


Summer 1990

The Relationship between School Learning Climate and Student Achievement

Craig Stanley Olson

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/graduate_projects

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL LEARNING CLIMATE
AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

A Project Report
Presented to
The Graduate Faculty
Central Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
Craig Stanley Olson
July, 1990

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL LEARNING CLIMATE AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

by

Craig S. Olson

July, 1990

Based on the review of the literature and research, the relationship of school learning climate and student achievement is explored. Common ideological, organizational, and leadership factors characteristic of high-achieving, "effective" schools are identified and their relationships examined. Ideological factors identified are: 1) A belief that all students are expected by staff to reach high levels of achievement; 2) A belief that individual and school-wide performance on achievement tests is an appropriate goal and measure of school effectiveness; and 3) A belief that self-concept is an important factor in student achievement. Organizational factors identified are: 1) High degree of trust; 2) High level of satisfaction and morale; 3) Opportunity for input; and 4) Safe and orderly environment. Leadership factors examined are: 1) Sense of vision; 2) Clearly stated goals and expectations; 3) Effective communication skills; and 4) Strong instructional leadership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Background of the Study	1
	Area and Focus	1
	Reasons and Justifications	3
	Definitions	5
	Effective School Learning Climate Factors	9
II.	Review of Related Literature	12
	Ideology of the School	14
	Organization of the School	27
	Leadership of the School	41
III.	Procedures of the Study	57
IV.	Guidelines for Implementation	61
V.	Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	73
VI.	References	79

Chapter One

Background of the Study

Area and Focus

The study of effective schools, those in which students have continually demonstrated high achievement, is relatively recent. According to Pinero (1982), closer study of these schools follows a period of rapid change in public education, which was itself preceded by years of unquestioning public acceptance of the schools. During those years, the schools seemed to be doing a good job, and the public saw no need to question their performance. The change in public perceptions of the schools, although gradual, was perhaps marked by the 1954 Supreme Court decision that separate is not equal. In *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka*, the Court ruled that in the field of education the doctrine of separate but equal had no place. Separate educational facilities were inherently unequal." In that statement was the tacit acknowledgment that the school a child attends does make an important difference in that child's achievement as a student. Furthermore, the ruling affirmed a basic right of all children to equal educational opportunity. Schools were obliged to see that every child was guaranteed this right. In short, the *Brown* decision focused public attention not only on the fact that separate-but-equal facilities were actually unequal and that desegregation was wrong, but on the schools and their effects, both positive and negative, on children.

Then, in 1966, when the government and the public were demanding that schools be the primary agents for social change, the ability of schools to effectively

do the job was directly challenged by the Coleman Report, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, and York, 1966). According to popular interpretation, the results of this study showed that schools did not make a difference in pupil achievement and in fact could do little. The Coleman Report researchers felt the environment that the child was brought up in and exposed to made the largest difference in student success and academic achievement. The data, however, were not as definitive as public reaction suggested. Although the study did indicate a strong relationship between pupil background and academic performance and achievement, this finding had limitations. For example, according to Pinero, while the researchers had considered certain school characteristics to be relevant to student achievement --such as age and condition of facilities, and availability of human, instructional, and financial resources--the study did not examine how these resources were used and organized, nor did it take into account the differences between classrooms within the same school.

The conclusions of the report, then, were not universally accepted. Not only did they deny deeply held beliefs about the potential of the schools to promote social change, they also contradicted the experiences of practitioners who had witnessed obvious differences between classrooms and between schools. These beliefs led researchers in a different direction. The focus shifted from the school to the classroom; from the study of school resources, physical characteristics, and demographics, to classroom processes and their relationships to student achievement. Researchers moved into the classroom to observe at close range what was happening.

Another group of researchers concentrated on the relative influence of environmental and school factors on student achievement. Selecting schools that were particularly effective at improving the achievement levels of children and carefully matching them with less effective ones in similar locations, these studies began to identify educational practices that contributed to increased student achievement. This important step shifted the emphasis away from what might be called environmental determinism, as suggested by the Coleman Report, and back to the school as the change agent. It also contributed a note of hope: all children are capable of adequate academic success, and schools must assume their responsibility for contributing to this achievement. The articles, journals, research findings, and discussions from this group of researchers and authors is the basis for this project.

Schools do possess the ability to positively affect student achievement. This report will identify school learning climate factors and characteristics which are closely associated with high levels of student achievement.

Reasons and Justifications

The pressures of improvement in education are increasing. New knowledge both in education and in other fields strains the ability of schools to incorporate what is known into existing educational programs. Technological advances that provide opportunities for new ways of learning remain underutilized, as the cost of obtaining them is overwhelming. Social expectations create pressure for schools to respond to the diverse needs of multicultural communities in ways for which schools are ill-prepared. Economic factors have the dual effect of creating pressures to better prepare students for the world of work and to do it with less

money. And yet, as pressures for improved schooling grow, it becomes increasingly evident that, until now, there has been no systematic approach to school improvement that has resulted in lasting change in schools.

Secondary and elementary public schools have experienced many innovations that have been full of promise yet failed to produce the desired results. Today's schools remain largely unchanged from those of decades earlier. Characteristics introduced for what were once important reasons persist though the reasons for their use have changed. Witness summer vacations, originally intended to allow our predominantly rural population to have the extra help of children during the peak work seasons on farms. Much of what we do in schools today is shaped by visions from our past. If schools are to improve and continue to respond to new demands and challenges, change efforts must include a commitment to increasing student achievement through increased school effectiveness.

According to Pino (1978), research has clearly indicated that the basic intelligent quotient of children can be positively or adversely effected by as much as thirty points by manipulating the learning environment positively or negatively; and, increasingly, evidence is being collected which also ties the quality of classroom climate to student achievement. Why, then, has the center core of the school--the classroom--and the main goal of the school--student achievement--been so neglected?

In recent years, great strides have been made to strengthen the American school system. Many new and architecturally attractive buildings have been built, innovative learning strategies have been initiated, exciting new curriculum materials

have been prepared, and a veritable explosion of multi-media materials have been made available. Despite these efforts, many feel that the kinds of learning environments desired have not been achieved. School leaders must seek means to provide an environment in which students may work more productively and with greater satisfaction (Smith, 1978).

Since schools share a common function in society, there is some similarity in learning climates. However, different schools stress different "philosophies," instructional practices and methodologies, beliefs and expectations of students' abilities to learn. Consequently, school learning climate varies sufficiently to produce different levels of student achievement (Brookover et al., 1982).

The purpose of this project is to identify and examine common characteristics of high-achieving "effective" schools. Dissatisfaction with the lack of academic achievement in schools is evident. Characteristics and factors of effective schools, characterized by continual high student achievement, must be identified, defined and implemented if we are to increase student achievement and school success.

Definitions

Before an attempt is made to define and describe school learning climate, the concept of school climate should be described and defined so one can note the similarities and differences.

School learning climate should be distinguished from other uses of the term "school climate." School climate, when used to indicate the physical environment, the professional climate, the organizational climate, or other related terms, identifies dimensions of the school rather than achievement. These other "climates" are not unimportant and may, if broken down and defined further, describe an element

related to school learning climate. But, generally stated, the use of the term "school climate" does not refer to achievement (Brookover, Beamer, Eftim, Hathaway, Lezotte, Miller, Passalacqua, and Tornatzky, 1982).

In an almost all-encompassing description of school climate, Howard (1982) stated that, "School climate may be defined as the qualities of a school, and the people in that school, which affect how people feel while they are there. The term "climate" refers to the total environment--physical and psychological--to which people respond.

"Schools with positive climates are places where people care, respect, and trust one another, and where the school as an institution cares, respects, and trusts people. In such a school people feel a high sense of pride and ownership which comes from making the school a better place."

"Schools with positive climates are unified places. People know what their school stands for. In such schools the social groups (cliques) communicate with one another, respect one another, and work with one another for school improvement. They are constantly changing as people reshape them in accordance with human needs. In such schools, school improvement is everybody's business. They are characterized by people-centered belief and value systems, procedures, rules, regulations and policies. Conversely, schools with negative climates are characterized as being institution-centered rather than people centered. The mission of institution-centered schools is basically to tell people what to do."

School climate is more than good morale, more than a happy glow. It is a positive climate in which everyone focuses on school goals and student outcomes

as well as on personal relationships and salutary feelings. The ideal school climate engages everyone enthusiastically in achieving the individual and group goals at hand. Howell (1978) defines school climate as a learning atmosphere which is humane, communicative, compassionate, individually responsive, and all other terms that mean "treat my kid like he counts for something."

Dumaresq and Blust (1981) describe school climate as being formed by peoples' norms, beliefs and attitudes which impact on the conditions, events and practices of the school environment. Climate not only concerns beliefs and expectations about how people get along, but also how the organization, as a whole, works towards its goals--how decisions get made, problems get solved and people get rewarded or punished within the organizational structure.

Keefe (1985) defines school climate as the relatively enduring patterns of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members and is influenced by both the organizational and cultural inputs on one hand, and student outcomes on the other. Climate has a reciprocal shaping influence on organizational characteristics, teacher satisfaction and performance, and also on student satisfaction and achievement.

While many authors and researchers describe school climate in general, sometimes environmental terms, they do not focus on student achievement as the primary goal. It is the purpose of this study to focus on school learning climate factors that the author has identified and how they impact student learning and achievement.

Researchers have found differences in learning climate between schools which produce high levels of student achievement. General descriptions of school

learning climate include Brookover et al. (1982), who state effective school learning climate is comprised of appropriate conditions for learning. It refers to attitudinal and behavioral patterns in a school which affect levels of achievement.

Lezotte, Hathaway, Miller, Passalacqua, and Brookover (1980) define school learning climate as the norms, beliefs, and attitudes reflected in the institutional patterns and behavior practices that enhance or impede student learning.

For the purpose of this report, school learning climate relates to student achievement and those factors within a school that effect achievement. The school learning climate describes the school as a social system. A school's learning climate is the collective set of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors within that system. It goes beyond the individual to the group norms of a school. These norms tend to be maintained over time with new members being socialized into the prevailing set of behaviors. Effective school learning climate refers to the particular characteristics and patterns of attitudes, beliefs, norms, organizational structure, instructional and leadership behaviors which are associated with high achieving effective schools.

The use of the term "effective," as in "effective schools" or "effective learning climate," refers to student achievement as measured by standardized achievement tests, usually in reading and math. Thus, a school that continually demonstrates high student achievement on standardized achievement tests is termed "effective." This is not to suggest that such schooling outcomes are the only objectives that should be considered but rather that they are, for now, the only variables on which we can easily compare schools.

An effective school is one in which essentially all of the students acquire the basic skills and other desired behavior within the school. Effective schools provide a learning climate in which all students will achieve and learn skills and knowledge.

Sergiovanni (1987) stated that the term **effective** is commonly understood to mean the ability to produce a desired effect. Thus, in a sense any school that produces effects desired by some group is considered effective by that group. Again, an effective school is understood to be a school whose students achieve well in basic skills as measured by achievement tests.

Effective School Learning Climate Factors

To better describe what is meant by school learning climate, it is helpful to identify those factors or characteristics that authors and researchers equate with an effective school learning climate in an effective school.

Pinero (1982) identified several characteristics of an effective school: 1) strong leadership by the school principal, especially in the instructional program; 2) an atmosphere that is safe and orderly; 3) schoolwide agreement on goals that emphasize basic skills; 4) shared teacher expectations for high levels of achievement by all students; and 5) continuous assessment of pupil performance that is related to instructional objectives.

Shoemaker (1982) stated that an effective school that obtains high achievement test scores by their students possesses the following characteristics: 1) safe and orderly environment; 2) clear school mission; 3) effective instructional leadership; 4) high expectations; 5) opportunity to learn and significant time on task; 6) frequent monitoring of student progress; and 7) good home-school relations.

It should be pointed out that no single factor or group of factors is associated with effective schools. Rather, effective schools, when measured by positive student outcomes, are the result of an integrated set of practices. These practices include: 1) strong administrative leadership coupled with workable district policies and solid management practices; 2) an atmosphere that is "orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand;" 3) "a climate of expectation in which no student is permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement;" 4) a building-wide commitment to "pupil acquisition of basic school skills;" and 5) "some means. . . by which the principal and the teachers remain constantly aware of pupil progress" (Edmonds, 1979).

In 1982, Edmonds redefined his five characteristics of an effective school as 1) the principal's leadership and attention to the quality of instruction; 2) an orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning; 3) teacher behaviors that convey expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least minimum mastery; 4) a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus; and 5) the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation.

School learning climates are characterized by the degree to which they are effective in producing the desired learning outcomes among the students. Again, it is stressed that most uses of the term school climate do not pertain to student achievement. The school learning climate characteristics are specifically designed to explain their association with student achievement.

One limitation to this project is that this list is far from conclusive. Many school learning climate factors were identified by the various authors and

researchers as having an effect on student achievement. Only those factors mentioned consistently are described in this project. However, the factors described in this project do represent a good cross-section of research and literature. Also, this project may be slanted toward reporting on those school learning climate factors associated with student achievement as found in secondary schools. Most of the research was done in secondary schools, and what may work in a secondary school may not work in a middle, junior high, or elementary school.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

The review of the related literature and the research is the focus of this project. The objective of this review is to identify and examine further the relationships between ideology, organization and leadership of the school, and student achievement.

Previous research seemed to indicate that schools made little difference in the achievement outcomes of students beyond the influences of family background characteristics. Race and socioeconomic status (SES), used to represent family background, seemed to account for differences in achievement from school to school (Coleman et al., 1966; Jencks, Smith, Acland, Bane, Cohen, Gintis, Heyns, and Michelson, 1972). However, more recent research indicates that schools can and do make a difference in student outcomes.

Researchers today have emphasized the examination of specific school processes and behaviors associated with student attitude and achievement. Many have collected information by schools, grouped schools by students' socioeconomic status, and examined school and classroom processes in high and low achieving schools within similar socioeconomic categories to discover what might account for achievement differences (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker, 1979).

High achieving, low income schools have been identified and studied (Phi Delta Kappa, 1980; Weber, 1971). Hoover (1978) listed common characteristics of black schools functioning at and above grade level. Edmonds (1979) reviewed

other studies of exemplary schools which produce high-achieving students. Brookover and Schneider (1975) studied high and low achieving pairs of schools matched for SES, race, and rural-urban backgrounds. Brookover and Lezotte (1977) studied schools that were improving or declining in achievement over a period of three years. Brookover et al. (1979) analyzed a random sample of 91 elementary schools in Michigan. The findings of this research were substantiated by Lezotte et al. (1980).

School learning climate as it affects student achievement and behavior is documented in other countries: Israeli junior high schools (Chen & Fresko, 1978); high schools in Ireland (Madaus, Kellaghan, Rakow, & King, 1979); London, England high schools (Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, 1979). The results of the foreign studies support the work done in this country.

Since schools share a common function in society, there is some similarity in learning climates. On the other hand, different schools stress different "philosophies," instructional practices and methodologies, beliefs and expectations of students' abilities to learn. Consequently, school learning climate varies sufficiently to produce different levels of student achievement (Brookover et al., 1982).

The characteristics of schools with effective learning climates are classified under the following general headings: Ideology of the School, Organization of the School, and Leadership of the School. An overview of the literature and research supporting each factor will support their association to student achievement.

Ideology of the School

Ideology of the school was identified by Brookover (et al., 1982) as a key element exhibited by an effective school. Ideology refers to the general beliefs, norms, expectations, philosophies, missions, and feelings which characterize the social system of the school. Research on effective schools indicates rather clearly that schools with clear missions and beliefs, that value hard work on the educational tasks at hand, promote better achievement in the basic skills than do schools with flaccid social climates (Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin, 1983). Studies of instructionally effective schools indicate that they have a clearly defined mission: improving student achievement. Effective schools have beliefs and attitudes that guide the behavior of staff and students (Lipham, 1981).

The belief that students can learn and teachers can teach is an important ideological characteristic of an effective school learning environment. This belief must also be associated with the staff's expectation that all students can and will achieve at high levels. The expectations for students become generalized, then, into norms or standards of achievement. It is worth noting here that, for schools desiring to become more effective, changes in attitudes, beliefs and understanding may usually be followed by changes in behavior (Fullan, 1982).

Based upon the review of the literature, effective schools, as determined by high achievement test scores for their students and as characterized by the instructional staff, share these beliefs of all children: high expectations by staff affect student behavior; achievement tests are an appropriate measurement of school effectiveness; and self-concept affects student achievement.

1. A belief that all students are expected by staff to reach high levels of achievement.

Based on the work of Brookover and his associates (1973, 1977, 1979, 1982), one aspect that stands out in high-achieving schools is that clear expectations exist on the part of teachers that all students can be taught. What teachers expect, students are likely to learn. This is the essence of the importance of teacher expectations, described by Brookover et al. (1982) as the self-fulfilling prophecy. Teacher expectations constitute a major part in setting the learning climate in a school. While teacher expectations are often talked about, seldom is the true extent realized to which staff attitudes and behaviors influence students.

In summarizing the research, it can be said that teacher expectations are inferences and evaluations that teachers make about the present and future academic achievement and general classroom behavior of their students. Teacher expectations are based on numerous factors including such student data and characteristics as past grades, IQ, home and family background, opinions of other teachers, and so on. These sources help form the expectations. However, daily contact with students in the classroom further shapes and refines teachers' opinions and expectations--for example, students' work habits, motivation, behavior, and compliance with school rules.

In effective schools, the expectations for all students, established by their classroom teachers, are set high and remain high. In these schools, teachers and administrators hold higher academic and social behavior expectations for their students than do teachers and administrators in less effective schools (Good,

1979). Joyce et al. (1983) stated that in a high-expectation environment, the students achieve in a manner that surprises them.

Teachers and principals in higher achieving schools express the belief that students can master their academic work, and that they expect to do so, and they are committed to seeing that their students learn to read, and to do mathematics, and other academic work. These teacher and principal expectations are expressed in such a way that the students perceive that they are expected to learn and the school academic norms are recognized as setting a standard of achievement. These norms and the teachers' commitment are expressed in the instructional activities which absorb most of the school day (Brookover et al., 1979). This may be referred to as academically-engaged time, academic learning time, or time-on task.

Research in Michigan schools (Brookover et al., 1979) indicated that schools in which the staff evaluates students as slow or unable to learn and in which they hold low expectations for student achievement will be characterized by the students' high sense of futility in regard to school achievement. When the school is characterized by such beliefs and feelings, it is likely that the level of achievement will be low.

Teachers' expectations for individual students as well as for the class as a whole greatly influences the teachers' classroom behaviors and how they treat individual students. All teachers hold opinions regarding the abilities and personalities of their students. Some of these opinions are accurate; some are distorted. Some teachers make quick judgments regarding individual students.

The result of inaccurate or inflexible perceptions of students is inappropriate teacher behavior.

Within any classroom, there is a wide range of individual differences in students' abilities, personalities and other personal attributes including behavior. Teachers observe individual differences in students which results in personal judgments as to what the student is like, how the student should be taught and how well the student is likely to perform or behave in the future.

On the basis of those judgments, teachers then form attitudes or expectations toward individual students and their performance in school. Accordingly, teachers' behavior changes with individual students. High expectations are often held by teachers for students who are physically attractive, sit at the front and down the center aisles of the classroom, write neatly, speak standard English and are high achieving. Low expectations are often held by teachers for students who are lower SES, nonstandard English speaking, poorly groomed, sit in the back or on the sides of the classroom, have poor performance records and are low achievers (Good and Brophy, 1974).

Kelley (1980) offered that, because people act according to the expectations that others hold for their behavior, effective schools are characterized by 1) a shared belief that high levels of learning and achievement are possible for all students, and 2) teachers who are strongly committed to high expectations for students, and who accept responsibility for achieving stated goals.

This role of expectations on achievement is supported by Bloom (1976) who stated that "all children can learn what any child can learn." This philosophical belief is paramount to the operation of an effective school. He raised a

fundamental challenge to the accepted belief that school learning is normally distributed because of individual differences in learning. Austin (1979) offered support for this belief and notes that a school which produces high achievement assumes that all children can and will learn whatever the school defines as desirable and appropriate.

Hoover (1978) identified characteristics of black schools located in low income areas where students were working at or above grade level. The study contains a notable listing of reasons most educators give to rationalize why they cannot teach minority and/or low income students to read well. He states that successful schools reject those excuses and commit themselves to teaching all pupils to read well.

Shoemaker (1982) stated that, in more effective schools, there is a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that all students can attain mastery of basic skills and that they (the staff) have the capability to help all students attain mastery.

One aspect identified by Edmonds (1979) as being common in effective schools was "a climate of expectation in which no student is permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement." Rutter (1979) also found in his study that effective high schools in London had created a climate of high expectation for student success.

Dumaresq and Blust (1981), in their study on effective school research, cited high teacher expectations of students as a crucial factor in effective schools. High expectations and optimism stand out among students and teachers in effective schools.

What students need more than anything else is purpose: meaningful goals toward which to channel their energies. Goals are formed due to the presence of high expectations. Good and Brophy (1978) added that expectations need to be high, as low expectations are destructive because they reduce student's task motivation and the time and effort that they are willing to devote to activities. Low and inflexible expectations can be self-defeating. If a teacher perceives a student to be a low achiever for whatever reasons, and if a teacher sees this as a permanent condition, then that teacher will most likely be unsuccessful in teaching that student.

Brophy (1982) also stated that teachers who aim for success rates of 90% to 100% on student assignments produce more learning than teachers who tolerate higher failure rates. Student success in school is related directly to the teacher's expectations of student achievement. Edmonds (1979) concluded the same and offers, in effective schools, teachers expect and receive a basic level of successful achievement from all students.

Research conducted by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) tested the hypothesis that students, more often than not, do what is expected of them. To test this hypothesis, the two researchers conducted an experiment in a public elementary school of 650 students. The elementary school teachers were told that, on the basis of ability tests administered the previous spring, approximately one-fifth of the students could be expected to evidence significant increases in mental ability during the year. The teachers were given the names of the high-potential students. These names of the "high-potential" students had in fact been chosen at random by the experimenters; and, when intelligence tests and other

achievement tests were administered some months later, those identified as "high-potential" students tended to score significantly higher than the children who had not been so identified. The conclusion drawn by Rosenthal and Jacobson is that the teacher, through his facial expressions, postures, and touch, through what, how, and when he spoke, subtly helped the child to learn. The evidence suggests strongly that children who are expected by their teachers to gain intellectually in fact do show greater intellectual gains after one year than do children of whom such gains are not expected.

2. A belief that individual and schoolwide performance on achievement tests is an appropriate goal and measure of school effectiveness.

Bloom (1980) stated that periodic formative testing and corrective procedures can be effective as one way of insuring that excellent learning takes place. Other authors are in agreement. Sagalnik (1980) stated that effective schools pay considerable attention to test results. Wynne (1981) added that, through testing, good schools maintain systems for identifying students who are not performing at grade level.

The primary factor to consider when measuring the school learning climate is the achievement level in the building. If achievement is low, the learning climate is ineffective. However, building and classroom test results provide only a global indication of the level of the learning climate. Although these results, interpreted in terms of the learning climate, give an idea of how much improvement is needed, more precise instruments are necessary in order to know why a school learning climate is ineffective. On the other hand, the amount of information that can be obtained from various test data should not be downplayed. It is simply stressed

that student achievement results may be the only available source of information about the learning climate in a classroom or school.

Both formative pre-tests, largely diagnostic in nature, and summative post-tests, where mastery of objectives is expected should be available for teachers to measure all of the various objectives at appropriate times. The formative evaluation tests should be regarded as part of the learning process and should in no way be confused with a student's capabilities or used as part of the grading process. Teachers and other personnel in the school can contribute to and facilitate the development of such tests, but someone, generally the principal, should make certain that the appropriate tests are available and are representative of the learning objectives which the school has established. At the secondary level, department heads or other instructional leaders may play the appropriate role in developing and supplying the test instruments.

Administrators and teachers in high-achieving effective schools monitor student academic progress more frequently than do staffs in less effective schools. Such monitoring consists of a combination of more frequent classroom tests and quizzes; formal and informal; written and oral; schoolwide, districtwide, and nationwide. Most emphasis is placed on frequent in class monitoring coupled with direct and immediate feedback to students. Such frequent monitoring serves an important diagnostic function, prevents students from falling behind, and tells students that what is being taught is important.

3. A belief that self-concept is an important factor in student achievement.

Self-concept can be defined as the way we perceive ourselves and our actions, and our opinions regarding how others perceive us (Silvernail, 1981). The

relationship of academic achievement to self-concept has received a great deal of attention by researchers. Canfield and Wells (1976) stated that by the time a child reaches school age his self-concept is quite well formed and his reactions to learning, to school failure and success, and to the physical, emotional and social climate of the classroom will be determined by the beliefs and attitudes he has about himself. There is considerable evidence to support this. The most dramatic is that of Wattenberg and Clifford (1962), who studied kindergarten students in an attempt to see if self-concept was predictive of reading success two and a half years later. It was. In fact, it was a better predictor than IQ! Children with low (poor) self-concepts did not learn to read or did not learn to read as well as children with high (good) self-concepts.

Self-concept is a significant determinant of student achievement performance, regardless of the student's IQ, race, or family socio-economic position. Bloom (1977) suggests that "an individual develops a positive self-regard and a strong ego by continual evidence of his (or her) adequacy--especially in early childhood and in the periods of latency (ages 6-11) and adolescence . . . since formal schooling occupies these latter two periods, we regard continual evidence of success or failure in the school as likely to have major effects on the individual's mental health." A review of the literature reveals that investigators have attempted to explore this question from almost every angle.

The relationship between student self-concept and achievement has been demonstrated in a wide range of academic areas. Most findings have indicated a significant and positive relationship between the two variables. High self-concept is concomitant with high achievement, low self-concept with low achievement. For

an example, high-achieving intermediate grade students were found to have significantly higher general self-concepts and academic self-concepts than low-achieving peers (Farls, 1967). Similar findings were reported for the relationship between reading and math achievement and self-concept (Williams and Cole, 1968). In a study of eleventh grade over- and underachievers, Farquhar (1968) found that students who exhibited high academic productivity levels tended to have higher self-concepts. Fink (1962) and Shaw (1961) found underachievers with more negative self-concepts than achievers.

At first, these differences in self-concept levels of achievers and underachievers might appear to be attributable to differences in intelligence. However, a study by Brookover (1965) involving over one thousand seventh grade students found that the positive relationship between achievement and self-concept remains intact even after IQ scores are factored out. Shaw (1963) revealed evidence that intelligent underachieving high school male students have more negative self-concepts than students of equal intelligence who are achieving at their ability levels. He found that achievement and self-concept are related and their relationship could not be accounted for solely on the basis of intelligence.

Brookover (1965) studied the "self" reports of more than 1,000 7th grade white students in an urban school district. The Self Concept of Ability Scale was given to each student to determine each individual's concept of ability in both general and specific subject areas. IQ was factored out. The results indicated the students' reported concepts of ability and grade-point averages were positively and significantly correlated. Brookover and his colleagues concluded: 1) the relationship between self-concept and grades is substantial even when IQ is

controlled; 2) specific self-concepts of ability are related to specific academic areas and differ from the self-concepts of general ability; 3) self-concept is significantly and positively correlated with the perceived evaluations of the student by others; and 4) self-concept of academic ability is associated with academic achievement at each grade level.

Canfield and Wells (1976) found that other studies affirm the position that self-concept is related to achievement in school; they indicate that the relationship is particularly strong in boys, that it begins to make itself evident as early as first grade, and that learning difficulties experienced in early school years persist. Finally, they say that it is possible to change self-concepts, and it is possible for teachers to effect the changes--either way, positive and negative.

Purkey (1970) stated that how a student views himself or herself, and his or her world, are products of how others see that person and are primary forces in academic achievement. He found that cognitive learning increases when self-concept increases. He also found that people are more functional when they think well of themselves. "Self-concept is a significant determinant of student achievement performance."

What principles should guide the teacher's actions in working with students to attain higher achievement? Canfield and Wells state: "The prevention of negative self-concepts is a vital first step in teaching. A child's self-concept decreases with repeated academic failure and is influenced by the type of classroom environment created for students. Secondly, teachers who view themselves in a positive manner will project these images to their students and will provide valuable role models for them. Teachers who have realistic conceptions

of themselves, who are accepting of themselves and others, and who accent their positive attributes will help students make realistic assessments and begin to view themselves in a positive light. Furthermore, how the teacher views his/her students will have an impact on the students' self-concept. A student's self-concept is influenced by the student's perception of the teacher's feelings toward him/her, and a teacher's expectations are oftentimes transferred to the student. Thus, teachers who view their students in a positive way and project favorable expectations will promote positive self-concept development."

Numerous researchers have examined the relationship between academic achievement and self-concept. With a few exceptions, the findings have indicated a significant and positive relationship between the two variables. High self-concept is related to high achievement, low self-concept with low achievement. Every child wants to be known as a unique person, and that by holding the student in esteem, the teacher is establishing an environmental climate that facilitates academic growth.

Purkey (1970) stated that "we in education have the responsibility, within the limits of our training, to investigate, to understand, and to utilize the self concept as a means of facilitating scholastic success." As educators, then, it behooves us to identify strategies for developing and enhancing the self-concepts of our students.

The belief that all students can learn, even when accompanied by high expectations, appropriate testing, and sensitivity to student self-concept, is not sufficient to produce learning. This positive ideology of beliefs, norms and expectations must be accompanied by a school social organization which defines

learning as desirable and rewards effective teaching as well as effective learning. Furthermore, students do not learn simply because of these norms and beliefs. The school as an organization must be designed in such a way as to promote learning and achievement. Some type of effective leadership in the school, especially in the instructional program, must also be directed toward the learning of specific kinds of behavior.

Organization of the School

In an excellent paper prepared for the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Dumaresq and Blust (1981) state:

"During the 60's and early 70's, faculties were bombarded with improvement methodologies. Sensitivity training, teacher effectiveness training and a variety of other attitudinal change and skill building approaches were literally laid on faculties.

The message became clear. Teachers were to blame for lack of student achievement. Teachers needed to be improved. So usually, without their consent, they were "inserviced" so that they would "learn" how to teach better. Unfortunately, programs which tried to change peoples' (parents, teachers, and students) attitudes and values by preaching or telling were unsuccessful."

They go on to state that students were also blamed during this period, citing behavior modification programs, alternative schools and other programs which "sought to cast blame on the students for not succeeding or not behaving the way the school demanded." Parents and the home environment also received a share of blame for lack of student achievement. Labeling and stigmatizing of students became a real concern for educators as students were separated and placed into special programs.

It became increasingly clear, then, that changing teacher, parent or student expectations is not successful when negative blaming or "finger-pointing" is used. Finding someone or something to blame doesn't work because people tend to get caught up in defense or in finding new groups to blame rather than finding first, the

real problems and secondly, solutions to the problems. Second, if attitudes are to be changed, a program must aim to change the conditions under which people work and the way they relate to one another. Telling people to change just does not work. As Dumaresq and Blust stated, "The focus should be on changing the organization. By helping people change the way they related and behave within an organization with one another, there is a strong likelihood that beliefs, values, and attitudes about working and learning in school will be changed."

In an organization, the people operate within a general environment created by the policies and practices of top management. This may be referred to as the organizational climate. The climate is established, for the most part, by how leaders and followers relate to each other. Appropriate organizational climates establish a balance between achievement of organizational goals and personal satisfaction of the work force.

The environment of a school or classroom has a profound effect on the satisfaction and achievement of its students. Schools with positive climates are places where people respect, trust, and help one another; and where the school as an organization projects a "feeling" that fosters both trust and learning. In the best of these schools, people exhibit a strong sense of pride, ownership and personal productivity that comes from helping to make the school a better place (Keefe, 1987).

People who spend a lot of time in schools find themselves describing them in climate terms. One might, for example, describe a school as a "warm, friendly place" or as a "cold, uncaring place;" as supportive and productive, or manipulative and disorganized. It is also apparent that some schools place an emphasis on

learning that is communicated to students. Others fail to convey a sense of that commitment. Schools, like people, have organizational personalities.

The school is a learning and a living center. When people begin taking mutual responsibility for the well-being of the school, when a sense of group mission is cultivated through the establishment of mutually beneficial, sound goals and objectives, and when people feel good and proud about what they are doing, the results may be astonishing.

This refined organizational system is effective and efficient; sensitive and responsive to its members; flexible, innovative, and nonhierarchical; has a clearly defined mission; and is powerfully productive. In short, this organization possesses many common organizational characteristics found in more effective schools.

If it is to be effective, the organizational pattern of the school must recognize and support elements, factors, and characteristics which foster effectiveness. Brookover (et al., 1982) emphasized that the school functions as a social system, a collective of various members occupying a range of roles and positions of status in a social organization. Every social organization has some purpose or goals which presume to direct and justify it. Achievement of the goals of an organization is highly related to the structure of the organization. For instance, Champlin (1987) stated that "schools should be organized according to what we know young people learn, not according to the customary and usual dictates of convenience and ease in moving numbers of young people. However, as Brookover et al. (1982) stated, social organizations frequently have their original intent displaced by secondary or unintended purposes.

The following list of common organizational climate elements and factors characteristic of more effective schools is presented and described.

1. High degree of trust.

Gibb (1978) stated that one can achieve organizational effectiveness using trust as the cornerstone of an organizational foundation. He suggests that the principal who is trusting will be more allowing, open, personal, and interdepending in the performance of administrative functions. The principal who is low in trust will be more closed, controlling persuasive, and depersonalizing.

Organizational development focusing on the creation of an open and trusting climate was found to be an effective way to promote both individual and organizational effectiveness. Gibb also believes that a high-quality environment (one in which trust is high) is vital for an organization to effectively attain its goals. Hollon and Gemmill (In McCarthy, 1977) concurred, and stated that in their study of 321 community college faculty members, trust was positively associated with and could be developed by allowing for participatory decision-making.

Argyris (1964) believed that under a climate of trust, workers increase their opportunities for psychological success. "Psychological success is created by the absence of stringent control mechanisms imposed by management and this is reciprocated by worker awareness of legitimate needs of the organization. Trust is the ingredient that facilitates psychological success where all organizational members are involved without focusing on the motives of each other."

Trust in relationships is cited as a primary principle of operations. "Without trust," Ouchi (1981) stated, "any human relationship will inevitably degenerate into conflict. With trust, anything is possible."

Trust has a relationship to how people treat others, how people are perceived, the effectiveness of personal as well as organizational communication, organizational theory, and the degree to which people are intrinsically motivated. Creating high trust environments would seem to facilitate establishing a favorable and healthy situation for both individual as well as organizational needs (McCarthy, 1986).

2. High level of satisfaction and morale.

Satisfaction and morale are attitudinal variables which reflect positive or negative feelings about a particular situation or person(s) (Gorton, 1983). The two concepts are often used synonymously with job satisfaction in the educational literature, as the state of one's morale reflects the extent of his satisfaction with a situation, person, or job.

The concepts of satisfaction, morale, and motivation have been linked to effective schools and refer to both students and teachers. In a comparison of teachers in lower-achieving schools to teachers in higher-achieving schools, teachers in the higher-achieving schools reported being more satisfied with the various aspects of their work. The relationship between achievement and morale was studied by the First National City Bank of New York City (1969). The results of the study found that significant improvement in reading skills was related to high teacher morale.

Many attempts have been made to define the terms "satisfaction" and "morale." The term "satisfaction, as it applies to the work context seems to refer to the degree to which an individual can meet his personal and professional needs in the performance of his duty. "Morale," on the other hand, as defined in the

educational literature seems to hold a broader meaning. Gross and Herriott (1965), in their study of staff leadership in the schools, identified the following six indices of morale: 1) Displays a sense of pride in the school, 2) Enjoys working in the school, 3) Displays a sense of loyalty to the school, 4) Works cooperatively with fellow teachers, 5) Accepts the educational philosophy underlying the curriculum of the school, and 6) Respects the judgment of the school administrators.

Gorton (1983) stated that, "However one chooses to define satisfaction and morale, it seems clear that they are viewed as desirable goals for school organizations." He goes on to state that a basic principle of personnel relations has long been the idea that a satisfied employee, one with high morale and satisfaction, is "likely to get along better with co-workers, will be more accepting of management's directives, will be more committed to achieving organizational goals, and in general will be more productive." This belief persists despite rather limited supportive research. There is little hard evidence to support the basic premise regarding the purported outcomes of high staff satisfaction and morale. In fact, at present there is no conclusive evidence that a satisfied employee with high morale is necessarily a motivated or productive employee. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to assume that a dissatisfied employee with low morale is not likely to be a maximally motivated and productive worker.

High staff satisfaction and morale can be considered either as ends in themselves or as necessary conditions for achieving the educational objectives of the school. Gorton's (1983) position was that high staff satisfaction and morale may be desirable as ends in themselves, but their primary value is in helping to achieve other kinds of worthwhile goals. These goals would include staff stability,

cohesiveness, and increased effectiveness. Although research on the consequences of high or low staff satisfaction and morale is not conclusive, it would appear that the extent of staff satisfaction and morale can influence the degree to which goals previously mentioned can be achieved (Gorton, 1982). For these reasons, schools as organizations must understand better the factors which contribute to low or high staff satisfaction and morale, and based on that understanding should develop conditions which will build and maintain the latter.

Closely related to satisfaction and morale is motivation. As defined by Gorton (1983), motivation is an intrinsic drive toward the fulfillment of personal needs and the improvement of one's perceived status. Motivation is influenced strongly by extrinsic factors such as personal values, past achievement, important people in the individual's life, and significant emotional experiences. In practice, the highly motivated individual is a goal setter and a goal achiever. The motivated person enjoys an acute understanding of needs, values, and strengths.

Gorton (1982) believed that "the most prominent--and common--component of successful schools is a motivated teaching staff. A motivated faculty, one that "makes things happen," is the one constant for all good schools. Without this critical factor the school tends to become ordinary and routine."

In 1983, Gorton concluded, "Motivation is the key to a successful school. It is the difference between achieving students and unachieving students, good and poor teachers, effective and ineffective administrators; and ultimately it makes the difference between successful and unsuccessful school programs. Where motivation exists, growth occurs. Where growth occurs there are happy and

fulfilled people. Motivation, goal achievement, and growth are habit forming and they enhance self-concept."

A recommended approach to increasing staff satisfaction, morale, and motivation is that of providing greater incentives, recognition, and rewards (Gorton, 1983). Chapman and Lowther (1981) found in their study that the recognition actually received from administrators and supervisors had a strong positive relationship to the career satisfaction of teachers. Greater recognition by administrators and supervisors was related to greater job satisfaction.

Miller and Swick (1976) proposed a large number of incentives and reward systems which they believe will motivate teachers to perform better, such as 1) acknowledgement of efforts by teachers for self-improvement, 2) compensation to encourage teacher self-improvement, 3) rewards for teacher accomplishments, and 4) community recognition of teacher efforts.

The study of satisfaction, morale, and motivation is not limited to reviewing the actions of teachers. When students learn the joy of working productively toward common goals, motivation inevitably improves.

In a review of the literature on intrinsic reward systems of the classroom, the most important satisfaction reported by teachers was the knowledge that they had induced students to learn. The dominant motivation and source or reward for teachers lies in promoting student growth and development. However, Brookover et al. (1977) found that effective schools have a system of clear and public rewards and incentives for student achievement. "Public display of excellent student work, honor roll published in the local newspaper, convocations to honor student excellence, notes sent home to parents, and statements and smiles serve to

motivate and sustain students' achievement of a school's high expectations for them." For teachers, public praise via the school newsletter, written praise with a copy going into the personnel records, appointment to an important committee, and sometimes just a "pat on the back" all help to motivate and energize those who do a good job.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) stated that an effective school recognizes students who exemplify desired behaviors. But the challenge is how we can provide opportunities and rewards for individuals of every degree of ability so that individuals at every level will realize their full potentialities, perform at their best, and harbor no resentment toward any other level.

3. Opportunity for input.

Every person cherishes the opportunity to contribute ideas and an effective organization provides for this opportunity. The research is very consistent on this subject.

Mitchell and Peters (1988), noting that "good schools are the best incentives for good teachers," suggested that participation in school governance is the most important organizational incentive for professional development. Peters and Waterman (1980) found that workers who were given the freedom to determine some of their own goals and the autonomy to develop strategies to achieve them, outperformed their more rigidly controlled counterparts again and again. In fact, providing for this opportunity was found to increase motivation and morale.

Purkey (1970) also noted that shared decision-making leads to increased job satisfaction. He also found that involving the staff in the diagnostic process is likely to have beneficial consequences for their sense of commitment to and

responsibility for the improvement plan based on that analysis. He stated, "Forcing people to change without providing them any choice diminishes their sense of responsibility and is not conducive to feelings of ownership and commitment." Providing a "workplace democracy" increased productivity and job satisfaction.

Little (1981) stated that "bringing faculty and administrators together to discuss the issue of school goals may be the significant factor in any event because the process can promote a shared language and can lead to collaborative work and collegial relations."

In 1976, Madden, Lawson and Sweet (in Dumaresq and Blust, 1981) studied 21 high-achieving schools paired with 21 low-achieving schools. They found that in comparison to the teachers of lower-achieving schools, teachers at higher-achieving schools believed their faculty as a whole had more influence on educational decisions.

Rutter (1979) and Edmonds (1980) suggested that one factor of effective schools was the degree to which faculties worked together to decide curriculum and to resolve school problems. In effective schools, faculties participated in ongoing decision making activities related to their schools.

Usually things have been "done" to teachers. They have been trained, sensitized, improved, modified and coerced into various behaviors which were often fads of the times. Rarely, was a faculty asked what it wanted, what it saw as important, and how it could mobilize to solve a critical issue (Dumaresq and Blust, 1981).

4. Safe and orderly environment.

In an effective, high-achieving school, administrators, teachers and students agree on basic rules of conduct. Each person may expect that such rules will be uniformly enforced, be they about property, courtesy, or cooperation and that all teachers will work together to ensure this observance. The attitude of each teacher is, "I will enforce the norms whether or not the students is in my particular class." (Joyce et al., 1983).

Brookover (1982) suggested the problems of school and classroom discipline cannot be understood fully apart from their relation to achievement. There is considerable evidence that educationally-oriented strategies with positive learning environments are associated with better discipline. His following points support this.

1. The school learning climate must be the emphasis of the school. When learning and achievement are not the priority goal, other behaviors detract time and effort from this fundamental purpose.

2. Schools sometimes get so caught up in how to deal with problem students that they forget why misbehavior occurs. Overwhelmingly problem children are those pupils with learning problems whom schools are not reaching. Students know that they go to school to learn. When they are unsuccessful at this, they turn to other means to satisfy their needs for success and attention. Any effective program of school discipline must meet those educational needs.

The concern for an orderly and disciplined school climate is not to be equated with oppression. Holt (1964) and Kozol (1967), critics of "oppressive schools," made their point very well that some came to believe that a disciplined

environment as such is oppressive. Not so, stated Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin (1983). "Chaos is oppressive and confusing." Effective schools seem to find that happy medium between strong discipline and respect and support for growing students. Joyce et al. stated that "effective schools recognize order as a social necessity, not a rigid order that snuffs out spontaneity and individualism, but a strong norm to keep on with the business of learning. The solitude of a tomb is not required but neither is the noise of a circus tolerated."

Edmonds (1979) described effective schools as attractive, clean, organized, secure and have adequate instructional space. They also maintain high standards of cleanliness and plant maintenance. Edmonds also listed five factors that he believes to be the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools. Included in that list was "an orderly, though not rigid, atmosphere that is conducive to performing the primary task of the school, instruction."

Austin (1979) viewed effective schools as characteristically quiet and clean, with a positive physical appearance. Shoemaker (1982) described a set of characteristics that separate the more effective schools from the less effective schools. First on her list is safe and orderly environment, which she defines as "an orderly, purposeful atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm. The climate is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning."

In their formal and informal studies of effective principals, Sashkin and Huddle (1988) found that effective school principals first establish a safe and secure physical setting. "Each person in the school may expect that rules and regulations will be uniformly enforced, be it chewing gum, running in the hallway, hitting

another person, stealing from another person, or showing disregard for school property."

It is emphasized that the school functions as a social system, a collection of various members occupying a range of roles, positions of status in a social organization. When trust is laid as a cornerstone, the foundation of the organization will be solid. When an organization strives to satisfy the needs of its employees, the increased morale sparks drive and motivation which, in turn, increase productivity. When employees are given an opportunity for their voices to be heard, they will respond by demonstrating accountability and responsibility at the workplace. When an organization has established a safe and orderly environment, it allows for productive work to take place without disruption.

It is logical to assume that in an unsafe and disorderly climate, teaching and learning would be adversely, negatively effected and the opportunities for student achievement greatly diminished. It does not mean, however, that schools, in an attempt to become effective, must establish tight rules and regulations, policies and procedures. Take broken windows. It isn't so much whether schools get windows broken, it's how long the windows remain unrepaired. It isn't so much whether the drinking fountains don't work, it's how long they don't work. There are many schools in which some teachers walk through the building or the parking lot ignoring everything they see because they disclaim responsibility for any activity outside their classroom. One of the reasons effective schools are relatively quiet is that all teachers take responsibility for all students, all the time, everywhere in the school.

Every social organization has some purpose or goals which direct and justify it. Therefore, schools that wish to be effective in producing high levels of student achievement should examine their goals and objectives carefully. If the students in school are not already achieving at high levels, the accomplishment of that goal will involve some changes in the schools' operation and organization.

Common ideological and organizational factors characteristic of school learning climates associated with high levels of student achievement have been identified. The process of creating the kind of learning environment needed for increased student achievement must be the responsibility of a strong leader. Studies indicate that school principals can be change agents in modifying the nature and structure of the school and its effectiveness in bringing students to high levels of achievement. It is certainly not likely that a school will have high achieving students if the principal and other leaders in the school do not openly seek to achieve that goal. It is therefore essential that the principal provide strong leadership or at least actively support other staff to bring about needed changes.

Leadership of the School

Researchers are emphasizing the examination of specific school processes and behaviors associated with student attitude and achievement. Many have collected information by schools, grouped schools by students' socioeconomic status, and examined administrative and instructional processes in high and low achieving schools within similar socioeconomic categories to discover what might account for achievement differences. Among the many variables examined, the leadership of the principal invariably has emerged as a key factor in the success of the school.

The reviews of effective leadership, especially from the effective schools research, indicate that effective institutions have strong leaders. Effective, high-achieving schools have administrative leaders, most often principals, who are advocates for and facilitators of the previous set of factors identified. Such leadership does not mean that the principal, for example, must do the curriculum revision, or be the master teacher, or conduct the teachers' evaluation; rather, it means that the principal is a person who helps to make sure these tasks are carried out appropriately. Such a person listens to staff requests and seeks to support these requests whenever possible and reasonable. This leader initiates dialogues concerning expectations, schoolwide rules, and the establishment of a good testing program. Most essentially, with such leadership, the administration is seen by both teachers and students as supportive, caring, and trusting, all of which helps create a climate for excellence.

Researchers have found that students in schools where the principal was a strong leader achieved significantly higher gains in reading and math over a two-

year period, compared with students in schools where the principal was an average or weak leader (Andrews and Soder, 1987). Cawelti (1980) also found significant correlations between student achievement and school characteristics. "High-achieving schools almost uniformly have principals who display strong leadership."

Over the years as a reporter, Lipham (1983) noted that he had never seen a good school with a poor principal or a poor school with a good principal. "I have seen unsuccessful schools turned around into successful ones and, regrettably, outstanding schools slide rapidly into decline. In each case, the rise or fall could be readily traced to the quality of the principal."

During a study of effective schools, journalists in a fellowship program at George Washington University's Institute for Educational Leadership visited schools across the country that were generally viewed as effective or that had higher student achievements than would ordinarily be expected. They learned that the principal emerges as the one who sets the focus, direction, philosophy, and tone of these schools (Brundage, 1980).

Robert Benjamin of The Cincinnati Post observed: "Good principals tend to rock the boat. They forsake the desire to be loved for the hard task of monitoring students' progress. They set achievement goals for their students, and they judge their teachers and themselves by them." (Benjamin, 1979).

Pope (1979) wrote that "Effective schools have effective leaders . . . usually described as people who have high expectations for staff and students, are knowledgeable in their jobs and set the tone for their schools."

Even though the reviews of effective leadership indicate that effective educational institutions have strong leaders, the qualities and characteristics identifying a strong leader are not clear (Guild, 1987). In a three-year study of successful instructional leaders, Dwyer (1984) reported that he found no single image or simple formula for successful instructional leadership.

In a five-year study at the University of Texas at Austin, Rutherford (1985) reported five essential qualities of effective principals: having a vision, identifying goals, creating a supportive climate, monitoring progress, and intervening appropriately. He was then asked whether effective leaders were all alike. He answered both yes and no. "Yes, effective school leaders will demonstrate the five essential qualities of leadership in their work. But no, they will not demonstrate these qualities through identical day-to-day behaviors."

In a review of the literature on leadership traits, the studies failed to support the assumption that a person must possess certain traits in order to be a successful leader. In some ways as Guild (1987) pointed out, . . . "this finding, frequently cited in the literature, is frustrating. But it is also an exciting and liberating conclusion that allows leadership to emerge in different ways for different people."

According to Batsis (1987), recent business and management publications have emphasized the topic of excellence. Numerous books and journal articles attempting to discern key characteristics of excellent organizations have almost without exception concentrated on the pivotal role played by the executive. "These business and management leaders possess a common set of characteristics and practices distinguishing them from the less successful executive." A similar

movement has been taking place in education. Dissatisfaction with the lack of achievement in schools has resulted in a number of publications dealing with the topic of excellence. While successful business executives are thought to possess certain characteristics, no consensus exists concerning educational leaders' roles. In a thorough review of the literature and research, though, five commonalities do exist that aptly describe the principal of an effective school.

1. Sense of vision.

To Deal (1987), the "quality of organizations of the future will be those in which leaders have created artful ways to reweave organizational tapestries from old traditions, current realities, and future visions." Owens (1987) stressed that "the vision must have some quality that can stir the human consciousness or others and induce their commitment to sharing it as their own purpose." Guild (1987) declared that "perhaps the first and most important (aspect of leadership) is the sense of vision, purpose, and mission that the leader holds." Green (1987) contended that "moral problems of educational leaders occur because they lack a clear vision of that their practice is centrally about--to educate."

According to Sheive and Schoenheit (1987), "Vision is a blueprint of a desired state. It is an image of a preferred condition that we work to achieve in the future." Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) related vision to "moral imagination" that "gives that individual the ability to see that the world need not remain as it is--that it is possible for it to be otherwise--and to be better."

Principals of effective schools articulate a vision concerning the school (Sergiovanni, 1984). While this vision certainly encompasses goals and objectives,

it is much more comprehensive. These leaders have a perspective allowing them to see how a particular task or program fits into a much broader scheme.

The Phi Delta Kappa study of effective urban schools (1980) concluded "the key to a school's success is the principal principle: the notion that a strong administrator with vision and with ability to carry out his or her goals can make an enormous difference in a school."

Persell (1982) stated that the implication in the literature is that "an effective principal has a clear vision of his/her goals and is strongly oriented to those goals. This vision is reflected in the principal's long-term goals and visions for their schools and teachers. It was also important for the principal to have this vision, or else he/she spent too much time putting out "brush fires."

School leaders must project energy, commitment, and a clear vision of the school's mission and core values. In schools that lack a vision, the principal works with the staff to develop one. When this vision emphasizes collaborative growth and planning and nurtures peer support, school learning climate becomes enhanced.

2. Clearly stated expectations for staff and students.

In effective, high-achieving schools, principals have clearly stated expectations for staff and student body. Bennis and Nanus (1985) referred to this practice as "trust through positioning." "People are not left wondering where they stand, they know." By contrast, Batsis (1987) identified a major complaint of teachers in marginal schools is that they seldom find clearly stated expectations. "All too often they feel frustrated by a series of conflicting demands that are at best

confusing. Interestingly enough, teachers in effective schools are not always in agreement with the principal's expectations, but that is not the point. Rather, they understand what is expected and can then discuss this matter on an objective basis with their supervisor. Clarity of purpose is the distinguishing note of such conferences."

Brookover et al. (1979) found that one indicator of consensus on and commitment to the goal of academic achievement is reflected in the way principals expected teachers to give of their personal time. "In schools with higher achievement, teachers were willing to do this, but in those with lower achievement, teachers were not willing to give extra time unless they were paid for it."

It should be noted that expectations should not only be clearly communicated, they should also be high and reachable. According to Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa, and Mitman (1983), high expectations for students has been cited as a critical factor in several studies of effective teaching and schooling. "High expectations for student performance among the school staff communicate the belief that all students can succeed in school. Academic excellence is not treated by the principal and faculty as the province of a select group of students. The principal has control over several policy areas that have an impact upon the staff's expectations, like student grouping, remediation, grading, reporting student progress, and classroom instructional practices."

Hallinger et al. stated that the principal is able to reinforce high expectations by establishing academic standards and incentives for student learning. These become part of the structure within which learning takes place in the school. "This function is particularly important because, in contrast to most of the other

leadership functions, it represents ways in which the principal can have a direct impact on student achievement."

In its most specific form, Persell (1982) noted that principals set a clear achievement goal, e.g., "Sixty percent of the students were to read at grade level or above" by a specific time. Venezky (1979) found that this clearly stated objective was correlated with improved reading scores in elementary schools.

3. Effective communication skills.

Effective communication, a characteristic intimately related to vision and expectations, is a key leadership quality. The principal is probably engaged in the process of communication more often than any other process, with the possible exception of decision-making. In order to persuade, instruct, direct, request, present, ask, or stimulate understanding, the principal must communicate.

For example, an administrator may wish to bring to the faculty's attention that there has been too much noise in the hallways during the week, and that the staff should increase their efforts to keep noise to a minimum. This is the message. In delivering the message, he has a choice of several different media for communication. He could write a memo, present the message at a faculty meeting, or have an assistant "pass the word." Each of these deliveries possesses advantages for delivering this message, depending on the principal's skill in communicating, the type of group to whom the message is delivered, and the nature of the circumstances surrounding the message.

Communicating is one of the most important administrative processes (Gorton, 1983). " By the very nature of the job, the principal communicates with a variety of people, including students, teachers, parents, and district office

personnel. The principal's success in working with these people and in productively carrying out his other responsibilities will be greatly influenced by the extent to which he can effectively communicate."

As the previous two qualities emphasized communication from the leader, truly effective leaders have built two-way patterns of communication. Such leaders establish a series of formal and informal channels allowing communication to flow freely in their direction.

The principal and his building should both have effective communications plans which should be consistent with district communications plans and policies, but parts of that plan should allow for the uniqueness of each school. A high quality newsletter, a sound working relationship with both parents groups and teachers, involvement of staff and community in planning new programs and approaches, working well with the news media, and a host of other approaches will enhance a building level communications program.

According to McCurdy (1983), "If principals and their assistants reserve time to carefully plan their school communications program and philosophy, they should see a significant improvement not only in communications, but in general school climate as well as staff morale and job satisfaction. Since school communications are so vital to the success of all educational pursuits, the communications philosophy deserves top priority from the administrative team." Therefore, six key communications attitudes identified by McCurdy are needed by administrators:

1. Desire to communicate and be communicated with.
2. Willing to listen--including the bad news.
3. Seeking to understand as well as to be understood.

4. Having the courage to say it as it is.
5. Maintain an open door--including going to people.
6. Making time available to circulate and chat with staff.

Nowhere is effective communication more important than in the evaluation process. Poor communication about the evaluation process can result in uncertainty and anxiety on the part of staff members. They don't know what to expect from the evaluation and, therefore, they may not participate cooperatively in the process or accept the administrator's findings or conclusions. Although most staff members are aware that the process of evaluation involves observation by an evaluator and a follow-up conference to discuss the results of the evaluation, questions about the nature, time, and frequency of observations and conferences are not resolved. And in many cases, teachers are observed for the purpose of evaluation without their possessing first hand knowledge of the criteria on which they are to be evaluated. The purposes, criteria, and procedures of staff evaluation need to be clearly communicated periodically to all staff members.

4. Strong instructional leadership.

Although the principal may have many other functions in operating a school organization, the leadership role in establishing an effective instructional program in the school is foremost. The particular style of leadership is perhaps less important than the accomplishment of the tasks that need to be done by the instructional leader. Some may accomplish the task by directive methods. Others may be successful through indirect methods, like mobilizing other personnel to achieve desired tasks and responsibilities.

Someone in the school, ideally the principal must provide leadership to establish clearly identified and specific learning objectives at each grade level and for each course. Unless all members of the organization understand what is to be achieved, they are likely to go in many different directions. Agreement on the objectives is essential for evaluating the school's effectiveness. It is unlikely that a single individual, even the most directive principal, can identify and specify all of the objectives at the various levels, but he should provide the leadership to see that this is done.

Effective principals emphasize the instructional leadership role by observing classroom teaching and communicating with staff about what is observed. In addition to classroom observation, these leaders interact in a variety of settings with teachers, staff, students and parents throughout the school day. The message being conveyed should be clear: this principal knows what is going on in the building. These school administrators, by their high visibility emphasize what Sergiovanni (1984) defined as cultural or symbolic leadership. These principals understand their role in transmitting and nurturing the culture of the school. The point of understanding the schools' culture is often missed by the inexperienced administrator who sets out to become a change agent without first attending to the task of learning the schools' culture (Batsis, 1987).

A number of reports emphasize the role of the principal as the instructional leader of the schools (Edmonds, 1979; Venezky, 1979). Batsis (1987) declared that effective principals are instructional leaders by virtue of their ability to recognize effective instruction, knowledge of curriculum, and skills in interpreting group

testing results. Venezky (1979) found that the principals in schools with higher reading scores were "openly and obviously achievement-oriented."

In the simplest terms, effective principals are able to identify quality instruction and support this conclusion with sound reasoning. The result is that principal and teacher have a common language and basis for discussing the learning process. It is possible that the principal and teacher may disagree over methodology; however, they have a medium allowing for a sharing of understandings.

Another aspect of technical knowledge concerns curriculum. Effective principals have studied curriculum theory and design, and are able to place the theoretical within the concrete experience of their backgrounds as instructors. Effective educational leaders have the ability to communicate this technical knowledge of the curriculum in such a way as to instill confidence in the staff when planning changes in school programs.

Several studies of educational innovation clearly indicated that the principal was a major factor in the success of educational improvement projects. Despite the concept of "principal-as-instructional leader," only a few studies have directly asked whether the principal's performance as an instructional leader has any bearing on school effectiveness and student achievement. Cotton and Savard (1980), though, reviewed seven of these "valid, relevant studies" and found support for the hypothesis that "active instructional leadership on the part of elementary school principals has a positive effect on the academic achievement of students." Among the specific principal behaviors that promoted student achievement were clear communication of expectations to staff, frequent classroom observation and/or participation in instruction, communication of high expectations for

instructional programs, and active involvement in planning and evaluation of the educational program.

To what extent does the principal of a school provide educational leadership that has a discernible impact on the learning of pupils? Smyth (1980) suggested that this question has not been clearly answered by educational researchers; however, "both intuition and the few studies that are available indicate that in schools where principals are closely involved with instructional matters, students do better on achievement tests." He cites one recent study that found higher student achievement in schools with principals who "felt strongly about instruction, frequently discussed teaching with teachers, and took responsibility for coordinating the instructional program."

"If future school principals are to deserve the title of educational leaders," said Smyth, "they will need to concentrate on acquiring new skills and a new orientation. They will have to learn that the classroom is the focal point of all activities, that the concerns and issues of teachers and students are the most important in the school, and that teachers must be frequently provided with objective feedback to improve the quality of their instruction. A principal who demonstrates that instructional matters are the primary concern of the school will influence teachers to think likewise."

Like everything in schools, the learning climate depends on leadership. Effective leaders of schools with good learning climate are concerned with vision (what currently exists and what could exist) and with people--not just with the nuts and bolts. They emphasize their organization's basic purposes, and they communicate actively and effectively with their staff. They enunciate their vision

with clarity and energy; they attend to the culture of their organization--its structure, processes, climate, values, and shared assumptions. They foster trust in the organization by practicing what they preach and by modeling realistic self-regard and growth.

The school principal exercises considerable influence over the school learning climate. This individual must be regarded as the most important change agent in promoting student achievement through increased effectiveness of the school learning climate. The management style, demeanor, thoroughness, professionalism, and attitude will be reflected in the school learning climate. The role of the "learning climate leader" cannot be delegated. The role must be accepted and constantly refined. As the principal goes, so goes the school.

In conclusion, schools and classrooms that have applied and practiced effective learning climate research and theory have demonstrated success at increasing student achievement. In comparing the socioeconomic status and race of these schools, a wide cross-section and background is found. This demonstrates that the factors previously presented will positively effect students from a wide variety of backgrounds.

A Chicago elementary teacher, Marva Collins, was portrayed on CBS's **60 Minutes (1979)**. A public elementary school teacher for 10 years, Ms. Collins by her own admission had failed in her attempt to teach black children. So she quit, only to open her own thirty-five pupil school in her house. The **60 Minutes** presentation shows her as the supremely successful teacher in her new setting, and it is interesting to note her new teaching conditions. First, the children were sent by parents who chose her school, and most paid extra for the privilege.

Second, the students knew they could and would be expelled if their behavior did not match the teacher's standards or expectations. Third, Ms. Collins was a bear for time on task, or what might be called academic learning time. Fourth, she held very high expectations for all students.

In December of 1979, Lake Washington School District #414 studied the job functions of a representative sample of principals. Consultants were hired to meet with principals and central office staff to discuss the role of school administrators in theory and research. Investigations revealed school administrators needed leadership and management skills in 1) planning in priority setting with the staff; 2) directing the establishment of goals and objectives, and for monitoring and calculating progress towards goals; 3) organizing the system to carry out plans; 4) human effectiveness--relating in positive, motivating way to the people who must carry out goals, and raise morale and communicate high expectations; and 5) controlling and monitoring the skills necessary for the accomplishment of school goals. The results were elementary test scores improving over 20 percentile points; administrators reporting dramatic improvement in teachers' instructional and classroom management skills; and the public approving school levies with a very high "pass" rate.

Although not very common nor highly advisable, one school has focused on one factor of effective high-achieving schools. At Apollo High School in Simi Valley, California, the concept of achievement through self-esteem is working. Apollo provides an alternative program for 400 at-risk students--students who have not succeeded in a traditional high school. The goal of Apollo High School is to increase students' self-esteem, in the belief that self-esteem **produces**

achievement. The results are astonishing. After the students enter Apollo, an average of 78 percent improve their attendance; drug use drops from 80 percent to 20 percent; students on criminal probation drop from 30 percent to 5 percent; and 86 percent graduate from high school.

Mt. Diablo, California, Unified School District launched a district-wide climate improvement project. Schools which met their climate improvement objectives reported improved achievement and higher morale. Emphasis in the projects was placed on improved planning and decision-making processes and improved instruction.

At Eisenhower Middle School in Carlsbad, New Mexico, five major climate improvement projects were organized. Three of the projects provided for extensive student involvement and leadership. The other two, strengthening the teacher-adviser program and launching an inter-disciplinary social studies-language arts program, were designed by the faculty. The results, after one year: 1) The number of students on the honor roll increased by 142%; 2) Truancies and absenteeism decreased; 3) The percentage of students receiving failing grades was reduced (10% in grade six to 3% in grade seven); 4) Significant academic gains for pupils in the interdisciplinary course were documented. Eisenhower's principal, Les Earwood reported that, though many areas need immediate attention, the data indicate that positive climate affects academic growth and social behavior of students.

One of the first schools to implement the climate improvement process was Cleveland High School in Seattle. Students and staff were involved in over a dozen improvement projects. The results were spectacular. Fighting among students

practically stopped; absenteeism and class-cutting declined significantly; and requests for transfer to other schools declined. Athletic teams won more games. The percentage of graduates entering college increased; and achievement, as measured by the school's testing program, increased.

At Carmody Junior High School in Denver, attendance and achievement in basic skills have improved dramatically. Carmody operates an extensive inservice program. Each inservice program focuses on one teaching skill. Teachers are observed by the principal, who assists them in applying the skill to the classroom. Emphasis is on positive reinforcement techniques for motivating students.

At Ranum High School, also in Denver, a very simple but effective student recognition program has been established, providing verbal and written reinforcement of students' positive efforts and achievements. Ranum's administrators have received numerous positive responses from students and parents, and feel that it is one of the most effective school-wide programs ever attempted, as student achievement has increased.

Chapter Three

Procedures of the Study

The compilation of materials for this project has been ongoing for over three years. In the first class taken in this Master's program, The Principalship, the author was asked to report on a topic of interest. School climate was chosen because it is firmly believed that the climate of a school makes a difference in the manner in which students achieve. In the Education Research class, a more specific definition of school climate was sought. Since school climate, as it affects student achievement was the intended focus, the subject was narrowed to school learning climate.

The research materials, articles, books, and reviews is vast and varied. After reading Creating Effective Schools: An Inservice Program for Enhancing School Learning by Brookover (et al., 1982), extensive use was made to many of the bibliographical references found in the book. The references to Good (1978), Moos (1979), Coleman (1966), Jencks (1972), Lezotte (1980), Bloom (1976, 1981), and Brookover (1973, 1975, 1979, 1982) were originally identified in this book. In reading through those books, more reference material was found. These books proved not only to be excellent reading, but also provided other excellent bibliographical and reference sources.

Likewise, Gorton's book, School Administration and Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities, was immensely useful in writing the the section on morale, motivation, and job satisfaction. He, too, listed many references that proved to be very helpful.

The CADRE publication School Climate: Evaluation & Implementation was referred to frequently. The different authors quoted from this book are Grahlman, Howard, Howell, Pino, and Smith. There is no publication date on this book, but in checking with a variety of sources, the best guess is 1978.

Another book referred to in which the various authors were quoted extensively is Leadership: Examining the Elusive. This is the ASCD 1987 annual yearbook. Much of the information concerning "vision" came from this source.

In addition to these publication, two theses were gleaned for information. McCarthy (1986) entitled his dissertation "The Relationship Among Trust, Job Satisfaction, and Teacher Perceptions of Principal Effectiveness". Much of the information on trust and job satisfaction, comes from this excellent paper. Also, several authors cited in this project were originally cited in McCarthy's paper (Gibb, Argyris, and Ouchi).

The other dissertation referred to Thomas Batsis' Characteristics of Excellent Principals. Some of the information appearing in the subsection entitled "Leadership of the School" was obtained from this paper.

Extensive ERIC searches yielded more good information. The searches discovered work by Glasheen (1977), Keefe (1985), Kelley (1980), Persell (1982), Ross (1981), Smyth (1980), Brookover (1977), Cawelti (1980), and Cotton (1980). By far and away the best source in this search was a research paper completed for the Pennsylvania Department of Education entitled School Climate Improvement: A Model for Effective Change. In this work, Richard Dumaresq and Ross Blust reported on the research findings of others and prepared a working

model for climate change in a school. Again, reference sources that these authors identified were used in the compilation of this project.

The articles by Phi Delta Kappa, usually found in The Kappan, were a good source of information. Articles by Bloom (1977, 1980), Brophy (1982), Rutherford (1985), and Wynne (1981) were helpful.

Articles appearing in Educational Leadership were utilized. Articles found in this publication and referred to were written by Greene (1989), Austin (1979), Dwyer (1984) Mitchell (1985), Sergiovanni (1984), and Edmonds (1979, 1982).

Many research projects and special reports were found. One of the best is entitled "The Journalism Fellows Report: What Makes an Effective School?," edited by Brundage. This report was published by George Washington University and contains many short articles. References made to Benjamin, Pope and Brundage are from this report.

Finally, this project includes information on the relationship between self-concept and student achievement. The search for information was heavily rewarded. Extensive reference was made to books and articles by Bloom (1976), Canfield and Wells (1976), Brookover (1965), Farls (1967), Farquhar (1968), Greene (1989), Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), Purkey (1970), Williams and Cole (1968), and Silvernail (1981).

Along with the books and publications mentioned, articles were also found in the following publications and journals:

Harvard Education Review (Madaus, 1979)

Sociology of Education (McDill et al., 1967)

California Journal of Education Research (Fink, 1973)

Dissertations Abstracts International (Farls, 1967)
Education & Urban Society (Deal, 1985; Tornatzky, 1980)
Encyclopedia of Ed. Research (Chen, 1978; Gorton, 1982)
NAASP Bulletins (Hallinger, 1983; Keefe, 1987; & Wilson, 1981)
Catalyst (Hersh, 1982)
The Reading Teacher (Hoover, 1978)
Education (Miller, 1976)
Review of Education Research (Finn, 1972)
Association for Youth Development (Howard, 1982)
Education R & D (Sagalnik, 1980)
Journal for Teacher Education (Good, 1979)
Personnel & Guidance Journal (Shaw, 1963; Williams, 1968)
Principal (Pintero, 1982)

In reading and scanning through these materials, the different factors and characteristics identified as being associated with student achievement were tracked. While these authors and researchers identified many factors, only those in which the school could directly affect were noted. For example, many reported on the close association between academic achievement and family background. Since the school cannot change the design, shape and structure of the families of the students, it was not tracked. However, it became apparent through this "tracking" that a consensus emerged on the characteristics. These factors, then, were grouped into the three general categories: ideology, organization, and leadership.

Chapter Four

Guidelines for Implementation

For this project study, a set of implementation guidelines is proposed for those who desire to make their school learning climates more effective in producing higher student achievement. These guidelines for implementation of school climate activities were proposed by Eugene R. Howard in 1978, and have been modified for school learning climate improvement programs.

How does a school change in order to improve the learning climate? The answer, at first, seems simple. A school improves by having schoolwide instructional goals, emphasizing teaching and learning, that teachers and administrators work together to accomplish. This would be a great start, but there is much more involved in changing the learning climate of the school.

Glickman and Pajak (1987) studied three improving school districts (as measured by scores on criterion-referenced achievement tests). District A took a "top-down" approach; decisions about curricula, time allocations, and lesson planning emanated from the central office and were directed to teachers via their principals. District B took a "democracy in action" approach, enjoining representative groups of teachers from each school to assess the needs of students in the district and to decide which changes should be made. The central office helped the process along by coordinating meeting schedules, expediting clerical tasks, and establishing deadlines. District C took a decentralized "top-down/bottom up" approach. The central office made clear the three goals of school improvement--higher achievement, better school climate, and more

community involvement--and asked each school to establish its own objectives and strategies. The central office then provided each school with appropriate resources to help it reach its goals.

This is exciting to note, as there is no "packaged" program or process to simply "take out of the box" and use. All three improving school districts found different ways in which to implement change. No single answer to the question of how to change was found, but several alternative approaches aimed at the same instructional outcomes were found. Other outcomes differed, including teachers' long-term acceptance of the changes, their feelings of pressure and stress, and the efficiency with which they used their time. But from the study, no one correct approach to change could be recommended.

The various schools that have been studied and researched have shown us that, truly, there is no one correct approach to become an effective school. All schools have different emphases, curricula, and agendas as characterized by different school leaders, teachers, and student bodies.

Preliminary Concerns. To list a basic guideline, then, is to oversimplify the task of changing a school's learning climate. School leaders who unequivocally seek to establish a positive effective learning climate should first, then, be aware of some pitfalls.

1. Expect some resistance. Sadly, many veteran teachers, particularly in hardpressed underachieving schools, have been unable to acquire and/or maintain a positive attitude to new programs that are designed to improve the educational organization. Many settle into the routine feeling of powerlessness, often mistrusting or rejecting sincere efforts to resolve longtime concerns. The

statement, "But we've always done it this way " may become common. Suspicion in many may arise if an attempt is made to involve them in participatory management. Some may feel that "they're trying to get more work out of us." To counteract this, one must understand that rebuilding trust takes time and perseverance. "Quick fixes" are unlikely. Establishment of a climate conducive to learning requires long-range outlooks stretching over years.

2. Establishment of an effective learning climate will occur through a series of small steps. The first step will not be enough to show an increase in student achievement. All parties concerned should continually be aware that there will be many steps involved in the process, and it is unrealistic to expect or assume that one or two steps in this process "should be enough."

3. Cooperation is required of all parties. Teachers, students, administrators, parents and other staff members need to participate in all planning and implementation activities and to share the responsibility for success or failure. When all parties convene to plan and implement, it is important that everyone is treated as equals and that opinions of students and parents are just as valuable as those of teachers and administrators.

Re-motivating the staff to participate in this change process is a key to its success; and may be a great challenge to an administrator. Remaining positive and promoting participation can be burdensome; frustration is inevitable. One should remember, though, that small improvements and small achievements at everyday tasks can make meaningful differences in morale and performance.

If beneficial change of the learning climate of the school is to occur, the following points should be stressed.

1. The direction of the change and the goals to be implemented should receive input from the individuals to be affected by the change. This may be a difficult point to get across, but a change in the learning climate will affect teachers and students more than anyone else. Because they are impacted more, they should be afforded the increased opportunity to participate and make decisions in this change process. If initiation of change comes from the outside, teachers should be consulted when making major changes. Their insights into activities within the classroom should not be ignored. With their involvement in the planning stages, the success of implementation is greatly enhanced. Individuals are more willing to participate in a change process when they recognize that their concerns have been addressed. Ownership is developed through involvement, and the greater the ownership the greater the desire for success. Teachers need not be looked to for the development of the new ideas, but teachers need to have an active role in providing input during the developmental stages of an innovation.

2. Those who will be directly affected by the change should be involved in the decisions made concerning implementation. Once the direction of changes has been determined and the goals identified, the process of implementation should involve opportunities for individuals to have input into the process. This should include the community serviced by the school, the student body, as well as other school personnel. It should be recognized that each school possesses a unique structure and culture, and this uniqueness must be addressed at the local level.

3. Adequate training should accompany the change procedure. Change does not occur simply because it is decreed. Changing the school learning climate

in order to produce high-achieving students will not occur because it is mandated. Change requires a training period involving suitable learning experiences. Too often, change agents desire the change to occur immediately, neglecting the time perspective from the view of the targets of change. The training period provides the opportunity for adjustment to new goals and expectations.

4. A support system should be developed. Involvement in change can be viewed as risk taking. This is not always a comfortable position, and requires a support system to allay anxiety. The support system should include justification for the change to counter-balance any restraining forces still present in the change target. Individuals need assurance that the change is beneficial and that they are highly regarded for their efforts. A strong, continuous support system will prevent the development of a negative situation.

5. Feedback should be provided. Knowledge of results, like publicizing the results of the first achievement tests, is a critical key to this endeavor. Teachers who are innovating change in the learning climate need information regarding their performance as seen through their students' performance. Teachers need regular feedback concerning their successes and consistent information to help them improve their weak areas. This feedback could also include peer evaluations, where fellow teachers come in to observe. As this would not be an official district evaluation, the observation would allow for a non-threatening critique.

6. An evaluation by all involved should be conducted. To determine whether the change has met pre-determined goals, an evaluation should be initiated. There is a continuous need to monitor new programs and practices, to spot problems and needed adjustments, then to make corrections when necessary.

The research on school learning climate is conclusive: People who feel good about themselves and what they do, more than any other factor, make a difference in creating and sustaining a positive learning climate. Being positive is contagious, and it is a key. If you want to build a positive learning climate, you must be a positive person.

The following set of guidelines, then, is proposed to school leaders who seek change in the learning climate of the school. The strategy used to launch school learning climate improvement projects will depend in each school on a variety of factors, such as the degree of readiness of the staff, the administrative style of the principal, the leadership potential of the student body leaders, the interest of the parents and the community, and the amount of support from the district office. Once these preliminary concerns have been attended to, then the school leaders should proceed with these steps.

Organization of the Improvement Team. A common first step in undertaking a school learning climate improvement program is the formation of a planning and coordinating team. This is not an advisory group, but an independent decision-making group. It is a working group which, along with the principal, will plan, coordinate and implement learning climate improvement activities in the school.

This team should be composed of staff members, parents and students who are convinced that the school learning climate should be changed; that these changes will affect student achievement positively; who thrive on participation on such a team; who have unique skills and talents to contribute; and who are willing to work to make the school a better place. Ideally, the staff members should be

representative of the different curriculum areas of the school; and the parents and students representative of the different grade levels of the school.

Prior to the first meeting, the principal should prepare a specific written charge statement informing the team what it is expected to accomplish . This charge statement should detail what the goals and expectations are of the team. Each of the aforementioned features of a positive school learning climate should be incorporated into this charge statement that describes their basic concepts.

At the first meeting, an intervention strategy should be developed in which each of the features of a positive learning climate would be presented to the staff. The relationship of each of these features to student achievement would then be described. The next step is for the team to translate the charge statement into a work plan. This is done by assigning responsibility for each activity defined in the charge statement to one team member. That team member proceeds, then, with suggestions and assistance of others on the team, to plan specific activities related to one portion of the charge. It should be understood that this charge statement can be modified by the team at any time as the work of the team progresses. It is important that each member of the team be responsible for a significant task, that each individual receive support from other team members, and that all team members plan their work.

Team Information Gathering. The third step will be for the team to gather information regarding the present status of the learning climate of the school and information regarding promising learning climate projects in other schools. Conducting a formal assessment using the Individualized Classroom Environment Questionnaire, developed by the C. F. Kettering Foundation is one way to measure

the degree of importance (what should be) and the level of attainment (what is). This questionnaire seeks responses from students, parents, community residents, school board members, teachers, certificated personnel, aides, administrators and supervisors, and classified employees.

The questionnaire elicits responses in four different areas: 1) General climate factors, such as trust, respect, input, cohesiveness; 2) Program determinants, such as learning, individualization, curriculum; 3) Process determinants, such as problem solving, school goals, communications, decision-making; and 4) Material determinants, such as resources, logistics, and facility. It is relatively easy to score and may pinpoint different areas of a schools' learning climate that needs to change.

Conducting a formal assessment is, however, only one way to obtain information about the learning climate of the school. Two additional procedures can also be used.

1. Conduct a series of meetings with staff, parents and students to identify and prioritize the major learning climate problems in your school. Some of the problems may not involve learning climate, but others will. The team can then plan improvement projects which relate to the problems that were identified.

2. Conduct a "mini-audit" of activities already under way in the school which are affecting the learning climate positively. Almost every school will have a variety of such activities. This "mini-audit" gives the team a picture of what is already happening and helps them visualize what may need to occur building-wide to increase achievement.

At this point, the team should make decisions regarding what, specifically, should be done to improve the school's learning climate. It then decides who should do it.

Analysis of Information. It may be that once the team collates all available information and identifies what is happening in the school already, it decides not to launch any new projects. It may make more sense to strengthen several existing programs rather than develop new ones.

The team may also decide at this point to develop one or more projects. For each project identified the team organizes a task force to assume responsibility for implementation. The membership on the task force is determined by the nature of the task. The team should make every effort to place on each task force individuals with the talent which will be needed to make the project work. Some task forces may be composed primarily of students; others of parents; others of staff members. Membership on the task force should be voluntary.

Each task force should be given a charge statement from the team that is similar to the charge statement given to the team. Once the task force receives a charge, it should plan its work. Each task force elects a chairperson who submits a plan of work to the learning climate team for approval. These work plans are essential as these task forces, by assuming responsibility for planning their work, earn the autonomy needed in order to do its work without red tape or unwanted interference.

Managing the Plan. Management of the team's plan and of each task force's plan is effective to the extent that each plan defines 1) What is to be done; 2) Who

is to do it; and 3) By when? If these three elements of the work plan are missing, the manager has nothing to manage and, as a result, nothing happens.

Typically the principal should serve as the manager of the learning climate improvement team's plan. The task of this manager includes: 1) Monitoring the progress of each part of the team's action plan and the plan of work for each task force; 2) Providing direct support and assistance to each person responsible for a task; 3) Serving as an organizational and planning specialist to each team member; and 4) Conducting team meetings in such a way that everyone finds out what everyone else is doing and that everyone assumes responsibility for tasks in accordance with his or her ability and interest.

Everyone on the team should realize that the action plans are flexible. Activities can and should be added, modified and deleted while implementation is under way. Target dates can be changed and tasks can be assigned to additional people as may be required.

Activity Implementation. Implementing change in a school is risky. Principals who push too fast can quickly become ex-principals. In most schools, there are some faculty members who tend to criticize any new project. The team members and school leaders should be recognize this and realize that no matter how great the program, there will always be someone to chastise it. Once learning climate improvement activities are firmly established in a school, though, opposition to the program will gradually disappear. During the first year, however, when only a few people may be involved and mistakes are going to be made, the whole program is vulnerable.

It is important, then, that during the first two years of improvement activity the faculty, parents, and students be well-informed of what the program is, why it is being implemented, and how the plans are progressing.

Pacing the Change. One common mistake made by most improvement committees is that, full of enthusiasm, they proceed too quickly with change. The learning climate improvement team should consider the first year a successful one if it completes an assessment, makes several visits to successful projects, and organizes a task force concerned with a high-priority problem. During the second year the number of task forces might be expanded to 3 and during the third year to 5 or 6.

The overall impact of the work of the team and task forces will usually be felt by the end of the second year. By that time the achievement of the students in general should be noticeably improved. By the end of the third year, a substantial increase in achievement should be in evidence and students' attitudes toward learning should be improved.

The organizational pattern of the learning climate team provides for a high degree of faculty, parent and student involvement. As this involvement increases, morale improves. A school with a positive, effective learning climate is not a sloppy school. It is not a place where everyone does his or her own thing. Rather it is a place where large numbers of people have a meaningful roles. It is a place where teaching and learning happen. Schools are infinitely improvable. Given the encouragement, people will seize the opportunity to shape the institutions which, in turn, shape them. It is a satisfying experience for students, parents, and staff

to have a part in making the school a better place to learn; and a satisfying experience will positively affect morale and productivity.

School learning climate has been defined and described, and its relationship to student achievement noted. Once the process and framework have been established for implementing change, it is, now, important to focus on those learning climate factors which need changing.

Chapter Five

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The task of the schools is to enable children to use their abilities and efforts in the most efficient and effective manner. The common thread of meaning in all that research has disclosed tells us that academically effective schools are "merely" schools organized on behalf of consistent and undeviating pursuit of learning. Effective schools which annually graduate high-achieving students have principals, teachers, parents and students who believe in the purpose, justification and methods of schooling. Their common energies are spent on teaching and learning in a systematic fashion. They are serious about the proposition that all children can and shall learn in schools. No extra special treatment, no voodoo magic, and no "dog and pony" show, just the provision of the necessary conditions for learning.

The nature of the learning climate that characterizes a school is affected by many factors, but the staff of the school--principal, teachers, aides, and other staff personnel--is the major determinant of the learning climate. The norms, beliefs, philosophies, expectations, organization, instructional practices, and leadership that characterize a school vary greatly from school to school. The staff members of a school are the primary change agents in developing the learning climate which defines the appropriate behavior for themselves and their students. The teachers and the principal in a school, not the district administration or others outside the building, determine the nature of the school learning environment.

Because of this fact, school learning climate and achievement levels in a school can change. What is created by the staff can be changed by the staff. Change does not come easily. The principal and key staff members must assume the burden of initiating the process. This will require a commitment on their part to produce high levels of student achievement and to make a collective effort to develop attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that characterize effective, high-achieving schools.

In recent decades the primary goal of teaching students basic communication, computation, cognitive skills, and knowledge has been partially displaced by other efforts. To a great extent this shifting of goals rests on the assumption that it would facilitate the achievement of the primary goal. For example, the emphasis on humanistic values and differentiated, individualized programs was intended to facilitate the achievement of basic cognitive skills and knowledge through developing personal and social skills. But these other objectives, no matter how desirable, result in reduced attention to academic goals and may lower achievement.

Recommendation #1. A primary task in the development of a high-achieving, effective school, then, is the clear identification and specification of the instructional goals and objectives for all students. Other behaviors may be identified as being essential, but the primary goal of basic skill achievement and mastery must not be displaced. Also, educators must expect that all students can achieve the goals and objectives of the school. Therefore, clear and concise goals and objectives must be developed, communicated, and implemented; and the expectation level of educators must be high.

Recommendation #2. The ways in which students are grouped and the associated academic expectations for each group have a great influence on student achievement. Grouping by ability, or tracking, with different goals and objectives for each ability group, has proven to have a negative effect on overall student achievement. However, heterogeneous grouping with high expectations for learning common objectives has a positive effect on student achievement. Therefore, grouping practices which have a limiting or inhibiting effect on students' basic skills learning should be reexamined and replaced with more appropriate and productive approaches.

Recommendation #3. If the students in school are not already achieving at high levels, the accomplishment of that goal will involve some changes in the school's operation. The process of creating a positive, effective school learning climate cannot be stated as a simple formula. However, studies of effective, high-achieving schools indicate that the principals can be the change agents in modifying the nature of the school and its effectiveness in bringing students to high levels of achievement. It is certainly not likely that a school will have high achieving students if the principal and other leaders in the school do not openly seek to achieve that goal. Therefore, it is essential that the principal provide strong leadership and support to bring about needed changes.

Recommendation #4. The effectiveness of the school can be determined only by assessing the degree to which the academic goals and objectives are achieved. Ongoing assessment is a common characteristic of exemplary schools. Administrators must know their state achievement test scores, and where they fall in comparison; their graduates' grade point averages in colleges compared to the

average GPA's of other students; SAT scores of their seniors who have earned a 3.0 or better GPA in comparison of state averages; how much growth in terms of months gained reflected in basic skills classes on pre-and post-tests; and attendance and truancy rates. Ongoing school achievement and diagnostic data should be used by teachers and principals to develop instructional strategies in the classroom, particularly in regard to programs designed for students who are low achievers.

In addition, well-conceived surveys of staff and student morale or attitudes, administered annually, provide valuable information. School districts should use graduate follow-up studies to help assess the effectiveness of school programs.

Recommendation #5. Finally, we must strive for a natural, human, democratic relationship in the classroom. All staff members should be sensitive to the needs and feelings of each student and understand the role that self-concept plays in student achievement. The student who has had a good deal of success in the past will be likely to risk success again and again; his self-concept can afford it. A student predominated by failures will be reluctant to risk failure again. His depleted self-concept cannot afford it. Similar to someone living on a limited income, he will shop cautiously and look for bargains. It is important, then, that we provide opportunities for success in even the smallest of learning steps, for it is in the accumulation of small successes that larger ones occur. Like a puzzle, every piece placed correctly represents success at finding that correct location, while completing the whole puzzle represents the larger, total success.

Summary and Conclusion

There is no shortage of good ideas about ways to increase student achievement in our schools, any more than there is a shortage of good teachers, capable students, and effective principals. Many school learning climate programs have been implemented and have positively effected student achievement. Many more are being designed. The ultimate test of any school learning climate program design should be its ability to cause an annual increase in student achievement.

Our task is to learn to use what is known to create powerful schooling that is appropriate for students in today's world. It should be recognized that variations do exist in the extent and type of research in which the characteristics of effective school learning climates are based. For instance, there is extensive research which states that the beliefs and expectations concerning students' ability to learn which teachers hold for students are highly related to student achievement. Similarly, there is an extensive body of research to support the conclusion that student achievement is highly related to the amount of "academically engaged time" devoted to learning. This project on effective school learning climate, then, is not an embellishment of one or two research reports. It reflects the research findings and published reports of many authors and researchers because it is firmly believed that many characteristics form an effective, high-achieving school.

Many of the schools researched by the various authors have achieved remarkable turn-arounds. Most of these schools have had at one time poor reputations, negative learning environments, and either mediocre or low student achievement. What stands out most in all of these studies is the fact that the dramatic "turn-around" started with a change in expectations. This "first step" was

not directed toward teachers in an effort to get them to "teach better;" it was not initiated with curriculum revision and changes; but instead it started with changing the attitudes of the teachers toward the students. A climate that was more conducive to learning was developed by first changing the teachers' attitudes.

Effective schools, those in which students achieve at high levels, do exist. School learning climate and student achievement levels in a school can change. Simple strategies and techniques can be implemented to dramatically, yet positively effect student achievement. Schools and classrooms can be altered and changed to positively effect student achievement. Schools do make a difference! It should be noted that all strategies, techniques, or alterations in the school learning climate designed to improve student achievement will not make any difference until school personnel develop and demonstrate a sense of accountability and responsibility for what happens in the classroom. Until we in education internally grasp what it is we are trying to accomplish; until we in education develop and maintain high academic standards for all to strive for, the best laid plans designed to help students achieve will be worth nothing. Our goal must be more than just accomplishing a graduation rate of 90%. Our goal must be to graduate more than 90% with skills and knowledge necessary to survive and succeed in the 21st century.

Winston Churchill once said, "We shape our buildings and thereafter, the buildings shape us." We need to reproduce the successes that other schools are achieving and reshape our buildings, not just the brick and mortar, but the arrangements, strategies, and feelings inside. If we do this at all levels of the building's operation, we can in one small, but important way begin to reshape our larger dream and destiny.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, R. I. and Soder, R. "Principal Leadership and Student Achievement",
Educational Leadership, 44, 6.
- Argyris, Chris (1964). Integrating the Individual and the Organization.
New York: Wiley.
- Austin, Gilbert R (1979). "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness."
Educational Leadership, vol. 37.
- Batsis, Thomas M. (1987, April 20-23). "Characteristics of Excellent Principals."
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Catholic Education
Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC ED 285 265)
- Benjamin, R. (1979). "Successful Schools: The Formula Begins with
Responsibility." The Journalism Research Fellows Report: What Makes an
Effective School? (Ed.) by D. Brundage. Washington, D. C.: Institute for
Educational Leadership. George Washington University.
- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge.
New York: Harper & Row.
- Bloom, Benjamin S. (1976). Human Characteristics and School Learning.
New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bloom, Benjamin S. (1977). "Affective Outcomes of Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan,
59.
- Bloom, Benjamin S. (1980, February). "The New Direction in Educational
Research: Alterable Variables." The Kappan.

- Bloom, B. S. (1981). All Our Children Learning: A Primer for Parents, Teachers, and other Educators. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W. (1980). The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brookover, W. B. (1965). "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement II: Improving Academic Achievement Through Students' Self-Concept Enhancement." U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1636. East Lansing, MI: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University.
- Brookover, W. B., Gigliotti, R. J., Henderson, R. P., and Schnieder, J. M. (1973). Elementary School Social Environments and Achievement. East Lansing, MI: College of Urban Development, Michigan State University.
- Brookover, W., and Schneider, J. (1975). "Academic Environs and Elementary School Achievement." Journal of Research and Development in Education, vol. 9.
- Brookover, W. and Lezotte, L. W. (1977). Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. East Lansing: Institute For Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. (ERIC ED 181 005)
- Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., and Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference. Brooklyn: J. F. Bergin, Co.
- Brookover, W., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., and Tornatzky, L. (1982). Creating Effective Schools: An

Inservice Program for Enhancing School Learning Climate and Achievement.

Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.

Brophy, Jere F. (1982, April). "Successful Teaching Strategies for the Inner-City Child." Phi Delta Kappan.

Brundage, D.(Ed.) (1980). The Journalism Research Fellows Report: What Makes an Effective School?. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University.

CBS (Producer) (1979). MARVA. From 60 Minutes.

New York: Carousal Films, Inc.

Canfield, J., and Wells, H. C. (1976). One Hundred Ways to Enhance Self-Concept in the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers and Parents.

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cawelti, Gordon, (1980, January). "Effective Instructional Leadership Produces Greater Learning," Thrust for Educational Leadership, vol. 9, no. 3.

(ERIC EJ 217 730)

Champlin, John (1987). "Leadership: A Change Agent's View." Leadership: Examining the Elusive, (Eds.) by L. Sheive and M. Schoenheit. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1987 Yearbook.

Chapman, David W. and Malcolm A. Lowther (1981). "Teachers' Satisfaction With Teaching." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Chen, Michael, and Fresko, Barbara (1978, February). "The Interaction Of School Environment and Student Traits." Educational Research, vol. 20, no. 2.

- Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., and York, R. (1966). Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Cotton, K. and Savard, W. G. (1980, December 12). The Principal as Instructional Leader. Research on School Effectiveness Project: Topic Summary Report. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
(ERIC ED 214 702)
- Deal, T. E., and Kennedy, A. (1982). Corporate Cultures. Reading, Mass.: Jossey-Bass.
- Deal, T. E. (1985, February). "National Commissions: Blueprints for Remodeling," Education and Urban Society, vol. 17.
- Deal, T. E. (1987). "The Culture of Schools." Leadership: Examining the Elusive, (Eds.) by L. Sheive and M. Schoenheit. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1987 Yearbook.
- Dumaresq, Richard and Blust, Ross (1981, July). School Climate Improvement: A Model For Effective Change. Pennsylvania Department of Education.
(ERIC ED 209 404)
- Dwyer, D. C. (1984, February). "The Search for Instructional Leadership: Routines and Subtleties in the Principal's Role." Educational Leadership, vol. 41.
- Edmonds, Ronald (1979, October). "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership.
- Edmonds, Ronald (1982, December). "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership, vol. 40, no. 3.

- Farls, R. J. (1967). "High and Low Achievement of Intellectually Average Intermediate Grade Students Related to the Self-Concept and Social Approval." Dissertations Abstracts International, vol. 28.
- Farquhar, W. W. (1968). "A Comprehensive Study of the Motivational Factors Underlying Achievement of Eleventh-Grade High School Students." U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 846. East Lansing, MI: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University.
- Fink, M. B. (1973). "Self-Concept as It Relates to Academic Achievement." California Journal of Educational Research, vol. 66.
- Finn, J. D. (1972). "Expectations and the Educational Environment." Review of Educational Research, vol. 42, n. 3.
- First National City Bank (1969). Public Education in New York City. New York City: First National City Bank.
- Fullan, Michael (1982). The Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Gibb, D. (1978). Trust: A New View of Personal and Organizational Development, 1st ed., Los Angeles: Guild of Tutors Press.
- Glasheen, J. D., Hadley, D. W., and Schneider, J. M. (1977, April). "Student Adaptation to High School Social Groupings and Normative Environments." Paper presented to American Educational Research Association. (ERIC ED 143 929)
- Glickman, Carl. D., and Pajak, Edward F. (1987, March). "Concepts of Change in Improving School Districts." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

- Good, T. L. (1979). "Teacher Effectiveness in the Elementary School: What We Know About It Now." Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 30.
- Good, T. L., and Brophy, J. E. (1974). Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.
- Good, T., and Brophy, J. (1978). Educational Psychology: A Realistic Approach. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1978.
- Goodlad, John I. (1984). A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Gorton, Richard A. (1982). "School Personnel Policy." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Harold E. Mitzel. New York: MacMillan Company.
- Gorton, Richard A. (1983). School Administration and Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Grahlman, Bill (1978). "School and Self Assessment." School Climate: Evaluation and Implementation, a CADRE publication, (Ed.) by Bruce Howell and Bill Grahlman.
- Green, T. F. (1987). "The Conscience of Leadership." Leadership: Examining the Elusive, (Eds.) by L. Sheive and M. Schoenheit. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1987 Yearbook.
- Greene, B., and Uroff, S. (1989, February). "Apollo High School: Achievement Through Self-Esteem." Educational Leadership, vol. 46, no. 5.
- Gross, Neal and Herriott, Robert E. (1965). Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Guild, Pat Burke (1987). "How Leader's Minds Work." Leadership: Examining the Elusive, (Eds.) by L. Sheive and M. Schoenheit. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1987 Yearbook.
- Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., Weil, M., Mesa, R., and Mitman, A. (1983, May). "Identifying the Specific Practices, Behaviors For Principals." NASSP Bulletin.
- Hersh, Richard H. (1982, Fall). "What Makes Schools, Teachers More Effective." Catalyst.
- Herzberg, Frederick (1959). The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Holt, John (1964). How Children Fail. New York: Pitman, 1964.
- Hoover, M. R. (1978). "Characteristics of Black Schools at Grade Level: A Description." The Reading Teacher, vol. 31.
- Howard, Eugene R. (1978). "Implementing School Climate Activities." School Climate: Evaluation and Implementation, a CADRE publication, (Eds.) by Bruce Howell and Bill Grahman.
- Howard, Eugene R. (1982, November/December). "Involving Students in School Climate Improvement." Association for Youth Development.
- Howell, Bruce (1978). "Essence of School Climate." School Climate: Evaluation and Implementation. A CADRE publication, (Eds.) by Bruce Howell and Bill Grahman.
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M., Cohen, D. Gintis, H., Heyns, B., and Michelson, S. (1972). Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

- Joyce, B., Hersh, R. and McKibbin, M. (1983). The Structure of School Improvement. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Keefe, J. W. (1985, November). "School Climate: Clear Definitions and a Model for a Larger Setting." NASSP Bulletin, vol. 69, no. 484.
(ERIC EJ 326 631)
- Keefe, J. W. (1987). Learning Style Theory and Practice. Reston, VA: NASSP.
- Kelley, E. A. (1980). Improving School Climate: Leadership Techniques for Principals. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary Schools Principals. (ERIC ED 202 120)
- Kozol, Jonathan (1967). Death At An Early Age. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lezotte, L. W., Hathaway, D. V., Miller, S. K., Passalacqua, J., and Brookover, W. B. (1980). School Learning Climate Student Achievement: A Social Systems Approach to Increased Student Learning. Tallahassee, FL: National Teacher Corps, Florida State University Foundation.
- Lipham, James M. (1964). "Leadership and Administration." Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, (Ed.) by Daniel Griffith, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Little, Judith W. (1981, January). "School Success and Staff Development: The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools." Report submitted to the National Institute of Education, Center for Action Research, Boulder, CO.

- Madaus, G. F., Kellaghan, T., Rakow, E. A., and King, D. J. (1979). "The Sensitivity of Measures of School Effectiveness." Harvard Educational Review, vol. 49, n. 2.
- McCarthy, T. W. (1986). The Relationships Among Trust, Job Satisfaction, and Teacher Perceptions of Principal Effectiveness. A dissertation submitted for Doctor of Education, Seattle University.
- McCurdy, Jack (1983). "The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools: Problems and Solutions." AASA Critical Issues Report. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- McDill, E. L., Meyers, E. D., Jr., and Rigsby, L. C. (1967). "Institutional Effects of the Academic Behavior of High School Student." Sociology of Education, vol. 40.
- Miller, L. G. and Swick, J. (1976, Spring). "Community Incentives for Teacher Excellence." Education.
- Mitchell, D. E. and Peters, M. J. (1985). "A Stronger Profession through Appropriate Teacher Incentives." Educational Leadership, 46, 3.
- Moos, R. H. (1979). Evaluating Educational Environments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Owens, R. G. (1987). "The Leadership of Educational Clans." Leadership: Examining the Elusive, (Eds). by L. Sheive and M. Schoenheit. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1987 Yearbook.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). Theory Z. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

- Patterson, J. L., Purkey, S. C., and Parker, J. V. (1986). Productive Schools Systems for a Nonrational World. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Persell, C. H. (1977). Education and Inequality: The Roots and Results of Stratification in America's Schools. New York: The Free Press.
- Persell, C. H. (1982, October 20-22). "Effective Principals: What Do We Know From Various Educational Literature." Prepared for the national conference on the principalship, convened by the National Institute of Education.
(ERIC ED 224 177)
- Peters, T. J., and Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper & Row.
- Phi Delta Kappan (1980). Why Do Some Schools Succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Pinero, Ursula C. (1982, March). "Wanted: Strong Instructional Leaders." Principal, v. 61, no. 4.
- Pino, Edward C. (1978). "Improving Classroom Climate." School Climate: Evaluation and Implementation. A CADRE publication, (Eds.) by Howell and Grahman.
- Pope, M. (1979). "Effective Leaders a Major Factor in Good Schools." The Journalism Research Fellows Report: What Makes an Effective School?, (Ed.) by D. Brundage. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University.

- Purkey, William W. (1970). Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher's Expectations and Pupil's Intellectual Development. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
- Ross, John A. (1981, October). "Strategies for Curriculum Leadership." The Australian Administrator, 2, 5. (ERIC ED 213 142)
- Rutherford, W. L. (1985). "School Principals as Effective Leaders." Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 67.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., with Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sagalnik, M. William (1980, Winter). "Researchers Team with Reporter to Identify Schools That Work." Educational R and D.
- Sashkin, Marshall and Huddle, Gene (1988, February). "Recruit Top Principals," The School Administrator, 45: 2.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. (1980). Educational Governance and Administration. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. (1984, February). "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling." Educational Leadership, vol. 41, no. 5.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. (1987). "The Theoretical Basis for Cultural Leadership," Leadership: Examining the Elusive, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1987 Yearbook, (Eds.) by Linda T. Sheive and Marian B. Schoenheit.

- Shaw, M. C., (with Alves, G. J.) (1963). "The Self-Concept of Bright Academic Underachievers: Continued." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol, 42.
- Sheive, L. and Schoenheit, M., (Eds.) (1987). Leadership: Examining the Elusive. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1987 Yearbook.
- Shoemaker, Joan (1982). "Effective Schools: Putting the Research to the Ultimate Test." Pre Post Press, (Ed.) by Judy G. Rule, vol. VII, no. 2, Mesa, AZ.
- Silvernail, David L. (1981). Developing Positive Student Self-Concept. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association.
- Smith, Blaine (1978). "Applying a School Climate Assessment Instrument." School Climate: Evaluation and Implementation. A CADRE Occasional Paper, (Eds.) by Bruce Howell and Bill Grahlman.
- Smyth, W. John (1980, February). "The Principal as an Educational Leader: To Be, or Not to Be?". The Australian Administrator, 1, 1.
(ERIC document ED 213 132)
- Tornatzky, L. G., Brookover, W. B., Hathaway, D. V., Miller, S. K., and Passalacqua, J. (1980, April). "Changing School Climate: A Case Study in Implementation." Urban Education, vol. 15, no. 1.
- Venezky, R. (1979). "Schools That Succeed Beyond Expectations in Teaching Reading." Technical Report #1. Newark, Del.: Department of Educational Studies.
- Wattenberg, W. W. and Clifford, C. (1962). "Relationship of Self Concept to Beginning Achievement in Reading," U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 377. Detroit: Wayne State University.

Weber, G. (1971). Inner City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Occasional Paper No. 18, Washington, D. C.: Council for Basic Education.

Williams, R. L. and Cole, S. (1968). "Self-Concept and School Adjustment." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 46.

Wilson, Kara Gae (1981, December). "Creating a Positive Organizational Climate." NASSP Newsleader.

Wynne, E. A. (1981). "Looking at Good Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, v. 62.