.

As this teacher further explained, the principal actively encourages and solicits teachers' involvement in this kind of shared decision making activity:

This is one example, among others, of the kind of shared decision making we've been able to become involved in with our principal here...he constantly encourages us to be a part of this kind of decision making.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school's O/S climate:

• The newly-created school advisory committee structure is viewed by the principal and teachers as a positive means for affording teachers input into supervisory decision making.

• Teachers and principal recognize daily scheduling constraints as a significant factor inhibiting staff efforts toward supervisory interaction.

• Teachers view the principal's positive support and encouragement as an important compensating element of the school's supervisory climate.
COMPARISON PAIR NO. 4

COMPARISON SCHOOL 4a
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>84.86</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>23.62</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>81.60%</td>
<td>83.39%</td>
<td>73.81%</td>
<td>72.29%</td>
<td>92.88%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This comparison school is one of a pair of K-6 elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 4, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample. Pair 4 fell within the Middle SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is between 45 and 60 percent), having a 1991-92 SES level of 53.77%. Comparison schools 4a and 4b were identified as having similar demographic features, while registering differences in independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, Comparison School 4a had a student enrollment of 198, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/16. The school’s 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure was 93.70%. The 1992 average mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for the school (fourth and sixth grades) was 54.92.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this elementary school was 43.75%. The school registered an Organizational Structure OSCI-S subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 84.86 (M%MaxOS=81.60%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 32.14 (M%MaxIPOE-S=80.35%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .59 (n=7).

The principal and two members of the school faculty participated in telephone interviews. The principal has been at this elementary school for 29 years, 24 years as
principal and the first five years as a teacher. Two teachers on the school faculty were interviewed. One teacher is a second grade teacher who has been on the school staff for five years; the other teacher is a sixth grade teacher with 13 years of teaching experience at this school.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

At the outset of the interview, OSCI-S summary profile scores for the school were shared with the principal. The principal was first asked to share his reflections concerning his school's relatively high Organizational Structure (OS) and organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) professional staff mean scores and moderately high OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation, and to comment on what it meant to him that teachers in his school saw a fairly strong, positive relationship between their perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and the school's level of overall organizational effectiveness. In responding to this question, the principal first emphasized that, in his view, the classroom observation and evaluation process constitutes only one element of the professional supervisory activities that teachers and administrators engage in within a school. He indicated that, at his school, "...formal classroom evaluation holds an almost negative connotation with my teachers". According to this principal, he and his teachers view professional supervision as much more multifaceted, consisting of a number of varied supervisory activities in addition to formal classroom observation and evaluation:

Well, as far as formal classroom evaluation is concerned, I don't stress it. It is supervision, and it's ok; but it is a tremendously small part of what I do in a day's time in terms of my considerations and observations of what teachers and students are doing, and my expectations I convey to teachers and students about what they can and have the potential to do and achieve.
The principal stressed that his own supervisory practices encompass observing and supervising teachers and students in a variety of teaching and learning activities:

...my supervision of teachers goes far beyond that [formal classroom evaluation]. I know when the teachers come to school, what they do when they get here, which ones are working with students, which teachers are working with other teachers, which ones are lolligagging in the teachers’ lounge, etc.

The principal indicated that he felt his school’s moderately high supervisory structure/organizational effectiveness correlation probably resulted from the fact that his teachers "...know that they are included in and have a significant voice in decision making".

The principal related that he consistently encourages teachers to assume decision making responsibility in instructional as well as staff development activities. He explained that he especially makes a point of including teachers "...as equal partners in the complete decision making process":

A big part of my overall philosophy of supervision is that I include the teachers in decision making....I encourage teachers to handle situations themselves and to be a part of the decision making process in many areas. For example, if I say to a teacher, ‘I have such and such a problem, can you help me?’ (any time, for instance, that I may have a conference with a parent - like this morning), I don’t care what it is about, the teacher is a big part of it, and I make sure the teacher becomes completely involved with me in solving the problem. I either invite the teacher to be a part of the conference - get her out of class to do this - or, I immediately share with the teacher the results of the parent conference, and make sure that the teacher feels a big part of the decision making process involving an individual child, and dealings with parents about that child.

Upon relating this example illustrating what he referred to as his ‘philosophy of supervision’, the principal quickly added:

...now, let me emphasize that this is just one example...I include teachers in decision making in this fashion no matter what instructional or supervisory matter is being addressed.
In elaborating further on his view of the importance of teacher decision making input in his school, this principal indicated that he values his teachers' ideas about instruction, and about "...what they feel is important about their own professional learning". In the principal's view, his teachers and their concerns are an extremely important part of the school's supervisory life:

One of my biggest philosophies about supervision is that these teachers are the main drive that make the school work. These teachers have to be happy, want to be here, and be a part of the whole game plan. I go out of my way to be supportive and helpful...I ask their opinion and then use their opinion, and let the teacher be a tremendous part of running the school. If the teachers have an opinion about something related to instruction and supervision in the school, I take what they give me and then do something with it. No matter what we're working on...we all try to keep the child-focus in mind.

In commenting on his staff's perceptions of the school's level of overall organizational effectiveness, the principal stated that he felt "...the teachers here are fairly satisfied with the overall output of the school." The principal explained that, in his view, a significant factor contributing to teacher perceptions of the school as a relatively effective organization is the strong, collaborative working relationships teachers at the school have developed with each other. The principal indicated that he consistently encourages his teachers to collaborate with each other on instructional and supervisory projects, especially across grade levels:

...teachers in our school have a high working relationship with each other. I tell my teachers that 'I want you to talk to the teachers both in the grades before you and the grades after you'...in other words, first and second grade teachers talk to third and fourth grade teachers and vice versa. Because the teachers confer with each other across grades, our first grade teachers, for example, are able to become very organized, and can cover all of the things that the second grade teachers want. This collaboration among teachers is very pronounced in our school...the teachers perceive that I allow and encourage them to collaborate often among themselves.
The principal was asked to compare his preceding comments with his school's Collaborative Sharing/Rapport professional staff mean score, which was slightly lower in comparison with staff mean scores on other OSCI-S subscales/dimensions. On reflecting on this, the principal remarked that "...part of the reason for this might be that teachers are complaining that they don't have enough time to collaborate as much as they would want to."

Concerning other kinds of teacher collaborative, supervisory activities at his school, the principal added that he "...allows peer observations to happen in an informal way", noting that he encourages teachers to engage in whatever supervisory activities "...they perceive as meaningful and relevant to their own professional growth."

The principal was then asked to comment on the very high OSCI-S subscale/dimension Self Reflection score (MSR=14.86, M%MaxSR=92.88%) obtained for his school. The principal related that he felt his teachers "...appreciate the amount of time that they have to reflect professionally, and that they appreciate the lack of formality "...concerning supervisory interactions at the school". The principal added that, at his school, "...supervision is practiced on an everyday - in the gutter - level."

Finally, during the interview, the principal described what he felt is a rather unique supervisory structure that his district has devised concerning scheduled time for teacher staff development. The principal explained that two years ago (1990-91 school year) the district instituted a new in-building staff development scheduling format, in which all schools in the district would dismiss students at 1:00pm every monday to allow teachers two hours each week of scheduled staff development time. The principal indicated that the teachers in each school were able to decide among themselves how they would use this professional development time, and the kinds of supervisory activities they would engage in:
...Monday meetings were originally pretty much formulated to give teachers the opportunity to collaborate among themselves. When the Monday in-building faculty planning afternoons were inaugurated two years ago, they were specifically designed to be afternoons for in-building meetings among faculty - for the purposes of planning, coordinating and engaging in individual and collective supervisory activities.

The principal noted, however, that - especially during the past school year - he has noticed a change in the district's thinking about the manner in which district staff should utilize this weekly staff development time. In the principal's view, the district has stifled much of the original flexibility teachers and administrators in each school had in utilizing their Monday staff development time due to the district's increasing practice of scheduling additional district program meetings during this same time period:

...what is happening now is that we are being somewhat stripped of this staff development time because of parish and committee meetings - for example, the drug-abuse program, special ed. committees - all of these are now being placed on Monday. Mondays are starting to be filled with more and more district supervisory meetings.

Thus, the principal felt that despite the promising beginning of the district's innovative staff development time scheduling format, gradual changes in the district's focus and emphasis on how time is to be utilized in the program has caused teachers and administrators to become progressively less enamored of its benefits.

And, finally, in addition to voicing his tempered enthusiasm for the way the district has creatively restructured teachers' professional time, the principal indicated that he felt some of the district-wide staff inservices that the central office has planned are not very useful. He stated that he felt this way because the district would often contract outside consultants to present workshops to the district's staff, and these "canned workshops" would leave many teachers as well as administrators feeling that these presentations were not really relevant to their school's own contextual situation and staff development needs:
Some of the [district] staff inservices we’ve had...sometimes they don’t wind up being very useful...well, let me just give you an illustration: we spent a fortune to get _to come from another state and give us information on student discipline. In my opinion this was a gigantic waste of time and money, and many of the teachers here felt the same way. We sat through all of this inservicing, participated in some program implementation phase, and never got any feedback on it.

Finally, the principal added that their school district has "...done quite a bit of this kind of pre-packaged inservicing - outsiders coming in and presenting workshops with no followup", and that most of these inservices have been "...designated by individuals in the central office."

**Teacher Interviews**

At the outset of the two interviews, each teacher was provided an overview of the OSCI-S survey profile scores for the school. The teachers interviewed were then asked to share their reflections regarding their school’s Organizational Structure (OS) and organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S) professional staff mean scores, and what it meant to them that their school evidenced a moderately high correlation between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and staff perceptions of overall school organizational effectiveness. In responding to this question, the teachers generated two reasons that they felt might explain the positive association teachers made between the school’s supervisory structure and its level of organizational effectiveness. The first reason involved the reflective planning the teachers are able to engage in during the monday staff development time. As one teacher explained:

...we have an afternoon of professional development time on mondays...[during this time] we focus on reflective practice. We do this on monday afternoons when we are motivated and we have the rest of the week ahead of us. We try to reflect on the last time when we taught specific units, how they could be better, etc. This is the third year we are doing this.
The second reason the teachers offered involved their mutual belief that instructional supervision in their school is a school-wide phenomenon. According to the teachers interviewed, this school-wide focus has enabled the faculty to plan and institute a number of changes and improvements in the quality of instruction at the school. One of the teachers remarked:

In our school, 90 percent of supervision is school-wide. There is a tremendous working relationship among the teachers...we’ve changed our program in the last couple of years; we wanted to change our style of teaching to better meet those needs. We have changed some of our books and updated most of our books - we’ve done this all ourselves - we’ve now designed them around the standardized tests.

The other teacher echoed this view:

The focus on supervision in our school is definitely schoolwide - we want to change some things in the school as a whole. The emphasis is on improving the whole school...the focus in terms of supervision when we work together as teachers is very much school-wide. We’re interested in supervision here as it plays out in the whole school. We are interested in how whole grades are doing, and how we interact together across grades...our school is definitely focused on supervision as an organizational process.

Elaborating on the kind of cross-grade supervisory activities the teachers engage in, one teacher commented:

...as a second grade teacher, I meet very often - along with the other second grade teacher - with the first and third grade teachers. I know what each [teacher] below and above me expects. Teachers here share freely across grade levels. In terms of schoolwide supervision, we are very happy with what we have...we feel we are very ‘school-based’ managed. We put a lot of input into designing and implementing the curriculum that we develop from identifying the needs of the kids that are here at this school - and we do this across grade levels. We are not trapped in having to teach in a particular subject -- we can teach different subjects in different ways and redesign lessons to meet the needs of each individual class...and we spend a great deal of time doing this.
Concerning the ways teachers use available time in the school for supervisory concerns, the teachers interviewed were in agreement in indicating that teachers at the school make the most of their available time on a day-to-day basis for collaborating about curricular planning. One teacher commented that she could understand how the staff might have slightly lower perceptions of the amount and quality of teacher collaborative sharing at the school because, in the teacher's words:

...sometimes we feel trapped in our classrooms...we would like to share more with each other, but our individual classroom responsibilities sometimes consume us. As far as teachers staying after school...last year we decided on a time that we made for ourselves to stay --- we took 35 to 45 minutes to share during that time. Even this year we still do this, but much less than last year.

But, despite their reservations about being able to collaborate as much as they would like, the teachers interviewed expressed their belief that teachers at the school are very involved in instructional supervisory activities, and take the initiative in engaging in a lot of teacher shared decision making about instructional and supervisory matters. As one of the teachers emphasized:

...we do a lot of our own decision making when it comes to instructional supervision. We actually should be doing this anyway, because we are supposed to be doing school-based management. But, we never have enough time for sharing, unless we make time for it.

As one of the teachers indicated she felt supervisory time in the school to be "at a premium", this same teacher noted that she felt this time constraint caused teachers to be more aware of the need to utilize their available time responsibly:

There is that responsibility factor as well...the idea that there is only a limited amount of time for supervision - only a limited amount of time during the school day that teachers can get together and work together. So, we feel we have to take our time and what we do with it very seriously.
During the interviews, both teachers indicated that the principal is very flexible in allowing teachers the freedom and opportunity to devise and engage in their own supervisory activities. As one teacher mentioned:

...our principal tells us that we can get an aid at any time so we can engage in the kind of supervision that we want to do. For example, we can go visit and observe another teacher or go to another school to do interschool visitation. We can engage and work on the things we want to in the ways we want.

This was affirmed by the other teacher, who stated:

...the principal encourages us to develop and work with supervisory ideas among ourselves, and to experiment with ideas for improving instruction in the classroom and across the school...and, our principal is always open to suggestions for improving instruction and supervision in the school.

Additionally, during each of the interviews, the teachers offered their reflections on the quality of the district-school supervisory climate, and the nature of the particular supervisory relationship existing between the school and the district office. As for previous questions, both teachers expressed similar views on this subject. The teachers’ comments indicated they strongly believe that the school’s instructional and staff development programs are developed and implemented by the teachers themselves at their school. They described supervisory practices at their school as characterized by teachers collaborating together to develop meaningful school-based programs primarily through a process of considering their particular students’ needs as well as their own needs as professionals. As one teacher explained:

...the district is at the bottom - supervision-wise - in our minds, we just don’t see a lot of district people around here at all. We take on our own supervision goals and objectives. We have to submit formal district supervisory goals and objectives, but when we get down to it, we formulate our own goals and objectives for actually improving our school. Those formally submitted, district-required goals really have nothing to do with
ourselves and our professional growth and what we are doing here as teachers.

Finally, the other teacher offered one further perspective on teachers' views of the school-district relationship at this school in stating that "...the real supervision that we do here is done by the teachers here at the school...we do supervision here ourselves all year long."

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- The principal actively encourages teachers to assume decision making responsibility in instructional and staff development activities and views this as an important element of his role as supervisory leader. Teachers affirm the principal’s supervisory stance as a positive influence on staff supervisory interactions.

- Teachers adopt a school-wide supervisory focus in instructional and supervisory interactions.

- While weekly district-wide staff development time is viewed as valuable if implemented as planned, principal and teachers feel district office personnel and supervisory programs are unresponsive to their school’s contextual needs.
Comparision School 4b

O/S Climate Profile

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>78.69</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>75.66%</td>
<td>76.22%</td>
<td>59.59%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
<td>76.94%</td>
<td>68.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This comparison school is the second of a pair of K-6 elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 4, Table 32, p. 182) identified in the sample in the Middle SES category. The 1991-92 SES level for this school was 51.42% (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches). Comparison school 4b evidenced similar demographic features as school 4a, while registering some differences in independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, Comparison School 4b had a student enrollment of 258, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/18. The 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure for this school was 94.24%. The 1992 average mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for the school (fourth and sixth grades) was 48.11.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this elementary school was 77.78%. The school registered an OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 78.69 (M%MaxOS=75.66%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 28.29 (M%MaxIPOE-S=70.73%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .75 (n=14).

The principal and two members of the school faculty participated in telephone interviews. The principal has been the administrator of this elementary school for 15 years. He has been an educator at this school for a total of 23 years, serving as a teacher during
his first eight years at the school. Two teachers on the school faculty were interviewed. One is a third grade teacher who has been on the school staff for eight years, and who has been a teacher in the district for twenty-five years. The other is a first grade teacher with four years of teaching experience at this school.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

As a preface to the interview, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was then asked to reflect on his school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S subscale/dimension of Organizational Structure (OS) and the IPOE-S, and on the high association obtained for his school between staff perceptions of the supervisory structure at the school and their perceptions of the school’s overall organizational effectiveness (OS/IPOE-S=.75, n=14). The principal was able to respond to this question with little hesitation. The principal replied that he believed teachers valued the supervisory structure at the school. He stated that he thought teachers could see a clear relationship between the kinds of supervisory activities they participate in and their effect on the quality of the school because "...working together on relevant instructional and supervisory concerns is what we stress around here." The principal added that "...at this school I let the teachers be the teachers...they are really the ones who make the school work, and I let and encourage them to do just that." The principal elaborated further:

...basically, I get out the way and let them teach. A big part of my philosophy is that I like people to get along as a faculty. I stress cooperation and colleagueship among faculty members. We’re very close here - like a family...we try to share everything. I try to support the teachers - back them up. When they’re wrong I bring them in and tell them that they’re wrong. Several of the teachers here have been with me a long time.
I know them and they know me...we have less turnover than anyone else in the parish.

The principal expanded upon what he meant by faculty 'colleagueship' at the school by relating that at his school supervisory interactions among teachers and himself are done in a very informal manner. According to the principal, informal supervisory meetings are always held to address specific instructional and supervisory needs. In the principal's words, "...we have a meeting structure that is very informal and need-driven...we never hold meetings that are simply ritualistic". The principal further explained:

We have informal faculty meetings whenever the need arises. Our philosophy about meeting is that we meet very informally and whenever there is a real need. For example, many times we will hold meetings with six teachers right in the hall...we have informal faculty grade-level meetings in the hall. We simply have meetings whenever we need them and wherever we can.

The principal stated that he felt the informal supervisory style he and his teachers engage in at the school complimented the staff's guiding philosophy concerning supervision:

As a faculty, our guiding philosophy of supervision is: 'We always make the decisions with the child first, the teacher second, and the parent third'. And, our second guiding philosophy is: 'Do the best you can for most of the students'.

During the interview, the principal talked at length about the "positive impact on supervision" the district has been having within the past two years in providing a variety of curricular program and staff development inservices to teachers and administrators throughout the district. According to the principal, following the appointment of a new superintendent to the district two years ago, the district has benefitted from the efforts of this superintendent and his staff that have resulted in a considerable increase in the number of inservice programs and workshops provided to district staff. The principal added that this new district-wide supervisory emphasis has also positively affected the number of
interactions as well as the quality of the professional relationship he and his teachers have with district office personnel. As the principal explained:

The superintendent has done a tremendous job of being concerned about and responsive to the particular needs of the teachers at each of our district schools. Since this superintendent has come on board, the number of district workshops and inservices that we have been involved in has increased dramatically. Our district staff development supervisor has initiated a lot of things in the district...she, along with the superintendent. Just in the last two years our teachers have been going to meetings and a lot of workshops with _______. The district has really succeeded in getting our people involved in district/state workshops. This has only been the case, however, since the new superintendent came on board two years ago.

In describing the nature of these district-level supervisory activities, the principal stressed that, in his opinion, the distinguishing characteristic of these district inservices is that "...teachers in the district view them as being genuinely useful". In the principal’s estimation, the reason for their generally high acceptance by teachers is that district personnel planners (under the leadership of the district’s staff development supervisor) have worked diligently to develop inservices that address specific staff development and curricular needs of teachers. According to the principal, teachers’ perceptions of the utility of the district inservices were a direct result of the success of district workshop presenters in focusing on "...what teachers’ needs really are in their own school situations". As the principal explained:

...the best thing, though, about these inservices is that they aren’t simply a waste of time. We’re not just having inservices to be having them...they are well planned, and they address specific staff development needs of teachers here...these district inservices focus on helping the teachers cope with the problems and challenges they are facing right here in our own schools.

Finally, elaborating on the specific way in which these district-wide inservices are structured, the principal added that "...we have inservices for teachers by specific grade levels across the district, and also by content area."
Teacher Interviews

OSCI-S summary profile scores were shared with each of the two teacher interviewed at the outset of the telephone interviews. Each teacher was then asked to share their reflections about the professional staff mean scores for the Organizational Structure (OS) OSCI-S subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S obtained for the school, as well as what it meant to them that the school registered a high, positive association between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their perceptions of the overall level of school organizational effectiveness. In responding to this question, both teachers were in agreement in describing their school staff, in one teacher's words, as a "...very open and sharing group". The teachers attributed this high level of sharing and collaboration to the fact that the teachers work together in a small school setting, interact informally together, and are willing to experiment:

Well, I think it's because we all get along and we all work together. This is a small school - we all give our input. We aren't afraid to say what we feel...everybody gets to share, whatever it is we're planning -- a workshop or whatever. Also, because we get along so well - we are laid back - and we share with one another...we all share with the principal and the teachers. We also are not afraid to share ideas. We actually use what works, and we are willing to change.

During the interviews, both teachers commented on the substantial influence the district has had on shaping the quality of the supervisory climate both within their own school and throughout the district. Teachers explained that, with the arrival of the new superintendent two years ago, the district has really witnessed "...a complete turn-around in the way schools relate with the central office", and the district has begun to assume an active and direct role in planning and providing district-wide staff development inservices and instructional workshops to its teachers and administrators. One teacher commented on
the positive influence the district workshops have had on disseminating instructional and supervisory information throughout the district and on providing individual schools and teachers with useful, focused assistance:

...we do have a new superintendent...one of the things that he has done is to create a new curriculum and staff development supervisor position for the district -- the person hired for this has come in and set up a lot of workshops...with all the schools in the parish participating. This is really great, because it gives us a better idea of what’s going on in the parish, as well as help us in this school. Some of the district inservice programs provided for our school are for individual grade levels as well as for cross-grade levels.

Corroborating this view, the other teacher commented that she felt that the teachers are beginning to have "...more input into supervisory decision making about the kinds and content of supervisory activities within their own schools and throughout the district." This teacher expressed her belief that this increased level of teacher participation in decision making about the focus of district supervisory activities has resulted in district workshops and other inservice activities that more meaningfully address teachers’ needs:

...we have a new superintendent, and a new supervisor of instruction and staff development for the district. In the past two years since they’ve arrived, we’ve had a much greater number of district-sponsored workshops and other activities that are helpful to teachers. Also, these district workshops are focused on the needs of the teachers. For example, [district supervisor] let’s us decide from memos she sends around which workshops we think are the most useful...and we actually get our say as to what workshops we want to attend. We feel that now the district listens much more closely to teachers’ opinions about the kinds of workshops we feel we really need.

Finally, in attempting to make sense of the change in supervisory climate focus that has come over her school and other schools in the district, one teacher commented that she felt that "...it’s not that this new superintendent has accomplished all of these changes by himself, it’s just that he’s given direction to our efforts and [he] allows us to focus in on our
own needs." This teacher summed up her perception of the positive district-school supervisory climate that is becoming increasingly evident in her school and district, and the more active district-school supervisory roles central office staff have begun to play in the district, by stating:

...the superintendent is working hard to get all the principals together, and get all parents and community together to try to improve our children’s learning and test scores. It’s been a combined effort. I’ve been in the parish over twenty-five years - only now is the district starting to play a much greater role. Everybody now is on the same wavelength...getting everybody involved to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the district.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

• The district superintendent and staff development supervisor are viewed by principal and teachers as important, positive supervisory agents affecting the district-school O/S climate, as well as the school’s own internal O/S climate.

• The school principal and faculty share a strong perception that district supervisory programs are focusing successfully on contextual needs of teachers within their school and the district.
LOW SES CATEGORY
(COMPARISON PAIR NOS. 5 & 6)
COMPARISON PAIR NO. 5

COMPARISON SCHOOL 5a
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>81.79</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>78.64%</td>
<td>75.94%</td>
<td>64.50%</td>
<td>73.46%</td>
<td>76.06%</td>
<td>70.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This comparison school is one of a pair of K-6 elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 5, Table 32, p. 183) identified in the sample in the Low SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is greater than 95%). For the 1991-92 school year, School 5a had an SES level of 98.21% (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches). Comparison schools 5a and 5b displayed similar demographic features, while registering differences in independent and dependent variable characteristics. Comparison School 5a had a student enrollment of 354, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/26 for the 1991-92 school year. The 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure for this school was 95.07%. The 1992 average mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for this school (fourth and sixth grades) was 42.05.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this K-6 elementary school was 92.31%. The school registered an OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 81.79 (M%MaxOS=78.64%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 31.07 (M%MaxIPOE-S=77.68%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .62 (n=24).
The principal and two members of the school faculty participated in telephone interviews. The principal has been the administrator of this elementary school for two years. One of the teachers interviewed is a second grade teacher who has been at the school for ten years. The other staff interviewee is a social studies teacher/librarian and member of the administrative advisory committee who has been at this school for twelve years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

As a preface to the interview, the O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was asked to reflect and comment on his school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to relate what it meant to him that his school registered a relatively high, positive association between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school’s overall level of organizational effectiveness. The principal responded that he believed his teachers are able to view the supervisory structure in the school as "high quality" and draw a positive connection between their involvement in school supervisory activities and the organizational output and effectiveness of the school because of the fact that he makes it a top priority, in working with his staff, to respect teachers as equal professionals and make them feel a valued part of the school’s instructional and supervisory decision making team. The principal emphasized that he felt the key to effective supervision in his school is to allow teachers to become part of the decision making process and to afford them the opportunity for meaningful input. In the principal’s words:

I feel that I am very up-front and honest with the faculty. Once they find out that everyone is respected and considered an equal professional - no
cliques, no pets, etc. - then you can start to implement your instructional program. We value our teachers as professionals...making the faculty a part of the decision making - letting them participate and giving them a meaningful voice in grade level meetings, professional meetings, any workshops that we have, in purchasing supplemental materials, etc.

The principal went on to emphasize that he always stresses, in working with his teachers, that he considers everyone on the school staff to be members of the same "professional team". This professional team mentality, according to the principal, is something that "...we continually cultivate as we work together in the school." In the principal’s view, this professional team spirit is an important component of maintaining an effective school supervisory environment:

We are interested in increasing our test scores...and, most principals view their instructional leadership role as being to improve test scores and create an environment that makes teachers feel part of the same team. Teachers’ opinions are important - they are valuable and their ideas are important. We have an open door policy - we always do things together as a team. Teachers here have quite a bit of input as far as supervision is concerned.

In discussing his teachers’ perceptions of the school’s effectiveness as an organization, the principal indicated that "...I make teachers a part of the process of evaluating the progress we’re making here." According to the principal, as members of the school’s supervisory team, his teachers are directly involved in reviewing and assessing the school’s instructional progress. Because of this, the principal indicated he believes his teachers are able to see and evaluate for themselves the progress that the school is making. As the principal explained:

...our teachers feel like they can see progress. We went back and looked at our test scores within a five-year period - I’ve been principal here two years - we’ve reviewed this, and we’ve begun to assess our progress within this five-year period.
The principal emphasized that, because the school serves students living in a depressed socioeconomic area, he and his teachers must continually address the particular learning problems and needs of their students. This administrator related that often teachers at the school feel frustrated because they cannot focus their professional energies on instructional improvement concerns, because they must first work to help their students develop more basic social, interactive skills and to improve students' personal self-esteem. The principal explained that, because of the particular contextual challenges the school faces, he and his teachers are presently working on three main supervisory improvement areas:

...I'd say that we are presently focusing on three main things in our school: test improvement, building positive self-esteem in teachers and students, and improving the learning climate - student discipline, the positive esteem of students.

Considering his school’s professional staff mean scores on other OSCI-S dimensions, the principal stated that he felt one reason the school’s Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) staff mean score was comparatively lower than other O/S climate dimensions was because, although he regularly emphasizes to his teachers the importance of sharing professionally, real opportunities for teacher sharing are limited at the school due to time constraints. He indicated that his teachers are very aware of the limited amount of scheduled time they have for supervisory activities, but stated that he and his teachers try to find ways to compensate for this by meeting informally whenever they can. The principal elaborated on the way he and his staff try to overcome their time-scheduling problem:

...we do have grade level meetings once a month. These meetings are the teachers’ opportunities for professional sharing. The teachers don’t have their planning period in their weekly schedules at the same time - it’s a time factor - so, it’s still hard for all the teachers in one grade to get together, because schedules are conflicting. But, we all encourage each other to do the best we can at sharing informally around here. Often, teachers will meet before school, or in the halls, or just whenever and wherever they can.
The principal added that when his teachers do meet and informally share however, they do so, again, as team players. According to the principal, the teachers not only share their instructional and supervisory ideas with other teachers in their own grade, but discuss their concerns with teachers in other grades as well. The principal stated that he constantly encourages his teachers to discuss and share their supervisory ideas with other teachers throughout the school and, most importantly, to collaborate as "team players":

...at our school the kindergarten teachers share ideas with first grade teachers, the first grade teachers discuss and share their ideas with the kindergarten and second grade teachers, and so on. We encourage our teachers to interact across grade levels... again, all of our teachers are encouraged to be team players. This is our big philosophy at our school - everyone is a ‘team player’.

In addition to discussing his school’s supervisory meeting structure, the principal also described what he considered to be an important supervisory group at his school - his ‘administrative advisory committee’. The principal explained that this advisory committee, consisting of teachers at the school, is designed to give teachers an opportunity to become directly involved in discussing options regarding school administrative and policy matters with the principal. The principal related that a primary purpose of this advisory committee is to encourage teachers to review, as well as express their opinions and recommendations, concerning administrative procedures and policies at the school:

...we have an administrative advisory committee composed of five teachers in our school...this committee looks at some of the things that teachers feel the administration should and could do. The committee is made up of five teachers, nominated and elected by the teachers and myself each year - we actually went out of our way and sought a devil’s advocate to be on this committee. We have an individual on this committee who is not afraid to disagree, to play the devil’s advocate - sort of keeps me honest. This person is willing to question procedures and administrative things -- willing to say the hard things without pulling the punches.
Finally, concerning his perceptions of the frequency and quality of teacher interactions with district office personnel and the overall nature of the school-district supervisory climate, the principal, while not elaborating extensively on this topic, did state that he felt the district has put forth some real effort to work with individual schools and provide some district-level inservices to school staff members in the district. The principal added that, though he believed the district was improving in this area, "...there is still a need for continued efforts." As the principal commented:

...our district has started to make some advance. The district is beginning to really ask teachers what it is they want to see in terms of supervision - asking what the teachers actually want and think in terms of workshops and activities, etc. The district is starting to put this idea of teacher input into practice - much more now than it has in the past, I'd say.

Teacher Interviews

As a preface to the professional staff interviews, O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each teacher. As in other staff interviews, each teacher was asked to reflect on the professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to the teacher that school survey results evidenced a relatively high, positive association between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school's overall level of organizational effectiveness. While not mentioning the "professional team" notion that the principal emphasized, the teachers were consistent in responding that they felt the supervisory climate in the school was typified by a "family-type" and "faculty-supported" environment, one in which teachers feel comfortable professionally and are able to participate readily in supervisory decision making. The teachers interviewed indicated that, because teachers at the school feel a part of the decision making process, they are able
to see a connection between the kinds of supervisory efforts they engage in and the impact of these efforts on the organizational productivity of the school. As one teacher explained:

We have sort of a family-type situation - everybody just works together from the top on down. The whole staff is always working together, the decisions are made by everybody. We decide on the goals, and everybody works toward the same goals. The whole thing is very much a faculty-supported environment...no dissension from anybody...it's very much a team effort - [there is] nothing that is forced. You are made to feel a big part of the decision making.

This feeling of faculty unity was shared by the other teacher, who expressed her belief that faculty members have a clear focus on school supervisory processes and their effects:

...we're very attuned to the ways in which supervision is enacted in the school, and we're clear about the things we do in supervisory activities and see a connection between these things and how students in the school or achieving.

Additionally, the teachers indicated that their faculty participated in extensive training in the state classroom evaluation form at their school site. This training, according to one teacher, has contributed to better and consistent understandings among the teachers of supervisory performance expectations and has improved the quality of classroom teaching:

...all of the teachers are aware of what the principal and other supervisors will be looking at as they do their work. An example of this is the state evaluation form - we still use this in our district. In our school, all teachers have had training in the TIP/TEP form - both at the parish and at the school level. We worked with the assessment program extensively at the school level to get teachers to acquire uniform expectations of what should be happening in their classrooms....because of this training, teachers know what good teaching is.

This view was shared by the other teacher as well, who indicated that training in the classroom evaluation process was provided to teachers at both the school and district level.
According to this teacher, this training has had an impact on improving professional supervision of classroom teaching at the school:

...the classroom assessment training that we've received both at the district and at the school level has caused teachers here to become more focused on classroom quality and on individually and collectively improving teaching at our school.

In sharing their reflections about their school's relatively high organizational effectiveness score, teachers expressed their view that faculty perceptions of the school's level of organizational effectiveness are probably shaped by two factors - one, faculty belief that they have genuine input into instructional decision making, and two, a unity of purpose among teachers regarding school goals. As one teacher indicated:

...you feel that you are a part of forming the effectiveness of the school - you have a say in forming and shaping the school. The staff all seem to have the same goal in mind - to see that our students can be the best that they can be...'all children can learn' - that's our school motto.

This view was corroborated by the other teacher interviewee, who added an additional tempering perspective. Noting that while the school faces its own set of problems and challenges, this teacher described teachers at the school as feeling a "sense of control" in being able to address these concerns and to then see the results of their improvement efforts:

Well, the school does have its problems...but there is some progress being made, and the teachers are seeing the results of this progress. We feel like we are improving things around here.

One teacher commented that she feels the principal assumes an effective supervisory leadership role in the school. The teacher described the principal as providing motivation to teachers to work actively in supervisory activities to foster school-wide instructional improvement as well as to continually strive to enhance their own professional growth. As this teacher explained:
______ has been here two years. The faculty perceives [the principal] as enthusiastic and a stimulus in their supervisory interactions with him. He does a good job of motivating teachers to work hard at their own improvement and for the overall improvement of the school.

This teacher added that "...the arrival of [the principal] two years ago is viewed by teachers as a big change and improvement historically for our school."

Concerning their reflections on other O/S climate subscale/dimension scores for their school, both teachers commented that the district does provide training workshops and other inservice opportunities to teachers. The district was cited by one teacher as providing helpful professional development workshops to teachers needing assistance in implementing specific teaching/learning components of the classroom assessment program:

...there is assistance in the form of workshops in the district to help improve those teachers who seem to be having some difficulty implementing the quality teaching components in the classroom.

But this teacher added that, though the district workshops are structured as opportunities for teachers to obtain additional assistance, the principal is viewed by teachers at the school as the primary supervisory source for information and expertise regarding components of the program:

The principal is our main supervisory person. He discusses the [classroom assessment] scores with each teacher in detail. If he and a teacher discuss one or more items that the teacher was ranked very low on, then the teacher has access to working with the principal, as well as working with supervisory personnel from the district. The principal, in providing assistance to the teacher, can recommend that the teacher attend a [district] workshop.

In addition to workshops provided to teachers by the district concerning classroom performance assessment, teachers indicated that the district develops and implements a variety of inservice projects. These projects vary from year to year and are structured around a designated theme targeted by the district as an appropriate goal for all district
schools for a given year. In describing these annual district-wide improvement efforts, one
teacher described the high level of cooperativeness displayed by central office personnel in
implementing these district efforts:

...the central office has various projects that come out - for example, last
year we started a new program called 'parent involvement'. Our goal this
year [1992-93] is to involve parents more, and to develop a whole new
'parenting center' for the district...the central office people are very
cooperative.

In noting the difference in staff mean scores for the school on the OSCI-S
dimensions of Organizational Structure (OS) and Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR), one
teacher expressed her belief that teachers for the most part are generally satisfied with the
quality and effectiveness of school instructional meetings and other supervisory activities
they participate in. This teacher indicated that she feels the prevalent view of teachers at
the school is that faculty and administrators simply need to continue working together to
"...find creative ways to provide teachers with more time to engage in these important kinds
of activities." This teacher described the current structure and format of collaborative
sharing among teachers at the school as follows:

...teachers here conduct grade level meetings about every six weeks or so.
Teachers meet together by primary grades and by upper grades because there
are similar problems in those situations. The first thing we do at all
meetings is to make sure that we all have input into anything that is on the
meeting agenda.

The other teacher interviewee also commented on teacher grade-level meetings at
the school, indicating that she viewed the grade-level meeting format as productive
opportunities for teachers to "...interact professionally and to discuss and share their
instructional ideas and concerns." As this teacher noted:
...we do hold periodic grade level meetings. The K-3 teachers, for example, work together at one time and discuss problems across their own grade levels - everything from classroom management to materials.

Finally, both teachers were in agreement in expressing their belief that teachers valued these opportunities for professional sharing, and that these instructional planning meetings contributed to teachers’ general feelings at the school of having "...some input and control over our instructional progress."

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

- The principal strives to cultivate a "professional team" decision making mentality among staff. While not referring to this professional team notion specifically, teachers have a clear sense of school supervisory processes and their effects on school productivity and feel a part of supervisory decision making.

- Teachers perceive the principal as a positive motivator in supervisory interactions.

- Teachers and principal focus their supervisory efforts primarily on addressing contextual social learning needs of students.
COMPARISON SCHOOL 5b
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>75.87</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>72.95%</td>
<td>74.75%</td>
<td>62.53%</td>
<td>63.57%</td>
<td>89.06%</td>
<td>73.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

This comparison school is the other of a pair of K-6 elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 5, Table 32, p. 183) identified in the sample in the Low SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is greater than 95%). The percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches for the 1991-92 school year was 98.16% (SES level) for this school. School 5b was similar to school 5a in demographic features, but evidenced differences in independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, comparison school 5a had a student enrollment of 415, and an administrator/staff ratio of 2/30. The 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure for this school was 96.57%. The 1992 average mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for this school (fourth and sixth grades) was 43.48.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this K-6 elementary school was 43.33%. The school obtained an OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 75.87 (M%MaxOS=72.95%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 29.09 (M%MaxIPOE-S=72.73%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was -.04 (n=13).

The principal and two members of the school faculty participated in telephone interviews. The principal has been the administrator of this K-6 elementary school for
eleven years. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is a sixth grade teacher with five years’ experience at the school; the other is a second grade teacher who has been at this school for three years.

**Qualitative Interview Results**

**Principal Interview**

To initiate the interview, O/S climate summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was asked to first consider his school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to reflect on what it meant to him that his school staff did not see any association between their perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of organizational effectiveness (OS/IPOE-S, r=-.04). In responding, the principal indicated that he was able to empathize with his teachers and could understand how they found it difficult to see the relationship between their involvement in the school’s supervisory activities and its impact on school productivity because, in his view, the teachers feel constrained by their classroom responsibilities and workloads. According to the principal, his teachers already must devote a considerable amount of their professional time to their classroom duties, and in doing this they often find themselves "...simply overwhelmed by teaching workloads and don’t have the time to engage in additional supervisory activities." In elaborating further, the principal explained that he and his assistant principal are working diligently to find additional supervisory planning time for teachers and are encouraging teachers to dedicate the time that they do have to meaningful professional development activities:

Well, I think it’s hard for teachers to see the direct connection between the quality of the kinds of activities we do here and the final impact on the
effectiveness of our school. I think that’s because most of the time they are so busy with their own classroom efforts, and I guess many times feel somewhat trapped in their classrooms. But, we are working on this and our teachers do have a planning period during the school day. We encourage them to use this time to work on their professional development activities.

The principal further added that, in offering encouragement to his teachers regarding their professional development efforts, he emphasizes to them the importance of conscientious instructional planning and, in particular, the importance of carefully planning to involve all students during available learning time:

I stress to my faculty that we need to always have a system in whatever we do together and individually in each classroom...to always plan adequately for proper instruction...to get all of the students involved during the instructional time. As I mentioned, we provide a planning period for all of our teachers starting in kindergarten.

In describing aspects of the school’s instructional and supervisory program focus, the principal emphasized that instructional efforts at his school are well-organized and monitored:

...we monitor very well here. The organization of activities is stressed a lot -- make sure everything is on target. We generate funds to get everything that we need for current textbooks, and equipment --- we’ve done this since I’ve been here, and I’ve been principal for eleven years at this school. We try to develop our faculty professionally --- we have basically a fairly young faculty -- so we have some real vitality in the classroom.

The principal was asked to elaborate further on some of the supervisory activities at his school that enhance the professional development of his teachers. The principal responded by citing his school’s participation in the current district-sponsored effective schools program:

Well, one of the things I can say is that I view the instructional phases of our school as a top priority - it appears in the teacher’s bulletins all the time. We are into the effective schools movement...we are working with __________, who is our consultant for this. We have grade level meetings, sharing of ideas, professional topics in faculty meetings, etc. We’ve had two
consultant workshops on this so far, one on whole language and the first on dyslexia.

Concerning teacher topic presentations during faculty meetings, the principal added:

I also encourage creativity when assigning professional topics to teacher committees for presentation in faculty meetings, and I make sure the teachers get all the necessary materials they need for these topics.

The principal was then asked to share his reflections on the school’s professional staff mean score for organizational effectiveness (IPOE-S). The principal again noted his school’s participation in the district-sponsored effective schools program, explaining that this program has helped his staff to "...obtain much useful information and focus in on specific instructional areas." The principal indicated that he considered his efforts in facilitating the smooth implementation of the effective schools program at his school to be a significant part of his instructional leadership role. Emphasizing that he believes his teachers view him as a capable instructional leader, the principal further cited a lack of continuous involvement between the school and the district office as one drawback to the otherwise positive effective schools program:

Well, I think I portray a good image as instructional leader to teachers - and they really appreciate this. The only problem that we have is we don’t have the continuity we need to have with our school and the central office. We have these isolated workshops then we go back to our school...we don’t have the continuous followup and feedback we need to help us along with our efforts at implementing these programs.

The principal then was asked to reflect on his school’s professional staff mean scores on individual OSCI-S subscales/dimensions. In noting his school’s relatively low score on the Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) dimension, the principal re-emphasized his teachers’ involvement in the effective schools program, and explained that he and his staff are very aware of the need to provide more time to teachers for supervisory activities.
According to the principal, he and his staff have succeeded in increasing the amount of available time teachers at the school now have for instructional meetings:

...even though this score is somewhat lower, I think that we have improved...because we have improved in providing time for teachers to have grade level meetings. Also, we have an improvement committee that sometimes works after school with the effective schools meetings. We are part of ten schools working with ______ in the parish. Ten principals and schools are involved in this phase, the rest of our schools are involved in a second phase of the effective schools program in the parish. So, all of our principals are involved in either one or the other of these phases.

Turning to the school’s District Supervisory Climate (DSC) staff mean score, the principal expressed his belief that the district has made some improvements in the kinds of district-school supervisory programs that are being implemented. According to the principal, this improvement can be largely attributed to the current superintendent’s efforts in establishing district-wide academic and staff development committees that involve administrators and teachers from throughout the district:

...under the current administration, the superintendent has been doing a lot of things that have not been done in the past. We have a district-wide academic committee that meets regularly. I serve on this, and teachers also serve on this committee. Additionally, there is a staff development committee, that many teachers from throughout the district serve on.

Finally, the principal expressed his view that he and his staff are continually working to improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers’ instructional and supervisory activities. Recognizing that "...continued improvements are still necessary", the principal stressed that in recent years his school has been involved in some important supervisory innovations, and that these improvement efforts are beginning to have an impact:

I’d like to say that in the past three years we’ve instituted two big innovations in our school...first, our teachers are paired within grade levels - the ‘team teaching’ or ‘team partners’ idea; secondly, we’ve instituted cooperative learning to see how this works in contrast to self-contained
learning. These innovations have been very well-received by our teachers, and we are beginning to see positive results from these programs.

Teacher Interviews

The O/S climate summary profile scores for the school were shared with each of the two teachers at the outset of the interviews. The teacher interviewees were asked to reflect on their school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to them that their school’s survey results indicated school staff did not see a meaningful relationship between their perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of organizational effectiveness. One of the respondents indicated that he felt the unique socioeconomic conditions of the area and the contextual teaching/learning challenges that this imposes on teachers has substantially affected teachers’ attitudes regarding their own and the school’s effectiveness:

Well, I think it’s the attitudes of our teachers more than anything else. Our teachers are working here under a lot of pressure and some difficult teaching circumstances. We have a school here where the students are all coming from homes and families that have a very low socioeconomic level...and the students come to school with lots of problems. The students themselves have very poor attitudes...low self-esteem and not a lot of motivation. This makes the job of teaching them much more difficult for our teachers and, we really feel the pressure here.

This teacher further explained that teachers at the school are interested in becoming involved in decision making processes concerning school improvement, but feel constrained by a lack of time and the daily pressure of coping with prevailing problems:

...however, the attitude of our teachers, also, is that we care about our work. Our feeling as teachers is that, if we are given the opportunity, we can make some improvements. We would like to have a lot more opportunities to become involved in making the kinds of decisions that would really improve our students’ learning...a big part of the problem is time though, and the fact that we are so overwhelmed with the kinds of problems we have to deal with.
The other teacher, while expressing similar views, also emphasized that teachers at the school are aware of the school’s comparatively low achievement scores and try to place the progress they feel they are making in perspective:

Over here, we don’t just look at the final test scores, we judge our worth and how we are doing in our school - how much progress we are making - by the small steps that we make in helping our kids improve, not only their grades and test scores, but their overall situation. For us to make a few little steps in this regard, in our minds this is comparable to when other less disadvantaged schools make higher test scores. We all show that we want to make some meaningful improvement. Although on a national percentile we are pretty low, we feel pretty good about what we are doing - we feel that we can make a difference. We take different standardized tests, but we don’t feel like this reflects what we do all by itself.

The teachers were asked to elaborate on the kind of structure present in the school for supervisory interaction. In responding, one of the teachers indicated that grade level meetings, though not a regular part of their supervisory structure, are worked into periodic district-wide inservice days:

Well, we do have grade level meetings when we can...usually about once every six weeks. We incorporate these meetings into the schedule when we have a district inservice day. We’ve stressed in the past couple of years that in the grade level meetings, by working together, we can see what we are doing from one classroom to another.

Commenting on the school’s Organizational Structure (OS) and Professional Autonomy (PA) scores, the other teacher noted that time and scheduling constraints hamper supervisory interaction among teachers. As this teacher explained:

Our teachers are only paired according to subject area -- only paired within subject areas. I’d have to say that this is the only way that we share with other teachers at this time. A big thing with our teachers is that we feel we just don’t have any time during the day to do any sharing. We are very much locked into what we are doing in the classroom...we just don’t have any time to do the kinds of preparing and sharing among ourselves that we want to. We’re just too busy doing our own thing in our own classrooms.
In addition to the periodic grade level meetings, one teacher also mentioned that the school is operating under a school improvement plan that is developed each year in response to a district requirement. In the teacher's view, this schoolwide plan connects teachers' individual classroom efforts with the school's overall goals and objectives:

Also, we’ve worked on school improvement plans to bring some consistency to what we are doing in each of our classrooms. We have autonomy within our own classrooms, but within certain parameters. We have goals and objectives for the whole school that all the teachers are following. Our school improvement plan - this is the plan that we are all following. Our school has to develop this plan each year and submit it to the district for approval.

Concerning the school-district supervisory relationship and the kinds and quality of district-wide supervisory activities available to teachers, teacher interviewees corroborated the principal's view that district-level staff development activities have improved under the current superintendent's administration. As one teacher explained, "...because of our superintendent's efforts the district has really improved the quality of their supervisory workshops". This teacher then described a district-sponsored supervisory training program initiated in 1991-92 that teachers throughout the district are involved in:

...since the past school year we have been working in a new trend called cooperative learning. We’ve attended a few district workshops and have had some inservices on cooperative learning. Cooperative learning builds on the idea of student peer tutoring or group learning...getting students to help other students...the idea that everyone has something to contribute in the classroom. The focus of the workshops has been on training teachers in strategies for getting individual students to present material in a cooperative group of other students...getting the students to present to each other in a way and terminology that the students will best be able to understand. I think cooperative learning has caused teachers here to think more about the impact their selection of teaching strategies has on students.

While also noting the improvements the district has made in its teacher inservice programs, the other teacher offered a tempered perspective on the actual ability of district
programs to address the contextual needs of teachers at this school. According to this teacher, two problems negatively affect district program effectiveness: (1) time and logistical constraints impeding teachers’ efforts at attending district inservices; and (2) the perceived inability of district inservices to address their own school’s specific contextual needs.

Regarding the first problem area, this teacher explained:

...we don’t have the flexibility or the time to go to many of the meetings from the district office...many of these are during the school day. Some are scheduled after school, but often, because of our location, we simply can’t get to the district office in time for these.

This teacher emphasized, though, that it is a second problem area associated with district-sponsored inservices that most concerns teachers:

But, the most important thing I want to stress is this - the district workshops may be very meaningful, but the workshops and inservices the district office provides many times are not helpful to us because we have such different needs. The area that our students come from has a lot to do with distinguishing the learning environment in which we teach in our school...our students live in a very low socioeconomic area. Because we’re serving kids from such a low socioeconomic level, we need different kinds of suggestions to help these special kids. These kids have particular needs that go beyond the average kids in middle and high level SES schools.

Finally, in considering the overall usefulness of district inservice programs and their impact on school staff, this same teacher noted that "...most often than not, we are just the victims of our own situation - we simply have to work with our own students as best we can."

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:
• The principal, to a large extent, views school supervision as a function of district supervisory programs. The principal sees himself primarily as a "facilitator" and implementor of district-sponsored supervisory programs.

• Teachers feel that classroom responsibilities and time constraints combine to produce few opportunities at the school for professional sharing.

• School staff value the information-generating potential of district supervisory workshops and inservices, but feel these programs are not responsive to the immediate contextual needs of their school.
School 6a is one of a second pair of K-6 elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 6, Table 32, p. 183) identified in the sample in the Low SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is greater than 95%). For the 1991-92 school year, the percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches at this school was 98.51% (SES level). School 6a and 6b were similar demographically, but displayed differences in independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, comparison school 6a had a student enrollment of 413, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/28. The 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure for this school was 95.14%. The 1992 average mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for this school (fourth and sixth grades) was 43.81.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this K-6 elementary school was 42.86%. The school obtained an OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 80.38 (M%MaxOS=77.29%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 31.50 (M%MaxIPOE-S=78.75%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was .71 (n=12).
The principal and two members of the school professional staff participated in telephone interviews. The principal has been the administrator of this elementary school for two years. Of the two teachers interviewed, one is a third grade teacher (and reading specialist) who has been at the school for fourteen years; the other teacher teaches language arts to all fifth graders in the school and has been on the staff for 21 years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

At the outset of the interview, the O/S summary profile scores for the school were shared with the principal. The principal was asked to consider his school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to him that survey results for his school indicated a high, positive relationship between his staff’s perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their view of the school’s overall level of organizational effectiveness. In reflecting on his school’s scores, the principal expressed his belief that his teachers’ ability to see a connection between their involvement in school supervisory activities and the school’s effectiveness as an organization is probably related to the fact that, according to the principal, he and his staff continually emphasize the importance of structuring and using time effectively:

I make a point of making time for sharing and giving information to teachers to help them with developing particular skills. I also make an effort to allow teachers to have input into faculty meetings. Once a month we have a faculty meeting set aside for professional topics...we schedule these meetings during the school day when possible. Teachers have input into what we are going to discuss during the year...many different supervisory things come up.

Describing further the way instructional and supervisory meeting time is structured at the school, the principal added:
Also, at mid-term we have a day that is set aside for professional topics and discussion among teachers and myself. We actually do this at the school site for an entire day. We get together and share across the curriculum - ideas about what each teacher is doing, informal sharing across all grade levels, etc. We do all this sharing, though, in a structured way. You need the time to do this in a structured way...and this time is scare, but we try to do this, at least to some extent, on a daily basis - we make time for this.

In addition to suggesting that effective scheduling is an important component of structuring a positive supervisory climate at his school, the principal also stated that he engages in frequent professional dialogue with teachers about the quality of their classroom teaching. The principal explained that classroom observations of teaching performance followed by sharing and discussion of assessment information with individual teachers in post-observation conferences is an important kind of professional development activity he and his teachers regularly engage in. In the principal’s words:

My perception is that we are pretty much like other districts...we have an instrument we use that is standard for the whole district. Post-[observation] conferences are stressed around here a lot though. I think that teachers appreciate it if they understand what it is they are being assessed on during the formal observation, but they also appreciate frequent walk-throughs in terms of noting strengths of weaknesses of their teaching and then sharing that information and talking about it together. Teachers find it very valuable to have this information - we do that a great deal around here.

Reflecting on the school’s relatively high organizational effectiveness staff mean score (M%Max=78.75%), the principal indicated that he believed teachers’ views of the school’s effectiveness may be tied to their perceptions of the level and quality of their own individual professional efforts. The principal emphasized though, that while it may be necessary to keep this caveat in mind, allowing teachers input into decision making is an important factor affecting the nature of a school’s supervisory environment as well as teachers’ perceptions of the school’s effectiveness:
I'm not sure, I guess, how seriously we ought to take this [survey] result. Teachers want to say that they work in a good place, and they are working very hard. Our test results, though, are not indicating that the school is very productive and successful...but, we have been progressing in the two years I've been here. If teachers are allowed to participate and make some decisions, then this goes a long way. There are, of course, some things that are delegated...but, until more restructuring happens, things are going to pretty much stay that way.

In discussing the nature of the district-school supervisory climate in his district, the principal indicated that in the last two years the district has implemented an effective schools program affecting schools district-wide. According to the principal, district personnel have actively promoted the effective schools philosophy and have provided inservice presentations to district administrators and teachers on ways to incorporate this philosophy into school instructional and supervisory plans:

...right now the effective schools philosophy is really pushed in our district - the philosophy that 'all students can learn'. This has really had an impact on all of us. Every teacher and principal is taking this very seriously. The district has provided inservices and workshops on this. This is only the second year [1992-93] we have done this...we are looking at disaggregated test scores and writing a school mission statement based on the basic philosophy of effective schools.

In discussing individual O/S climate staff mean scores for his school, the principal again referred to the impact that the district office, and particularly the superintendent, has had on his own and other schools in the district as a result of the district-sponsored effective schools program. Noting his school's relatively high scores for Professional Autonomy (PA) and Self Reflection (SR), the principal acknowledged that he felt the ongoing encouragement and support the district has provided to principals in implementing the effective schools model has contributed to fostering a better quality supervisory climate in his school. The principal explained that the effective school emphasis has caused him to engage in increased and more purposeful collaborative activities with his teachers:
The superintendent has had a lot to do with this...he has emphasized the
effective schools stuff. He has emphasized the effective schools philosophy
and encouraged us as principals to work diligently with our teachers on this.
Because of this emphasis, I sit down now with teachers very frequently - in
our school it's during our 'common planning period' time, and look at our
own needs and devise strategies. We do this very often - each week.

Finally, commenting on his school's comparatively low Collaborative
Sharing/Rapport staff mean score, the principal again referred to the district’s efforts,
emphasizing the positive effects that district-school supervisory programs are having on
individual schools within the district. In the principal's view, present district efforts at
revising the state teacher evaluation instrument will likely result in improved teacher
perceptions of the opportunities for individual professional development and professional
sharing in their school:

...the parish is presently redesigning the state evaluation instrument to meet
the needs of our schools...and I think that, as this is accomplished and
implemented in each school, this will cause teachers' perceptions of
collaborative sharing in our school to go up.

Teacher Interviews

As a preface to the teacher interviews, O/S climate summary profile scores were
shared with each teacher. Each teacher was then asked to reflect on the school's staff mean
scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S,
and to comment on what it meant to him/her that survey results indicated a strong, positive
relationship between staff perceptions of the school's supervisory structure and their view
of the school's overall effectiveness as an organization. In responding to this question, both
teachers stated their belief that the principal assumes an active supervisory leadership role
in encouraging teachers to become involved in meaningful supervisory activities.
Additionally, teachers indicated that the principal makes an effort to customize staff
supervisory activities to the specific instructional needs of the school. As one teacher related:

...as a faculty we try to keep up to date on what is new and what is better. Our principal encourages us to find appropriate activities that reinforce what we need to be working on. This semester, for example, we had a workshop on dyslexia. The principal finds activities and encourages us to make them fit the needs of the school. Also, if there is something that recently happened in our school we incorporate this need into our supervisory planning.

This teacher also related that teacher visitations to other schools are another important component of their school faculty’s supervisory efforts. The teacher explained that, as their school serves students in a low socioeconomic area, school staff members have been able to acquire additional knowledge from visiting other schools similar to their own, and studying how other teachers and administrators have been successful in motivating their students:

We look also for what other schools are doing...and we go visit these schools and try to learn from the ideas of other teachers. We have teachers go to other schools to learn better ways to motivate students...and our district supports us in this. Our school is in a disadvantaged area - we’re in a drugs area - so, we are very focused on ways to motivate our students to achieve on a higher level.

This inter-school supervisory activity was also alluded to by the other teacher interviewee, who indicated that teachers at the school engage in site visits to other schools to examine ways different teachers and administrators are coping with similar challenges in working with students:

We share among ourselves and look for ideas from other teachers and administrators in other schools. Students here have very low self-esteem. We actually visit other schools and talk to other teachers to see what they are doing to motivate students and raise their self-esteem levels. We are the third school in the parish to organize an honor club...we got the idea for this through visiting another school. We are consciously focused on finding creative ways to improve students’ self-esteem.
In reviewing their school’s relatively high District Supervisory Climate (DSC) staff mean score, teacher interviewees indicated that teachers interact regularly with district office personnel and discuss instructional and supervisory strategies relevant to teachers’ needs. One teacher described the structure of professional interactions between individual school staffs and central office personnel as involving a number of useful supervisory workshops strategically placed during the school year. According to the teacher, faculty members seek to apply and adapt the knowledge they obtain at the district workshops to their own efforts with students:

We have three workshops at the beginning of the year for all of our teachers here in the district...motivation workshops to motivate teachers and improve and increase our self-esteem. We also have school-level district meetings during the middle of the year; and there are also three or four meetings held during the school year for induction-year teachers. During these district-wide meetings, we discuss with central office personnel new ideas about how to become professionally motivated...and we then try to pass down the motivation we acquire at these workshops to the students.

The other teacher - a master teacher in the school - further explained that the district professional development plan includes three master teacher organizations, structured by grade level, with membership consisting of master teachers from every school in the district. In this teacher’s view, these district-sponsored organizations provide a useful focus for the discussion of important instructional and supervisory concerns, and provide an important impetus to master teachers to return and share valuable information with their individual school faculties:

...we have a master teacher organization for elementary teachers in the district. There is a similar organization in the district for middle and secondary teachers. This organization meets at one central school site. Master teacher organization members meet and discuss new regulations and guidelines for master teachers in and across elementary content areas, and we discuss ways that the master teachers can provide this information to their teachers back at their school.
Finally, in discussing the school’s relatively high Professional Autonomy (PA) staff mean score, one teacher noted that teachers at the school have substantial input into supervisory decision making. Elaborating on the structure and extent of teachers’ supervisory input, this teacher explained:

...we have a lot of input into supervisory decision making in our school. We have grade level meetings...in these meetings we can really share with other teachers. At our grade level meetings we can discuss individual students’ needs across content levels. For example, the third grade math teacher and reading teacher can discuss the relative progress of one student across content areas.

Additionally, this same teacher related that peer observations are a part of teachers’ supervisory activities at the school as well. According to this teacher, these observations are conducted during teachers’ planning periods, and are used by teachers as an in-house method of collegially observing and assessing the effectiveness of various new classroom instructional techniques:

We also observe among ourselves during our planning period, particularly when we know there is one or more teachers trying some new technique or teaching strategy in their class, then we go in and observe each other and provide feedback on how it went.

O/S Climate Summary

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:

• The principal is actively concerned with providing time for teachers to share professionally and develop new skills.

• Teachers view the principal as a primary motivator in focusing staff efforts on developing supervisory activities that meet school needs.
The principal and staff view district-sponsored supervisory programs as providing useful instructional information and fostering increased within- and between-school administrator/staff supervisory interactions.
COMPARISON SCHOOL 6b
O/S CLIMATE PROFILE

OSCI-S Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/S Variable:</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean Score:</td>
<td>74.93</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mean %Max:</td>
<td>72.05%</td>
<td>73.81%</td>
<td>62.88%</td>
<td>63.86%</td>
<td>70.56%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Background Information

School 6b is the other of the second pair of K-6 elementary schools (Comparison Pair No. 6, Table 32, p. 183) identified in the sample in the Low SES category (percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches is greater than 95%). For the 1991-92 school year, the percentage of students on free and/or reduced cost lunches at this school was 98.52% (SES level). Although similar demographically to school 6a, school 6b differed from its paired school in independent and dependent variable characteristics. For the 1991-92 school year, school 6b had a student enrollment of 386, and an administrator/staff ratio of 1/23. The 1991-92 yearly student average daily attendance (ADA) figure for this school was 93.64%. The 1992 average mean normal curve equivalent (MNCE) total battery score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) for this school (fourth and sixth grades) was 44.12.

The OSCI-S professional staff survey response rate for this K-6 elementary school was 56.52%. The school obtained an OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension professional staff mean score of 74.93 (M%MaxOS=72.05%), and an IPOE-S professional staff mean score of 26.86 (M%MaxIPOE-S=67.15%). The OS/IPOE-S intercorrelation for this school was -.26 (n=13).

The principal and two members of the school faculty participated in telephone interviews. The principal has been the administrator of this elementary school for three
years. Two teachers on the school faculty were interviewed. One teacher is a fifth/sixth grade teacher (and math specialist) with four years’ teaching experience in the school. The other teacher is a third grade teacher who has been teaching at this school for three years.

Qualitative Interview Results

Principal Interview

As a preface to the interview, the OSCI-S summary profile scores for this school were shared with the principal. The principal was asked to reflect on his school’s professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS) subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to him that his school’s survey results evidenced only a slight association between staff perceptions of the school’s supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school’s overall level of organizational effectiveness. In considering his school’s mean scores, and the school’s relatively low OS/IPOE-S correlation (OS/IPOE-S, r=.26), the principal indicated that he was not very surprised by these survey results. The principal explained that he and his staff must deal everyday with sets of educational problems and challenges unique to their school situation. These circumstances, according to the principal, are very much "...a product of the socioeconomic and cultural conditions existing in the community our school serves."

In describing further the kinds of instructional and supervisory challenges that he and his teachers are involved with, the principal drew a parallel between his own school and another school in the district having contrasting demographic features in terms of its student clientele:

Last week I visited a principal in a city school with only a small number of students on free lunch...a third of the kids can walk to school. He is dealing with substantially different kinds of problems than the ones I and my teachers are experiencing at our school. So, I think that this has a lot to do
with the way that my teachers might perceive the professional climate in our school. They have just a whole lot of social and community problems that they must contend with as they work with these kids - and, sometimes, they just get a little overwhelmed.

The principal elaborated on his perception of how his school’s socioeconomic situation has affected his staff’s efforts at instructional and professional improvement:

Sometimes we can take ten giant steps, but we can never get up to where everyone else is, simply because of the nature and magnitude of the social and economic problems that we are grappling with that affect our kids and parents. Also, in a large school, you may have an opportunity to send twenty to thirty teachers to workshops in a given year, but we don’t have that opportunity because we are so small.

In the principal’s view, the impact of community conditions on students’ and parents’ attitudes about learning contribute to some of the more frustrating problems that his teachers must contend with. The principal expressed his belief that his teachers’ relatively low perceptions of the school’s effectiveness can be directly traced to the many unproductive and often frustrating encounters teachers have with parents. As the principal explained, many of the most vexing instructional problems teachers must contend with at the school often stem from parents’ culturally ingrained educational priorities:

...even though that effectiveness score seems low, I’m actually happy we did that well. We are over 90 percent free lunch...we get disheartened a lot because we see a lot of the family lives, etc., of the students, and they aren’t very good. A typical case in point that just happened the other day: one of my math teachers came in and told me that one of her students was just in the process of taking a math test, when the parent came in right in the middle of the test to tell the teacher she was taking her child out of school to go Christmas shopping.

Citing this example as representative of the kinds of problems involving parental and student learning attitudes his teachers regularly contend with, the principal emphasized:

These are the kinds of attitudes that we have to deal with. Parental attitudes are a big problem in our school...we try to establish parental programs, but the parents that come are the wrong parents. The parents that really need
help and could actually benefit from the program are the very parents that
don’t want to come.

In commenting on his school’s comparatively low District Supervisory Climate
(DSC) staff mean score, the principal indicated that he felt that the lower score on this
supervisory climate dimension did not necessarily reflect any feelings on the part of teachers
of lack of confidence in the quality of district instructional and supervisory programs.
Rather, the principal stated that this score probably reflected more his teachers’ feelings of
distancing from the central office due to geographical isolation in the parish and the
logistical difficulties involved in attending district-sponsored supervisory activities. As the
principal explained:

...at our school we have a continual problem - we worry about being isolated
from professional contact with central office people and educators from other
schools because our school is very much a rural school. The district
workshops are our only opportunity for finding out what’s going on
instructionally in the district. The district does schedule a number of
workshops on different things, but we don’t get to participate in every one
of the workshops.

Elaborating further on this point, the principal offered an example to illustrate the problem:

The district usually has several different workshops at the same time...our
faculty is very small - so, we have to pick and choose who goes to what
workshop. A classic case is the computer workshop last
week...unfortunately, it was at the same time that I and another teacher were
attending a school executive workshop - so, none of my teachers could go
because our faculty is too small. Also, sometimes they will schedule
workshops at 3:00. It’s a forty-five minute drive for us to get to the central
office...so, often our teachers never make it to the workshops on time.

Turning to the way staff planning time is structured at his school, the principal
related that, while teachers have some daily planning time, he and his staff recognize the
inadequacies of the current scheduling situation:

...teachers now have a half-hour planning time each day. The teachers, of
course, have to spend most of this time doing all of the paper work that
teachers are required to fill out. I think my teachers value their planning
time but they don’t feel like they have enough of it.

Although admitting that instructional and supervisory meeting time at his school is
at a premium, the principal did explain some of his teachers are members of a school-site
supervisory committee that meets periodically to discuss instructional and supervisory
concerns. According to the principal:

One thing that we try to do once of month is hold a meeting of the school
supervisory committee...about a third of the staff is on this. Teachers make
up the agenda for this meeting and bring up instructional ideas and
suggestions.

Finally, the principal commented on his school’s relatively high Centralization (CEN)
staff mean score. In the principal’s view, this high score was probably attributable to the
relatively small size of the school faculty, and the proportionately large number of
instructional and organizational duties that individual teachers consequently must assume.
Thus, the principal indicated that teacher’s workloads at the school possibly contributed to
their feelings in this area:

Perhaps one of the reasons that our score is high here is because we have
a very small faculty, and our smallness makes everyone work much harder.
This causes everyone to have to take on a very heavy load in terms of what
they are required to do. This could be part of the reason why teachers might
feel they are told they have to do a lot of things around here.

Teacher Interviews

To initiate the staff interviews, O/S climate summary profile scores for the school
were shared with each teacher. As with all staff interviews, each teacher was asked to
reflect on the professional staff mean scores for the OSCI-S Organizational Structure (OS)
subscale/dimension and the IPOE-S, and to comment on what it meant to the teacher that
school survey results indicated only a slight association between staff perceptions of the
school’s supervisory structure and their perceptions of the school’s overall level of effectiveness as an organization. Both teachers responded with some amazement that the scores for their school were even as high as they were. One teacher was quite explicit in her reaction to the school’s Organizational Structure (OS) score:

Oh, no...this is not right...we are not encouraged by the principal at any time to engage in any kind of collaboration or sharing among ourselves. So, I don’t understand the reason supervisory structure is so high. A lot of times when teachers have to fill out these surveys though, they will just simply take the middle road and not answer how they truthfully feel -- this is what I think happened here. We definitely do not have a structure in our school for supervisory interactions among faculty or between faculty and principal.

The other teacher provided additional information regarding the extent to which teachers at the school are able and encouraged to professionally interact:

...it’s very hard for teachers to meet here. There is not a push at all for any type of supervisory meeting structure from the administrator at this school. There is not a push from the top - so, in effect our hands are tied.

This same teacher further explained that, in her view, the principal is ineffective in providing needed motivation and encouragement to teachers, and fails to offer teachers opportunities for input into instructional decision making. As this teacher related:

...it’s the motivational factor...there is no cohesiveness in the supervisory framework here. The teachers and the principal are not on the same wavelength...we just don’t work together. There is just no interest on the part of the principal in encouraging and motivating us, and especially in giving us some decision making authority in instructional matters.

The teacher was quick to add, however, that her perception is that teachers at the school would not want the principal to turn over to them decision making authority on all matters. In her view, the problem centers on the principal’s inability to assume an appropriate supervisory leadership role in the school:

...but, we wouldn’t want him to just all of a sudden say to us that we now can run everything - that’s not what we want. The problem is that the
principal doesn't assume the supervisory leadership that we think he should and that we want him to. The quality of leadership here is just not what it could be.

Commenting on the possibilities for holding faculty planning meetings during the school day, one teacher indicated that, although teachers at the school each have a thirty-minute planning period, faculty size and scheduling constraints combine to preclude any opportunities for collaborative planning during the school day:

I think parish-wide it is mandated that there is a planning period for elementary teachers - that all elementary teachers have a thirty-minute stretch each day where they can plan or do whatever. But here we can't use this for any kind of meetings among teachers because we are a very small school - we only have one section for each grade...and teachers are off at different times, so we can't meet across grades very well either.

The other teacher pointed out that two district-wide inservice days during the year provide the only opportunities for scheduling grade-level meetings:

We do have two mandatory inservice days during the school year, and this is a time when we can actually meet together by grade-levels...during these scheduled meetings, kindergarten through third grade teachers and fourth through sixth grade teachers meet as two separate groups.

One of the teachers indicated that she felt teachers' relatively low perceptions of the school's organizational effectiveness and the only slight association they perceived between supervisory structure and effectiveness were related to the socioeconomic situations of the school's students and the problems this poses for teachers. As this teacher explained:

...the socioeconomic problems are a big factor. We have to teach the total child...there is very little teaching going on at home. We're proud of the fact that, in fact, our students actually come to school given the kinds of problems that they have to cope with at home. They're not getting the push they need at home. It's very hard for many of our students to understand the need or importance of education because the student's environment does not show that to him. His environment does not have give the student that push. Many of them are capable, because we see them doing well.
This teacher went on to explain that some of the teachers at the school actually further aggravate the problem by constructing alterative standards for certain students:

We have some teachers here though that don’t expect a child coming from these kinds of poor home conditions to perform well, and this is one of the biggest problems we have with some of our teachers here - they actually construct lower sets of expectations for the kids with difficult home environments - those kids who come from disadvantaged backgrounds...and, this causes the students not to achieve in the way that they actually could if they were pushed and motivated and given higher sets of expectations from the teacher. We really do have this problem with some of our teachers here.

Finally, the teachers were asked to comment on their school’s supervisory relationship with the district office. One of the teachers indicated that, while she perceived an increase in the number of district-level workshops being presented, these inservice efforts typically lose momentum at the school-site level:

...one of the goals for the parish is the effective schools program. A little before the effective schools program, and definitely since it started a couple of years ago, I’ve actually seen an increase in the amount of workshops in the district than what it used to be - and I’ve been here now fifteen years. These inservice programs are done well at the parish level but, when they get to the local school level, they typically fizzle out.

Commenting also on the availability of instructional workshops through the district office, the other teacher added that, in some cases, substitute funds are provided so that individual teachers can attend a district workshop during the professional day:

The district does provide a number of instructional workshops at the district office after school, as well as some during the day...and also during the summer time. Some are even done with funds for substitutes...so, it’s actually possible to get a substitute so a teacher can attend a district workshop.

**O/S Climate Summary**

Based on review of principal and staff responses to interview questions, the following propositional statements are made regarding this school’s O/S climate:
- Principal and staff view the low socioeconomic and cultural conditions of their students as a substantial factor affecting their instructional and supervisory efforts.

- Teachers perceive the principal as an ineffective supervisory leader. In their view, the principal’s ineffectiveness as a supervisory leader stems from his failure to provide an adequate structure for teacher sharing and decision making input on instructional and supervisory matters.
APPENDIX H: SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES
Table H-1:

Test of Common Methods Variance
Table H-1
Summary of Within School Correlations Between the IPOE and Subscales of the OSCI-S by Each School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
Table H-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
## Table H-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>- .22</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table H-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table H-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table H-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSCI-S Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table H-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>OSCI-S Subscales</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>CEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: CONCEPTUAL DEFINITIONS OF OSCI FACTORED SUBSCALES/DIMENSIONS
Conceptual Definitions of
OSCI Factored Subscales/Dimensions

Organizational Structure (OS) - refers to the nature and quality of administrator and staff involvement in formal and informal group supervisory activities focusing on school instructional needs

Professional Autonomy (PA) - refers to the extent to which individual staff have control over their own work activity and professional development

Collaborative Sharing/Rapport (CSR) - refers to the extent to which staff (and administrators) engage in collegial dialogue and review of individual staff professional work activities

District Supervisory Climate (DSC) - refers to the extent to which district office policies, programs and services are responsive to the instructional and supervisory needs of individual school personnel

Self Reflection (SR) - a self-perceptual index of the extent to which individual personnel spend time thinking about personal and schoolwide instructional improvement

Centralization (CEN) - refers to the degree of administrator influence in determining kinds and extent of staff involvement in individual and group supervisory activities
APPENDIX J: CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES FURTHER MEDIATING O/S CLIMATE AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
Figure J-1: Within-school contextual variables further mediating the relationship between Organizational Structure (OS) and Organizational Effectiveness (IPOE)
MULTISTAGE/MULTILEVEL THEORY-BUILDING
(TWO-STAGE/TWO-LEVEL METHODOLOGY)

**STAGE ONE** - Quantitative Inquiry (normative level analyses)

- **Level One:** schools used as the units of analysis (school means - variation among schools)
- **Level Two:** individuals within schools used as the analytic units (individual scores - variation within schools) (variation in relationships from one school to the next)

**STAGE TWO** - Qualitative Inquiry (cultural level analyses)

- **Level One:** individual school probes; construction of school O/S climate profiles
- **Level Two:** inductive assertion process; identification of context variables

Figure K-1: Multistage/multilevel inquiry process depicting the complementarity between quantitative and qualitative stages (each employing multiple unit of analysis levels) within an integrated theory-building/research methodology design.
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